

Kirklees Draft Local Plan: Summary of comments and the Council's Responses

Sites rejected in the Draft Local Plan

This report provides the number of comments made (Support, Conditional Support, Object and No Comment) on the Draft Local Plan Consultation (November 2015 - February 2016) and summary of these comments and the Council's response, including proposed changes to the Local Plan. Comment references are listed - full details of each comment are available at www.kirklees.gov.uk/localplan

Summary of comments		Council Response			
Employment					
E1707	Land north of, 2 - 32, Exchange Street, Cleckheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		No comments were received on this site.			
		The council rejected this site on the grounds that the it would be designated as Urban Green Space. The Council does not therefore, propose any change.			
E1748	Land to the north of, Wakefield Road, Clayton West DLP_RSO1363, DLP_RSO2646	Support	Conditional Support	Object 2	No Comment
Site should be allocated for employment rather than E2333. Brownfield site should be used for employment allocation rather than green belt sites.		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
		The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
		This is an extensive area of green belt that maintains separation between villages and delineates the northern extent of Clayton West in this location. The land north of Park Mill industrial estate is elevated and prominent and there are few features on the ground to allow for settlement extension without significant land release. The location, extent and configuration of this site would result in a large, poorly related projection of built form onto an elevated and prominent hillside to the significant detriment to the openness of the green belt. Any benefit from the provision of a strong defendable green belt boundary is not outweighed by the perceived harm. A better alternative to accommodate the employment needs has been accepted in this location due to better access and site configuration. Exceptional circumstances cannot therefore be demonstrated.			
		The objection to the sites rejected status has been noted, however, the site falls within the green belt and is Greenfield in nature. Reasons for its rejection are set out in the conclusion above.			
E1823	Land to the north of, Barnsley Road, Shepley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
		The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
		Site is detached from the non-green belt settlement and would therefore not be a suitable site to be removed from the green belt. Unacceptable impacts on openness. Third party land required for access			
		No representations have been made on this site.			
E1824	Land to North east of , Bent Ley Industrial Estate, Bent Ley Road, Meltham	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from the draft Local Plan			
		The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
		Site access not achievable. The site is close to Hall Dike, a UK BAP Priority habitat. In green belt terms, site is contained by Hall Dike, the sewage works and the slope to the east. However, the elongated nature of the option would significantly project built form from the north, which while it borders the waste water treatment works has little relationship to it and would also introduce height and bulk into this open area to the detriment of openness. Employment option rejected.			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
E1825	Industrial premises, Westgate, Cleckheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		No comments were received on this site.			
		The council rejected this site on the grounds that the net development area falls below 0.4ha. The Council does not therefore, propose any change.			
E1826	Bent Ley Farm, Bent Ley Road, Meltham DLP_RSO3961	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Proposals comply with purposes of including land in the green belt		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
it is considered that very special circumstances exist such as to justify the release of this green belt land.		The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
The new green belt boundary would be clearly defined by physical and environmental constraints. The land owner supports development of the site. There is currently a demand for employment land in the Meltham area. Land to extend the Meltham Greenway across my clients' land would, in principle, be made available		This is an extensive area of green belt that separates Meltham from Honley and Netherton. The settlement edge in this location is delineated by the line of Hall Dike which presents a strong natural edge to the settlement. The landform and existing land uses present few opportunities for infilling or rounding off. This option would represent an elongated extension to the built form of Meltham, with limited relationship to the settlement edge. It is separated from the settlement by the course of Hall Dike which along with its associated wildlife habitats is best protected by its green belt designation. The option includes the line of the former railway and its embankment which could act as a buffer between the development and views from Huddersfield Road. Employment option rejected.			
		Comments in support of the allocation have been noted, however, reasons for objection in relation to the green belt are set out in the conclusion above.			
E1827	Land Between, Wakefield Road and Liley Lane, Grange Moor DLP_RSO799, DLP_RSO1300	Support	Conditional Support	Object 2	No Comment
Any scheme would look to accommodate and improve the football pitch facility.		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
Potential demand for more employment land in the Grange Moor area. Local firms looking to expand but there is a lack of available sites. The allocation of this site would help with supply of employment land across Kirklees. Adjacent employment sites so this land is not in isolation.		The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
		The proposed option does not provide defensible green belt boundaries. This would make land beyond the boundary vulnerable to sprawl and encroachment contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. Noise and odour impacts of any proposal would need to be considered as well as an air quality management plan. The site is close to an archaeological site therefore pre-determination archaeological evaluation is required.			
		The objections to the rejected status of this employment option have been noted. However, the impacts upon the green belt - as set out in the above conclusion - are considered to be significant and justify the rejection.			
E1828	Land off, Carlinghow Lane, Batley DLP_RSO2299	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Access can be achieved without obtaining third party land. Road network can take additional capacity. Site located close to the A62 Located in flood zone 1		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
Green bet separating Carlinghow and Birstall has already been breached. Carlinghow for part of the wider urban mass of Batley, Dewsbury, Heckmondwike and Liversedge. Towns have already merged, green belt no longer serves purpose of preventing neighbouring towns merging. Objection to the rejection of the employment. Site should be removed from the green belt for either employment or housing option. Housing is the preferred option. Site in single ownership.		The employment site option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
		One of the purposes of the green belt is to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. This area of green belt is considered to be a strategic gap separating Carlinghow/Batley and Birstall. This large site is located within a wedge of green belt that helps to separate the urban areas of Birstall and Batley and as such plays an important green belt role. It is acknowledged that there is existing development along Ealand Road as well as to the east of Bradford Road so the settlements are to some extent already joined. The green belt over washes the existing ribbon development on the east side of Smithies Moor Lane which cuts the area off from the wider green belt to the west. The site is considered sufficiently important in its role to warrant retention of the green belt designation which prevents reinforcement of the ribbon development and maintains a lack of depth to			

Summary of comments

Council Response

	<p>development along Smithies Moor Lane. Any sense or glimpse of open land to the rear of these properties does at least give the impression of the movement from one settlement to another which is important in retaining the sense of Birstall as a separate settlement. The site is also at a higher level than most of the surrounding areas and so could be intrusive in views to the detriment of the openness of the green belt. Employment option rejected.</p> <p>Representation have been received on this site and have been noted as follows:</p> <p>Highways confirm site access is achievable and there no immediate road capacity issues had the option been accepted.</p> <p>Comments in relation to the green belt have been taken into account and addressed in the conclusion above.</p> <p>The employment option for this site has been rejected due to the overlay negative impact it will have upon the role and function of the green belt in this area.</p>				
<p>E1830 Land north east of, Park Mill House, Kiln Lane, Clayton West DLP_RSO3052</p> <p>This site option provides a more appropriate northern edge would be the existing drive which leads to Gillcar Farm and the associated farm buildings. This would allow for creation of a meaningful landscape buffer and a defensible green belt boundary.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Support</td> <td>Conditional Support</td> <td>Object 1</td> <td>No Comment</td> </tr> </table> <p>No change from the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:</p> <p>South western corner of site is attached to the settlement, the rest is surrounded by Green Belt. So this extension would undermine the role and function of green belt in this area, particularly given the prominence of the site to the north. Employment option rejected.</p> <p>Comments in support of the site option have been noted.</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment		
<p>E1833 Land north east of, Park Mill House, Kiln Lane, Clayton West</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Support</td> <td>Conditional Support</td> <td>Object</td> <td>No Comment</td> </tr> </table> <p>No change from the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The employment option has been rejected on this site for the following reasons:</p> <p>This site would represent a large extension to Clayton West, which may undermine the role and function of the green belt in this area, particularly given the prominence of the land to the north. Alternative option E2333a has been accepted on this site as the better alternative as the impact upon the green belt is less severe whilst maintaining a sufficient employment land area to meet the needs of industry.</p> <p>No representations received on this site.</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment		
<p>E1834 Cooper Bridge, Leeds Road (A62), Mirfield DLP_RSO2210</p> <p>Support the rejection of this site.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Support 1</td> <td>Conditional Support</td> <td>Object</td> <td>No Comment</td> </tr> </table> <p>No change.</p> <p>Site has been rejected as site option E1832c has been accepted as the better alternative. The reasons for rejection include:</p> <p>Site abuts the green belt in Calderdale. The size of the option would impact significantly on the strategic gap contrary to the role and function of the green belt, although the presence of green belt in Calderdale prevents physical merger. The configuration and extent of the site means that development would be poorly related to any settlement and would represent significant encroachment into this countryside landscape. The option does not in places follow any feature on the ground so would leave the adjacent green belt vulnerable to sprawl and further encroachment contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. There are areas of priority habitat within the site and historic assets in close proximity, the settings of which are best protected by the green belt designation.</p>	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment		

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		Supporting comments have been noted.			
E1838	Land South West , Calderbank Mills, Calderbank Road , Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
		The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
		Most of the site is within Flood Zone 3a therefore a sequential test would be required. 3rd Party Land Required to achieve access via Calder Bank Road, which is a private road and would require making up to adoptable standards.			
		3rd party land may also be required to achieve 2.4 x 43m visibility splays to the right at Thornhill Road / Calder Bank Road junction. Site falls within an established business and industrial area. This has been accepted as a PEA (D&M15). In view of this employment allocation rejected.			
		No representations received on this site.			
E1839	Land off, Moorlands Road, Birkesnshaw	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		No comments were received on this site.			
		The council rejected this site as no suitable access can be achieved. The Council does not therefore, propose any change.			
E1840	Land north of, Mill Lane, Hunsworth	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from the Draft Local Plan.			
		The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
		Site access is not achievable. No frontage to the adopted highway. The configuration of this site at its extreme south western extent would significantly impact on the gap that allows the green belt to wash over land to the south, effectively separating it from the wider green belt. This would place the land to the south at high risk of development pressure contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. In view of this, the employment option is rejected.			
		No representation have been received on this site.			
E1842	Land to the south of, Barnsley Road, Flockton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
		The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
		Impacts on the openness of the green belt and lack of defendable boundaries provided by this isolated incursion into the green belt. Site access is not achievable as Barnsley Road would provide the only access and this is not suitable for HGV access. Noise and odour assessments would be required depending on the use class proposed.			
E1843	Land north of , Blackmoorfoot Road, Crosland Hill	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected employment allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
	<p>The larger accepted mixed use site allocation MX1930 covers this site option.</p> <p>No representations received on this allocation.</p>
E1844 Lane north of, Dobb Lane, Hinchliffe Mill	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
No Representations received	<p>No change from the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:</p> <p>Access is not achievable as the only site frontage is on to Dobb Lane which is unsuitable for HGV's. The surrounding road network is also unlikely to be suitable for further intensification. Site also lies on the south bank of the River Holme which is a UK BAP priority habitat which should remain protected. Site has been accepted as an UGS option. Employment option rejected.</p> <p>No representations received on this site.</p>
E1846 Land north of, 83 - 95, Huddersfield Road, Skelmanthorpe	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
No Representations received	<p>No change from the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:</p> <p>This is quite an elevated site and on its own would result in protrusion of the built up area beyond Huddersfield Road. Huddersfield Road and the houses to the north act as a strong boundary at the moment. The railway to the north could act as a defensible boundary but this is probably too far from the settlement to restrict sprawl. Employment option rejected.</p> <p>No representation received.</p>
E1847 Land South of, Cliffe Street, Clayton West	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
No Representations received	<p>No change from the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:</p> <p>Site access cannot be achieved. This is an extensive area of green belt but where the existing settlement pattern and land use features present few opportunities for settlement extension because of the presence of steep slopes and significant areas of tree cover. The area occupied by the bowling green is a former quarry site and there is a significant change in levels across the site. The site includes a significant number of trees which currently present a natural edge to the settlement. Development that retained the trees would be poorly related to the remainder of the settlement. Employment option rejected.</p> <p>No representation received.</p>
E1848 Land west of, Gillroyd Lane, Linthwaite	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
No Representations received	<p>No change from the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:</p> <p>The eastern extent of the site could introduce development on to a prominent hillside to the detriment of the openness of the green belt, although it is acknowledged that there is already development at 'Height' to the east. Employment option rejected.</p> <p>No representations received on this site.</p>

Summary of comments		Council Response			
E1849	Bank Bottom Mills, Mount Road, Marsden	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
		The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
		Mixed use option MX1919 has been accepted on this site. Employment option rejected.			
E1850	Land south / west, 11 to 26, Monks Ings Avenue, Birstall	Support 21	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO114, DLP_RSO222, DLP_RSO602, DLP_RSO605, DLP_RSO607, DLP_RSO788, DLP_RSO1062, DLP_RSO1129, DLP_RSO1186, DLP_RSO1216, DLP_RSO1295, DLP_RSO1303, DLP_RSO1370, DLP_RSO1791, DLP_RSO4194, DLP_RSO4262, DLP_RSO4342, DLP_RSO4932, DLP_RSO4933, DLP_RSO4934, DLP_RSO5023		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
Road capacity issues		The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
- Gomersal Hill Top (A643/A651)		<p>The only site frontage is on to Monks Ing Avenue, which is a residential street and not suitable for HGV use. The size of this option would significantly erode the strategic green belt gap between Gomersal and Birstall and therefore compromise the overall strategic role of the green belt in this location. The northern extent of the option does not present a defensible new green belt boundary and would probably necessitate the removal of the frontage properties from the green belt in order to make Bradford Road the new green belt boundary. Open spaces, or the appearance of open space immediately behind frontage properties, are critically important in retaining a sense of separation between towns. The loss of the open spaces would significantly undermine the role and function of the green belt in this location.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p> <p>The comments supporting the rejection of this site are noted.</p>			
- Birkenshaw Roundabout (A58/A651)					
- Gomersal Road (A62/A651)					
- Church Lane (A643/A652)					
- Birstall Smithies (A62/A651)					
Impact on local road network					
- Monk Ings Avenue.					
- Bradford Road					
Parking issues					
- Monk Ings					
- Birstall Town Centre					
Inadequate site access from Monk Ings Avenue					
Insufficient drainage capacity					
Poor air quality					
Increased CO2 emissions					
Wildlife will be affected, foxes, rabbits, squirrels, lesser spotted woodpeckers, jays, sparrow hawks, owls, herons, pheasants, goldfinches, green finches, chaffinches, bullfinches, blue tits, great tits, coal tits, long-tailed tits, nuthatches, dunlocks, wrens, magpies, crows, jackdaws, blackbirds, robins and sparrows.					
Bats, pheasants, badgers, deer					
Loss of trees on site					
Protect the following buildings and their surroundings; Pollard Hall, the Public Hall, Red house museum, Oakwell Hall					
Insufficient school capacity					
Health services insufficient					
- Dentists					
- Doctors					
- Hospitals					
Green space in short supply in North Kirklees					
Loss of informal recreation land, footpaths SPE/54/20, BAT/1/30 and bridleway BAT/1/10					
Proposal go against purpose of green belt					
Site prevents sprawl within settlements					
Prevents flooding					
Improves air quality for residents					
Lack of infrastructure					
Poor ground conditions					
Mining in the area					
Should use Brownfield land first					
Vacant buildings should be used first					
Lack of employment to sustain new homes					
Rejection supported					
Negative impact on Birstall Town Centre, already deteriorating without adding further businesses to the area.					
Existing businesses should be assisted and supported in order to benefit the local economy					
Support from local councillors					

Summary of comments		Council Response			
E1851	Land west of, Muffit Lane, Gomersal DLP_RSO4938, DLP_RSO4939, DLP_RSO4940	Support 3	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Support by local councillors		<p>No change from the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:</p> <p>One of the purposes of the green belt is to preserve the countryside from encroachment. This is a poorly configured site unrelated to settlement which would introduce an isolated developed area into the countryside. Part of the boundary does not follow a feature on the ground so a new defensible green belt boundary would need to be found, particularly at the south western extent of the site, if future encroachment were to be prevented.</p> <p>No representations received.</p>			
E1852	Land to the west of, Dirker Bank Road, Marsden	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change to the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The employment option has been rejected for the following reason:</p> <p>Site has no suitable HGV access so is unlikely to be suitable for employment use. The land is functionally linked to the SPA / SAC / SSSI. Employment option rejected.</p> <p>No representations received on this site.</p>			
E1853	Land east of, Whether Hill Road, Lindley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>New site option.</p> <p>This employment option has been rejected for the following reason:</p> <p>This site has been accepted as a housing site (H623). In view of this employment option rejected.</p>			
E1854	Land north of, Lindley Moor Road, Lindley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>New site option.</p> <p>This employment option has been rejected for the following reason:</p> <p>This narrow and confined parcel of land between the M62 and Lindley Moor Road has no association with the wider countryside being physically and visually separated from it by the line of the motorway. It is separated from a small isolated residential development in Calderdale only by the old route of Weather Hill Road now severed by the motorway. Any development would therefore appear contiguous with Calderdale unless a buffer was retained. The new development at Stirling Wood Close and existing development at Ainley Top, although separated from development in Calderdale by roads rather than a track, are little different in character and degree of separation than would be presented by any new development on this site.</p>			
E1855	Land south west of, 245-247, Huddersfield Road, Meltham	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change to the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:</p> <p>Beck and woodland are UK BAP priority habitat, any development would be required to minimise disturbance to neighbouring habitats. Site access would require third party land to improve visibility and reduced traffic speeds on Huddersfield Road in this location. It is considered unlikely that the required third party land will be acquired during the plan period therefore employment option considered to be undeliverable. Site promoter has also</p>			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response				
	proposed office use only, this location is not deemed appropriate for an office scheme - not within town centre.				
	No representation received on this site.				
E1856	Land east of, Dathan Tool & Co Ltd, Mean Lane, Meltham	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No change from the draft Local Plan.				
	The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:				
	Development of this site on its own would require improvement to Mean Lane to provide access. Whilst the site is adjacent to current employment land, this is part of the wider POL site where the principle for housing development is already established in the north of it. Housing option H67 has been accepted instead.				
	No representations received on this site.				
E1857	Land north of, Cardwell Terrace, Savile Town, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No change from the draft Local Plan.				
	The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:				
	Site option requires third party land to achieve access; however site falls within a larger business and industrial area which has been accepted as a priority employment area (D&M1). In view of this employment option has been rejected.				
	No representations received on this site.				
E1858	Land to the south of, Egypt Farm, Cliff Lane, Cleckheaton DLP_RSO1407	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Retention of green belt supported. Rejection supported	No change from the draft Local Plan.				
	The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:				
	This area of green belt forms part of a reasonably extensive gap between Cleckheaton and Gomersal and there are opportunities west of the line of the former railway for limited rounding off or infill development without compromising the strategic role of the green belt. However, this site is unrelated to any settlement and although it is clearly distinct from the spoiled land to the east associated with the former railway and Round Hill Mill it has no strong boundary with it. Development of the site could lead to the sprawl of built form down a prominent slope and potential encroachment to the east.				
	The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.				
E1859	Land east of, Boundary Street, Heckmondwike	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No Change				
	Site option has been rejected for the following reasons:				
	Housing option H1772 has been accepted as the better alternative for this site.				
E1860	Primrose Hill Farm, Primrose Lane, Cleckheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No change from the draft Local Plan.				
	The employment options has been rejected for the following reasons:				

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
	Primrose Lane would present a strong new defensible boundary but the greenway, although linear, is not strong on the ground. Leaving a buffer to the watercourse could reduce the relationship the site has with the settlement. Development up to the proposed south eastern extent of the site where Primrose Lane meets the greenway would leave only an extremely narrow gap connecting the green belt to the north with the green belt to the south. Although the route of the greenway prevents merger it is not a strong feature on the ground and would be venerable to encroachment.
E1861 Land north of, Halifax Road, Moorbottom	Support Conditional Support Object No Comment
No Representations received	No change.
E1862 Land north of, Halifax Road, Moorbottom	Support Conditional Support Object No Comment
No Representations received	No Change.
E1865 Land to the east of, Woodhouse Road, Brockholes, Honley	Support Conditional Support Object No Comment
No Representations received	No change from the draft Local Plan. The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons: Housing option E1865 has been accepted on this site.
E1867 Land to the east of, Bluehills Farm, Whitehall Road West, Birkenshaw	Support Conditional Support Object No Comment
No Representations received	No change from the draft Local Plan. The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons: Exceptional circumstances for release of land from the green belt have not been shown. Better alternative green belt options have been accepted. No need for additional employment land in this location. Housing option H218 has been accepted on this site. In view of this employment option rejected. No representation have been received on this site.
E1870 Land to the South West of, Victoria Terrace, Manchester Road, Marsden DLP_RSO982	Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment
The site should be developed for housing.	No change from the draft Local Plan. The employment option has been rejected for the following reason: Housing option H2649 has been accepted on this site. Employment option rejected. No representations received on this site.
E1872 Centre 27, Gelderd Rd, Birstall	Support Conditional Support Object No Comment
No Representations received	No Change. Employment option has been rejected for the following reasons: No absolute constraints identified although the buffer zone for the overhead power line might impact on height and layout for employment use. Site has been allocated for business and industry since the adoption of the UDP but no significant developer interest has come forward. The gypsy and traveller option (GTTS2487) has been accepted as the better alternative therefore employment option rejected.

Summary of comments		Council Response			
E1874	Land West, 46-99, Mayman Lane, Batley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change to site option</p> <p>This site option has been rejected for the following reasons:</p> <p>No change to site option. Has PP for residential that has commenced development.</p> <p>No representations received on this site.</p>			
E1875	Land East of , 26 - 42, Smithies Moor Lane , Birstall	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change: No rep's received.			
E1877	Land East of , Syke Ing Mills, Syke Lane , Earlsheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change from the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:</p> <p>This site has planning permission for the erection of 62 dwellings (2007/94743). Employment option rejected.</p> <p>No representations received on this site.</p>			
E1878	Shaw Cross Business Park, Flagship Square, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>Employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:</p> <p>Site is predominantly built out for business and industry. PEA designation (D&M16) has been accepted as the better alternative.</p> <p>No representation received.</p>			
E1882	Land east and south east of, 4, Spen Vale Street , Heckmondwike	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		NO Change: No rep's received.			
E1883	Plot B, Junction 26, Bradford Road, Cleckheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change from the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:</p> <p>This is a predominantly built out business and industrial site. In view of this employment option rejected and a PEA designation (B&S12) has been accepted instead.</p> <p>No representations were received on this site.</p>			
E1884	Land NE & SW, 50 - 60a, Slipper Lane, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected employment allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p>			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		This site option has been rejected due to a mixed use option being accepted on the site.			
E1886	Bradley Road Business Park , Old Lane / Bradley Road	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
		This site option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
		This site is a rejected employment option. Half of this site has been developed for business. The undeveloped area has been accepted as a smaller employment site option (E1836).			
		No representations received on this site.			
E1887	Land to the east of, Stafford Mills , Bankhouse Lane, Milnsbridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
		The employment option has been rejected for the following reason:			
		All lowland mixed deciduous woodland UK BAP priority habitat. Option rejected.			
		No representations received on this site.			
E1888	Britannia Road , Milnsbridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
		The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
		Lowland mixed deciduous woodland covers most of site. May impact on group of listed buildings at Scar Bottom to west of site. Unlikely to form a deliverable employment site. Site rejected.			
		No representations received on this site.			
E1889	Allocation B8.1, Crosland Road , Lindley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
		This site option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
		This is a rejected employment option. Mixed use site option MX1911 has been accepted which covers this site.			
E1891	Land to the east of, Huddersfield Road, Huddersfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from draft Local Plan.			
		The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
		Site falls within a wider business and industrial area. The land in question has already been granted permission for business and industry which has been commenced but seen no recent progress. In view of this the employment option has been rejected and a PEA designation (KR10) accepted instead.			
		No representations received on this site.			
E1892	Land to the west of, Abbey Road North, Shelley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from the draft Local Plan.			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response			
	The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons: High flood risk areas in the northern part of the site. Planning consents for housing. Unlikely to form deliverable employment allocation.			
E1893 Land to the north of, 16-32, Dark Lane, Birstall	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No Change: No rep's received.			
E1894 Colliers Way, Clayton West DLP_RSO1361, DLP_RSO2643	Support	Conditional Support	Object 2	No Comment
Maximises use of Brownfield land Minimises loss of green sites	No change from the draft Local Plan. The employment option has been rejected for the following reason: Most of the site is developed for business and industry. In view of this employment option rejected and site to the designated a Priority Employment Area (KR24). No representations received for this site.			
E1895 Land north of, Spinksmire Mill, Huddersfield Road, Meltham	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No change from the draft Local Plan. The employment option has been rejected for the following reason: Site is part of larger site option E1866 which has been accepted as the better alternative. No representations received on this site.			
E1896 Rohm & Has (UK) Ltd, Heckmondwike Road, Dewsbury Moor	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No change from the draft Local Plan. The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons: Site Access Not Achievable - No site frontage on to the adopted highway. No suitable site access can be achieved. This site is suitable expansion land for the existing adjacent business, as there is no access apart from through the existing adjacent site. There is no evidence that this company wants to expand. Therefore reject as an employment option. No representations received on this site.			
E1897 Land north of , 9, Cardwell Terrace, Saville Town	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No change from the draft Local Plan. The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons: Site overlays rejected employment option E1857. Site option requires third party land to achieve access; however site falls within a larger business and industrial area which has been accepted as a priority employment area (D&M1). In view of this employment option has been rejected. No representations received on this site.			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
E1984	Albion Works and Northgate Mills, Northgate, Cleckheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected employment allocation. It formed a rejected employment allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Two additional allocations are on this site: H1983 (housing) and MX1931 (mixed use).			
		The employment allocation has been rejected as housing option (H1983) has been accepted as the better alternative.			
E1986	Centre 27 Business Park, Woodhead Road, Birstall	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from the draft Local Plan			
		The employment option has been rejected on this site for the following reasons:			
		This is a predominantly built out business and industry site. In view of this the employment option has been rejected and accepted as a PEA (B&S3)			
		No representations have been received.			
E1987	Smithies Mill Industrial Estate, Bradford Road, Birstall, Batley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
		The employment site option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
		Third party land would be required if this site were to be developed independently, however, this site is currently used for open storage and includes some industrial units. In view of this business and industry has already been established. Employment option rejected.			
E1988	Land Adjacent, Bradford Road, Batley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
		The employment option has been rejected for the following reason:			
		Majority of site falls within flood zone 3.			
		No representations received on this site.			
E1989	Land north of, Calder Bank Road, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
		The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
		Site falls within an established business and industrial area which has been accepted as a Priority Employment Area (D&M15). In view of this the employment option has been rejected.			
		No representations received on this site.			
E1990	Land off, Forge Lane, Thornhill Lees	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
		The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:			

Summary of comments

Council Response

E1992 Land to the north and south of, 237, Soothill Lane, Soothill
DLP_RSO3061, DLP_RSO3335

The site should be accepted. It does not form part of the green belt and is surrounded on three sides by development.
Support the rejection of this site.

Developed site for business and industry. Reject option.

Support 1 Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

No change.

Employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:

The extent of the site in this location would result in continuous development along Soothill lane, thereby effectively merging the two settlements (Soothill and Woodkirk) which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The site as proposed does not follow strong features on the ground and therefore does not represent a defensible green belt boundary. There are better employment alternatives to this site therefore exceptional circumstances can not be demonstrated.

Representation made on this site have been noted. The site does fall within the green belt and performs an important role as summarised in the reasons for objection above.

Support for the rejection of this allocation has been noted.

E1993 Former Spenborough Waste Water Treatment Works, Smithies Lane, Heckmondwike

No Representations received

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change from the draft Local Plan.

The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:

This site covers the area occupied by the Spen Waste Water Treatment Works. It is poorly configured relative to the settlement, and would result in an isolated projection of built form to the south. The option also includes an isolated and detached area to the west, which is separated by the route of the designated pedestrian/cycle route. While it is acknowledged that this site is already developed, current guidance allows for redevelopment of such sites provided that impact on openness is preserved. This could not be the case if the site were removed from the green belt, and as the site abuts the Country Park at its southern extent and has a boundary with a pedestrian cycle route, openness is best preserved by its green belt designation. The area also contains a habitats and species of significant importance.

No representations have been received.

E1996 Land south of, Helme Lane, Meltham

No Representations received

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change from the draft Local Plan.

The employment option has been rejected for the following reason:

Access unsuitable for HGV's. Housing option H67 has been accepted on this site. Employment option rejected.

No representations received on this site.

E1997 Land at, Riverside Drive, Cleckheaton,

No Representations received

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Change: No rep's received.

E2102 Taylor Hall Farm, Little Taylor Hall Lane, Roberttown	Support 306	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment 1
<p>DLP_RSO601, DLP_RSO694, DLP_RSO978, DLP_RSO999, DLP_RSO1139, DLP_RSO1249, DLP_RSO1505, DLP_RSO1719, DLP_RSO1724, DLP_RSO1803, DLP_RSO1813, DLP_RSO1826, DLP_RSO1886, DLP_RSO1890, DLP_RSO1896, DLP_RSO1901, DLP_RSO1906, DLP_RSO1921, DLP_RSO1926, DLP_RSO1931, DLP_RSO1936, DLP_RSO1946, DLP_RSO1951, DLP_RSO1964, DLP_RSO1969, DLP_RSO1974, DLP_RSO1980, DLP_RSO1989, DLP_RSO2004, DLP_RSO2008, DLP_RSO2021, DLP_RSO2041, DLP_RSO2042, DLP_RSO2052, DLP_RSO2064, DLP_RSO2070, DLP_RSO2081, DLP_RSO2086, DLP_RSO2098, DLP_RSO2119, DLP_RSO2124, DLP_RSO2135, DLP_RSO2146, DLP_RSO2147, DLP_RSO2157, DLP_RSO2171, DLP_RSO2177, DLP_RSO2183, DLP_RSO2188, DLP_RSO2193, DLP_RSO2198, DLP_RSO2211, DLP_RSO2362, DLP_RSO2367, DLP_RSO2372, DLP_RSO2377, DLP_RSO2382, DLP_RSO2387, DLP_RSO2393, DLP_RSO2398, DLP_RSO2408, DLP_RSO2413, DLP_RSO2418, DLP_RSO2423, DLP_RSO2428, DLP_RSO2433, DLP_RSO2438, DLP_RSO2448, DLP_RSO2453, DLP_RSO2458, DLP_RSO2463, DLP_RSO2467, DLP_RSO2472, DLP_RSO2482, DLP_RSO2487, DLP_RSO2492, DLP_RSO2509, DLP_RSO2514, DLP_RSO2524, DLP_RSO2529, DLP_RSO2534, DLP_RSO2539, DLP_RSO2544, DLP_RSO2554, DLP_RSO2563, DLP_RSO2564, DLP_RSO2569, DLP_RSO2579, DLP_RSO2584, DLP_RSO2590, DLP_RSO2595, DLP_RSO2600, DLP_RSO2605, DLP_RSO2610, DLP_RSO2617, DLP_RSO2620, DLP_RSO2628, DLP_RSO2630, DLP_RSO2645, DLP_RSO2651, DLP_RSO2656, DLP_RSO2664, DLP_RSO2671, DLP_RSO2676, DLP_RSO2681, DLP_RSO2686, DLP_RSO2691, DLP_RSO2696, DLP_RSO2708, DLP_RSO2713, DLP_RSO2718, DLP_RSO2723, DLP_RSO2728, DLP_RSO2733, DLP_RSO2738, DLP_RSO2743, DLP_RSO2750, DLP_RSO2756, DLP_RSO2762, DLP_RSO2766, DLP_RSO2772, DLP_RSO2782, DLP_RSO2787, DLP_RSO2792, DLP_RSO2797, DLP_RSO2802, DLP_RSO2807, DLP_RSO2812, DLP_RSO2823, DLP_RSO2828, DLP_RSO2833, DLP_RSO2838, DLP_RSO2844, DLP_RSO2858, DLP_RSO2863, DLP_RSO2902, DLP_RSO2907, DLP_RSO2912, DLP_RSO2917, DLP_RSO2980, DLP_RSO2985, DLP_RSO2990, DLP_RSO2995, DLP_RSO2996, DLP_RSO3005, DLP_RSO3010, DLP_RSO3015, DLP_RSO3020, DLP_RSO3025, DLP_RSO3030, DLP_RSO3035, DLP_RSO3040, DLP_RSO3045, DLP_RSO3050, DLP_RSO3080, DLP_RSO3085, DLP_RSO3090, DLP_RSO3091, DLP_RSO3100, DLP_RSO3105, DLP_RSO3110, DLP_RSO3144, DLP_RSO3149, DLP_RSO3154, DLP_RSO3159, DLP_RSO3289, DLP_RSO3327, DLP_RSO3348, DLP_RSO3352, DLP_RSO3386, DLP_RSO3391, DLP_RSO3396, DLP_RSO3401, DLP_RSO3406, DLP_RSO3411, DLP_RSO3416, DLP_RSO3421, DLP_RSO3426, DLP_RSO3431, DLP_RSO3436, DLP_RSO3441, DLP_RSO3446, DLP_RSO3451, DLP_RSO3456, DLP_RSO3461, DLP_RSO3466, DLP_RSO3471, DLP_RSO3476, DLP_RSO3481, DLP_RSO3486, DLP_RSO3493, DLP_RSO3498, DLP_RSO3503, DLP_RSO3508, DLP_RSO3513, DLP_RSO3518, DLP_RSO3523, DLP_RSO3528, DLP_RSO3534, DLP_RSO3539, DLP_RSO3553, DLP_RSO3558, DLP_RSO3563, DLP_RSO3568, DLP_RSO3573, DLP_RSO3578, DLP_RSO3583, DLP_RSO3588, DLP_RSO3672, DLP_RSO3690, DLP_RSO3874, DLP_RSO3897, DLP_RSO3910, DLP_RSO3915, DLP_RSO3920, DLP_RSO3925, DLP_RSO3931, DLP_RSO3937, DLP_RSO3946, DLP_RSO3951, DLP_RSO3960, DLP_RSO3968, DLP_RSO3974, DLP_RSO3986, DLP_RSO3995, DLP_RSO4001, DLP_RSO4006, DLP_RSO4011, DLP_RSO4016, DLP_RSO4021, DLP_RSO4026, DLP_RSO4031, DLP_RSO4058, DLP_RSO4063, DLP_RSO4068, DLP_RSO4073, DLP_RSO4078, DLP_RSO4083, DLP_RSO4088, DLP_RSO4093, DLP_RSO4098, DLP_RSO4103, DLP_RSO4119, DLP_RSO4124, DLP_RSO4141, DLP_RSO4154, DLP_RSO4165, DLP_RSO4170, DLP_RSO4175, DLP_RSO4203, DLP_RSO4218, DLP_RSO4223, DLP_RSO4228, DLP_RSO4233, DLP_RSO4238, DLP_RSO4275, DLP_RSO4288, DLP_RSO4293, DLP_RSO4298, DLP_RSO4304, DLP_RSO4309, DLP_RSO4314, DLP_RSO4319, DLP_RSO4324, DLP_RSO4328, DLP_RSO4366, DLP_RSO4374, DLP_RSO4386, DLP_RSO4394, DLP_RSO4405, DLP_RSO4415, DLP_RSO4424, DLP_RSO4429, DLP_RSO4434, DLP_RSO4439, DLP_RSO4463, DLP_RSO4468, DLP_RSO4478, DLP_RSO4480, DLP_RSO4494, DLP_RSO4504, DLP_RSO4509, DLP_RSO4510, DLP_RSO4569, DLP_RSO4574, DLP_RSO4578, DLP_RSO4583, DLP_RSO4598, DLP_RSO4659, DLP_RSO4664, DLP_RSO4684, DLP_RSO4690, DLP_RSO4723, DLP_RSO4735, DLP_RSO4745, DLP_RSO4751, DLP_RSO4755, DLP_RSO4760, DLP_RSO4770, DLP_RSO4775, DLP_RSO4780, DLP_RSO4785, DLP_RSO4790, DLP_RSO4795, DLP_RSO4800, DLP_RSO4805</p>				
Road congestion issues will increase along the A62, Lumb Lane, Child Lane and Roberttown Lane		No change from the draft Local Plan.		
The impact on road network will increase				
Site is poorly served by roads		The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:		
The roads are not fit for purpose				
Road capacity issues		This site falls within a strategic area that separates Mirfield from Roberttown. The site would sprawl along Far		
- Roberttown Lane		Common Road and merge with the buildings at Moor Top, bringing them within the settlement. This is an area of		
Road safety issues		urban fringe where there is already sporadic development within the green belt. Although Taylor Hall Lane could		
- Roberttown Lane		provide a new boundary the presence of development immediately beyond it risks further encroachment.		
Access into Roberttown Lane would make a dangerous road even more dangerous				
Flooding will increase		The supporting comments for the rejection of this site have been noted.		
Consideration should be given to drainage				
Noise pollution from traffic due to prevailing wind, will be heard in Roberttown and Hartshead				
Preservation of trees and green belt improves air quality				
The environment should be safeguarded for future generations				
Development will cause disruption to local wildlife				
- Owls				
- Slow Worms				
Loss of informal recreational land, public footpaths on site				
Should be preserved for leisure activity				
Rejection maintains natural barrier between Roberttown and Mirfield				
Supports protection of green belt				
Infrastructure cannot support the development proposed				
Negative impact on visual amenity				
Site is green field and would undermine councils Brownfield regeneration policies				
Developers should be encouraged to engage with councils Brownfield polices				
Site is in an unsustainable location				
Bring vacant premises back into use first				
Rejection of site is supported				
Area needs jobs not housing				
Further development should be a new town, complete with new infrastructure				

Summary of comments		Council Response			
Over development would lead to Kirklees being an unattractive place to live Allocation of land does not create demand for space nor jobs. Vacant units will lead to vandalism					
E2135	Land south of, Grange Road Industrial Estate, Off Bromley Road, Hanging Heaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change from draft Local Plan.			
		The employment option has been rejected for the following reason:			
		Development would compromise the strategic role of the green belt in this location and isolate a large area of green belt to the west from its wider setting.			
		No representations were received on this site.			
E2311	Land adjacent, Wakefield Road, Clayton West, Huddersfield DLP_RSO3051	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
The site is sustainably located within easy walking distance of the existing local amenities within Clayton West and bus stops located on Wakefield Road.		No change from the draft Local Plan.			
The scale of development proposed for allocation can be accommodated by the existing highway network without adverse impact on the safe and free flow of traffic.		The employment option has been rejected for the following reasons:			
There are opportunities to deliver sustainable urban drainage techniques on Site to deliver Greenfield run off rates and though the introduction of balancing ponds, further benefits to site wide biodiversity.		Alternative employment option E2333a has been accepted on this site. Option boundary rejected.			
The site is of low conservation value with the existing trees and hedgerows on Site being considered to be of only local ecological value.		The supporting comments for the sites rejection have been noted.			
Although there is evidence of badger activity, this species (if present) is capable of relocating and does not present an insurmountable constraint on development.		The comments in support of the allocation are noted, however, an alternative employment site option has been accepted on this site which would address / support the comments being made.			
The land would have no material impact on the Grade II parkland landscape of Bretton Hall and the Scheduled Ancient Monument of Bentley Grange to the north east of the Site.					
Whilst the agricultural land is acknowledged to be of positive visual and landscape character, the area is already characterised by built form within Scissett and Clayton West.					
A financial appraisal carried out for the Site demonstrates that the proposed development is viable.					
Needs of local businesses wishing to expand could be met on Brownfield land.					
The limited availability of Brownfield land throughout Rural Kirklees means that there is a need to draw upon sustainable Greenfield sites.					
Clayton West is in the South Kirklees functional employment area, though it is closer to the M1 making it more suitable to regional and national occupiers.					
The site has the potential to deliver new jobs to Clayton West, meeting the demands of the newly arising residents. Clayton West has significant number of people commuting longer distances to work.					
The Council's suggestion that land is necessary in Clayton West to provide an additional 55,000 sq m of employment development is considered appropriate and sound in market terms.					
The Kirklees Market Strength Assessment outlines the requirement for employment floor space					

Summary of comments

Council Response

Housing

H1	Land to the east of, Cambridge Chase, Gomersal	Support 10	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO501, DLP_RSO502, DLP_RSO781, DLP_RSO1106, DLP_RSO1213, DLP_RSO1454, DLP_RSO3962, DLP_RSO4107, DLP_RSO4367, DLP_RSO5015					
Cumulative impact on local road network - Bradford Road		No Change			
No capacity to cope with additional traffic		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
Will create new dangerous junctions					
Congestion with impact of M62		Access to this site cannot be achieved without a significant use of third party land.			
Will minimise pollution					
Wildlife would be affected - bats, herons, owls, pheasants, foxes, rabbits, squirrels, badgers and deer					
Woodland would be affected		Supporting comments for the rejection of this site have been noted.			
Will minimise impact on historic fabric/ natural amenity/ visual amenity					
Oversubscribed schools					
Health services insufficient					
Minimises loss of informal recreational space					
Public footpaths/bridleways					
Green fields should be kept					
Proposals comply with purposes of green belt.					
Green belt should be protected.					
Good quality open space; improves opportunities for better quality of life, health and well-being - less strain on NHS					
Mining in area					
Should use Brownfield first					
Available land in South Kirklees without taking green belt in Gomersal/Birstall					
Protects area for future generations					
Infill plot					
No development under this current plan					
Loss of privacy and visual amenity					
H2	Land at, Downshutts, St George's Road, Scholes	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO4833					
Support for rejection of site - process has blighted surrounding areas and affected property valuations.		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Undeveloped frontages along roads connecting settlements help to maintain the appearance of openness and separation. The part of this option that fronts St George's Road represents a strategically important gap between Scholes and Totties. Development would therefore significantly undermine the role and function of the green belt in this location. There are no exceptional circumstances to remove this site from the green belt.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
H3	Land south of, Nutter Lane, Birstall	Support 19	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO80, DLP_RSO545, DLP_RSO779, DLP_RSO1061, DLP_RSO1123, DLP_RSO1194, DLP_RSO1209, DLP_RSO1375, DLP_RSO1457, DLP_RSO1594, DLP_RSO2033, DLP_RSO2268, DLP_RSO4193, DLP_RSO4345, DLP_RSO4846, DLP_RSO4857, DLP_RSO4953, DLP_RSO4954, DLP_RSO4955, DLP_RSO5018					
Road congestion, road capacity and road safety issues including Bradford Road.		No Change			
Accessibility - The site is well related to the built up area and enjoys high levels of accessibility to jobs and services. The site benefits from being within easy walking distance of a number of services and facilities within the village including primary schools, GPs surgery and a number of convenience shops. There is an existing public right of way which runs through the middle of the site and provides quick and convenient access to the centre of Birstall. The significant retail and employment opportunities present at Birstall		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). The option overlaps a smaller option (H352).			
		The reasons for rejection are: The site contains one open watercourse and there is another in very close proximity whose relationship with the countryside would be compromised by development of this site. Protection			

Summary of comments

(Centre 27) Retail Park are also accessible.. In addition, the site is also within walking distance of a number of bus stops on Dewsbury Road and Low Lane, which provide a regular service to Cleckheaton, Huddersfield, Birkenshaw and Leeds.

Road access to the Park off Nutter Lane and via Nova Lane should be maintained in character as should access via Bridleway BAT/1/10.

Any additional development would require access on to Dewsbury/Bradford Road or Oxford Road which would be unacceptable and beyond the capacity of the road to cope.

The junctions where the biggest problems occur are A62/A651 and the A643/A651.

Access can be achieved off Nutter Lane.

Drainage capacity insufficient.

The site is located within Flood Zone 1 and therefore is not subject to flooding. It is considered that run-off from the site would be mitigated through a SUDS drainage scheme.

Loss of wildlife including bats, heron, owls, pheasants, foxes, rabbits, squirrels, badgers and deer.

Loss of habitat and loss of trees.

Do not consider the negative score identified in the SA under ecology for this site to be correct.

Impact on Oakwell Parkland the important green buffer and corridor to the wildlife that exists

The proposal would have no impact on any heritage assets. The site is not visible from Birstall

Conservation Area or Oakwell Hall and would have no direct impact on their setting. Nevertheless, any

perceived impact could be mitigated through the implementation of a comprehensive landscaping scheme.

School capacity insufficient

Health services/health provision insufficient.

Need to retain Greenfield's and green belt for health purposes including walking.

Need to maintain the Bronte Walk and path from Oakwell Hall Park to Bradford Road and Monk Ings and

Monks Ings to Red House.

Impact on bridleway

Need to protect Oakwell Country Park and other local historic buildings to maintain quality of the environment.

Protect the green lung between Bradford Road and Oakwell Hall.

Nutter Lane provides a well-defined boundary, which would prevent further sprawl in the future beyond the proposed new Green Belt boundary.

The site forms part of an extensive area of Green Belt and therefore its loss would not impact on this strategic purpose of the Green Belt. The development of the site would not result in the reduction of the 'green gap' between settlements, which is recognised as the important aspect of the Green Belt in this location.

The site is contiguous with the urban area and is bordered by built development on all three sides. As a result, the site clearly forms part of the urban fringe, which is separate and distinct from the open countryside to the north. The allocation would not lead to the outward sprawl of the settlement or encroachment into the countryside.

The site has no direct relationship with any listed buildings and is remote from the Birstall Conservation Area. Nevertheless, Birstall is not considered to constitute a 'historic town' within the meaning of the Framework.

The proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the regeneration of the more deprived parts of the Borough. It is clear that there is insufficient Brownfield land within Birstall to meet both the housing need and demand within the settlement.

The site is visually contained and would respect the traditional form and character of the area. The proposed development would not impinge on any Landscape Designations or proposed Green Corridors.

Council Response

of the watercourse and its important wildlife habitat would detach the site from the remainder of the settlement. These features and their related important wildlife habitats are best protected by the green belt designation.

Additionally, Oakwell Hall which is situated 160 metres to the north of this area is a Grade I Listed Building. The loss of this area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of this building. A medieval settlement (PRN8278) is also considered to be close to the area. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the development of this site would not impact on heritage assets.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

Summary of comments

Council Response

The typography is typical of the area and is not considered a constraint to development. It is considered that Site H3 represents the most appropriate site option when considered against reasonable alternatives in Birstall.

The site is available, suitable, accessible

The Brownfield element of the site could come forward in the first 5 years of the plan. Poor ground condition resulting from mining in the area.

There is likely to be a moderate risk of contamination on part of the site because of its use for employment purposes. However it is not considered that the level of contamination would be prohibitive. The remainder of the site is used for agricultural purposes and therefore the risk of contamination is low.

Loss of green belt and potential for merging of development between Birkenshaw, Birstall, Cleckheaton, Gomersal and Batley.

Green belt should be protected for future generations.

Green belt gap between Oxford Road and Dewsbury/Bradford Road should be maintained.

Brownfield should be used first.

In order to ensure that the Allocations document is justified and effective, it should identify additional land within the 'Batley and Spen' sub area to deliver on the opportunities presented by the Northern Powerhouse initiatives and the devolution of the Leeds City Region.

The site is bordered on to by development on all three sides and therefore constitutes an infill site within the built up area. The site is 14 hectares in size and has capacity for approximately 290 dwellings (based on 30 dph with 70% gross to net ratio).

The site is closely located to a Priority Employment Site providing opportunities for employment.

H4 Land to the north west of, Woodhouse Farm, Woodhouse Lane, Emley
DLP_RSO874, DLP_RSO1057, DLP_RSO1065

Support 2 Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

No change

The site is detached from any development and would form an isolated site in the countryside. It would appear very difficult to establish defensible boundaries around this site if it was removed from the green belt as it currently appears to be bound by very poorly defined field boundaries. (Wakefield Council)

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

This is a very large site whose release from the green belt would result in a significant amount of new development in a location that is remote from any existing settlement in Kirklees. The land is relatively flat adjacent to Woodhouse Lane then slopes down to Little Dike. Extending development north of the watercourse would necessitate bridging the dyke. This site is an integral part of the open countryside landscape in this area and its removal would represent encroachment into the countryside to the significant detriment of the role and function of the green belt.

Comments regarding the green belt role and function in relation to the site are noted.

H5 Land to the north-east of, Holt Lane, Holmfirth

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Development of this option would lead to the coalescence of the main settlement of Holmfirth with the hillside development at Holt. Physical site access possible but issues with the suitability of the wider road network.

H6 Land to the north east of, 15-29, Dewsbury Road, Gomersal
DLP_RSO4907, DLP_RSO4908, DLP_RSO4909

Support 3 Conditional Support Object No Comment

Road congestion, road capacity issues including A62, A58, A651, A652, A643 and A650. Acknowledge proposed improvements to Birstall Smithies and Tong Street but these will not mitigate against new

No change

Summary of comments

development.

The area has had significant development in the past which has impacted on the green belt and the quality of the area, therefore support rejection of this site.

Support rejection of the site which should remain in green belt.

Concerned about development in Bradford and Leeds and impact on area.

Council Response

The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

This is a small site with limited relationship to the wider countryside and could be removed from the green belt without significant impact on openness. However, the site does not present a defendable new eastern boundary which would leave the adjacent land vulnerable to encroachment contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

H7	Taylor Hall Farm, Little Taylor Hall Lane, Roberttown	Support	301	Conditional Support	Object	6	No Comment
DLP_RSO597, DLP_RSO690, DLP_RSO975, DLP_RSO1000, DLP_RSO1135, DLP_RSO1245, DLP_RSO1503, DLP_RSO1715, DLP_RSO1720, DLP_RSO1799, DLP_RSO1817, DLP_RSO1822, DLP_RSO1882, DLP_RSO1889, DLP_RSO1892, DLP_RSO1897, DLP_RSO1902, DLP_RSO1911, DLP_RSO1922, DLP_RSO1927, DLP_RSO1932, DLP_RSO1942, DLP_RSO1947, DLP_RSO1960, DLP_RSO1965, DLP_RSO1971, DLP_RSO1983, DLP_RSO1985, DLP_RSO1990, DLP_RSO2000, DLP_RSO2009, DLP_RSO2017, DLP_RSO2037, DLP_RSO2047, DLP_RSO2048, DLP_RSO2059, DLP_RSO2066, DLP_RSO2077, DLP_RSO2082, DLP_RSO2094, DLP_RSO2115, DLP_RSO2120, DLP_RSO2131, DLP_RSO2142, DLP_RSO2151, DLP_RSO2152, DLP_RSO2167, DLP_RSO2172, DLP_RSO2179, DLP_RSO2184, DLP_RSO2189, DLP_RSO2194, DLP_RSO2212, DLP_RSO2358, DLP_RSO2363, DLP_RSO2368, DLP_RSO2373, DLP_RSO2378, DLP_RSO2383, DLP_RSO2388, DLP_RSO2394, DLP_RSO2404, DLP_RSO2409, DLP_RSO2414, DLP_RSO2419, DLP_RSO2424, DLP_RSO2429, DLP_RSO2434, DLP_RSO2439, DLP_RSO2444, DLP_RSO2449, DLP_RSO2454, DLP_RSO2459, DLP_RSO2468, DLP_RSO2476, DLP_RSO2483, DLP_RSO2488, DLP_RSO2505, DLP_RSO2510, DLP_RSO2515, DLP_RSO2520, DLP_RSO2525, DLP_RSO2530, DLP_RSO2535, DLP_RSO2540, DLP_RSO2545, DLP_RSO2555, DLP_RSO2556, DLP_RSO2565, DLP_RSO2570, DLP_RSO2575, DLP_RSO2580, DLP_RSO2586, DLP_RSO2591, DLP_RSO2596, DLP_RSO2601, DLP_RSO2606, DLP_RSO2611, DLP_RSO2613, DLP_RSO2621, DLP_RSO2622, DLP_RSO2638, DLP_RSO2647, DLP_RSO2652, DLP_RSO2660, DLP_RSO2667, DLP_RSO2672, DLP_RSO2677, DLP_RSO2682, DLP_RSO2687, DLP_RSO2692, DLP_RSO2704, DLP_RSO2709, DLP_RSO2714, DLP_RSO2719, DLP_RSO2724, DLP_RSO2729, DLP_RSO2734, DLP_RSO2739, DLP_RSO2746, DLP_RSO2752, DLP_RSO2757, DLP_RSO2758, DLP_RSO2768, DLP_RSO2778, DLP_RSO2783, DLP_RSO2788, DLP_RSO2793, DLP_RSO2798, DLP_RSO2803, DLP_RSO2808, DLP_RSO2819, DLP_RSO2824, DLP_RSO2829, DLP_RSO2834, DLP_RSO2839, DLP_RSO2854, DLP_RSO2859, DLP_RSO2898, DLP_RSO2903, DLP_RSO2908, DLP_RSO2913, DLP_RSO2976, DLP_RSO2981, DLP_RSO2986, DLP_RSO2991, DLP_RSO3000, DLP_RSO3001, DLP_RSO3006, DLP_RSO3011, DLP_RSO3016, DLP_RSO3021, DLP_RSO3026, DLP_RSO3031, DLP_RSO3036, DLP_RSO3041, DLP_RSO3046, DLP_RSO3076, DLP_RSO3081, DLP_RSO3086, DLP_RSO3092, DLP_RSO3096, DLP_RSO3101, DLP_RSO3106, DLP_RSO3140, DLP_RSO3145, DLP_RSO3150, DLP_RSO3155, DLP_RSO3160, DLP_RSO3345, DLP_RSO3382, DLP_RSO3387, DLP_RSO3392, DLP_RSO3397, DLP_RSO3402, DLP_RSO3407, DLP_RSO3412, DLP_RSO3417, DLP_RSO3422, DLP_RSO3427, DLP_RSO3432, DLP_RSO3440, DLP_RSO3442, DLP_RSO3447, DLP_RSO3452, DLP_RSO3457, DLP_RSO3462, DLP_RSO3467, DLP_RSO3472, DLP_RSO3477, DLP_RSO3482, DLP_RSO3489, DLP_RSO3494, DLP_RSO3501, DLP_RSO3504, DLP_RSO3509, DLP_RSO3514, DLP_RSO3519, DLP_RSO3524, DLP_RSO3529, DLP_RSO3535, DLP_RSO3549, DLP_RSO3554, DLP_RSO3559, DLP_RSO3564, DLP_RSO3569, DLP_RSO3574, DLP_RSO3579, DLP_RSO3584, DLP_RSO3669, DLP_RSO3686, DLP_RSO3906, DLP_RSO3911, DLP_RSO3916, DLP_RSO3921, DLP_RSO3926, DLP_RSO3933, DLP_RSO3940, DLP_RSO3947, DLP_RSO3956, DLP_RSO3964, DLP_RSO3969, DLP_RSO3981, DLP_RSO3991, DLP_RSO3997, DLP_RSO4002, DLP_RSO4007, DLP_RSO4012, DLP_RSO4017, DLP_RSO4022, DLP_RSO4027, DLP_RSO4049, DLP_RSO4059, DLP_RSO4064, DLP_RSO4069, DLP_RSO4074, DLP_RSO4079, DLP_RSO4084, DLP_RSO4089, DLP_RSO4094, DLP_RSO4099, DLP_RSO4115, DLP_RSO4120, DLP_RSO4133, DLP_RSO4150, DLP_RSO4161, DLP_RSO4166, DLP_RSO4171, DLP_RSO4199, DLP_RSO4214, DLP_RSO4219, DLP_RSO4224, DLP_RSO4229, DLP_RSO4234, DLP_RSO4266, DLP_RSO4271, DLP_RSO4284, DLP_RSO4289, DLP_RSO4294, DLP_RSO4300, DLP_RSO4305, DLP_RSO4310, DLP_RSO4315, DLP_RSO4320, DLP_RSO4325, DLP_RSO4362, DLP_RSO4369, DLP_RSO4382, DLP_RSO4387, DLP_RSO4400, DLP_RSO4411, DLP_RSO4420, DLP_RSO4425, DLP_RSO4430, DLP_RSO4435, DLP_RSO4458, DLP_RSO4459, DLP_RSO4464, DLP_RSO4474, DLP_RSO4490, DLP_RSO4500, DLP_RSO4505, DLP_RSO4565, DLP_RSO4570, DLP_RSO4575, DLP_RSO4579, DLP_RSO4589, DLP_RSO4655, DLP_RSO4660, DLP_RSO4680, DLP_RSO4686, DLP_RSO4714, DLP_RSO4729, DLP_RSO4741, DLP_RSO4746, DLP_RSO4747, DLP_RSO4756, DLP_RSO4766, DLP_RSO4771, DLP_RSO4776, DLP_RSO4781, DLP_RSO4786, DLP_RSO4791, DLP_RSO4796, DLP_RSO4801							

Road capacity including A62, Roberttown Lane, Far Common Road, Child Lane, Sunny Bank Road, Church Road, Fountain crossroads.

Road congestion and public transport poor.

Road safety must be considered particularly in relation to the school.

Roberttown is used as a rat run for traffic and is gridlocked.

Public transport in the area is inadequate.

School traffic already a problem.

The site should be reconsidered as it has good access.

Flooding issues may arise from increased development.

Surface water drainage concerns.

Sewerage capacity insufficient.

Proposal will result in noise pollution from increased traffic.

Need to protect oxygen producing trees.

The site should be protected for its wildlife and leisure value.

School capacity insufficient.

Health provision/health services insufficient.

Need to protect public footpaths.

Need to protect green spaces.

The allocation of the site would overburden public amenity provision.

No Change

This site is proposed as a rejected as a housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan.

This site falls within a strategic area that separates Mirfield from Roberttown. The site would sprawl along Far Common Road and merge with the buildings at Moor Top, bringing them within the settlement. This is an area of urban fringe where there is already sporadic development within the green belt. Although Taylor Hall Lane could provide a new boundary the presence of development immediately beyond it risks further encroachment and although Leeds Road is within the green belt the extent of development proposed would give the appearance of merger.

The loss of H7 will lead to urban sprawl.

Summary of comments

Local Infrastructure cannot support the development.
 The development of Greenfield sites would undermine the council's Brownfield regeneration policies.
 Should use Brownfield first and empty buildings.
 Protect green belt at all cost.
 The area needs jobs not housing.

Unsustainable location poorly served by roads and public transport.
 If the site is developed, Roberttown will lose its identity as a green village and development will result in urban sprawl.
 Development would result in loss of view.
 Protect green belt now and for benefit of future generations.
 There is no requirement for industrial development.
 The proposals will shatter the peace of our green and pleasant land.
 Hartshead and Roberttown should be kept as villages not big housing estates.
 Growth in population and/or economic activity should not be regarded automatically as inevitable or desirable.
 Danger if additional commercial space is developed it will remain vacant and result in vandalism.
 The character of Roberttown should be maintained.
 Privacy and amenity would be severely impacted.
 An approval has already been given for Teale's garage and the area cannot take any more development.
 Development will lead to loss of agricultural land and a reliance on imported food.
 A smaller part of the site should be reconsidered for development which includes the area adjacent to the built up area of Roberttown and the area fronting Leeds Road.

Site is adjacent to the built up area of Roberttown making it sustainable.

The area fronting Leeds Road should also be considered.

Council Response

H9	Broad Oak Farm, Church Lane, Linthwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Site overlaps with accepted housing option H1776.			
H10	The Folly, Cowlersley Lane, Cowlersley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Habitats of principal importance. Proposed that these are removed from the net area. This would reduce site area to below 0.4 ha. Existing access to the site, but this is unsuitable to provide for the total capacity on this site			
		No draft Local Plan consultation comments received			
H12	Land to south west of, Snelsins Lane, Chain Bar	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Development of this site would result in the creation of a new Air Quality Management Area.			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H13	Land south of, Grange Cote, Sheffield Road, Jackson Bridge DLP_RSO1774	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Development would not result in the loss of an important open space or recreation facility.		No change.			
Proposal represents an infill plot.		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This site sits on a section of undeveloped road frontage between ribbon development on Sheffield Road. The site is located close to the over washed settlement of Butterley but is not considered to be a part of it, nor does the Local Plan strategy include the removal of Butterley from the green belt. Open spaces along frontages with ribbon development help to maintain the appearance of separation between settlements and this site is an important gap between Butterley and Jackson Bridge.			
		The supporting comments for this option are noted. The site is not considered to be an infill plot as it is not part of a settlement.			
H14	Land to the south of, Lydgate Drive, Lepton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Insufficient evidence that site access could be achieved to ensure a deliverable site without the further use of green belt land (not subject to a local plan development option).			
H15	Land to the east of, Wheat Royd Lodge, Wheatroyd Lane, Almondbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is a rejected housing option. Third party land is required to gain access. It is a detached site within the green belt. This is an extensive area of green belt that delineates the edge of the settlement in this location and over washes both the Almondbury conservation area and open countryside. The site sits in an area of urban fringe where there are numerous existing residential and other properties. The green belt designation prevents the intensification of built form in this area and helps to preserve the historic setting of the conservation area. Removal of this site from the green belt would create an isolated pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			
H16	Bolster Moor, Bolster Moor Road, Golcar	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		This site is located within the over washed settlement of Bolster Moor. Releasing the site from the green belt in isolation would leave the other properties in this triangle of land formed by Slades Road, Drummer Lane and Bolstermoor Road within the green belt which would not be in the best interests of planning for the area. The site is too large to be considered as an infill plot for the purposes of national planning policy and the Local Plan does not include the removal of Bolster Moor from the green belt. The removal of this site from the green belt would result in an isolated area of non-green belt land surrounded by residential and other property that is within the green belt which would undermine the role and function of the green belt in this location.			
H17	Park Mill Houses 2 and 4, Wakefield Road, Clayton West DLP_RSO413	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
The site is located in a sustainable location.		Proposed hanger.			
Residential development in proximity to B1 uses (at Colliers Way) is capable of being mitigated in terms of					

Summary of comments

noise, visual or disturbance issues.

Kiln Lane forms a visual and acoustic gap between E2333 and the site.
Site is partially undeveloped, measures could improve biodiversity within the site.

The site represents a reasonable 'rounding-off' of the settlement

The site does not meet the purposes of the Green Belt as set out in national policy.

Council Response

The site is proposed as an accepted housing allocation. This represents a change from the draft Local Plan (November 2015) where the site was rejected for housing. The reasons for the change are outlined below:

The site already has residential occupiers living adjacent to existing employment uses to the west. Kiln Lane could potentially form a buffer between the proposed employment to the east and this site.

Potential third party land required to improve visibility at junction with Wakefield Road or Kiln Lane - but site has highway frontage.. Potential issues with amenity from nearby industrial units, though this land already has existing occupiers. Impact of potential new employment site to the east will depend on the layout and scale of mitigation. This site could be accommodated with Kiln Lane representing a defendable Green Belt boundary to the east and Wakefield Road to the south east. 15% of site within high risk mining area.

H18 85, Hartshead Lane, Hartshead
DLP_RSO1133, DLP_RSO2213

Development would have an adverse impact on green belt.
Supports the rejection of site

Support 2 Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

This site is located within an urban fringe area where there is already encroachment of residential properties in the green belt and removing the house and its garden from the green belt would have limited impact on openness. The site itself however is not well related to the existing settlement pattern and would begin to isolate land to the east which could come under pressure for development, contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. Accepting the site would also require the removal of no. 81 and possibly no's 71- 73 Hartshead Lane from the green belt in order to create a long term defendable green belt boundary.

Supporting comments for the rejection of this site have been noted.

H19 Land off, Radcliffe Road, Slaithwaite

No Representations received

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

Steeply sloping site. It's removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The site is closely associated with the ribbon development along Radcliffe Road which gives the appearance of settlement but which is actually separated from the unallocated area of Slaithwaite by the line of the railway and by a significant change of levels. A significant area of additional land would need to be released from the green belt in order to incorporate this site and its immediate surroundings into the settlement.

H20 Land off, Miller Hill, Denby Dale
DLP_RSO1542

The site is in a sustainable location close to the centre of Denby Dale.

The site is located close to public transport connections.

Removal of the site from Green Belt would still allow Green Belt to perform its primary function.

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

While the scale of this option relative to the settlement edge is reasonable it may be prominent on rising ground. The southern boundary of the site does not follow a feature on the ground so there would be a significant risk of sprawl and would leave land to the south vulnerable to encroachment, contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.

H21 Land north of, Moor Lane, Netherthong

No Representations received

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change.

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
<p>H22 Land around, Links Lodge, Sands Lane, Mirfield DLP_RSO3932</p> <p>Highways infrastructure needed and improvements to existing network Sewers needed. Increased run off from development on Greenfield, increase flooding Greenfield's act as lung Schools needed Green fields have physical and mental health value</p> <p>Loss of agricultural land New homes are needed, but housing is not accessible to local people</p>	<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The configuration of this option relative to the existing settlement pattern would project development into the countryside contrary to the role and function of the green belt.</p> <p>Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Third party land required. Sands Lane is part adopted and would need to be brought to full adoptable standard in the vicinity of the site access. Due to the alignment and topography of Sands Lane, achieving acceptable visibility splays would be a challenge. This site consists of a large house in extensive grounds and is located on the west side of Sands Lane where there is already a degree of built form in the green belt, including the Dewsbury Golf Club house and a number of individual properties. Apart from these properties however this is an area of countryside remote from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p>
<p>H24 Holme Barn, Red Deer Park Lane, Bristfield DLP_RSO3541</p> <p>Land at Red Deer Park Lane Bristfield rejected due to 'greenbelt' and lack of acreage. Now doubled with inclusion of land to existing submission also a further hectare adjoining both pieces of land. Greenbelt policy outlined in plan omits reference to Government planning policy June 2011 page 15 no 38 statement 3 which points out the need to protect decline of rural outposts.</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site is within the green belt. To the south, the site is separated from the settlement by an area of open land which would need to be removed from the green belt in order to give the development any relationship to the settlement. As such the site has only a limited relationship to the existing settlement form and appears more as an integral part of the countryside that slopes down Bristfield Lane to the south. The northern extent of the site while bounded by a wall could begin to appear as sprawl with very little relationship to Grange Moor. Development would result in the encroachment of urban form into the countryside contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p>
<p>H25 Land west of, Hollin Brigg Lane, Holmbridge DLP_RSO1283, DLP_RSO1331</p> <p>Site lies on fringe of settlement and would provide an appropriate scale of development to sustain the village. If site remains rejected, consider for safeguarded land. Site is immediately available for development.</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object 2 No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site impacts on Dobb Dike UK BAP priority habitat and also White Gate Wood and the beck corridor mean that the site should not be allocated for development. This parcel of land forms the steep valley side to Dobb Dike which is an open watercourse and its associated important wildlife habitats. The best protection for the countryside features and sensitive environmental areas is through the green belt designation. Development would lead to significant encroachment of built form into the countryside severely undermining the role and function of the green belt in this location. The site would require access through parts of the road network not suitable for intensification of use.</p> <p>Comments in support of housing on this site have been noted as have the comments that the site is available for development. The site option has been rejected for the reasons above but it has also been assessed whether it</p>

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		should be a safeguarded land option (SL2729).			
H26	Land between, Dunford Road and Dover Lane, Holmfirth	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This site is on a small plateau of land that sits above the narrow steep valley of the River Ribble which is at a significantly lower level than the site. As such the site would be prominent and intrusive to the detriment of the openness of the wider green belt.			
H27	Land to the east of, Penistone Road, Fenay Bridge DLP_RSO1453, DLP_RSO1846	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Site would add to cumulative impact on Penistone Road.		No change.			
Site should be removed from the green belt as this does not meet the five purposes of green belt designation. Amending the Green Belt boundary at this location presents an opportunity to more clearly define a new boundary (i.e. Penistone Road), which would be more 'defensible' and clearly understood.		The site is a rejected housing option.			
		The site has biodiversity constraints, including a Tree Preservation Order on significant portion of the site. West Yorkshire Ecology suggest reducing the net area to 0.21ha. This is an extensive area of green belt that washes over the open countryside south of Huddersfield. Locally this very narrow area is separated from the wider green belt by the line of Penistone Road. It is mostly covered by protected trees.			
H28	Land between, 974A and The Commercial PH, New Hey Road, Outlane DLP_RSO29	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
The site is linked to a complex Roman water supply system associated with Slack Roman fort. Evidence shows Roman activity spread well beyond the fort boundary and site has archaeological significance.		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Potential impact on setting of listed buildings. Site adjacent to Slack Roman Fort - may have archaeological significance.			
H30	Land south-west of, Scar Lane Bridge, Golcar DLP_RSO36	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Site could support new train station at Milnsbridge The land is overgrown and attracting fly tippers and potentially crime.		No change.			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Third party land required to achieve access. Topography issues. Visibility issues, particularly as access may need to be required from road by a sharp bend adjacent to Scar Lane Bridge. Site is priority habitat (lowland mixed deciduous woodland)			
		A site of this size would be unlikely to be able to support a new station at Milnsbridge. Milnsbridge is not one of the locations prioritised for new rail stations in West Yorkshire and York.			
H34	Moorlands Wood Turning Co, Luke Lane, Thongsbridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Release of the site would undermine the role and function of the green belt in this location. A significant proportion of the site is in high flood risk areas, potentially impacting on the achievement of a deliverable site layout. The disturbance this option would cause to Habitats of Principal Importance is also too great.			

Summary of comments

Council Response

H35	Support	Conditional Support	Object 54	No Comment
<p>Land east of, Red Deer Park Lane, Briestfield</p> <p>DLP_RSO130, DLP_RSO684, DLP_RSO923, DLP_RSO939, DLP_RSO969, DLP_RSO995, DLP_RSO1001, DLP_RSO1002, DLP_RSO1003, DLP_RSO1004, DLP_RSO1005, DLP_RSO1007, DLP_RSO1008, DLP_RSO1013, DLP_RSO1014, DLP_RSO1020, DLP_RSO1021, DLP_RSO1045, DLP_RSO1381, DLP_RSO1827, DLP_RSO1828, DLP_RSO1829, DLP_RSO1830, DLP_RSO1831, DLP_RSO1832, DLP_RSO1834, DLP_RSO2399, DLP_RSO2846, DLP_RSO2853, DLP_RSO2865, DLP_RSO3290, DLP_RSO3291, DLP_RSO3292, DLP_RSO3293, DLP_RSO3294, DLP_RSO3295, DLP_RSO3296, DLP_RSO3297, DLP_RSO3298, DLP_RSO3299, DLP_RSO3300, DLP_RSO3301, DLP_RSO3302, DLP_RSO3303, DLP_RSO3304, DLP_RSO3305, DLP_RSO3306, DLP_RSO3307, DLP_RSO3308, DLP_RSO3309, DLP_RSO4114, DLP_RSO4440, DLP_RSO4445, DLP_RSO4498</p> <p>Direct route to main road that will divert new traffic straight to main road instead of coming through village. Parking will become more spread through village and fewer cars blocking bus route.</p> <p>Access to area would have much less impact than H36 and H270 which have always been used for agriculture, more negative impact on village, more difficult to access selected sites. Traffic will need to go through village before getting to main road creating more congestion. Insufficient parking already building up on sides of road, on bus route becoming increasing difficult to get through village. New houses on H36 and H270 will increase traffic in village.</p> <p>Not on greenbelt as previously used as a sewage site Expansion onto H35 would result in more rounded settlement, Red Deer Park Lane provides a clear physical feature to northern edge in contrast to H270. Existing Dike would provide defined Eastern boundary. Green Belt Edge review conclusion is would have limited impact on openness. Build on plot as completes village and fills in missing gap. Plot and land above round off village rather than extending it. New houses should not be built on H36 and H270 as expanding village when still areas in village that need to be filled in. Move new house build on plot H36 and H270 to plot H35. H35 with land along to the east and north of SL2165 should be allocated for housing in in preference to H270.</p> <p>Well situated in village, has services on site. Part industrial land, including sewage works and has previously had houses on land with utilities already installed or nearby.</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The site is within the green belt. This is an elongated site between the settlement edge and a tract of trees. The trees provide containment so there would be no risk of sprawl or encroachment to the east. The configuration of the site would leave land to the west, particularly south of Red Deer Park Lane vulnerable to development pressure and this is already an area of urban fringe. Development beyond Red Deer Park Lane could begin to appear as encroachment into the countryside to the north.</p> <p>A new housing option H2576 has been generated through the draft Local Plan consultation which contains the southern part of the site. It is proposed to accept this option and reject sites H36 and H270 on impact on the green belt.</p>			
<p>Land north of, South View Road, East Bierley</p> <p>DLP_RSO1180, DLP_RSO4865, DLP_RSO4866, DLP_RSO4867</p> <p>The site should be allocated for affordable housing as it has access to main road. The land does not flood.</p> <p>Support rejection of this site as green belt should be protected and to prevent development merging.</p> <p>The land should be developed for affordable housing as it is not green belt. It used to be industrial - i.e. the railway line to Bradford ran through the length of it. Infrastructure already exists and would benefit fro additional housing. Object to the rejection of this site as it should be allocated for affordable housing which would be in keeping with council vision and would provide a wonderful site for families to live on.</p> <p>Additional land should be allocated in East Brierley to enable community to grow.</p>	<p>Support 3</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The reasons for rejection are green belt grounds and access. The northern boundary does not appear to be a strong feature on the ground to provide a long term defensible green belt boundary and would leave neighbouring land vulnerable to encroachment.</p> <p>Three connections to the public highway are shown. However, these are not of sufficient width to accommodate suitable access to a development of this scale. Also, the southern connection is opposite a school and the northern access on South View Road is too close to the junction with A651 Bradford Road. Access can be achieved from a private road off South View Road between plots 1 and 12 however, third party land would be required to achieve access. Visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m onto South View Road cannot be achieved without third party land.</p>			

Summary of comments

Council Response

H41	New Laithe Farm, 190, Denby Lane, Upper Denby	Support 199	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>DLP_RSO436, DLP_RSO594, DLP_RSO702, DLP_RSO1258, DLP_RSO1263, DLP_RSO1510, DLP_RSO1649, DLP_RSO1938, DLP_RSO1977, DLP_RSO2035, DLP_RSO2104, DLP_RSO2108, DLP_RSO2112, DLP_RSO2219, DLP_RSO2265, DLP_RSO2270, DLP_RSO2302, DLP_RSO2306, DLP_RSO2312, DLP_RSO2316, DLP_RSO2321, DLP_RSO2324, DLP_RSO2329, DLP_RSO2332, DLP_RSO2336, DLP_RSO2340, DLP_RSO2344, DLP_RSO2351, DLP_RSO2355, DLP_RSO2401, DLP_RSO2867, DLP_RSO2871, DLP_RSO2875, DLP_RSO2879, DLP_RSO2883, DLP_RSO2887, DLP_RSO2891, DLP_RSO2895, DLP_RSO2920, DLP_RSO2926, DLP_RSO2930, DLP_RSO2934, DLP_RSO2938, DLP_RSO3120, DLP_RSO3162, DLP_RSO3165, DLP_RSO3169, DLP_RSO3173, DLP_RSO3177, DLP_RSO3181, DLP_RSO3185, DLP_RSO3189, DLP_RSO3193, DLP_RSO3197, DLP_RSO3201, DLP_RSO3205, DLP_RSO3209, DLP_RSO3213, DLP_RSO3217, DLP_RSO3221, DLP_RSO3222, DLP_RSO3226, DLP_RSO3230, DLP_RSO3234, DLP_RSO3238, DLP_RSO3242, DLP_RSO3246, DLP_RSO3250, DLP_RSO3254, DLP_RSO3258, DLP_RSO3262, DLP_RSO3266, DLP_RSO3270, DLP_RSO3274, DLP_RSO3278, DLP_RSO3282, DLP_RSO3288, DLP_RSO3589, DLP_RSO3593, DLP_RSO3597, DLP_RSO3601, DLP_RSO3616, DLP_RSO3620, DLP_RSO3624, DLP_RSO3629, DLP_RSO3635, DLP_RSO3639, DLP_RSO3646, DLP_RSO3651, DLP_RSO3655, DLP_RSO3660, DLP_RSO3664, DLP_RSO3673, DLP_RSO3681, DLP_RSO3682, DLP_RSO3691, DLP_RSO3696, DLP_RSO3700, DLP_RSO3704, DLP_RSO3708, DLP_RSO3712, DLP_RSO3716, DLP_RSO3720, DLP_RSO3724, DLP_RSO3728, DLP_RSO3732, DLP_RSO3736, DLP_RSO3740, DLP_RSO3744, DLP_RSO3748, DLP_RSO3752, DLP_RSO3756, DLP_RSO3760, DLP_RSO3764, DLP_RSO3768, DLP_RSO3772, DLP_RSO3776, DLP_RSO3784, DLP_RSO3788, DLP_RSO3792, DLP_RSO3796, DLP_RSO3800, DLP_RSO3804, DLP_RSO3808, DLP_RSO3812, DLP_RSO3816, DLP_RSO3820, DLP_RSO3824, DLP_RSO3828, DLP_RSO3834, DLP_RSO3838, DLP_RSO3839, DLP_RSO3845, DLP_RSO3849, DLP_RSO3853, DLP_RSO3857, DLP_RSO3861, DLP_RSO3865, DLP_RSO3873, DLP_RSO3878, DLP_RSO3882, DLP_RSO3898, DLP_RSO3902, DLP_RSO3939, DLP_RSO3952, DLP_RSO3975, DLP_RSO3979, DLP_RSO3988, DLP_RSO4126, DLP_RSO4129, DLP_RSO4134, DLP_RSO4142, DLP_RSO4146, DLP_RSO4178, DLP_RSO4181, DLP_RSO4185, DLP_RSO4189, DLP_RSO4240, DLP_RSO4244, DLP_RSO4250, DLP_RSO4277, DLP_RSO4281, DLP_RSO4376, DLP_RSO4379, DLP_RSO4391, DLP_RSO4397, DLP_RSO4408, DLP_RSO4417, DLP_RSO4470, DLP_RSO4482, DLP_RSO4486, DLP_RSO4495, DLP_RSO4539, DLP_RSO4558, DLP_RSO4562, DLP_RSO4586, DLP_RSO4591, DLP_RSO4599, DLP_RSO4603, DLP_RSO4607, DLP_RSO4611, DLP_RSO4615, DLP_RSO4619, DLP_RSO4623, DLP_RSO4627, DLP_RSO4632, DLP_RSO4636, DLP_RSO4642, DLP_RSO4666, DLP_RSO4670, DLP_RSO4697, DLP_RSO4701, DLP_RSO4725, DLP_RSO4730, DLP_RSO4738, DLP_RSO4762, DLP_RSO4807, DLP_RSO4812, DLP_RSO4816, DLP_RSO5043</p>	<p>Support 199</p> <p>Conditional Support</p> <p>Object</p> <p>No Comment</p>				
<p>Infrequent public transport</p>	<p>No change</p>				
<p>Road congestion</p>	<p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p>				
<p>Parking problems</p>	<p>This site is separated from Upper Denby by open fields, has little relationship with the existing built form and is large in relation to the scale of the existing village. Development of this site would represent significant encroachment into the countryside and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p>				
<p>Highway safety issues</p>	<p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>				
<p>Potential impact on drainage.</p>					
<p>Wildlife affected</p>					
<p>School capacity issues</p>					
<p>Impact on footpaths</p>					
<p>Development would have a detrimental impact on role and function of the Green Belt.</p>					
<p>Difficulty in establishing defendable green belt boundary.</p>					
<p>The green fields in this area make an important contribution to rural landscape of the district.</p>					
<p>Physical infrastructure will not cope with development</p>					
<p>Lack of local shops / facilities</p>					
<p>Negative impact on quality of life / community</p>					
<p>Small scale housing may be appropriate (e.g. starter homes)</p>					
<p>Impact on tourism</p>					
<p>-----</p>	<p>-----</p>				
<p>H42</p>	<p>Land west of, Helme Lane, Meltham</p>				
<p>Support</p>	<p>Conditional Support</p>				
<p>Object</p>	<p>No Comment</p>				
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No change</p>				
<p></p>	<p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p>				
<p></p>	<p>Site is detached from the non-green belt area and the removal of this extensive area from the green belt would create an area of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt land which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt, potential impacts on Helme Conservation Area and Grade II listed building, investigation required into surface water management.</p>				
<p>-----</p>	<p>-----</p>				
<p>H43</p>	<p>Land South-East of, 2, Clough House Lane, Slaithwaite</p>				
<p>Support</p>	<p>Conditional Support</p>				
<p>Object 1</p>	<p>No Comment</p>				
<p>DLP_RSO1240</p>	<p>No change</p>				

Summary of comments

Council Response

Site area should be reduced to form frontage with Clough House Lane.

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

This site is isolated from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The site is largely covered by protected trees, contains a watercourse and is a site of principal habitat importance. The best way to protect these countryside features from encroachment is through the green belt designation.

H45 Land to the north of, Still House Farm, Upper Batley Low Lane, Upper Batley
DLP_RSO3338

Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment

Road congestion on A643 - Support the rejection of this site (Leeds City Council)

No change

The site has been rejected as a housing allocation.

The configuration and location of this site would both reduce the gap between Birstall and Upper Batley and be poorly related to the existing settlement form, projecting new development to the south. A new boundary along the line of the former railway could contain sprawl but in itself is a weak feature on the ground. However, there is already a degree of built form to the east of Upper Batley Lane and the railway does form the green belt boundary further to the south.

Further to this insufficient information has been submitted to demonstrate that issues associated with heritage impact and surface water drainage could be satisfactorily mitigated against.

The supporting comment from Leeds City Council for the site rejection is noted.

H46 Land to the south west of, Dewsbury Rams RLFC, Owl Lane, Shaw Cross
DLP_RSO870

Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment

No evidence with regard to role of whole of site in serving purposes of the Green Belt or confirming it is possible to define robust, defensible new boundaries should this site be deleted from it. Notable Kirklees Green Belt Edge Review considers further development of site would breach existing strong boundary formed by edge of industrial development and trees. Site could be considered to play important role in preventing coalescence of settlements in Kirklees and Wakefield. Wakefield Council

Proposed Change

This site has planning permission for 206 dwellings (2014/90780) therefore the principle for the development of this site has been established.

It is proposed that the green belt boundary is to be amended as part of the Local Plan process to exclude the site.

H49 Land to the rear of 20, Oddfellows Street, Scholes
DLP_RSO5069

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

Access is achievable.
The site is not in an area of flood risk.

No Change

Welcomes the green belt edge review which supports the identification of this site for housing. The site is available, deliverable and suitable for housing. This site is currently identified as SL2294 but should be allocated as housing to come forward during the plan period.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing site. It formed a rejected housing site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

The site is bounded to the north by Oddfellows Street, to the west by residential development and to the east and south by agricultural, residential and commercial land uses. The boundary of the site can be strengthened through planting.

The location and size of this site presents an opportunity for some rounding off, although the southern extent does encroach into more open countryside and leaves land to the west between the site and the settlement vulnerable to pressure for development. The site is bounded on the west and north by the existing settlement but the southern and eastern boundaries are very poorly defined and do not represent strong defensible boundaries. For these reasons the site has been rejected. A smaller allocation (H49a) is however, proposed as an accepted housing allocation.

Development would round off the settlement.

The support for the site is noted.

The comment on Safeguarded Land Option SL2294 is noted. This is now proposed as a rejected site in the light of the proposal to accept H49a.

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H51	Victoria Yard, Sheffield Road, Hepworth	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site is remote for any settlement and could not be released in isolation therefore the housing option has been rejected. For the previously developed element of this land, National planning policy allows for the redevelopment of Brownfield sites in the green belt subject to assessment of openness and any scheme would be determined through the planning applications process.</p>			
H53	Land North East of, St Joseph's J&I School, Healds Road, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The site has been rejected on the basis that this whole site is lowland mixed deciduous woodland UK BAP priority habitat and as such has been rejected as a potential allocation.</p> <p>The site is also proposed as an urban greenspace. The site lies adjacent to a school and school playing fields. The woodland is predominantly mixed deciduous and regenerating woodland, and partly protected by Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs).</p>			
H54	Former Brook Motors Playing Fields, New Mill Road, Brockholes	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Site accepted as employment allocation - E1829. Site wholly within flood zone 3.</p>			
H55	Calder Garage, Ravensthorpe Road, Thornhill Lees	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The site is surrounded by 24 hour industry. There are multiple sources of noise which may affect receptors. It is also near to PM10 air quality management area declared due to particulates generated from road traffic and industry in this area. It is also on potentially contaminated land.</p> <p>No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan</p>			
H56	Land south of, Rose Cottage Farm, Bristfield Road, Grange Moor	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The site is within the green belt. It is an area of urban fringe where there are already sporadic buildings in the green belt and a fragmented land use pattern. This site would be contained by roads on three sides, but would</p>			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response								
	<p>abut residential property to the north which would remain in the green belt. This would increase pressure for encroachment contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The site is very poorly related to the existing settlement and would result in an elongated settlement pattern and isolate an area of green belt between the site and the settlement edge from the wider green belt which would come under considerable pressure for development.</p> <p>No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan</p>								
<p>H57 Land at, Bill Lane, Wooldale, Holmfirth,</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Support</th> <th>Conditional Support</th> <th>Object</th> <th>No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Development of this site would impact on the setting of the listed Wooldale Methodist Church within the site in the south. Even a reduction in capacity would be unlikely to preserve the setting of this listed building.</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment				
Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment						
<p>H58 Land to the north of, Denby Lane, Grange Moor</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Support</th> <th>Conditional Support</th> <th>Object</th> <th>No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The majority of site is a projection out to the east of Grange Moor, so would have an impact on openness of the Green Belt.</p> <p>No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment				
Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment						
<p>H59 Land east of, Ben Booth Lane, Grange Moor</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Support</th> <th>Conditional Support</th> <th>Object</th> <th>No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Development of this site would breach the existing strong boundary of Ben Booth lane which prevents sprawl of Grange Moor to the east. Development would appear unrelated to the existing settlement. Potential for deep surface water flooding on parts of the site, potentially contaminated land, noise and odour sources. Half of the site is within a high risk mining area.</p> <p>No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment				
Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment						
<p>H60 Land West & North-West of The Kaye Arms Public House, Wakefield Road, Grange Moor</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Support</th> <th>Conditional Support</th> <th>Object</th> <th>No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site is isolated from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. Surface water drainages issues would require further investigation as no record of sewers or watercourses in</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment				
Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment						

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		the vicinity of this site. Site is close to a known archaeological site and potential noise issues therefore assessment required.			
		No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.			
H61	Land to the south west of, 49, Cross Bank Road, Carlinghow	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The reason for rejecting the site is that it forms part of a wider Urban Greenspace. It comprises natural/semi-natural greenspace off North Bank Road with a public footpath through the middle. The western part is well treed and the eastern part is unused.			
		Additionally, a suitable site access layout and visibility splays (2.4m x 43m) cannot be achieved from Cross Bank Road without third party land.			
		No Comments were received on this site.			
H62	Land to the South-East of, Warehouse and Depot, Union Road, Heckmondwike	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation within the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The reason for rejecting the site is that the majority of the site falls in flood zone 3a. In accordance with the council's site allocation methodology , the site has been rejected on flood risk grounds.			
H63	Land south of, Bracken Hall Road, Sheepridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is a rejected housing option. Site access unachievable. No site frontage to the adopted highway. Access via Occupation Road is not suitable due to the narrow width of this road.			
H64	Land to the South and South-West of, The Common, Thornhill	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This is a large site that would remove the whole of the land west of The Common from the green belt and thereby remove any sense of openness between the built up areas of Thornhill and Thornhill Lees. While the site has little relationship with the wider countryside, it contains a significant sized pond/reservoir and important associated wildlife habitats. The best means of protecting the open water and its environs is through the green belt designation. There is also a significant change in levels associated with the pond and development would risk being poorly related to the residential areas it abuts on the southern part of the site.			
		No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan			
H65	Land North-East of, Rectory View, Thornhill	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO3064		No Change			

Summary of comments

Does not form part of the Green Belt and is surrounded on three sides by development including established housing areas
Capable of providing up to 22 dwellings to address current planned shortfall in housing in draft local plan.

Council Response

The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

No site frontage onto adopted highway therefore third party land required. The site does not have access off The Combs & it looks like Rectory View is unadopted.

The site has been rejected on access grounds. It is not in the green belt and is adjacent to housing development.

The accepted housing allocations in the Draft Local Plan meet objectively assessed need.

H66 Land to the west of, Westroyd Avenue, Hunsworth
DLP_RSO962

Road capacity is insufficient - adverse impact on local road network
The site contains a wildlife and opportunities for walking along the footpaths.
School capacity insufficient.

The site is in the green belt and should not be developed.
More explanation is required to explain how the plan will boost local infrastructure to support additional development should this site be considered for development.
Whilst a need for affordable and better housing is required in this area, object is made to this site for development as it is not considered a viable option.

Alternative sites:
Moorend school
Disused factories around the march area
Newly cleared areas in Cleckheaton Town Centre

Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

This site is well related to the settlement and could form a small settlement extension with limited impact on openness. Mill Lane could present a strong boundary to the north but the field boundary that marks the western boundary is not a strong feature on the ground and could leave adjacent land vulnerable to encroachment.
Removing the site from the green belt would also leave the narrow area of green belt to the west between the site and the settlement under significant development pressure contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.

Supporting comments have been noted.

H68 Land at, Dunford Road, Hade Edge, Holmfirth,
DLP_RSO1252

Access can be achieved off Dunford Road.
Accessibility assessment score for Hade Edge is harsh - some facilities in Hade Edge and adequate public transport links to nearby larger centres. Also, employment opportunities in Holmfirth.
Not within an area of flood risk.
There are no environmental designations affecting the site therefore the reason for rejection is unclear.
Primary School and Pre-School nursery in the village.

Support for not including this site in the green belt as it fulfils none of the 5 purposes of the green belt and has been allocated as Provisional Open Land in the UDP since 1999.
Local convenience store, public house and village hall provide facilities.
Need for further housing sites in Hade Edge.
There are no environmental designations affecting the site therefore the reason for rejection is unclear.
This land is not located in an unsustainable location.
Land is available and to be made available by the landowner immediately.

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Note that a smaller housing option (H288a) has been accepted which covers part of H68.

Environmental Health objection raised relating a housing site adjacent to the chicken farm to the south east of this site.

Comments promoting this site for development have been noted. Highways information shows that site access can be achieved. The reason for site rejection is set out above in relation to an Environmental Health objection but note the smaller option accepted on this land (H288a)

The site is not proposed to be returned to the green belt as there would need to be exceptional circumstances to do so. The fact that the land is available is noted.

H69 Merchant Fields, Hunsworth Lane, Cleckheaton
DLP_RSO1308

Concerned about pollution is development accepted.
Concerned about loss of green space if development accepted

If development has to go ahead this development is preferable to MX1914 however there are problems of loss of green space and pollution.

Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment

Proposed Change

The site is proposed as an accepted housing allocation. This represents a change from the draft Local Plan (November 2015) where the site was rejected for housing. The reasons for change are:

Summary of comments

Council Response

<p>H71 Land west of, Wakefield Road, Clayton West DLP_RSO3067</p> <p>A defensible green belt boundary could be defined along Langley Lane to the north. The site has a willing landowner. Development of the site would contribute to maintaining and enhancing the services and facilities available in Scissett and Clayton West and proposed employment allocation to east of Clayton West.</p>	<p>After reviewing the site allocations in line with the Council's site allocation methodology, this site is suitable for residential development.</p> <p>Environmental Health has raised the issue of potential impact of noise on residential amenity but considers that this can be addressed through the provision of a noise Assessment. Subject to the masterplan, further noise mitigation measures may be required.</p> <p>The Local Plan contains policies which require new housing development to provide or contribute towards open space, sport and recreation facilities in the district.</p> <p>Support for this site option has been noted.</p> <p>Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment</p> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Langley Lane could form a strong new settlement boundary to the north. This site is not well related to the settlement and would leave a triangle of land between the site and Wakefield Road vulnerable to encroachment. Wakefield Road presents a strong green belt boundary in this location and although already breached by industrial development further north of this site prevents the encroachment of further development into the flood plain. The north of this site is severely constrained by flooding.</p>
<p>H72 Land off, Station Road, Skelmanthorpe</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>Proposed change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as an accepted housing allocation. This represents a change from the draft Local Plan (November 2015) where the site was rejected for housing. The reasons for the change are outlined below:</p> <p>Reconsideration of how development needs can be met in Skelmanthorpe, due to the rejection of a previously accepted site in the vicinity.</p> <p>Sloping site with development to the north and west and light railway to the south. The existing settlement pattern and land use features present the opportunity for some limited infilling or rounding off without compromising the role and function of the green belt in this location. Access achievable provided visibility splays can be provided on Station Road. Flood Zone 1. Potential drainage issues relating to site topography. 94% of the site within a high risk coal mining area.</p>
<p>H73 Lower Busker Farm, Busker Lane, Scissett</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>This site is contained by Busker Lane to the south and existing development, including Scissett Middle School to the north and east. To the west the treed footpath would represent a strong and defensible new boundary minimising any risk of further encroachment or sprawl. The location and configuration of the site means that it is well related to the settlement and would represent rounding off. The land slopes up towards Busker Lane so could be prominent in long distance views from the north. Development at a high density be poorly related to current built form of Scissett and sense of place, adjacent to the middle school and school field. The site has been accepted as safeguarded land.</p>
<p>H74 Land South of, 114 - 132, Fort Ann Road, Soothill</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p>

Summary of comments

Council Response

	<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing site. It formed a rejected housing site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The introduction of housing in this location is not considered acceptable due to the potential conflicting neighbour uses associated with the adjoining priority employment area. No evidence has been submitted that residential amenity would not be adversely affected by the neighbouring employment uses.</p> <p>Further to this, there is no site frontage to the adopted highway and third party land would be required to achieve access.</p>
<p>H75 Land to west of, Outlane Methodist Church, New Hey Road, Outlane DLP_RSO4834</p> <p>The site is linked to a complex Roman water supply system associated with Slack Roman fort. Evidence shows Roman activity spread well beyond the fort boundary and site has archaeological significance.</p>	<p>Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Close proximity to Slack Roman Fort scheduled monument, particularly if extension to this monument is agreed by Secretary of State. Air quality and noise issues arising from proximity of M62.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>
<p>H76 Land east of, Manor Farm, Soothill Lane, Soothill DLP_RSO3054, DLP_RSO3329</p> <p>Support rejection of site due to traffic congestion on the A653 (Leeds City Council)</p> <p>The site does not form part of the green belt and is adjacent to development.</p> <p>Support rejection of site on grounds of Green Belt as it would close the strategic gap between Batley and West Ardsley and form encroachment into the countryside towards Leeds (Leeds City Council). This site should be allocated to address the shortfall in housing.</p>	<p>Support 1 Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejecting housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The reason for rejecting the site is on green belt grounds. One of the purposes of the green belt is to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. This area of green belt is strategically important in preventing the merger of Kirklees with Leeds. The green belt over washes the ribbon development along Soothill Lane so as to preserve the open gaps in the road frontage and so maintain an appearance of separation with Woodkirk. The loss of these gaps would significantly undermine the role and function of the green belt in this location.</p> <p>The support for the rejection of the site from Leeds City Council is noted.</p>
<p>H77 Land north of, Manor Farm, Soothill DLP_RSO3055, DLP_RSO3330</p> <p>Support rejection of the site on grounds of road congestion and traffic on the A653 (Leeds City Council).</p> <p>Support rejection of the site on the grounds that it would close the strategic gap between Batley and West Ardsley and encroachment into the countryside towards Leeds (Leeds City Council). The site should be allocated to address the housing shortfall identified in the draft Local Plan.</p>	<p>Support 1 Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>There is an existing strong green belt edge along the rear of properties east of Manor Farm Drive. Although there is the potential for some limited settlement extension that would not undermine the role and function of the green belt, the northern and eastern extent of this option risks prominent development on rising ground.</p> <p>The support for the rejection of the site by Leeds City Council is noted.</p>
<p>H78 Land west of, 809 - 835, Bradford Road, East Bierley DLP_RSO77, DLP_RSO1179, DLP_RSO4868, DLP_RSO4869, DLP_RSO4870</p> <p>Support the rejection of the site on road capacity and road congestion grounds. Acknowledge the proposed road improvements but these will not mitigate against the impact of new development.</p>	<p>Support 3 Conditional Support Object 2 No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p>

Summary of comments

The land already has access to Bradford Road.

The site should be retained as green belt.

The land is a reclaimed railway cutting and not part of the original green belt.
The area has previously been subject to development which has had an impact on the green belt and the quality of the area.

Concerned about the impact of development in Bradford and Leeds on the area.
Further opportunities should be made for development in East Bierley to provide housing opportunities for the community including affordable housing.

The site adjoins additional housing and would overlook open space making it an attractive location for housing.

H79 Land to the west of, Abbey Road North, Shepley
DLP_RSO320, DLP_RSO474, DLP_RSO521, DLP_RSO990, DLP_RSO1855

Road congestion on Penistone Road, A629, B6116 and narrow local roads, parking issues (Far Bank, Shelley), lack of footpaths.
Public transport frequency issues.
Flooding issues
Potential noise pollution.
School capacity issues.
Health provision capacity issues.

Proposal would go against the purpose of green belt.
Physical infrastructure needs to be able to cope.
Lack of distribution of revenue to rural areas.
Lack of local amenities.
Do not use green belt - use sites where planning approval has already been given such as the old Firth Street Mill on Abbey Road.
Do not use Greenfield sites.
Lack of local employment opportunities.
Support for rejection of option.

H80 Land south of, Grasscroft, Almondbury
DLP_RSO778

Development of the site would improve vehicular access by providing a turning head.
Existing vegetation on the site is of low ecological value.

H81 Hall Ing, Hall Ing Lane, Honley
DLP_RSO2440, DLP_RSO4967

The site is prone to flooding / water logging

Council Response

The site is proposed as a rejected housing option. It formed a rejected housing option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

The reason for rejecting the site is on green belt grounds. The site is partly contained by an urban land use to the south west and has only a limited relationship with the wider countryside it adjoins. However, the new green belt boundary to the west would not follow any feature on the ground. The site is poorly configured and would partly result in unsatisfactory backland development. There has already been some garden encroachment and in one place the existing boundary no longer follows any feature on the ground. The new boundary presented by this site would be equally weak.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

Support 5 Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

This site constitutes the only significant gap on the west side of the main road between the two villages and so plays a significant role in helping to maintain separation. Its removal from the green belt would seriously undermine the role and function of the green belt in this location.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Site access is not available. This site sits within an extensive area of green belt that both delineates the southern extent of Almondbury and over washes the Almondbury conservation area. It is an area of urban fringe containing numerous residential and other properties and a number of listed buildings. The green belt designation prevents the intensification of built form and helps to preserve the historic setting of the conservation area. The site is also detached from the settlement edge and would therefore require additional land to be released in order to avoid creating an isolated pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt which would be contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.

Site area is less than 0.4ha after woodland is netted off.

Support 2 Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change

Summary of comments

The site is crossed by PROW

The land is Green Belt.

Development would result in high visual impact across the valley.

Council Response

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

The scale of this option would begin to sprawl to the south down the elevated hillside and would represent encroachment into this countryside setting, being poorly related to the settlement form. Removing the land from the green belt would also begin to encroach on the historically separate grouping of buildings at Hall Ing, the majority of which are listed, which would undermine the role and function of the green belt which is to prevent the merger of settlements.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

H82 Land to the east of, electricity sub station, Heath Road, Linthwaite
DLP_RSO3889

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

The landowner has submitted a different site boundary to this - and one that is part of a wider selection of sites, with the intention of creating a defensible green belt boundary. This option will be assessed independently.

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

This site is on an elevated and prominent hillside where development would be highly visible in long distance views to the detriment of the openness of the green belt. It is isolated and unrelated to any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.

H83 Land at junction of, Paris and Sandy Gate, Scholes

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The removal of the site from the green belt would begin to consolidate the area of urban fringe where there is existing residential development along Sandy Gate, which could lead to pressure for further encroachment. The land rises to the north where development could be prominent. There are no exceptional circumstances to remove this site from the green belt.

H84 Land to the west of, Swallow Farm, Hodgson Lane/Station Lane, Birkenshaw
DLP_RSO4874, DLP_RSO4875, DLP_RSO4876

Support 3 Conditional Support Object No Comment

Support rejection of the site on road capacity and road congestion grounds. Acknowledge proposed road improvements but this will not mitigate against the impact of new development.

No Change

The site should be retained within green belt.

The area has previously been subject to development which has had an impact on the green belt and the quality of the area.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

The reasons for rejecting the site are:

Concerned about the impact of development in Bradford and Leeds on the area.

This site lies within the boundary and/or within the setting of the Registered Battlefield at Adwalton. Historic England has objected to this option. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. National planning policy confirms that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. This option could lead to substantial harm to the registered battlefield and the inclusion of the site option in the plan is not justified.

This site is well related to the settlement and could form infill between existing residential areas. The western edge follows a feature on the ground which although not a strong feature could form a new green belt boundary.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H86	Land between, Scholes Moor Road and Oak Scar Lane, Scholes	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		There are no exceptional circumstances to remove this site from the green belt.			
H88	Land to East of, Outlane Methodist Church, New Hey Road, Outlane	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO4835					
The site is linked to a complex Roman water supply system associated with Slack Roman fort. Evidence shows Roman activity spread well beyond the fort boundary and site has archaeological significance.		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Potential impact on Roman Fort scheduled monument. Class II archaeological site. Air quality and noise issues arising from proximity to motorway.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
H89	Land South-East of, 74, Barnsley Road, Flockton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The configuration of this site would result in a poorly related projection of development to the detriment of openness and contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			
H90	Land at, Thornccliffe Lane, Emley, Huddersfield,	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO3070					
A lower density on the site would be supported.		No change			
Owner supports development.		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Site access is not achievable - no highway frontage.			
		The density shown for the site is indicative - based on past delivery across the district.			
H91	Land West of, 132 - 168, Foxroyd Lane, Thornhill, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO3066					
Green belt boundary could be defined between edge of housing to east and covered reservoir to west as a defensible and definable physical boundary.		No change			
Should be allocated to address current planned shortfall in housing set out in draft local plan.		The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The site is within the Green Belt and it does not relate well to existing development as the reservoirs to the west are not strong urban features. The lack of a boundary to the north risks ridge line development and encroachment onto the prominent hillside.			
		The accepted housing allocations in the draft Local Plan meet objectively assessed need.			
H92	Land to the north of, Crossley Lane, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment

Summary of comments

No Representations received

Council Response

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

There is no site frontage onto the adopted highway, third party land is required. This is a relatively small site which is well related to the settlement edge. While it sits in a strategic gap its release could be accommodated without significantly compromising the role and function of the green belt in this location. It is contained on two sides by existing development and on its north side by the line of trees at Finching Dike. However, its eastern boundary follows a footpath which is a very weak ground feature and which would leave the adjacent land at significant risk from encroachment, contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.

H93 Land at, Rodley Lane, Emley, Huddersfield,
DLP_RSO3071

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

A lower density on the site would be supported.

No change

Owner supports development.

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

Access to site is poor, not adoptable standard and poor visibility. Road would need widening to provide footway, which would require third party land.

The density shown for the site is indicative - based on past delivery across the district.

H96 Land to the north of, Quarryfields, Crossley Hill

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Third party land is required to achieve access. This site sits in an area of green belt that appears as part of the wider countryside. The site is poorly configured relative to the settlement edge and would result in an isolated projection of built form to the detriment of the openness of the green belt in this location.

H97 Land to the north of Park House Farm, The Common, Thornhill Lees
DLP_RSO3065

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

Green belt boundary could be defined along the east following former railway embankment as a defensible and definable physical boundary.

Should be a housing allocation to address planned shortfall in local plan.

No Change

The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The site is within the green belt. This is a well proportioned and well located site relative to the settlement edge which does not impact significantly on the strategic role of the green belt in this location. The land rises to the south west and is visible in long distance views to the detriment of openness, but there is already development at that level along The Common. However, the site does not have a defensible south eastern boundary and would reinforce merger with property at Park House Farm, extending the linear settlement pattern and increasing the risk of encroachment.

It is acknowledged that the line of the former railway would present an acceptable new green belt boundary and indeed has done so south east of this site as well as elsewhere in the district. However, there is nothing to suggest that the current position of the boundary, which follows the garden boundaries of houses off The Common, is incorrectly drawn, nor that it could not endure beyond the life of the plan. The green belt review is not a general review of the position of the boundary, nor is it a 'drawing back' exercise. The correct judgement of the position of the boundary is through the assessment of site H97 and a new green belt boundary would be found should the site be accepted for housing development. Otherwise, no exceptional circumstances exist that

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		would justify moving the boundary from its current position.			
		The accepted housing allocations in the draft Local Plan meet objectively assessed need.			
H99	Land north of, Branksome, Rotcher Lane, Slaithwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Topography of site frontage would impede access to the site. Removal of land that is habitats of principal importance would take site area to below 0.4 hectares			
H100	Ravensthorpe Mills, Calder Road, Ravensthorpe	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its allocation is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Site is within an Air Quality Management Area and adjacent to existing industry which runs 24 hours. There are issues with air quality, noise, odour and contaminated land. 56% of the site is in flood zone 3.			
		No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan			
H103	Saville Business Centre, Wharf Street, Savile Town	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its allocation is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The site is surrounded by 24 hour industry. Issues with noise, on potentially contaminated land. All of the site in Flood Zone 2, investigation required into surface water risk			
		No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan			
H104	Land to the south of, Norrithrope Lane, Norrithrope	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This is an extensive site relative to the alignment of the settlement edge. There is no other obvious new boundary to the south to reduce the scale and the impact. There are reasonable ground features that could create new boundaries but the option on its own would not present a satisfactory settlement extension without further land release.			
H105	Land south of, Foldhead Mills, Huddersfield Road, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		All of the site is within Flood Zone 2, some is within FZ3a. Environmental health objection, site has multiple risks, noise and contaminated land being significant. Not			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		considered suitable for housing.			
H106	Land to the east of, 301, Woodhead Road, Holme	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This site is detached from the non-green belt area and its removal from the green belt would create an area of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt land which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. This area provides an immediate setting to the national park and is a valuable transitional landscape, the setting and character of which is best protected through the green belt designation.			
H107	Land south of, Ashbrow Road, Fartown	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing option. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The removal of the woodland section of the site would reduce the site area to less than 0.4ha which would render the site unable to be allocated and therefore would not be consistent with the site allocation methodology.			
		No representations received for this site option.			
H108	Land to the east of, Hawkroyd Bank Road, Honley DLP_RSO3368	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
The transport constraints to delivery of this site appear inconsistent with other evidence presented. In terms of site specific highway safety constraints i.e. the delivery of a safe and appropriate access, assessments on adjacent sites (e.g. H660 and H629) have not suggested that an access (or accesses) cannot be achieved off Hawkroyd Bank Road or Sandbeds for the partial or complete development of the site.		No change.			
The Sustainability Appraisal of Kirklees Local Plan: Residential Site Options scored the site positively (++) stating that in accessibility heat mapping work undertaken for the Council, this site was classed as 'green;' in terms of its access to four of the right features (e.g. services, facilities, employment) concluding "therefore a significant positive effect is likely".		This site is a rejected housing option. Adequate access is not achievable. This site is a detached site in the green belt. One of the purposes of the green belt is to prevent the merger of settlements and the location and configuration of this site would significantly undermine the role of the green belt which is to maintain separation between Netherton and the properties at Magdale. The site has no relationship to any settlement and could not be released in isolation.			
H109	Land to the south of, 38, Duke Wood Road, Clayton West DLP_RSO649, DLP_RSO650, DLP_RSO3929, DLP_RSO4679	Support 4	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Inadequate/Unachievable access to site.		No change			
Access via 38 Dukewood Rd is from a very steep hill Woodland effect (Cliff Woods) Impact on conservation area Impact on rights of way		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
Loss of GB		This site is located within a reasonably contained area of green belt where the presence of trees screen the area from wider views. However, it is located on elevated and rising land and is not well related to the settlement. Development would result in a projection of poorly related built form into the countryside to the detriment of the role and function of the green belt.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
H110	Land north of, Dobb Lane, Hinchcliffe Mill	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
	Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. The open space evidence provides justification for the retention of this site as urban greenspace. Also, development of this site would have an unacceptable impact on biodiversity and in particular the BAP priority habitat in this area. The highway network is poor and unsuited to further intensification at this point.
H111 Land to the south of, New Laithe Hill, Newsome, Huddersfield, DLP_RSO752, DLP_RSO1629, DLP_RSO4535 Support the decision to put land into green belt to preserve the setting of Castle Hill Scheduled Monument. Strong agreement with adding site to green belt. Support for protection of site to maintain openness of Castle Hill's setting.	Support 3 Conditional Support Object No Comment No change. This site is a rejected housing option. The allocation of this site would bring development to within 250 metres of the Scheduled Monument at Castle Hill. The site is in an area of undeveloped land that is of critical importance to the setting of the Castle Hill Scheduled Ancient Monument as identified in the Castle Hill Setting Study. There are a number of Grade II Listed Buildings within 185 metres of this site including 150, 152 and 155 Ashes Lane, and the outbuilding, garage and principal barn at Ashes Common Farmhouse. The loss of this site and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to their significance. Support for the rejection of the housing option noted.
H112 Land north of, Prospect Road, Longwood No Representations received	Support Conditional Support Object No Comment No change This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected. Urban Greenspace designation to be retained
H113 Land to the East of, Moor Lane, Birkenshaw DLP_RSO4901, DLP_RSO4902, DLP_RSO4903 Development will impact on highways network Should remain as green belt	Support 3 Conditional Support Object No Comment No Change The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. Access on this site is not achievable without the use of significant third party land. The site's configuration would result in an unsatisfactory narrow projection into the countryside to the detriment of the openness of the green belt in this location. The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.
H114 Land to the east of, 34, Pike Law Road, Scapegoat Hill No Representations received	Support Conditional Support Object No Comment No change This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected. Site topography would make access very difficult to achieve. This site is located adjacent to the inset settlement of Scapegoat Hill but within an area fronting Pike Law Road which is characterised by a loosely dispersed pattern of development whose overall character is open and rural. The significant slope also makes the site prominent in long distance views and adds to the sense of openness of this part of the hillside. Development would therefore significantly impact on openness contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.
H115 Land South of, 201 - 287, Whitechapel Road, Scholes No Representations received	Support Conditional Support Object No Comment No Change The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
	<p>Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site access is not achievable without significant third party land. The location and configuration of this site means that it is poorly related to the settlement at its eastern end and its southern extent would project development into the countryside and be unrelated to the settlement, to the detriment of the openness of the green belt. The western part of the site has a better relationship with the settlement but is crossed by a public right of way. The site could not be released from the green belt in isolation and would require the removal of the houses between the site and Whitechapel Road. This would reinforce the ribbon development effect along Whitechapel Road and result in a much narrower gap connecting to the large area of green belt to the south.</p>
<p>H117 Haughs Road, Quarmby, Huddersfield, DLP_RSO4651</p>	<p>Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
<p>Support for rejection.</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. This site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>It is considered the scale of the development proposed would have an unacceptable impact on the local highway network.</p> <p>Comments of support noted.</p>
<p>H118 Land to the east of, Upper Quarry Road, Bradley, Huddersfield, DLP_RSO770</p>	<p>Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
<p>1 rep supporting the rejection of this site.</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its allocation is considered consistent with the Councils site allocation methodology.</p> <p>A suitable site access currently cannot be achieved for the level of development. Issues of road safety in the area and the access road will require making up to adoptable standard.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>
<p>H119 Land to the south of, Carr Top Lane, Golcar, Huddersfield,</p> <p>Traffic congestion and highway safety Drainage issues – future development should help mitigate these problems Impact on education provision Access for emergency services and impact of potential A&E closure at HRI</p> <p>Impact on healthcare provision</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>The site requires third party land to secure safe site access, site topography may impact on site configuration and site drainage. Close to listed buildings. Fragmented ownerships unlikely to form a deliverable housing site. Part of the site is accepted option H550.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>
<p>H122 Land to the east of, Primrose Lane, Liversedge,</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site option overlaps accepted option H2159.</p>

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H123	Land south of, Whitcliffe Road, Cleckheaton, DLP_RSO1168	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
<p>Limited wildlife value - tree to the north could retain environmental quality. Minimises loss of informal UGS - land cannot be confidently used by residents</p> <p>Potential to provide recreational activity, wildlife habitat and housing on the site.</p>		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site has been retained as Urban Greenspace. The allocation of this site as urban green space is justified based on evidence from the Kirklees Open Space Study 2015 and Kirklees Urban Green Space Review.</p> <p>UGS2156 is a natural and semi-natural greenspace including woodland and grassland. Assessed through the Kirklees Open Space Study as having high value as open space based on its ecological importance due to the presence of lowland mixed deciduous woodland UK BAP priority habitat and acid grassland. Identified as part of the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network.</p> <p>Forming an important wider section of the Spen Valley Greenway corridor and close to Cleckheaton Town Centre, the site has the potential for enhancement for informal recreation use as public open space.</p> <p>Supporting comments for this site have been noted.</p>			
H125	Balderstone Hall Lane, Mirfield, DLP_RSO378	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>Loss of recreational opportunity</p>		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Third party land required. Access can be achieved from an extension to the end of Woodward Court. However, the visibility splays at the junction of Woodward Court and Wellhouse Lane are sub-standard. The site frontage on to Hepworth Lane has sub-standard visibility splays and would require third party land to provide the standard 2.4 x 43m visibility splays. I would note that the width of Hepworth Lane is also substandard (4.5m wide) and not suitable for intensification of use. Balderstone Hall Lane is unsuitable.</p>			
H126	Part of POL, Upper Batley Lane, Upper Batley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site is only part of the larger POL. Developing this site alone without the rest of the POL, would not sit well with surrounding development and it would project out into the open countryside.</p> <p>Site is accepted as safeguarded land option SL2197.</p>			
H127	Land north west of, Netherfield Close, Kirkburton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>A significant area of third party land is required for access therefore this site is unlikely to be deliverable or developable.</p>			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H128 DLP_RSO5066	Land to the north west of, Urban Terrace, Denby Lane, Grange Moor	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
<p>This site would round off the village rather than extending it. Site would have much less impact than H36 and H270. Brownfield site could be used.</p>		<p>Proposed change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as an accepted housing allocation. This represents a change from the draft Local Plan (November 2015) where the site was rejected for housing. The reasons for the change are outlined below:</p> <p>The site is adjacent to new proposed accepted housing site H2576 providing opportunity for cumulative housing development with open space provision. 3 mine entrances on site and all of site is within high risk mining area which is not an absolute constraint.</p> <p>The site is also potentially on contaminated land.</p>			
H131	Land south west of, Quarry Road, Crosland Hill, Huddersfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No Change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The larger mixed use site allocation MX1930 is accepted and covers this site.</p> <p>No representations received on this site.</p>			
H132	Land south of, Gasworks Street, Huddersfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is a rejected housing option. There are significant environmental constraints including contamination, noise, odour and being within Health and Safety Executive inner and middle zones.</p>			
H133 DLP_RSO1044	Land to the north of, Woodside View, Burnlee	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Avoid development in flood zones.		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site occupies the steep and prominent valley sides to Black Sike Dike which is flanked by protected trees. The site has major biodiversity constraints relating to the woodland, dike and semi-improved acid grassland.</p> <p>The site is not within a high flood risk area.</p>			
H135	Land to the south east of, Dobb Lane, Hinchcliffe Mill, Holmfirth,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The site is adjacent to a poor highway network unsuited to any intensification of use at this point and achievement of the required visibility splays may not be possible.</p>			

Summary of comments

Council Response

H136	Land to the east of, Woodsome Road, Farnley Tyas	Support	80	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>DLP_RSO37, DLP_RSO88, DLP_RSO103, DLP_RSO122, DLP_RSO138, DLP_RSO148, DLP_RSO164, DLP_RSO168, DLP_RSO176, DLP_RSO193, DLP_RSO235, DLP_RSO242, DLP_RSO250, DLP_RSO271, DLP_RSO297, DLP_RSO334, DLP_RSO346, DLP_RSO364, DLP_RSO367, DLP_RSO386, DLP_RSO392, DLP_RSO487, DLP_RSO533, DLP_RSO555, DLP_RSO572, DLP_RSO695, DLP_RSO728, DLP_RSO822, DLP_RSO907, DLP_RSO913, DLP_RSO947, DLP_RSO1031, DLP_RSO1090, DLP_RSO1099, DLP_RSO1151, DLP_RSO1158, DLP_RSO1266, DLP_RSO1386, DLP_RSO1403, DLP_RSO1435, DLP_RSO1477, DLP_RSO1484, DLP_RSO1553, DLP_RSO1585, DLP_RSO1601, DLP_RSO1656, DLP_RSO1674, DLP_RSO1696, DLP_RSO1701, DLP_RSO1736, DLP_RSO1750, DLP_RSO1768, DLP_RSO1804, DLP_RSO1860, DLP_RSO1914, DLP_RSO1999, DLP_RSO2016, DLP_RSO2031, DLP_RSO2043, DLP_RSO2178, DLP_RSO2199, DLP_RSO2204, DLP_RSO2228, DLP_RSO2245, DLP_RSO2256, DLP_RSO2278, DLP_RSO2289, DLP_RSO2499, DLP_RSO2639, DLP_RSO2946, DLP_RSO3134, DLP_RSO3363, DLP_RSO3605, DLP_RSO4032, DLP_RSO4044, DLP_RSO4209, DLP_RSO4357, DLP_RSO4453, DLP_RSO4515, DLP_RSO4542</p> <p>Road congestion - especially at peak times, narrow lanes and pinch points. Particular issues on Penistone Road, Manor Road/Farnley Road junction, Woodsome Road, Storthes Hall Lane, Rowley Lane, Fenay Lane, North Road, Station Road, Tofts Lane, Field Lane.</p> <p>Road safety issues - increased danger for horse riders.</p> <p>Public transport frequency issues.</p> <p>Parking issues.</p> <p>Increased flood risk including surface water flood risk.</p> <p>Drainage capacity insufficient.</p> <p>Sewage infrastructure will not cope.</p> <p>Increased air pollution due to standing traffic.</p> <p>Wildlife would be affected.</p> <p>Negative impact on character.</p> <p>Negative impact on Farnley Tyas Conservation Area.</p> <p>Protect Castle Hill and views</p> <p>School capacity insufficient (infant/junior and secondary).</p> <p>Health provision insufficient.</p> <p>Loss of farmland.</p> <p>Protect open spaces and sports facilities such as golf, tennis, bowls (Farnley Tyas Bowling Club is located on this site).</p> <p>Land was left to the community for recreation purposes.</p> <p>Development of the site would lead to urban sprawl.</p> <p>Adverse impact on the role and function of the green belt.</p> <p>Unacceptable impact on landscape.</p> <p>Physical infrastructure would not cope.</p> <p>Negative impact on community.</p> <p>Disproportionate level of development to existing settlement size.</p> <p>Cumulative impact of development would be unacceptable on character.</p> <p>Lack of local amenities</p> <p>Loss of green belt.</p> <p>Proposals for a country park should not be linked to or used to justify new housing developments.</p> <p>Should use Brownfield land first.</p> <p>Do not use Greenfield sites.</p> <p>Bring vacant houses back into use instead of building new ones.</p> <p>Negative impact on tourism.</p> <p>Housing mix would not meet needs in the area and would not be affordable.</p> <p>No need for new housing.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The majority of this site has been justified as urban greenspace therefore this option has been rejected.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>					
<p>H137</p> <p>Land to the north of, Burton Royd Lane, Kirkburton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support</p> <p>Conditional Support</p> <p>Object</p> <p>No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site is detached from the non-green belt area and its removal from the green belt would create an area of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt land which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p>					

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H139	Land west of, Storthes Hall Lane, Kirkburton DLP_RSO4213	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Road congestion - Penistone Road and Penistone Road/Storthes Hall Lane junction, narrow roads. Archaeological sites in the area and Listed Buildings. School capacity insufficient.		No change. The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. The removal of this site from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt which would be contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
H140	Land to north west of, 3, Two Gates, Slaithwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected. Development on this site would occupy an elevated position on a very prominent steep slope which would have a significant impact on the openness of the green belt.			
H141	Land between, South View and Hunsworth Lane, East Bierley DLP_RSO1182, DLP_RSO1544, DLP_RSO4851, DLP_RSO4858, DLP_RSO4859	Support 4	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Site access available from main road Will have significant effect on the local highway network No flooding in recent months Will have significant effect on the local environment Local schools would benefit Land was not previously greenbelt. Site used to be industrial (railway line) Prevents sprawl of villages within the ward. Infrastructure already in place Continuation of development Would provide land to meet vision and is a good site for housing		No Change The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. This site is only loosely related to the settlement and large in relation to it. The extent of the site makes it highly visible on the approach to East Bierley to the detriment of the openness of the green belt and would result in significant encroachment into this open countryside setting. Site promoter comments promoting the site for development have been noted. The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
H142	Land west of, Chandler Lane, Honley DLP_RSO1312	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Public transport links (train station) should lead to more allocations in Honley. This site would be a sensible urban extension which would not undermine any of the purposes of the green belt. Honley is a sustainable location so more land should be allocated. Green belt required to meet housing needs. Safeguarded land should be considered if the housing option continues to be rejected.		No change. The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. The development of the site would introduce a block of urban land use in this essentially open agricultural landscape undermining the role and function of the green belt which is to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Comments supporting the allocation of this site for housing are noted. Settlement appraisal information for each settlement was set out in the local plan evidence base but in this case the proposal has been rejected as it would have an unacceptable impact on the role and function of the green belt in this location as set out above. This site has been considered as a Safeguarded Land option as requested (SL2733) to determine whether this would be a suitable allocation.			
H143	Land to the east of, Milton Road, Liversedge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment

Summary of comments		Council Response			
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The council rejected this site on the grounds that part of the development site is located in flood zone 3b. The site is also a good quality football pitch used by Littleton FC. The council has decided to protect the pitch as Urban Green Space.</p>			
H144	Land west of, Chandler Lane, Honley	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO1366					
Public transport links (train station) should lead to more allocations in Honley.		No change.			
<p>This site would be a sensible urban extension which would not undermine any of the purposes of the green belt.</p> <p>Honley is a sustainable location so more land should be allocated.</p> <p>Green belt required to meet housing needs.</p> <p>Safeguarded land should be considered if the housing option continues to be rejected.</p>		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The development of this site would introduce a block of urban land use in this essentially open agricultural landscape undermining the role and function of the green belt which is to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. This site would also appear as a prominent and area of built form to the detriment of the openness of the green belt in this location.</p> <p>Comments supporting the allocation of this site for housing are noted. Settlement appraisal information for each settlement was set out in the local plan evidence base but in this case the proposal has been rejected as it would have an unacceptable impact on the role and function of the green belt in this location as set out above.</p> <p>This site has been considered as a Safeguarded Land option as requested (SL2734) to determine whether this would be a suitable allocation.</p>			
H146	Land north of, Linthwaite Sports & Social Club, Linfit Lane, Slaithwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		<p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Significant engineering works required to achieve access due to topography. Existing access serving sports club not suitable.</p>			
H147	Land to the south of, Cliffe Lane, Cleckheaton	Support 2	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO1404, DLP_RSO5057					
Road within the area are narrow and will not cope with additional pressures.		No Change			
<p>Proposals comply with purposes of green belt.</p> <p>Helps maintain fringes of Gomersal.</p> <p>Development will have a negative impact on character</p>		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Release of this site would significantly impact on the River Spen. Cliffe Lane and field boundaries would present a reasonable new green belt boundary but the site as a whole is not well related to the settlement as it is separated from it by the route of the river. Preserving the river and its sensitive wildlife habitats would disassociate development from the settlement edge leading to a poor relationship with the edge of Cleckheaton. The existing boundary does not in places follow a feature on the ground so release of the site presents an opportunity for a strong new boundary to be found. However, this would not outweigh the harm to the green belt caused by the release of this site.</p> <p>Comments of support for the rejection of this site have been noted.</p>			
H148	Land off, New Steet, Cleckheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			

Summary of comments

Council Response

<p>Sustainable location range of local facilities can be accessed Consider site would not impact on Grade II listed Balderstone Hall to the south of the site Loss of recreational opportunity</p> <p>Adjacent to Mirfield built up area and Crossley Lane eastern boundary forms a defensible green belt boundary. Site is available, suitable and viable for residential development. Strong housing market Low site preparation costs Site can make a significant contribution to housing requirement. Mirfield should make meaningful contribution to housing needs.</p>	<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site access not achievable as it does not have a frontage to the adopted highway. This is a poorly configured site not well related to the settlement. Development towards the east on higher ground could be prominent and would therefore impact on the openness of the green belt. The former railway is not a strong feature on the ground and would make a weak green belt boundary. Site option includes extension to the Spenn Valley Greenway.</p>
<p>H149 Primrose Farm, Crossley Lane, Northorpe DLP_RSO382, DLP_RSO1178</p>	<p>Support 1 Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site is well related to the settlement edge and well proportioned to the existing settlement pattern. This area of green belt while separated from the wider green belt by Crossley Lane is visually linked and retains a countryside character, so development would constitute encroachment. The site for a large part does not follow any feature on the ground strong enough to present a defensible new green belt boundary. This would leave adjacent land vulnerable to encroachment contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p>
<p>H150 land to north east of, 55, Calder Road, Lower Hopton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site has been retained as Urban Greenspace. The allocation of this site as urban green space is justified based on evidence from the Kirklees Open Space Study 2015 and Kirklees Urban Green Space Review.</p> <p>This site has been retained as Urban Greenspace (UGS1272). Well used allotments are located on this site.</p>
<p>H151 Birkby Plastics, Headlands Road, Liversedge DLP_RSO772</p> <p>Assessment of site is inconsistent with overriding characteristics of the draft Local Plan. The site has 6 green lights and no red.</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment 1</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This is a Brownfield site removed however, a housing option on this site is not deliverable as there existing operational businesses on the site and it would introduce residential into a commercial area. Lowland mixed deciduous woodland UK BAP habitat on site, 1.26ha removed from developable area leaving 5.02ha. In addition this site is now allocated as a Priority Employment Area.</p>
<p>H152 Land South of, Batley Frontier, Bradford Road, Batley Carr</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Majority of the site falls within flood zone 3a. In line with the councils site allocation methodology (para 4.33) this allocation has been rejected.</p>

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H153	Holme Mills, West Slaithwaite Road, Slaithwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		This is an isolated and poorly configured site that contains the River Colne and a significant number of protected trees. Part of the site contains an existing mill building and is therefore Brownfield and national planning guidance states that redevelopment of Brownfield sites may be acceptable providing that openness is maintained. However the Brownfield element is only part of this site and the best means of protecting the important wildlife habitats is through the green belt designation. This site is isolated from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create an area of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			
H154	Hay Royds Colliery, Wheatley Hill Lane, Clayton West	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		This is a Brownfield site with a number of buildings and surface infrastructure associated with the use of the site as a colliery. Current policy allows for redevelopment of such sites provided that impact on openness is preserved. The isolated location makes an assessment of openness essential to any consideration of the redevelopment of this site but this ability would be lost if the site were removed from the green belt. Current access to colliery but this is not adoptable standard and visibility splays couldn't be achieved at junction with Wheatley Hill Lane without third party land.			
H155	Land east of, Far Common Road, Mirfield	Support 308	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO598, DLP_RSO691, DLP_RSO977, DLP_RSO998, DLP_RSO1136, DLP_RSO1246, DLP_RSO1504, DLP_RSO1716, DLP_RSO1721, DLP_RSO1800, DLP_RSO1814, DLP_RSO1823, DLP_RSO1883, DLP_RSO1887, DLP_RSO1893, DLP_RSO1898, DLP_RSO1903, DLP_RSO1916, DLP_RSO1923, DLP_RSO1928, DLP_RSO1933, DLP_RSO1943, DLP_RSO1948, DLP_RSO1961, DLP_RSO1966, DLP_RSO1970, DLP_RSO1981, DLP_RSO1986, DLP_RSO2001, DLP_RSO2006, DLP_RSO2018, DLP_RSO2038, DLP_RSO2044, DLP_RSO2049, DLP_RSO2060, DLP_RSO2067, DLP_RSO2078, DLP_RSO2083, DLP_RSO2095, DLP_RSO2116, DLP_RSO2121, DLP_RSO2132, DLP_RSO2143, DLP_RSO2148, DLP_RSO2154, DLP_RSO2168, DLP_RSO2173, DLP_RSO2180, DLP_RSO2185, DLP_RSO2190, DLP_RSO2195, DLP_RSO2214, DLP_RSO2359, DLP_RSO2364, DLP_RSO2369, DLP_RSO2374, DLP_RSO2379, DLP_RSO2384, DLP_RSO2390, DLP_RSO2395, DLP_RSO2405, DLP_RSO2410, DLP_RSO2415, DLP_RSO2420, DLP_RSO2425, DLP_RSO2430, DLP_RSO2435, DLP_RSO2445, DLP_RSO2450, DLP_RSO2455, DLP_RSO2460, DLP_RSO2464, DLP_RSO2469, DLP_RSO2479, DLP_RSO2484, DLP_RSO2489, DLP_RSO2506, DLP_RSO2511, DLP_RSO2516, DLP_RSO2521, DLP_RSO2526, DLP_RSO2531, DLP_RSO2536, DLP_RSO2541, DLP_RSO2551, DLP_RSO2557, DLP_RSO2558, DLP_RSO2566, DLP_RSO2571, DLP_RSO2576, DLP_RSO2581, DLP_RSO2587, DLP_RSO2592, DLP_RSO2597, DLP_RSO2602, DLP_RSO2607, DLP_RSO2612, DLP_RSO2614, DLP_RSO2623, DLP_RSO2626, DLP_RSO2641, DLP_RSO2648, DLP_RSO2653, DLP_RSO2661, DLP_RSO2668, DLP_RSO2673, DLP_RSO2678, DLP_RSO2683, DLP_RSO2688, DLP_RSO2693, DLP_RSO2705, DLP_RSO2710, DLP_RSO2715, DLP_RSO2720, DLP_RSO2725, DLP_RSO2730, DLP_RSO2735, DLP_RSO2740, DLP_RSO2747, DLP_RSO2753, DLP_RSO2759, DLP_RSO2763, DLP_RSO2769, DLP_RSO2779, DLP_RSO2784, DLP_RSO2789, DLP_RSO2794, DLP_RSO2799, DLP_RSO2804, DLP_RSO2809, DLP_RSO2820, DLP_RSO2825, DLP_RSO2830, DLP_RSO2835, DLP_RSO2840, DLP_RSO2855, DLP_RSO2860, DLP_RSO2899, DLP_RSO2904, DLP_RSO2909, DLP_RSO2914, DLP_RSO2977, DLP_RSO2982, DLP_RSO2987, DLP_RSO2992, DLP_RSO2997, DLP_RSO3002, DLP_RSO3007, DLP_RSO3012, DLP_RSO3017, DLP_RSO3022, DLP_RSO3027, DLP_RSO3032, DLP_RSO3037, DLP_RSO3042, DLP_RSO3047, DLP_RSO3077, DLP_RSO3082, DLP_RSO3087, DLP_RSO3093, DLP_RSO3097, DLP_RSO3102, DLP_RSO3107, DLP_RSO3141, DLP_RSO3146, DLP_RSO3151, DLP_RSO3156, DLP_RSO3286, DLP_RSO3325, DLP_RSO3346, DLP_RSO3350, DLP_RSO3383, DLP_RSO3388, DLP_RSO3393, DLP_RSO3398, DLP_RSO3403, DLP_RSO3408, DLP_RSO3413, DLP_RSO3418, DLP_RSO3423, DLP_RSO3428, DLP_RSO3433, DLP_RSO3438, DLP_RSO3443, DLP_RSO3448, DLP_RSO3453, DLP_RSO3458, DLP_RSO3463, DLP_RSO3468, DLP_RSO3473, DLP_RSO3478, DLP_RSO3483, DLP_RSO3490, DLP_RSO3495, DLP_RSO3502, DLP_RSO3505, DLP_RSO3510, DLP_RSO3515, DLP_RSO3520, DLP_RSO3525, DLP_RSO3530, DLP_RSO3536, DLP_RSO3550, DLP_RSO3555, DLP_RSO3560, DLP_RSO3565, DLP_RSO3570, DLP_RSO3575, DLP_RSO3580, DLP_RSO3585, DLP_RSO3668, DLP_RSO3687, DLP_RSO3870, DLP_RSO3894, DLP_RSO3907, DLP_RSO3912, DLP_RSO3917, DLP_RSO3922, DLP_RSO3927, DLP_RSO3934, DLP_RSO3943, DLP_RSO3948, DLP_RSO3957, DLP_RSO3965, DLP_RSO3971, DLP_RSO3983, DLP_RSO3992, DLP_RSO3998, DLP_RSO4003, DLP_RSO4008, DLP_RSO4013, DLP_RSO4018, DLP_RSO4023, DLP_RSO4028, DLP_RSO4055, DLP_RSO4061, DLP_RSO4065, DLP_RSO4070, DLP_RSO4075, DLP_RSO4080, DLP_RSO4085, DLP_RSO4090, DLP_RSO4095, DLP_RSO4100, DLP_RSO4116, DLP_RSO4121, DLP_RSO4135, DLP_RSO4151, DLP_RSO4162, DLP_RSO4167, DLP_RSO4172, DLP_RSO4200, DLP_RSO4215, DLP_RSO4220, DLP_RSO4225, DLP_RSO4230, DLP_RSO4235, DLP_RSO4267, DLP_RSO4272, DLP_RSO4285, DLP_RSO4290, DLP_RSO4295, DLP_RSO4301, DLP_RSO4306, DLP_RSO4311, DLP_RSO4316, DLP_RSO4321, DLP_RSO4326, DLP_RSO4363, DLP_RSO4371, DLP_RSO4383, DLP_RSO4389, DLP_RSO4402, DLP_RSO4412, DLP_RSO4421, DLP_RSO4426, DLP_RSO4431, DLP_RSO4436, DLP_RSO4460, DLP_RSO4465, DLP_RSO4475, DLP_RSO4491, DLP_RSO4501, DLP_RSO4506, DLP_RSO4511, DLP_RSO4566, DLP_RSO4571, DLP_RSO4576, DLP_RSO4580, DLP_RSO4595, DLP_RSO4656, DLP_RSO4661, DLP_RSO4681, DLP_RSO4687, DLP_RSO4720, DLP_RSO4731, DLP_RSO4742, DLP_RSO4748, DLP_RSO4752, DLP_RSO4757, DLP_RSO4767, DLP_RSO4772, DLP_RSO4777, DLP_RSO4782, DLP_RSO4787, DLP_RSO4792, DLP_RSO4797, DLP_RSO4802					
Poorly served by roads and public transport Road capacity issues Footpaths not fit for purpose Road safety issues - Roberttown Lane		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			

Summary of comments

- Church Road
 Impact on road network local and wider
 - M62 J25
 - Leeds Road A62 - car park
 - Three Nuns area
 - Roberttown Lane
 - Far Common Road
 - Child Lane
 - Sunny Bank Road
 No known proposals for these to be improved
 Drainage capacity insufficient
 Consideration should be given to run-off
 Proposals will bring problems of noise pollution
 - Roberttown and Hartshead Villages
 Proposals will reduce impacts of on air quality - preservation of trees
 Minimises effects on wildlife and biodiversity
 -owls
 -slow worm
 Visual amenity lost
 School capacity insufficient
 - Roberttown Junior School being the most oversubscribed in north Kirklees
 Insufficient health facilities - doctors/dentists
 -Puts pressure on Mirfield and Heckmondwike services
 Minimises loss of informal recreational space - footpaths

Proposals comply with purposes of green belt
 Land should be preserved for future generations
 Infrastructure and service could not support the level of development
 Infrastructure should be put in place first
 Should use Brownfield first
 Greenfield sites- would undermine council's Brownfield regeneration policies
 Identity of Roberttown & Hartshead will be lost
 Unsustainable locations
 If all areas get passed for housing Roberttown really will be a town
 Quiet and not over populated
 Unsustainable locations
 No more please we are full
 No need for industrial units when there are so many premises empty within surrounding area.
 Area needs jobs not houses
 Site should remain rejected
 Busy enough without adding further pressure
 Parking in village is poor especially at school times
 Once agricultural land is built on it is lost, making country too reliant on imported food.
 Further development should be a new town complete with its own infrastructure.
 Against all development in Roberttown
 No Post Office

Council Response

The site is detached from the settlement. Removing this site from the green belt would breach the existing strong boundary formed by Leeds Road which retains in the green belt land that naturally separates Mirfield from Roberttown and Moor Top and helps to maintain openness in this significant urban fringe area.

Supporting comments for the rejection of this site have been noted.

H156	Land south of, Kinder Avenue, Cowlersley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		This is an exceptionally elevated site rising up on the steep valley side above Milnsbridge where development would be very prominent. The extent and configuration of the site would also begin to impact on the strategic separation of Milnsbridge and Crosland Moor.			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H157	Land north of, 83 - 95, Huddersfield Road, Skelmanthorpe	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Development of this option would result in the encroachment of poorly related built form onto a prominent slope to the significant detriment of the openness of the green belt.			
H158	Land to the north-west of, Northgate, Honley DLP_RSO434, DLP_RSO926	Support 2	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Road safety - site access would be dangerous. Biodiversity affected (Upper Wood Nature Reserve).		No change.			
Don't use green belt. Co-owners of this site would not consent to the development of the land for housing or any other purpose and they support the rejection of this option.		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This is an extensive area of green belt that appears as open countryside with a number of isolated residential properties. The landscape character is that of countryside with tracts of protected trees. The site is totally unrelated to any inset settlement and development of this site would undermine the role and function of the green belt which is to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Its removal from the green belt would create an area of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
H159	Netherley, Old Mount Road, Marsden DLP_RSO980, DLP_RSO1243, DLP_RSO1313	Support 2	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Development here restricts opportunities for travel by sustainable modes of transport		No change			
Mount Road inappropriate for increased vehicular traffic		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
Visibility splays could not be achieved, particularly because of the parked cars.		No site frontage to highway, access only via narrow private road.. While there is existing residential development already at the northern extent of this site, including Butterley View and at Netherley, this site is elevated above the settlement on sloping ground and could impact on the openness of the green belt in this location. This is an area of urban fringe with a number of existing properties off Old Mount Road, which are only separated from the edge of Marsden by the fields of which this site forms a part. The site sits in very close proximity to the South Pennine Moors Phase 2 Special Protection Area and South Pennine Moors Special Area for Conservation/SSSI. The best means of preserving the habitats which support these sensitive wildlife areas is through the green belt designation.			
The higher Netherley Drive / Mount Road junction (to the south) is in no way a viable alternative route for vehicles from the proposed development site		It is considered that the access for this site is poor, notwithstanding the potential to improve site access from Netherley Drive.			
Site is 1.1km from Marsden centre, exceeding distance identified in Manual for Streets for walkable neighbourhoods. The site is 1.4km from Marsden station		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
The landowners own the site frontage and this would provide an opportunity to widen the road to improve access. Site adjacent to Special Area of Conservation Negative impact on historic landscape					
Proposals go against purpose of green belt - development would be urban sprawl and an incursion into the quality of the landscape Significant impact on landscape					
Highly visible from village and moors The site is available and development is achievable. Development would be contrary to current settlement pattern					
Site is in unsustainable location, isolated from amenities					
The site is in a sustainable location and close to Marsden centre.					

Summary of comments		Council Response			
Should use Brownfield land first					
H160	Land east and to the rear of, Syke Lane Bradford Road, Oakenshaw	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO2945					
Site now promoted as employment option.		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The location and configuration of this site means that it would be wholly contained east of the greenway and therefore there would be little risk of sprawl to the west. The greenway would form the new green belt boundary. However, the southern extent of the site would significantly undermine the strategic role of the green belt in preventing the merger of Oakenshaw with Cleckheaton. The green belt overwashes the lower density ribbon development and the industrial park to the west of Bradford Road in order to prevent the intensification of built form and to prevent any depth of development to the west and so maintain the appearance of separation which would be lost should the option be accepted.			
		Through representations that have been received from the consultation this site has also been considered as an employment option (E2700).			
H163	Land at, 538, Hunsworth Lane, East Bierley	Support 4	Conditional Support	Object 2	No Comment
DLP_RSO32, DLP_RSO1184, DLP_RSO1543, DLP_RSO4871, DLP_RSO4872, DLP_RSO4873					
Good access from Hunsworth Lane Mains sewer on site running from Birkenshaw to Oakenshaw Not prone to flooding or standing water Schools would benefit from new development		No Change			
Land allocated as green belt in 1949 for a 50 year term only. New water main and gas pipes laid in 1990's for future development. Land was previously industrial Already situated in between development. The land is ideal for infill development Objection against rejection. Land should be reconsidered for development. Would be an ideal site for eco-friendly and affordable housing. Would provide a wonderful site for families Support for the rejection of the site from local councillors and resident		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This is a remote site beyond the settlement limits of East Bierley. It is loosely associated with a small group of dwellings largely fronting Hunsworth Lane but would reinforce the extensive ribbon development on the south side of Hunsworth Lane as well as significantly projecting development into the open countryside. Its removal from the green belt would create a small area of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt which is contrary to the role and function of the green belt.			
		Comments in favour of this site been allocated as a housing option have been noted.			
H164	Church Farm, Church Lane, Gomersal	Support 23	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO422, DLP_RSO644, DLP_RSO786, DLP_RSO1011, DLP_RSO1012, DLP_RSO1042, DLP_RSO1125, DLP_RSO1188, DLP_RSO1220, DLP_RSO1372, DLP_RSO1462, DLP_RSO1576, DLP_RSO2349, DLP_RSO2494, DLP_RSO2550, DLP_RSO3074, DLP_RSO3656, DLP_RSO4155, DLP_RSO4299, DLP_RSO4923, DLP_RSO4924, DLP_RSO4925, DLP_RSO5020					
Road Congestion and capacity issues at peak times. - Hill top junction - Muffit Lane - Bradford Road - Church Lane Parking problems for local residents Road safety issues - Church Lane Flooding issues, loss of natural soakaway, will create surface run-off problems Standing water on site, localised flooding will increase Springs and water courses present between Church Lane and Bradford road Increase in noise pollution Increased air pollution due to increased traffic. Air quality and dust issues within the area. Wildlife would be affected; bird, insect and bat populations; herons, owls, pheasants, foxes, rabbits, squirrels, badgers and deer Newts in residents back garden		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This is a poorly configured site relative to the existing settlement pattern and lies within an area where there is a restricted gap separating major settlements. It is contained by houses at The Coppice to the east and landform and trees to the north so there is no danger of further sprawl towards Birstall. It lies behind existing ribbon development to the north side of Church Lane that connects Gomersal to Birstall and the green belt in this location prevents any intensification of this connection. Inclusion of this site as a housing option would significantly reinforce the appearance of connection as it would introduce depth to the existing ribbon development, contrary to the role and function of the green belt.			
		Supporting comments for the rejection of this site have been noted.			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Loss of trees
 Protect the following important landmarks; Red House Museum and Oakwell Hall
 Maintain the existing mix of natural and historic environment
 School capacity insufficient
 Health and dental services insufficient
 Loss of informal recreation land - footpath leading to Church Woods
 Loss of open green space
 Loss of farmland
 Forms important green backbone of Gomersal Community.
 Needed to maintain the fitness of residents

Proposals comply with purposes of green belt.
 Retaining land as green belt will prevent sprawl
 Protection for future generations
 Poor ground conditions from mining in area
 Infrastructure will not cope, already stretched and failing
 Disproportionate level of development
 Negative impact on quality of life and community
 Should use Brownfield first
 Bring vacant mills and houses back into use.
 If accepted allocation would contradict the vision of the plan "healthy people enjoying a great quality of life for longer"
 CIL will not compensate for additional pressure on local infrastructure
 Will not offer business investment or job creation, improve new infrastructure or schools nor build a new sustainable community.

Ex industrial sites on Westgate Cleckheaton are a more suitable option. They have good walking and cycling access to Cleckheaton and would not impact on the green belt.

H165	Land to the rear of, 10, Oxford Road, Gomersal	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
-------------	--	---------	---------------------	--------	------------

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Release of the site from the green belt would further erode the narrow gap that separates Gomersal and Liversedge which is already encroached upon by existing residential properties that line the frontage to Oxford Road. The green belt designation prevents the intensification or consolidation of this line of ribbon development, where open spaces, or the appearance of open spaces to the rear of frontage properties, are critically important in retaining a sense of separation. The area of slope at the rear of the site should be protected from development because it contains priority habitat and is also a steep and prominent slope where new development would be prominent to the detriment of openness.

H166	39, Sandy Lane, South Crosland	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
-------------	--------------------------------	---------	---------------------	--------	------------

No Representations received

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

This is an extensive area of green belt which maintains separation between Huddersfield and neighbouring settlements. The green belt over washes South Crosland in order to retain its character as a traditional hill top settlement. The site itself is somewhat remote from the settlement being the garden of a large detached property. Development of the site would introduce urban form into this remote location contrary to the purposes of the green belt which is to safeguard the countryside from encroachment.

No representations have been received for this site option.

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H167	Land to the north of, Quarry Lane, Lascelles Hall	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO610					
Support for the rejection of the site.		No Change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The scale of land release in this location would merge Lascelles Hall with the historic cluster of buildings at Lower Hall contrary to the role and function of the green belt. This is an urban fringe area with numerous sporadic residential and other buildings. The over washing of the green belt in this location prevents the further intensification of built form and helps maintain the appearance of separation.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
H168	Land off, Pilling Lane, Scissett	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO3069					
It is considered that the Green Belt boundary could be defined along the hedgerow to the west and the railway to the north as a defensible and definable physical boundary. Consideration of the Sustainability Appraisal suggests the site would have significant positive effects and some adverse effects.		No change.			
Schools are located close to the site - but this doesn't seem to be picked up in SA.		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		No site frontage to adopted road, would need to be accessed through land to the east. The site is contained by Pilling Lane, woodland and the light railway but would represent a westwards extension of the settlement in this area which may weaken the role of the greenbelt regarding the site to the south.			
H169	Site to the north of, Penistone Road, Shelley	Support 11	Conditional Support	Object 3	No Comment
DLP_RSO7, DLP_RSO26, DLP_RSO261, DLP_RSO300, DLP_RSO792, DLP_RSO1010, DLP_RSO1113, DLP_RSO1833, DLP_RSO1844, DLP_RSO2922, DLP_RSO2924, DLP_RSO3328, DLP_RSO3337, DLP_RSO3634					
Road congestion - particularly Penistone Road (A629) and B6116, too expensive to upgrade roads.		No change.			
Road safety - often lack of footpaths, dangerous traffic levels.					
Parking issues.					
Encourages commuting.					
Public transport frequency issues.					
Site has good access to public transport facilities.					
Proposals will bring problems of noise pollution and air pollution.					
Site has no known environmental constraints.					
Wildlife would be affected.					
School capacity insufficient.					
Site located close to a primary school.					
Health provision insufficient.					
Loss of informal recreation - footpaths, dog walking. Fields are an extension of Healey Greave Meadow.					
Loss of farmland.					
Loss of protected trees.					
The proposal will deliver public open space.					
The site is contained by development and activity (residential properties, farm access road, Trans Pennine Trail and woodland - development would have a limited impact on openness - consistent with purposes of including land in the green belt.					
Current green belt boundary around Shelley is not robust.					
Land prevents urban sprawl between villages.					
Unacceptable impact on landscape - place of natural beauty.					
Site would form a logical extension to Shelley and have limited impact on the visual openness of the existing landscape.					
Physical infrastructure cannot cope.					
Negative impact on quality of life and community.					
Disproportionate level of development to existing settlement size.					

Summary of comments	Council Response				
<p>Cumulative impact unacceptable. Negative impact on tourism. Don't use green belt. Loss of Greenfield sites. Lack of local amenities. This land should remain open as it provides a buffer between adjacent villages. Important to fairly share funding. This site is required to meet the housing requirement. Site should be allocated in Shelley because this is a sustainable location. Site is currently under-utilised. Site will provide a good mix of housing. Site is available for development now. Could phase the site to allow some development during this plan period and some beyond the end of the plan.</p>	Support	1	Conditional Support	Object	1 No Comment
<p>H170 Land west of, Huddersfield Road, Shelley DLP_RSO25, DLP_RSO1863</p> <p>Road congestion - Near Bank, Far Bank. Road safety - restricted sight lines. Site can be accessed directly from Huddersfield Road. Sewer infrastructure inadequate. Flooding issues - will create surface run-off problems.</p> <p>Proposals comply with purposes of including land in the green belt - Site is a reasonable extension to Shelley, immediately adjoins properties. Sensitive planting and layout could mitigate impacts. Physical infrastructure could not cope. Don't use green belt. The draft local plan already identifies other sites to be developed in the green belt. Sustainability appraisal identifies potential significant positive effects in relation to employment, education, leisure, sustainable transport, climate change with only one potential significant negative effect (biodiversity/geodiversity). Site is available.</p>	No change	The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.	Although this option would be contained by field boundaries the existing elongated settlement pattern does not present a strong edge, making the existing settlement edge reasonably unintrusive when viewed from the north. Development of this option would extend the settlement down the north facing slope and would be highly prominent in long distance views. Development would also effectively incorporate the property at 49 and 51 Huddersfield Road within the settlement extending the elongated development form.	The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted. Comments in support of the housing allocation are also noted including that the site can be accessed from Huddersfield Road, the view that the proposals are consistent with green belt policy and represent a reasonable extension to Shelley and that sensitive planting could mitigate impacts. The site has been rejected for the reasons set out above but it is noted that the site is available.	
<p>H171 Land to the north of, Highmoor Lane, Hartshead Moorside DLP_RSO1445</p> <p>Use Brownfield first Rejection supported Cost should not be an issue Developers get away with not following guidelines or fulfilling their promises</p>	No Change	The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.	Site access is achievable. Site is a former school which is now demolished. The land is unused and assessed as low value. Provision of natural/semi-natural greenspace in the Cleckheaton ward is above the standard. Site overlaps with accepted housing option H1704.	Supporting comments for the rejection of the site have been noted.	
<p>H175 Land off, Midway, South Crosland</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	No Change	The site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).	The green belt in this location maintains separation between Netherton and South Crosland. The green belt over washes South Crosland in order to retain its character as a traditional hill top settlement. The site is closely		

Summary of comments

Council Response

associated with the existing settlement of South Crosland but is large in relation to it and would not constitute infill for the purposes of national planning policy. The Local Plan strategy does not include the removal of South Crosland from the green belt. Removal of this site from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. There no suitable access point to the site.

No representations were received on this site option.

H176 Land behind former Blue Bell PH, Close Hill, Taylor Hill

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change.

The site is a rejected housing option. The site requires 3rd party land for access. An accepted housing option covers the majority of this site.

H177 Land at Springfield Farm, Penistone Road, Birds Edge

Support 17 Conditional Support 1 Object 17 No Comment

DLP_RSO57, DLP_RSO59, DLP_RSO76, DLP_RSO78, DLP_RSO129, DLP_RSO207, DLP_RSO209, DLP_RSO210, DLP_RSO216, DLP_RSO224, DLP_RSO265, DLP_RSO319, DLP_RSO329, DLP_RSO350, DLP_RSO414, DLP_RSO500, DLP_RSO549, DLP_RSO646, DLP_RSO647, DLP_RSO751, DLP_RSO865, DLP_RSO1236, DLP_RSO1253, DLP_RSO1255, DLP_RSO1256, DLP_RSO1279, DLP_RSO1637, DLP_RSO2493, DLP_RSO2751, DLP_RSO3111, DLP_RSO3633, DLP_RSO4265, DLP_RSO4829, DLP_RSO4966, DLP_RSO4986

Adverse impact of increased traffic on A635.

No change.

Adverse impact on roads surrounding the village.

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

Limited public transport

This site is closely associated with the existing settlement of Birds Edge but is poorly configured in relation to it and would not constitute infill for the purposes of national planning policy. The site could not be released in isolation and the Local Plan strategy does not include the removal of Birds Edge from the green belt.

Access close to a bend with limited visibility

This would be contrary to the Local Plan strategy to remove the settlement from the Green Belt. Consideration has been given to the removal of the settlement from the Green Belt in the Settlement Appraisal technical paper. This concluded that it would not be appropriate for any of the over washed villages to be removed from the Green Belt, including Birds Edge.

Development would encourage commuting

Site access was deemed satisfactory for camping and caravan site

Birds Edge does not suffer from high levels of traffic congestion.
Impact on the drainage system
Affect on wildlife
Insufficient school capacity at Birds Edge

Birds Edge has a school and a village hall, but no other facilities and an infrequent bus service. The pattern of development in the settlement means that it would be difficult for a defensible Green Belt boundary to be created around it, which upheld the roles and function of Green Belt as set out in national policy. Access to the site could be achievable from Penistone Road, subject to the provision of visibility splays.

No robust evidence that the development would support the school

A large number of pupils travel from outside of Birds Edge to keep the school open.
Concerns about additional healthcare provision

This land is currently green belt.
The land is available for development.

Infrastructure in the village could not cope with additional development
Disproportionate level of development to existing settlement size

Birds Edge would change the rural nature of the settlement.

No guarantee that development would contain affordable houses.

Larger housing development would be out of character with the village

Support for additional housing development in the village, including family housing

A smaller development may be appropriate to sustain the school and village life.

Summary of comments

Council Response

Site owner: An infill development of less than 58 houses would be submitted

Last significant housing development in Birdsedge circa 1965.

No attempt made to provide or promote sustainable housing to maintain families in rural communities

Significant constraints placed on villages washed over by green belt, whilst some are inset.

Allocating this site may set precedent for other green belt sites elsewhere.

Broadband speeds are slow

Electricity supply issues

H179 Land to th east of, Huddersfield Road, Honley

DLP_RSO1778

Road congestion - particularly Woodhead Road.

Negative impact on character and visual amenity.

Unacceptable impact on landscape.

Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

This is a large site which would effectively cut off from the wider green belt all the land to the south, including Honley High School and a number of properties in extensive grounds. While this is an area of urban fringe there is extensive cover of protected trees and a number of listed buildings, the settings of which are best protected through the green belt designation.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

H180 Land off, Greenhill Bank Road, Scholes

DLP_RSO1282

Insetting Totties would allow for proper planning of the area and sustain the settlement with planned growth.

Site would round off the settlement.

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The settlement of Totties is over washed within the green belt and the Local Plan strategy does not include the removal of Totties from the green belt. The removal of this site could not occur without also removing the remainder of the settlement, as otherwise it would leave an area of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.

The supporting comments for the development of this site are noted. As stated above, Totties is over washed within the green belt as such this land could not be allocated for development unless the whole of Totties was also removed from the green belt.

H181 Land east of, St George's Road, Scholes

DLP_RSO8

Support for rejection of site - process has blighted surrounding areas and affected property valuations.

Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Undeveloped frontages along roads connecting settlements help to maintain the appearance of openness and separation. The northern most part of this site represents a strategically important gap between Scholes and Totties. Development would therefore significantly undermine the role and function of the green belt in this location. A significant section of the eastern boundary of the site does not follow a feature on the ground and there would therefore be significant risk of encroachment onto land to the east, although this extent would be

Summary of comments

Council Response

limited by the containment offered by the protected trees. There are no exceptional circumstances to remove this site from the green belt.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

H182 Land to the rear of, Springfield Avenue, Clayton West

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

This option appears to be well contained by landform to the east and by the boundary of the recreation ground to the west, but its southern edge does not follow any feature on the ground which would leave adjacent land vulnerable to encroachment. Leaving a buffer to the adjacent ancient woodland would result in a very poorly related development form.

H183 Gunthwaite Top Farm, Gunthwaite Lane, Upper Denby

Support 200 Conditional Support Object No Comment

DLP_RSO579, DLP_RSO582, DLP_RSO585, DLP_RSO593, DLP_RSO705, DLP_RSO1259, DLP_RSO1264, DLP_RSO1310, DLP_RSO1650, DLP_RSO1939, DLP_RSO1978, DLP_RSO2105, DLP_RSO2109, DLP_RSO2113, DLP_RSO2220, DLP_RSO2266, DLP_RSO2271, DLP_RSO2303, DLP_RSO2307, DLP_RSO2313, DLP_RSO2317, DLP_RSO2322, DLP_RSO2325, DLP_RSO2330, DLP_RSO2333, DLP_RSO2337, DLP_RSO2341, DLP_RSO2345, DLP_RSO2352, DLP_RSO2356, DLP_RSO2402, DLP_RSO2868, DLP_RSO2872, DLP_RSO2876, DLP_RSO2880, DLP_RSO2884, DLP_RSO2888, DLP_RSO2892, DLP_RSO2896, DLP_RSO2921, DLP_RSO2927, DLP_RSO2931, DLP_RSO2935, DLP_RSO2939, DLP_RSO3121, DLP_RSO3163, DLP_RSO3166, DLP_RSO3170, DLP_RSO3174, DLP_RSO3178, DLP_RSO3182, DLP_RSO3186, DLP_RSO3190, DLP_RSO3194, DLP_RSO3198, DLP_RSO3202, DLP_RSO3206, DLP_RSO3210, DLP_RSO3214, DLP_RSO3218, DLP_RSO3223, DLP_RSO3227, DLP_RSO3231, DLP_RSO3235, DLP_RSO3239, DLP_RSO3243, DLP_RSO3247, DLP_RSO3251, DLP_RSO3255, DLP_RSO3259, DLP_RSO3263, DLP_RSO3267, DLP_RSO3271, DLP_RSO3275, DLP_RSO3279, DLP_RSO3283, DLP_RSO3590, DLP_RSO3594, DLP_RSO3598, DLP_RSO3602, DLP_RSO3617, DLP_RSO3622, DLP_RSO3625, DLP_RSO3630, DLP_RSO3636, DLP_RSO3641, DLP_RSO3647, DLP_RSO3652, DLP_RSO3657, DLP_RSO3661, DLP_RSO3665, DLP_RSO3674, DLP_RSO3678, DLP_RSO3683, DLP_RSO3692, DLP_RSO3697, DLP_RSO3701, DLP_RSO3705, DLP_RSO3710, DLP_RSO3713, DLP_RSO3717, DLP_RSO3721, DLP_RSO3725, DLP_RSO3729, DLP_RSO3733, DLP_RSO3737, DLP_RSO3741, DLP_RSO3745, DLP_RSO3749, DLP_RSO3754, DLP_RSO3757, DLP_RSO3761, DLP_RSO3765, DLP_RSO3769, DLP_RSO3773, DLP_RSO3777, DLP_RSO3785, DLP_RSO3789, DLP_RSO3793, DLP_RSO3797, DLP_RSO3801, DLP_RSO3805, DLP_RSO3810, DLP_RSO3813, DLP_RSO3817, DLP_RSO3821, DLP_RSO3825, DLP_RSO3829, DLP_RSO3833, DLP_RSO3840, DLP_RSO3842, DLP_RSO3846, DLP_RSO3850, DLP_RSO3854, DLP_RSO3858, DLP_RSO3862, DLP_RSO3867, DLP_RSO3875, DLP_RSO3879, DLP_RSO3883, DLP_RSO3899, DLP_RSO3903, DLP_RSO3941, DLP_RSO3953, DLP_RSO3976, DLP_RSO3980, DLP_RSO3989, DLP_RSO4127, DLP_RSO4130, DLP_RSO4137, DLP_RSO4143, DLP_RSO4147, DLP_RSO4179, DLP_RSO4182, DLP_RSO4186, DLP_RSO4190, DLP_RSO4241, DLP_RSO4245, DLP_RSO4251, DLP_RSO4278, DLP_RSO4282, DLP_RSO4377, DLP_RSO4380, DLP_RSO4393, DLP_RSO4398, DLP_RSO4409, DLP_RSO4418, DLP_RSO4471, DLP_RSO4483, DLP_RSO4487, DLP_RSO4496, DLP_RSO4540, DLP_RSO4559, DLP_RSO4563, DLP_RSO4587, DLP_RSO4592, DLP_RSO4600, DLP_RSO4604, DLP_RSO4608, DLP_RSO4612, DLP_RSO4616, DLP_RSO4620, DLP_RSO4624, DLP_RSO4628, DLP_RSO4633, DLP_RSO4637, DLP_RSO4643, DLP_RSO4667, DLP_RSO4671, DLP_RSO4698, DLP_RSO4702, DLP_RSO4726, DLP_RSO4733, DLP_RSO4739, DLP_RSO4740, DLP_RSO4763, DLP_RSO4808, DLP_RSO4813, DLP_RSO4817, DLP_RSO5044

Infrequent public transport

No change.

Road congestion

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

Parking problems

This site consists of a large property in extensive grounds and a field to the west, which is located within Barnsley district. The field is very poorly related to the existing settlement and would project development into the countryside to the considerable detriment of openness and contrary to the role and function of the green belt. There would be no physical merger with any settlement within Barnsley.

Highway safety issues

Potential impact on drainage.

Wildlife affected

School capacity issues

Impact on footpaths

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

Development would have a detrimental impact on role and function of the Green Belt.

Difficulty in establishing defendable green belt boundary.

The greenfields in this area make an important contribution to rural landscape of the district.

Physical infrastructure will not cope with development

Lack of local shops / facilities

Negative impact on quality of life / community

Small scale housing may be appropriate (e.g. starter homes)

Summary of comments	Council Response				
<p>H184 Dry Hill Farm, Dry Hill Lane, Denby Dale DLP_RSO28, DLP_RSO576, DLP_RSO581, DLP_RSO586, DLP_RSO592, DLP_RSO1058, DLP_RSO1077, DLP_RSO1270 Highway safety issues - junction at the Dunkirk Development of the site could enable safety improvements to junction at the Dunkirk The site is served by bus - Denby Dale, Huddersfield and Barnsley. The site is 2km from Denby Dale station Site has safe pedestrian route to Denby Dale via Miller Hill The site is adjacent to several listed buildings. Development of the site could demonstrate special circumstances as it could enable major highway works to take place at the Dunkirk junction. The site is available for development. Development of the site with H472 could provide junction improvements at The Dunkirk. Impact on rural character</p>	Support	5	Conditional Support	Object 3	No Comment
	No change				
	This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.				
	This site is isolated from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.				
<p>H185 Land north of, Langley Lane, Clayton West No Representations received</p>	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
	No change				
	This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.				
	This is an extensive green belt area but opportunities for settlement expansion are limited in this immediate location due to flooding issues associated with Park Gate Dyke.				
<p>H186 Land west of, Fusden Lane, Gomersal No Representations received</p>	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
	No Change				
	The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.				
	Objection raised concerning noise from the adjacent business. The green belt in this location prevents the reinforcement of urban land uses along Spen Lane. Undeveloped gaps help to preserve the sense of separation between settlements and this site represents one of the few remaining undeveloped frontages. The site abuts an area of ancient woodland the setting of which is best protected by its green belt designation.				
<p>H187 Land north of, Banks Avenue and Ashford Park, Golcar No Representations received</p>	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
	No change				
	This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.				
	Development of this site on this steep slope immediately adjacent to the settlement edge would result in very prominent development on an elevated site, to the detriment of the openness of the green belt.				

H188 Land to the west of, Penistone Road, Fenay Bridge	Support 187	Conditional Support	Object 6	No Comment
<p>DLP_RSO18, DLP_RSO52, DLP_RSO62, DLP_RSO93, DLP_RSO99, DLP_RSO134, DLP_RSO144, DLP_RSO156, DLP_RSO167, DLP_RSO190, DLP_RSO204, DLP_RSO257, DLP_RSO263, DLP_RSO270, DLP_RSO279, DLP_RSO283, DLP_RSO290, DLP_RSO307, DLP_RSO311, DLP_RSO315, DLP_RSO337, DLP_RSO359, DLP_RSO411, DLP_RSO416, DLP_RSO420, DLP_RSO430, DLP_RSO460, DLP_RSO490, DLP_RSO491, DLP_RSO494, DLP_RSO508, DLP_RSO535, DLP_RSO538, DLP_RSO560, DLP_RSO567, DLP_RSO625, DLP_RSO629, DLP_RSO632, DLP_RSO641, DLP_RSO651, DLP_RSO668, DLP_RSO671, DLP_RSO708, DLP_RSO710, DLP_RSO717, DLP_RSO725, DLP_RSO737, DLP_RSO748, DLP_RSO761, DLP_RSO775, DLP_RSO796, DLP_RSO805, DLP_RSO818, DLP_RSO832, DLP_RSO838, DLP_RSO846, DLP_RSO856, DLP_RSO858, DLP_RSO863, DLP_RSO864, DLP_RSO868, DLP_RSO877, DLP_RSO879, DLP_RSO889, DLP_RSO902, DLP_RSO916, DLP_RSO927, DLP_RSO937, DLP_RSO942, DLP_RSO954, DLP_RSO960, DLP_RSO972, DLP_RSO1026, DLP_RSO1037, DLP_RSO1055, DLP_RSO1067, DLP_RSO1078, DLP_RSO1084, DLP_RSO1100, DLP_RSO1110, DLP_RSO1116, DLP_RSO1140, DLP_RSO1156, DLP_RSO1166, DLP_RSO1170, DLP_RSO1171, DLP_RSO1197, DLP_RSO1285, DLP_RSO1289, DLP_RSO1320, DLP_RSO1348, DLP_RSO1356, DLP_RSO1377, DLP_RSO1384, DLP_RSO1394, DLP_RSO1399, DLP_RSO1410, DLP_RSO1416, DLP_RSO1434, DLP_RSO1442, DLP_RSO1473, DLP_RSO1495, DLP_RSO1508, DLP_RSO1522, DLP_RSO1531, DLP_RSO1538, DLP_RSO1555, DLP_RSO1567, DLP_RSO1602, DLP_RSO1613, DLP_RSO1618, DLP_RSO1627, DLP_RSO1638, DLP_RSO1646, DLP_RSO1652, DLP_RSO1665, DLP_RSO1666, DLP_RSO1683, DLP_RSO1689, DLP_RSO1693, DLP_RSO1702, DLP_RSO1712, DLP_RSO1726, DLP_RSO1729, DLP_RSO1737, DLP_RSO1748, DLP_RSO1756, DLP_RSO1765, DLP_RSO1777, DLP_RSO1779, DLP_RSO1788, DLP_RSO1809, DLP_RSO1837, DLP_RSO1841, DLP_RSO1859, DLP_RSO1875, DLP_RSO1915, DLP_RSO1952, DLP_RSO1993, DLP_RSO2012, DLP_RSO2056, DLP_RSO2071, DLP_RSO2101, DLP_RSO2129, DLP_RSO2136, DLP_RSO2159, DLP_RSO2163, DLP_RSO2208, DLP_RSO2225, DLP_RSO2234, DLP_RSO2241, DLP_RSO2255, DLP_RSO2259, DLP_RSO2282, DLP_RSO2495, DLP_RSO2546, DLP_RSO2632, DLP_RSO2659, DLP_RSO2698, DLP_RSO2952, DLP_RSO2953, DLP_RSO2970, DLP_RSO2972, DLP_RSO3123, DLP_RSO3127, DLP_RSO3322, DLP_RSO3355, DLP_RSO3357, DLP_RSO3371, DLP_RSO3373, DLP_RSO3610, DLP_RSO4038, DLP_RSO4045, DLP_RSO4109, DLP_RSO4348, DLP_RSO4353, DLP_RSO4455, DLP_RSO4516, DLP_RSO4525, DLP_RSO4543, DLP_RSO4555, DLP_RSO4704, DLP_RSO4711, DLP_RSO4717, DLP_RSO4839, DLP_RSO4862, DLP_RSO4913, DLP_RSO4971, DLP_RSO5041, DLP_RSO5088</p>				
<p>The site would increase congestion and pressure on the road infrastructure including Penistone Road (A629), Wakefield Road, Storthes Hall Lane, Rowley Lane, Fenay Lane, Woodsome Road, North Road, Station Road. Links to motorways are difficult. Local roads are narrow. There are no plans to improve Penistone Road. Parking problems in Kirkburton would be increased. Country Park benefit; a reason to improve public transport links and services in south Huddersfield.</p> <p>Land is in flood zone 3 / 3b. Land is a flood plain protecting Fenay Bridge, Waterloo, Dalton, Morrisons and Gallagher Retail Park. Development would cause a sewage backlog. Increased run off from site would increase flood risk. Any development would affect the management of local rivers and Fenay Beck.</p> <p>Site would increase noise and pollution and traffic would reduce air quality.</p> <p>The area is an extensive wildlife habitat. Area has diverse flora and fauna. Site is located within a wildlife corridor. Country Park benefit; funding, and a reason to preserve wildlife and historical sites of interest. Development would affect the setting of Castle Hill Ancient Monument.</p> <p>The site would increase pressure on school infrastructure. (Rowley Lane J I and N School and King James High School) There are no plans for extra schools. Country Park benefit; outdoor education.</p> <p>The site would increase pressure on health infrastructure. There are no plans for extra doctor's surgeries or dentists. There is uncertainty over the future of Huddersfield A&E. Social care infrastructure needs to be improved. Country Park benefit; health.</p> <p>Country Park benefit; would improve cycling opportunities, greater access to good quality green space for local people, more facilities for sport and recreation in a relatively safe environment.</p>	<p>No change.</p>	<p>This site is a rejected housing option. 9.36ha has been removed from the net developable area due to flood risk and biodiversity constraints. This is an extensive area of green belt that washes over the open countryside south of Huddersfield. The area includes sensitive environmental habitats, Fenay Beck and numerous historic assets. Penistone Road and the route of the former railway line currently delineate the edge of Lepton and this site would breach this very strong boundary, introducing significant additional built form west of Penistone Road. The route of Fenay Beck would prevent further sprawl to the west but as a countryside feature the river and its setting it best protected by its green belt designation so as to prevent encroachment into the countryside.</p>		<p>Support for the rejection of the site is noted.</p>
<p>Green belt land should not be used. This encroachment would remove the green buffer between the villages and Huddersfield. The site does not abut adjoining communities which might otherwise justify relaxing green belt boundaries. Including this site would be against national green belt policy. Building in the green belt is not sustainable and will make the green belt more vulnerable. Request to remove 12.82 ha of land rejected in the draft Local Plan as Site ref. SG12109/H188 from the Green Belt and allocate for a mix of uses compatible with the aims and objectives of the Country Park, as set out in Policy DLP34 of the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The Woodsome Valley and surrounding area is of great beauty and can be enjoyed by the public in its current form. Cumulative impact of accepting this site with others would be detrimental to the landscape. Inclusion of all these sites is not in accordance with Policy DLP33, as the landscape character would be damaged.</p> <p>Local services will have to expand including: police, dentist, street cleaning, rubbish collection, postal services, school accommodation, public transport, effluent discharge, surface water drainage.</p> <p>Brownfield sites should be used before green fields. There is a lack of jobs that would lead to dormitory estates. Cumulative impact of accepted housing options in the area will increase pressure on infrastructure. Development of site would lead to urban sprawl.</p> <p>Support for rejection of site. Kirklees needs housing for the local population, small starter homes, housing for older people, and reasonably priced family homes to promote social diversity. Development proposed is for financial gain. Safety of children attending King James' School would decrease. Sustainability Appraisal rates the site negatively. There is no evidence of demand for more housing. Site would lead to ribbon</p>				

development. Support for the Country Park; Greater access to green space, local regeneration, jobs, supplement farming income, rural diversification, benefits to wildlife conservation, education and tourism. The site would help fund Farnley Country Park; the site is close enough to existing settlements and maintain green space. Country Park benefit; tourism, job creation, economic growth. If land has to be removed from the green belt for housing, it should help to deliver and Country Park. Farnley Country Park would be of national significance.

H189	Land to the north and south of, Woodsome Road, Fenay Bridge	Support 195	Conditional Support	Object 17	No Comment
DLP_RSO19, DLP_RSO35, DLP_RSO53, DLP_RSO54, DLP_RSO73, DLP_RSO94, DLP_RSO98, DLP_RSO133, DLP_RSO143, DLP_RSO157, DLP_RSO186, DLP_RSO191, DLP_RSO205, DLP_RSO214, DLP_RSO217, DLP_RSO256, DLP_RSO269, DLP_RSO280, DLP_RSO284, DLP_RSO291, DLP_RSO299, DLP_RSO308, DLP_RSO313, DLP_RSO316, DLP_RSO338, DLP_RSO358, DLP_RSO412, DLP_RSO421, DLP_RSO432, DLP_RSO440, DLP_RSO461, DLP_RSO481, DLP_RSO489, DLP_RSO492, DLP_RSO495, DLP_RSO509, DLP_RSO536, DLP_RSO539, DLP_RSO554, DLP_RSO561, DLP_RSO566, DLP_RSO619, DLP_RSO626, DLP_RSO628, DLP_RSO633, DLP_RSO639, DLP_RSO652, DLP_RSO657, DLP_RSO664, DLP_RSO669, DLP_RSO675, DLP_RSO676, DLP_RSO689, DLP_RSO709, DLP_RSO711, DLP_RSO718, DLP_RSO726, DLP_RSO732, DLP_RSO738, DLP_RSO744, DLP_RSO749, DLP_RSO760, DLP_RSO806, DLP_RSO819, DLP_RSO833, DLP_RSO840, DLP_RSO847, DLP_RSO849, DLP_RSO857, DLP_RSO859, DLP_RSO878, DLP_RSO880, DLP_RSO890, DLP_RSO900, DLP_RSO903, DLP_RSO918, DLP_RSO929, DLP_RSO938, DLP_RSO941, DLP_RSO955, DLP_RSO961, DLP_RSO964, DLP_RSO1027, DLP_RSO1038, DLP_RSO1050, DLP_RSO1056, DLP_RSO1068, DLP_RSO1070, DLP_RSO1079, DLP_RSO1085, DLP_RSO1101, DLP_RSO1111, DLP_RSO1117, DLP_RSO1141, DLP_RSO1157, DLP_RSO1167, DLP_RSO1172, DLP_RSO1198, DLP_RSO1206, DLP_RSO1274, DLP_RSO1286, DLP_RSO1290, DLP_RSO1311, DLP_RSO1335, DLP_RSO1336, DLP_RSO1352, DLP_RSO1357, DLP_RSO1378, DLP_RSO1385, DLP_RSO1397, DLP_RSO1411, DLP_RSO1417, DLP_RSO1423, DLP_RSO1433, DLP_RSO1443, DLP_RSO1496, DLP_RSO1502, DLP_RSO1509, DLP_RSO1514, DLP_RSO1519, DLP_RSO1526, DLP_RSO1532, DLP_RSO1539, DLP_RSO1556, DLP_RSO1562, DLP_RSO1568, DLP_RSO1579, DLP_RSO1583, DLP_RSO1586, DLP_RSO1603, DLP_RSO1612, DLP_RSO1614, DLP_RSO1620, DLP_RSO1634, DLP_RSO1639, DLP_RSO1645, DLP_RSO1647, DLP_RSO1667, DLP_RSO1684, DLP_RSO1690, DLP_RSO1694, DLP_RSO1703, DLP_RSO1713, DLP_RSO1727, DLP_RSO1730, DLP_RSO1738, DLP_RSO1757, DLP_RSO1766, DLP_RSO1780, DLP_RSO1789, DLP_RSO1810, DLP_RSO1838, DLP_RSO1842, DLP_RSO1856, DLP_RSO1868, DLP_RSO1873, DLP_RSO1876, DLP_RSO1917, DLP_RSO1953, DLP_RSO1994, DLP_RSO2011, DLP_RSO2057, DLP_RSO2072, DLP_RSO2089, DLP_RSO2102, DLP_RSO2130, DLP_RSO2137, DLP_RSO2164, DLP_RSO2207, DLP_RSO2226, DLP_RSO2236, DLP_RSO2240, DLP_RSO2253, DLP_RSO2260, DLP_RSO2281, DLP_RSO2290, DLP_RSO2477, DLP_RSO2496, DLP_RSO2500, DLP_RSO2547, DLP_RSO2633, DLP_RSO2699, DLP_RSO2777, DLP_RSO2814, DLP_RSO2954, DLP_RSO2957, DLP_RSO2973, DLP_RSO3118, DLP_RSO3124, DLP_RSO3128, DLP_RSO3356, DLP_RSO3358, DLP_RSO3374, DLP_RSO3615, DLP_RSO4039, DLP_RSO4046, DLP_RSO4110, DLP_RSO4260, DLP_RSO4354, DLP_RSO4454, DLP_RSO4517, DLP_RSO4527, DLP_RSO4544, DLP_RSO4705, DLP_RSO4712, DLP_RSO4718, DLP_RSO4861, DLP_RSO4972, DLP_RSO5031, DLP_RSO5059, DLP_RSO5089					

The site would increase congestion and pressure on the road infrastructure including Penistone Road (A629), Wakefield Road, Storthes Hall Lane, Rowley Lane, Woodsome Road, North Road, Station Road. Links to motorways are difficult. Local roads are narrow. There are no plans to improve Penistone Road. Parking problems in Kirkburton would be increased. Country Park benefit; A reason to improve public transport links and services in south Huddersfield.

Land is in flood zone 3 / 3b. Land is a flood plain protecting Fenay Bridge, Waterloo, Dalton, Morrisons and Gallagher Retail Park. Development would cause a sewage backlog. Increased run off from site would increase flood risk. Any development would affect the management of local rivers and Fenay Beck.

Site would increase noise and pollution and traffic would reduce air quality.

The area is an extensive wildlife habitat. Area has diverse flora and fauna. Site is located within a wildlife corridor. Country Park benefit; funding, and a reason to preserve wildlife and historical sites of interest. Development would affect the setting of Castle Hill Ancient Monument.

The site would increase pressure on school infrastructure. (Rowley Lane J I and N School and King James High School) There are no plans for extra schools. Country Park benefit; outdoor education.

The site would increase pressure on health infrastructure. There are no plans for extra doctor's surgeries or dentists. There is uncertainty over the future of Huddersfield A&E. Social care infrastructure needs to be improved. Country Park benefit; health.

Country Park benefit; would improve cycling opportunities, greater access to good quality green space for local people, more facilities for sport and recreation in a relatively safe environment.

Green belt land should not be used. This encroachment would remove the green buffer between the villages and Huddersfield. The site does not abut adjoining communities which might otherwise justify relaxing green belt boundaries. Including this site would be against national green belt policy. Building in the green belt is not sustainable and will make the green belt more vulnerable.

The Woodsome Valley and surrounding area is of great beauty and can be enjoyed by the public in its current form. Cumulative impact of accepting this site with others would be detrimental to the landscape. Inclusion of all these sites is not in accordance with Policy DLP33, as the landscape character would be damaged.

Local services will have to expand including: police, dentist, street cleaning, rubbish collection, postal services, school accommodation, public transport, effluent discharge, surface water drainage.

Brownfield sites should be used before green fields. There is a lack of jobs that would lead to dormitory estates. Cumulative impact of accepted housing options in the area will increase pressure on infrastructure. Development of site would lead to urban sprawl.

No change.

This site is a rejected housing option. Access is not achievable due to its proximity to the junction of Woodsome Road and Penistone Road. This site is not associated with the settlement edge and as such would require additional land to be released in order to incorporate it within Lepton. Penistone Road is a very strong boundary which delineates the edge of the settlement further north and although there is some built form already west of Penistone Road development of the site would reduce the appearance of separation between Lepton and Kirkburton/Highburton along the road frontage. The green belt over washes this area so as to prevent the intensification of built form.

Support for rejection of the site is noted.

Summary of comments

Council Response

Support for rejection of site. Kirklees needs housing for the local population, small starter homes, housing for older people, and reasonably priced family homes to promote social diversity. Development proposed is for financial gain. Safety of children attending King James' School would decrease. Sustainability Appraisal rates the site negatively. There is no evidence of demand for more housing. Site would lead to ribbon development. Support for the Country Park; Greater access to green space, local regeneration, jobs, supplement farming income, rural diversification, benefits to wildlife conservation, education and tourism. The site would help fund Farnley Country Park; the site is close enough to existing settlements and maintain green space. Country Park benefit; tourism, job creation, economic growth. If land has to be removed from the green belt for housing, it should help to deliver and Country Park. Farnley Country Park would be of national significance. Bring empty properties back into use as these would be more affordable.

H191 The Sun Inn and land to the south of, Barnsley Road, Flockton
DLP_RSO2767

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

Only limited impact on openness, edge of green belt is not severely constrained or remote from the settlement and would be a reasonable extension relative to the settlement.
Site scores better than accepted safeguarded land options SL2296 and SL2297.
Lower density scheme of 6-8 dwellings proposed rather than 16 dwellings shown in the allocations report with potential smaller boundary.

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The configuration of this site would result in a poorly related projection of development down the slope to the detriment of openness and contrary to the role and function of the green belt.

Supporting comments for this option noted. The development of this site would have an unacceptable impact on the role and function of the green belt. A lower density scheme would also have an unacceptable impact on the green belt.

H193 Land north of, Holme House, Oxford Road, Gomersal
DLP_RSO1541

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

Preliminary flood risk advice from JOC Consultants. Flooding and drainage are not a significant constraint in the site. Supporting advice included.
Air Quality Assessment submitted, not seen as a constraint for development.
Preliminary Noise Assessment submitted, concludes that noise levels are below those anticipated for such close proximity to a major highway.

Proposed Change

The site is proposed as an accepted housing allocation. This represents a change from the draft Local Plan (November 2015) where the site was rejected for housing.

Site access is achievable. There are no significant constraints with the site which cannot be mitigated against at the planning application stage.

Supporting information has been submitted to consultees for further assessment. No issues have been identified that cannot be mitigated against as part of a detailed planning application.

Approx 60% of site in coal mining area. Agent advised that it is likely to be of shallow depth. Not seen as a constraint to develop the site. Site owner prepared to carry out Intrusive Ground Investigation for possible remediation.
High voltage power lines on site. Supporting information included from site promoter.

H194 Thistledome Farm, Lees Hall Road, Thornhill Lees

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its allocation is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The site lies within the green belt and is detached from the settlement. Removing this site from the green belt would result in a large unrelated area of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt and would leave the fields between the site and the settlement edge on all sides vulnerable to encroachment to the detriment of the purposes of including land in the green belt. The site has no frontage to an adopted highway and two accesses and 3rd party land are required.

No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan

H195 Land at Moor Top, Far Common Road, Mirfield	Support 308	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
<p>DLP_RSO599, DLP_RSO692, DLP_RSO976, DLP_RSO997, DLP_RSO1137, DLP_RSO1247, DLP_RSO1355, DLP_RSO1506, DLP_RSO1717, DLP_RSO1722, DLP_RSO1801, DLP_RSO1815, DLP_RSO1824, DLP_RSO1884, DLP_RSO1888, DLP_RSO1894, DLP_RSO1899, DLP_RSO1904, DLP_RSO1918, DLP_RSO1924, DLP_RSO1929, DLP_RSO1934, DLP_RSO1944, DLP_RSO1949, DLP_RSO1962, DLP_RSO1967, DLP_RSO1972, DLP_RSO1982, DLP_RSO1987, DLP_RSO2002, DLP_RSO2007, DLP_RSO2019, DLP_RSO2039, DLP_RSO2045, DLP_RSO2050, DLP_RSO2061, DLP_RSO2068, DLP_RSO2079, DLP_RSO2084, DLP_RSO2096, DLP_RSO2117, DLP_RSO2122, DLP_RSO2133, DLP_RSO2144, DLP_RSO2149, DLP_RSO2155, DLP_RSO2169, DLP_RSO2174, DLP_RSO2181, DLP_RSO2186, DLP_RSO2191, DLP_RSO2196, DLP_RSO2215, DLP_RSO2360, DLP_RSO2365, DLP_RSO2370, DLP_RSO2375, DLP_RSO2380, DLP_RSO2385, DLP_RSO2391, DLP_RSO2396, DLP_RSO2406, DLP_RSO2411, DLP_RSO2416, DLP_RSO2421, DLP_RSO2426, DLP_RSO2431, DLP_RSO2436, DLP_RSO2446, DLP_RSO2451, DLP_RSO2456, DLP_RSO2461, DLP_RSO2465, DLP_RSO2470, DLP_RSO2480, DLP_RSO2485, DLP_RSO2490, DLP_RSO2507, DLP_RSO2512, DLP_RSO2517, DLP_RSO2522, DLP_RSO2527, DLP_RSO2532, DLP_RSO2537, DLP_RSO2542, DLP_RSO2552, DLP_RSO2559, DLP_RSO2560, DLP_RSO2567, DLP_RSO2572, DLP_RSO2573, DLP_RSO2577, DLP_RSO2582, DLP_RSO2588, DLP_RSO2593, DLP_RSO2598, DLP_RSO2603, DLP_RSO2608, DLP_RSO2615, DLP_RSO2618, DLP_RSO2624, DLP_RSO2627, DLP_RSO2642, DLP_RSO2649, DLP_RSO2654, DLP_RSO2662, DLP_RSO2669, DLP_RSO2674, DLP_RSO2679, DLP_RSO2684, DLP_RSO2689, DLP_RSO2694, DLP_RSO2706, DLP_RSO2711, DLP_RSO2716, DLP_RSO2721, DLP_RSO2726, DLP_RSO2731, DLP_RSO2736, DLP_RSO2741, DLP_RSO2748, DLP_RSO2754, DLP_RSO2760, DLP_RSO2764, DLP_RSO2770, DLP_RSO2780, DLP_RSO2785, DLP_RSO2790, DLP_RSO2795, DLP_RSO2800, DLP_RSO2805, DLP_RSO2810, DLP_RSO2821, DLP_RSO2826, DLP_RSO2831, DLP_RSO2836, DLP_RSO2841, DLP_RSO2856, DLP_RSO2861, DLP_RSO2900, DLP_RSO2905, DLP_RSO2910, DLP_RSO2915, DLP_RSO2978, DLP_RSO2983, DLP_RSO2988, DLP_RSO2993, DLP_RSO2998, DLP_RSO3003, DLP_RSO3008, DLP_RSO3013, DLP_RSO3018, DLP_RSO3023, DLP_RSO3028, DLP_RSO3033, DLP_RSO3038, DLP_RSO3043, DLP_RSO3048, DLP_RSO3078, DLP_RSO3083, DLP_RSO3088, DLP_RSO3094, DLP_RSO3098, DLP_RSO3103, DLP_RSO3108, DLP_RSO3142, DLP_RSO3147, DLP_RSO3152, DLP_RSO3157, DLP_RSO3287, DLP_RSO3326, DLP_RSO3347, DLP_RSO3351, DLP_RSO3384, DLP_RSO3389, DLP_RSO3394, DLP_RSO3399, DLP_RSO3404, DLP_RSO3409, DLP_RSO3414, DLP_RSO3419, DLP_RSO3424, DLP_RSO3429, DLP_RSO3434, DLP_RSO3439, DLP_RSO3444, DLP_RSO3449, DLP_RSO3454, DLP_RSO3459, DLP_RSO3464, DLP_RSO3469, DLP_RSO3474, DLP_RSO3479, DLP_RSO3484, DLP_RSO3491, DLP_RSO3496, DLP_RSO3506, DLP_RSO3511, DLP_RSO3516, DLP_RSO3521, DLP_RSO3526, DLP_RSO3531, DLP_RSO3537, DLP_RSO3551, DLP_RSO3556, DLP_RSO3561, DLP_RSO3566, DLP_RSO3571, DLP_RSO3576, DLP_RSO3581, DLP_RSO3586, DLP_RSO3670, DLP_RSO3688, DLP_RSO3871, DLP_RSO3895, DLP_RSO3908, DLP_RSO3913, DLP_RSO3918, DLP_RSO3923, DLP_RSO3928, DLP_RSO3935, DLP_RSO3944, DLP_RSO3949, DLP_RSO3958, DLP_RSO3966, DLP_RSO3972, DLP_RSO3984, DLP_RSO3993, DLP_RSO3999, DLP_RSO4004, DLP_RSO4009, DLP_RSO4014, DLP_RSO4019, DLP_RSO4024, DLP_RSO4029, DLP_RSO4056, DLP_RSO4060, DLP_RSO4066, DLP_RSO4071, DLP_RSO4076, DLP_RSO4081, DLP_RSO4086, DLP_RSO4091, DLP_RSO4096, DLP_RSO4101, DLP_RSO4117, DLP_RSO4122, DLP_RSO4136, DLP_RSO4152, DLP_RSO4163, DLP_RSO4168, DLP_RSO4173, DLP_RSO4201, DLP_RSO4216, DLP_RSO4221, DLP_RSO4226, DLP_RSO4231, DLP_RSO4236, DLP_RSO4268, DLP_RSO4273, DLP_RSO4286, DLP_RSO4291, DLP_RSO4296, DLP_RSO4302, DLP_RSO4307, DLP_RSO4312, DLP_RSO4317, DLP_RSO4322, DLP_RSO4327, DLP_RSO4364, DLP_RSO4372, DLP_RSO4384, DLP_RSO4390, DLP_RSO4403, DLP_RSO4413, DLP_RSO4422, DLP_RSO4427, DLP_RSO4432, DLP_RSO4433, DLP_RSO4437, DLP_RSO4461, DLP_RSO4466, DLP_RSO4476, DLP_RSO4492, DLP_RSO4502, DLP_RSO4507, DLP_RSO4512, DLP_RSO4567, DLP_RSO4572, DLP_RSO4581, DLP_RSO4596, DLP_RSO4657, DLP_RSO4662, DLP_RSO4682, DLP_RSO4688, DLP_RSO4721, DLP_RSO4732, DLP_RSO4743, DLP_RSO4749, DLP_RSO4753, DLP_RSO4758, DLP_RSO4768, DLP_RSO4773, DLP_RSO4778, DLP_RSO4783, DLP_RSO4788, DLP_RSO4793, DLP_RSO4798, DLP_RSO4803</p>				
<p>Cumulative impact on road network, more grid lock will occur. Site is poorly served by roads and public transport.</p>				No Change
<p>Road Congestion issues - M62 Jct 25 - Huddersfield Road A62 - Roberttown Lane - Sunny Bank - Far Common Rd - Child Lane - Lumb Lane - Roberttown Village - Church Road is impossible to cross at certain times of day Road and public highways not fit for purpose Road safety issues along Roberttown Lane and Church Lane Parking problems in the village, especially at school times New development will make the situation within the area worse Encourages greater commuting times Roberttown Lane is used as a cut through to avoid congestion on surrounding roads Flooding issues will increase Insufficient sewerage system Proposals will bring problems of noise due to extra traffic. Proposals will bring problems of air pollution due to removal of trees from the green belt. Environment needs to be safeguarded for future generations Disruption to local wildlife Negative impact on visual amenity School capacity insufficient - Roberttown Junior School Health services insufficient; health centres, dentists and welfare facilities cannot support level of development Pressure on Heckmondwike and Mirfield health services Loss of informal recreational space</p>				<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site lies within an extensive area of green belt that separates Mirfield, Roberttown and Hartshead. It contains industrial buildings and is located where there are a number of residential and farm buildings in an urban fringe area. It is unrelated to either Mirfield or Roberttown and so could not be released from the green belt in isolation as it would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. National planning guidance states that redevelopment of Brownfield sites may be appropriate provided that openness is preserved and this should be an important consideration should any redevelopment scheme be proposed, in order not to reinforce the urban fringe. The ability to consider openness would be lost if the site were to be removed from the green belt.</p> <p>Supporting comments have been noted.</p>

Summary of comments

Council Response

- footpaths

Proposals go against purpose of green belt
 Without the natural barrier Roberttown, Cleckheaton and Heckmondwike will be swallowed up in the sprawl of Mirfield, Leeds and Bradford
 Green belt should be protected to benefit communities; wildlife and leisure
 Land is previously developed, therefore there will be no detrimental harm to the green belt as harm has been established for some years.
 Infrastructure cannot cope, inadequate to support growth
 Infrastructure should be put in place first
 Disproportionate level of development to existing settlement size
 Roberttown should be left as it is
 Keep Hartshead and Roberttown as villages
 Negative impact on local residents quality of life
 Do not over populate Roberttown
 Use Brownfield first
 Shortage of green space in the North; should be preserved
 New development should be a new town with its own infrastructure
 Unsustainable location
 Greenbelt development would undermine council's Brownfield regeneration policies
 Site promoter - land is previously developed
 Support the rejection of the site and no further development should be imposed on the green belt
 If all these housing sites get passed, Roberttown will really be a town.
 Area needs jobs not housing
 Inadequate facilities
 Support rejection due to MX1929 being accepted. This site alone will have impact on the road network

H196	XL Joinery Ltd, Bradford Road, Batley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
-------------	---------------------------------------	---------	---------------------	--------	------------

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Evidence indicates that this is an operational business within an existing area dominated by business and industry.

H208	Land at, Grove Street, Longwood	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
-------------	---------------------------------	---------	---------------------	--------	------------

No Representations received

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

Smaller part of site is overlapped by an accepted housing option. Site is lowland mixed deciduous woodland UK BAP priority habitat.

H210	Land south east of Hanging Heaton Golf Course, Leeds Road, Hanging Heaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
-------------	---	---------	---------------------	--------	------------

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its allocation is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The site is within a narrow area of green belt that includes Hanging Heaton Golf Course and the steep valley sides of Crackenedge that help to maintain separation between the main built up areas of Dewsbury and Batley. It is a sloping site that appears as part of the open land associated with Hanging Heaton golf course. Development could be prominent in long distance views and therefore impact on the openness of the green belt.

Summary of comments

Council Response

		Development would be poorly related to the settlement as it is largely separated from it by the land at Caulms Wood Quarry and by the golf course to the north and east.			
		No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan			
H211	Land to the east of, Newgate, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
	No Representations were received				
H220	Land south of, Nabbs Lane, Slaithwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
	No Representations received	No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		The site has a partial overlap with an accepted option and part of the site is developed (Old Bank Works)			
H223	Land north of, Royd House Lane, Linthwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
	No Representations received	No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		This site is poorly configured and is unlikely to form a deliverable housing site. Site does not appear to be deliverable or developable at this point in time. Topographical constraints.			
H226	Land south of, Hightown Road, Liversedge DLP_RSO2263, DLP_RSO3886, DLP_RSO5094	Support	Conditional Support	Object 3	No Comment
	Access is achievable from Hightown Road. Development will reduce impact on Quaker Lane. Highways access statement previously supplied. Development would help enhance the existing sports facility.	No Change			
	Land does not serve any purpose of green belt. New boundary could be formed to the east of site H564 along the footpath. Allocation H564 leaves a green wedge of green belt surrounded by development. Site is a sustainable location, allocation of H564 justifies this. Site could be developed alongside H564.	The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This is a well contained site that could be released without compromising the strategic extent of the green belt in this location. However, the site is poorly configured relative to the settlement edge and would isolate a significant area of green belt between Quaker Lane and Hightown Road which would become vulnerable to development pressure contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. Although contained to the south by a watercourse this is an area of urban fringe with limited relationship to the wider countryside to the east.			
		Comments from site promoter have been noted, supporting information has been re-assessed as part of the site refinement process.			
		A petition has been received objecting the rejection of this site, 750 signatures.			
H227	Land south of, Fenay Lane, Fenay Bridge DLP_RSO758, DLP_RSO1492, DLP_RSO1493, DLP_RSO4160	Support 3	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
	General support for rejection of this site, impact on historic character of Farnley Tyas, flooding and detriment to Green Belt.	No Change			
	Site ptomoter highlights recent PP for garden centre ref. 2014/93595 which provides a new access from Fenay Lane.	The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		This site is detached from any settlement and could not be released from the green belt in isolation as this would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			

Summary of comments

Council Response

H228 Land south of, Greenhill Bank Road, New Mill

No Representations received

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

The recent grant of planning permission at the site for a garden centre is also noted.

Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The settlement of Totties is over washed within the green belt and the Local Plan strategy does not include the removal of Totties from the green belt. This site is only tenuously related to the wider settlement of Totties and its removal would leave an area of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt which would be contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.

H229 Land west of, Clough Road, Slaithwaite

No Representations received

Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

This is an extensive area of green belt characterised by steep valley slopes and sporadic development. This site sits on a very steep slope where development would be visually intrusive to the detriment of openness. Although it is close to an area of ribbon development fronting Rock Lane the slope and change in levels means it has little association with it or with any settlement. It is isolated and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.

H231 Wheatleys Farm, Dewsbury Road, Gomersal

DLP_RSO612, DLP_RSO616, DLP_RSO4820, DLP_RSO4910, DLP_RSO4911, DLP_RSO4912

Support for rejection - congestion on local road network would increase, local roads are already at capacity.

Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
5		1	

No Change

Two points of access will be needed for the site and can be achieved with visibility and junction layouts to appropriate standards.

Local road network can accommodate increase in traffic flows.

Yorkshire Water have confirmed site should be drained on separate surface water and foul water systems. There are a number of open and cultivated ordinary watercourses within the site. Delaying reservoir located north of the site boundary. Flood risk from these sources is unknown but considered to be high.

Noise should be considered during master planning. Noise from the M62 should be taken into account as far as practicable. Noise should not prohibit development on site.

No records or signs of protected species found on site. There is potential for bat habitats in buildings and mature trees located on the site. Land is low quality arable grassland.

The site is not part of an historic town

Loss of informal recreational space

Support for rejections maintains access to good quality open spaces

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Option would create a new AQMA. This is an urban fringe area where built form is already present, but there are also sensitive environmental areas including extensive areas of protected trees and an open watercourse. The site is visually linked to the neighbouring parkland. The drive to the Gomersal Park Hotel/Wheatley Farm does not present a sufficiently strong feature on the ground to form a new defendable green belt boundary.

Supporting comments for the rejection of the site have been noted.

Proposals go against the purpose of green belt

Rejection of site maintains the green belt gap between Gomersal and Birstall

Supporting information from site promoter concludes there would be no unrestricted sprawl. Merging of neighbouring towns would not happen due to the location of the M62 located within the gap of the two settlements. Development could strengthen the green belt boundary.

The site is not part of the open countryside, the site is also heavily influenced by the urbanising element of the M62.

Site is available for development

Local Councillors support the rejection of the site

Supporting information from site promoter.

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H232	Land west of, Bradshaw Road, Honley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Site is detached from the non-green belt area and its removal from the green belt would create an area of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt land which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			
H234	Land south of, Wessenden Head Road, Meltham DLP_RSO398	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Traffic congestion - inadequate road infrastructure. Impact on flooding - increased run-off from hills. Impact on wildlife.		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		This area of green belt sits between the edge of Meltham and the boundary of the Peak District National Park. These open areas contribute to the immediate setting of the national park and are recognised for the role they play in maintaining landscape character beyond the boundary of the national park. The green belt in this location therefore plays an important role in maintaining this openness by protecting the areas from the encroachment of built form. The site is only tenuously related to the settlement form and would appear as a poorly related projection of development in a prominent location.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
H235	Land east of, Pinfold Lane, Lepton DLP_RSO272	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Road capacity issues - Penistone Road. Negative impact on character.		No change.			
Physical infrastructure will not cope. Should use Brownfield land first.		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The Local Plan strategy does not include the removal of Lepton Thorn from the green belt and removing the site in isolation would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
H236	Land south of, Cliffe Street, Clayton West DLP_RSO1280	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Access could be achieved via Cliffe Street or High Street.		No change			
Removal of the site from Green Belt would not have a detrimental effect on the purposes of the Green Belt.		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
The site is bounded by development to north and east, with limited development to the south. The trees to the west would provide a logical boundary for the Green Belt edge. The site should be removed from the Green Belt as an unallocated site.		Suitable site access can not be achieved. The area occupied by the bowling green is a former quarry site and there is a significant change in levels across the site. The site includes a significant number of trees which currently present a natural edge to the settlement. Development that retained the trees would be poorly related to the remainder of the settlement and would encroach into the countryside contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. Any development of this site would need to retain or replace this facility unless provision is deemed to be surplus to requirements.			
H237	Land south of, Carrs Road, Marsden	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
	<p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>This site represents one of the few opportunities for development in this part of Marsden that would be relatively unconstrained by the degree of slope on the valley side. However, this site has a large number of trees on it, both parkland trees within the site and mixed deciduous trees on its edges which is a habitat of principal importance. The best means of preserving the important wildlife habitat is through the green belt designation.</p>
H238 Land south of, Ash Lane, Emley	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
No Representations received	<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>This site is isolated from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p>
H239 Land north of, Bretton Street, Savile Town	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
No Representations received	<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The site is proposed to be safeguarded from development for minerals infrastructure.</p> <p>No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan</p>
H240 Land north of Mazebrook, Drub Lane, Cleckheaton	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
No Representations received	<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Development of the site would fill the gap between housing on Mazebrook Avenue and the settlement of Drub to the east. This would lead to the coalescence of settlements contrary to the purpose of the green belt. Development would sever a stretch of Nann Hall Beck from its wider countryside setting and impact on important wildlife habitats.</p>
H241 Land south of, Whitehall Road, Scholes	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
No Representations received	<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site has no relationship to any settlement, although the ribbon development along Whitechapel Road gives some appearance of merger with Scholes. The properties fronting Whitechapel Road are over washed by the green belt in order to prevent intensification. Development of the site frontage would result in almost continuous development between Scholes and Cleckheaton and impact on the strategic gap between the two settlements, although the presence of the M62 will prevent physical merger. There are no exceptional circumstances that would justify the removal of this site from the green belt for housing development.</p>
H242 Land north of, 72, Peep Green Road, Hartshead DLP_RSO1134, DLP_RSO2216	<p>Support 2 Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
	<p>Proposed Change</p>

Summary of comments

Council Response

Rejection of site supported on green belt grounds

The site is proposed as an accepted housing allocation. This represents a change from the draft Local Plan (November 2015) where the site was rejected for housing.

Site access is achievable from Peep Green Road. There are no significant constraints with the site which cannot be mitigated against at the planning application stage.

The site is contained by existing development and Peep Green Road to three sides and a strong treed boundary on the north side. As such there is no risk of sprawl or further encroachment. This would be a small scale development well related to the settlement.

H243 Land south of, Mazebrook Farm, Drub Lane, Drub

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Development of the site would fill the gap between housing on Mazebrook Avenue and the settlement of Drub to the east. This would lead to the coalescence of settlements contrary to the purpose of including land in the green belt. Development would leave the Nann Hall Beck and its associated important wildlife habitats isolated from the wider countryside. The best way to protect these features from encroachment is through the green belt designation.

H244 Land west of, Reservoir Site Road, Blackmoorfoot

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

Part of site is habitat of principal importance, however removing this from net area would result in a site area that is too small to allocate. Removal of this site from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The site is closely associated with the grouping of properties at Blackmoorfoot but is poorly configured in relation to it and would not constitute infill for the purposes of national planning policy. The Local Plan strategy does not include the removal of Blackmoorfoot from the green belt.

H245 Land south of, Penistone Road, Shelley

Support 4 Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

DLP_RSO11, DLP_RSO497, DLP_RSO524, DLP_RSO993, DLP_RSO1858

Road congestion. Particular issue on the A629.
Road safety issues in Shepley - lack of footpaths in places.
Car parking issues.
Site would not develop on high flood risk areas.
Yorkshire Water have carried out some remedial work.
Lower area of the site would be made available as an open space for the community and wildlife.
Negative impact on character.
School capacity issues.

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

This is an elongated site poorly related to the settlement edge. The site abuts Shepley Dike and Geldered Wood which is an area of ancient woodland. The watercourse and woodland and their associated important environmental habitats are countryside features and development would result in significant encroachment contrary to the role and function of the green belt. Recommendation to remove the whole site as a development option. There are also Habitats of Principal Importance and Species of Principal Importance within this area. A small section of Gelder Wood Local Wildlife Site overlaps this option.

Development at the top of the slope would not be seen from the north or south. Sensitive screening could be implemented.
Physical infrastructure may not cope.
Do not use green belt.
Use sites with planning permission first (Old Firth Mill site).
Site promoter requesting 4-6 dwellings rather than 42.
Proposal would improve the management of the land.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted. Comments of support also noted including that screening could be provided, a lower site capacity could be implemented and that the southern area of the site at a lower level could be kept open. Option H245a sets out development on the northern part of the site only.

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H246	Land between, Castle Hill Road and Firthcliffe Parade, Gomersal DLP_RSO498	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Support for the rejection of the site Would not enhance the area, in contrast would spoil it		No Change The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. Releasing the site would lead to the merger of Gomersal and Liversedge contrary to the role and function of the green belt. The site is on a prominent area of high ground and development would also significantly impact on openness. Supporting comments for the rejection of this site have been noted.			
H247	Land east of, Oxford Road, Gomersal DLP_RSO4, DLP_RSO81, DLP_RSO603, DLP_RSO606, DLP_RSO783, DLP_RSO1128, DLP_RSO1191, DLP_RSO1218, DLP_RSO1296, DLP_RSO1305, DLP_RSO1373, DLP_RSO1459, DLP_RSO1470, DLP_RSO4197, DLP_RSO4261, DLP_RSO4843, DLP_RSO4852, DLP_RSO4917, DLP_RSO4918, DLP_RSO4919, DLP_RSO5025	Support 19	Conditional Support	Object 2	No Comment
Local roads are at capacity. Main impacted junctions are Gomersal Hill Top (A643/A651), Birkenshaw roundabout (A58/A651), Gomersal Road (A62/A651), Church Lane (A643/A652), Birstall Smithies (A62/A652), Birstall "Coach & Six" (A62/A643. Traffic congestion would increase Traffic in and around Birstall is chaotic, parking is problematic. Site access is limited. Flooding on houses located on Monk Ings, due to over flowing stream. KMC taking measures to alleviate situation. Wildlife will be affected particularly bird life, herons, owls, pheasants, foxes, rabbits, squirrels, badgers and deer. Loss of existing trees Site is within close proximity to listed buildings; Pollard Hall, Public Hall, Red House Museum and Oakwell Hall Local schools are oversubscribed Health and dental services oversubscribed. Loss of informal recreational space, footpaths located on site; SPE/54/20, BAT/1/30 and Bridleway BAT/1/10. Open space needed for exercise. Green belt is in short supply within the area. Built up areas have already merged. Small areas of green belt that are left need to be protected to prevent further sprawl. Green belt plays a huge part in the sustainability of the environment, wildlife, air quality and flood prevention. Should be protected for future generations. Safeguards from encroachment. Local businesses and commercial areas within Birstall should be supported to support the local economy before any new development. Poor ground conditions from mining in the area. Use Brownfield first. One comment of support ideal site for housing former school building located next to site which has recently closed down. Redevelopment opportunity.		No Change The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. This is an important open area whose green belt role is to help prevent the merger of Gomersal and Birstall. The configuration of the site would impact on this role as it would significantly reduce the extent of the gap. It is poorly related to Gomersal and would represent significant encroachment into the countryside and impact on an extensive area of protected trees which is a priority habitat and which is best protected by the green belt designation.			
H248	Land west of, Gillroyd Lane, Linthwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected. The western extent of this option could be released from the green belt without significant impact on openness, although it is somewhat disassociated from the settlement because of the presence of the very steep gully/cliff immediately east of the industrial complex, and which is also at a lower level. The eastern extent could introduce development on to a prominent hillside to the detriment of the openness of the green belt, although it is acknowledged that there is already development at 'Height' to the east.			

Summary of comments	Council Response					
<p>H249 Land north of, Birdsedge Lane, Birdsedge DLP_RSO58, DLP_RSO60, DLP_RSO199, DLP_RSO266, DLP_RSO574, DLP_RSO888, DLP_RSO1446, DLP_RSO3112, DLP_RSO4841, DLP_RSO4842</p> <p>Highway safety issues - speed of traffic, parked cars, access to school at start / end of day Impact on wildlife.</p> <p>Work on the site has sought to provide a nature reserve.</p> <p>Physical infrastructure cannot cope with development Site is disproportionate to size of settlement.</p> <p>Impact on rural character Should use Brownfield land first. Broadband speeds are slow</p> <p>Electricity supply issues</p>	Support	10	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment	
	No change					
	This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.					
	Removal of this site from the green belt would create an area of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The site is located on the edge of the existing settlement of Birds Edge but is both poorly located and large in relation to the existing settlement pattern. The Local Plan strategy does not include the removal of Birds Edge from the green belt.					
	The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.					
<p>H250 Land north of, Manor Road, Farnley Tyas DLP_RSO39, DLP_RSO87, DLP_RSO101, DLP_RSO121, DLP_RSO136, DLP_RSO146, DLP_RSO159, DLP_RSO169, DLP_RSO177, DLP_RSO194, DLP_RSO233, DLP_RSO243, DLP_RSO252, DLP_RSO273, DLP_RSO293, DLP_RSO335, DLP_RSO344, DLP_RSO362, DLP_RSO369, DLP_RSO387, DLP_RSO393, DLP_RSO482, DLP_RSO528, DLP_RSO556, DLP_RSO571, DLP_RSO696, DLP_RSO720, DLP_RSO731, DLP_RSO763, DLP_RSO837, DLP_RSO884, DLP_RSO908, DLP_RSO945, DLP_RSO1015, DLP_RSO1029, DLP_RSO1092, DLP_RSO1094, DLP_RSO1146, DLP_RSO1160, DLP_RSO1387, DLP_RSO1402, DLP_RSO1431, DLP_RSO1465, DLP_RSO1478, DLP_RSO1485, DLP_RSO1549, DLP_RSO1587, DLP_RSO1599, DLP_RSO1653, DLP_RSO1657, DLP_RSO1671, DLP_RSO1677, DLP_RSO1698, DLP_RSO1704, DLP_RSO1739, DLP_RSO1751, DLP_RSO1769, DLP_RSO1805, DLP_RSO1854, DLP_RSO1907, DLP_RSO2015, DLP_RSO2201, DLP_RSO2229, DLP_RSO2243, DLP_RSO2258, DLP_RSO2275, DLP_RSO2291, DLP_RSO2502, DLP_RSO2947, DLP_RSO2964, DLP_RSO3135, DLP_RSO3316, DLP_RSO3361, DLP_RSO3606, DLP_RSO4033, DLP_RSO4047, DLP_RSO4211, DLP_RSO4358, DLP_RSO4451, DLP_RSO4518, DLP_RSO4530, DLP_RSO4545</p> <p>Road congestion - especially at peak times, narrow lanes and pinch points. Particular issues on Penistone Road, Manor Road/Farnley Road junction, Woodsome Road, Storthes Hall Lane, Rowley Lane, Fenay Lane, North Road, Station Road, Tofts Lane, Field Lane.</p> <p>Road safety issues - risk for children walking to school, increased danger for horse riders. Public transport frequency issues. Parking issues. Site access issues - Field Lane is one vehicle wide public bridleway and Manor Road has sections only wide enough for one vehicle. Increased flood risk including surface water flood risk. Drainage capacity insufficient. Sewage infrastructure will not cope. Increased air pollution due to standing traffic. Wildlife would be affected. Negative impact on character. Negative impact on Farnley Tyas Conservation Area. Protect Castle Hill and its environs. School capacity insufficient (infant/junior and secondary). Health provision insufficient. Loss of farmland.</p> <p>Development of the site would lead to urban sprawl. Unacceptable impact on landscape. Proposals would impact on an area of natural outstanding beauty. Physical infrastructure would not cope. Negative impact on community. Disproportionate level of development to existing settlement size. Cumulative impact of development would be unacceptable on character. Lack of local amenities. Loss of green belt. Proposals for a country park should not be linked to or used to justify new housing developments. Should use Brownfield land first. Do not use Greenfield sites.</p>	Support	81	Conditional Support	Object	1	No Comment
	No change.					
	The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.					
	Major impact on Farnley Tyas Conservation Area and adjacent listed building with no mitigation possible. Although this option would be entirely contained by the line of Toft Lane which separates this area of green belt from the wider countryside, this would leave a gap between the properties on Field Lane and the site, necessitating a significant amount of additional land to be removed from the green belt between the site and the edge of the village. Without a strong boundary this would leave the land between the site and the settlement edge at high risk of encroachment, contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.					
	The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted. There was some support for housing but this option has been rejected for reasons relating to impacts on green belt and the historic environment.					

Summary of comments

Council Response

Bring vacant houses back into use instead of building new ones.
 Negative impact on tourism.
 Potential for this site to be used for housing.
 Housing mix would not meet needs in the area and would not be affordable.

H251 Land north of, Manor Road, Farnley Tyas	Support 75	Conditional Support	Object 2	No Comment
DLP_RSO40, DLP_RSO84, DLP_RSO100, DLP_RSO119, DLP_RSO135, DLP_RSO145, DLP_RSO160, DLP_RSO170, DLP_RSO178, DLP_RSO195, DLP_RSO232, DLP_RSO244, DLP_RSO253, DLP_RSO274, DLP_RSO294, DLP_RSO336, DLP_RSO343, DLP_RSO361, DLP_RSO370, DLP_RSO388, DLP_RSO394, DLP_RSO483, DLP_RSO529, DLP_RSO570, DLP_RSO697, DLP_RSO722, DLP_RSO730, DLP_RSO764, DLP_RSO839, DLP_RSO885, DLP_RSO909, DLP_RSO944, DLP_RSO1016, DLP_RSO1030, DLP_RSO1093, DLP_RSO1095, DLP_RSO1147, DLP_RSO1161, DLP_RSO1388, DLP_RSO1400, DLP_RSO1430, DLP_RSO1467, DLP_RSO1479, DLP_RSO1486, DLP_RSO1548, DLP_RSO1588, DLP_RSO1598, DLP_RSO1658, DLP_RSO1672, DLP_RSO1678, DLP_RSO1699, DLP_RSO1705, DLP_RSO1740, DLP_RSO1752, DLP_RSO1770, DLP_RSO1852, DLP_RSO1908, DLP_RSO2200, DLP_RSO2230, DLP_RSO2246, DLP_RSO2274, DLP_RSO2292, DLP_RSO2637, DLP_RSO2948, DLP_RSO2965, DLP_RSO3136, DLP_RSO3317, DLP_RSO3362, DLP_RSO3607, DLP_RSO4034, DLP_RSO4048, DLP_RSO4212, DLP_RSO4359, DLP_RSO4450, DLP_RSO4519, DLP_RSO4531, DLP_RSO4546				
Road congestion - especially at peak times, narrow lanes and pinch points. Particular issues on Penistone Road, Manor Road/Farnley Road junction, Woodsome Road, Storthes Hall Lane, Rowley Lane, Fenay Lane, North Road, Station Road, Tofts Lane, Field Lane, difficulties in winter weather. Road safety issues – risk for children walking to school, increased danger for horse riders. Public transport frequency issues. Parking issues. Increased flood risk including surface water flood risk. Drainage capacity insufficient. Sewage infrastructure will not cope. Increased air pollution due to standing traffic Wildlife would be affected. Negative impact on character. Negative impact on Farnley Tyas Conservation Area. Protect Castle Hill and its environs. School capacity insufficient (infant/junior and secondary) Health provision insufficient. Loss of farmland.	No change	The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.	Major impact on the Farnley Tyas Conservation Area and listed buildings with no mitigation possible. The lack of feature on the ground at the northern extent of the site would leave the adjacent fields vulnerable to encroachment contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt and impact on the important setting of the Conservation Area.	The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.
Development of the site would lead to urban sprawl and the start of merging settlements. Unacceptable impact on landscape. Proposals would impact on an area of natural outstanding beauty. Physical infrastructure would not cope. Negative impact on community. Disproportionate level of development to existing settlement size. Cumulative impact of development would be unacceptable on character. Lack of local amenities. Loss of green belt. Proposals for a country park should not be linked to or used to justify new housing developments. Should use Brownfield land first. Do not use Greenfield sites. Bring vacant houses back into use instead of building new ones. Negative impact on tourism.				

H252 Land west of, Farnley Road, Farnley Tyas	Support 165	Conditional Support	Object 10	No Comment
<p>DLP_RSO15, DLP_RSO31, DLP_RSO41, DLP_RSO49, DLP_RSO66, DLP_RSO69, DLP_RSO83, DLP_RSO90, DLP_RSO105, DLP_RSO118, DLP_RSO140, DLP_RSO150, DLP_RSO153, DLP_RSO163, DLP_RSO171, DLP_RSO179, DLP_RSO185, DLP_RSO187, DLP_RSO196, DLP_RSO201, DLP_RSO211, DLP_RSO220, DLP_RSO227, DLP_RSO231, DLP_RSO239, DLP_RSO246, DLP_RSO248, DLP_RSO276, DLP_RSO287, DLP_RSO298, DLP_RSO303, DLP_RSO331, DLP_RSO342, DLP_RSO349, DLP_RSO366, DLP_RSO371, DLP_RSO374, DLP_RSO389, DLP_RSO395, DLP_RSO441, DLP_RSO459, DLP_RSO462, DLP_RSO480, DLP_RSO484, DLP_RSO496, DLP_RSO510, DLP_RSO526, DLP_RSO530, DLP_RSO540, DLP_RSO553, DLP_RSO562, DLP_RSO569, DLP_RSO653, DLP_RSO658, DLP_RSO670, DLP_RSO677, DLP_RSO688, DLP_RSO698, DLP_RSO712, DLP_RSO735, DLP_RSO743, DLP_RSO765, DLP_RSO802, DLP_RSO821, DLP_RSO825, DLP_RSO827, DLP_RSO828, DLP_RSO829, DLP_RSO843, DLP_RSO852, DLP_RSO860, DLP_RSO883, DLP_RSO891, DLP_RSO899, DLP_RSO910, DLP_RSO924, DLP_RSO949, DLP_RSO951, DLP_RSO957, DLP_RSO1017, DLP_RSO1022, DLP_RSO1033, DLP_RSO1046, DLP_RSO1066, DLP_RSO1071, DLP_RSO1080, DLP_RSO1088, DLP_RSO1096, DLP_RSO1102, DLP_RSO1107, DLP_RSO1142, DLP_RSO1148, DLP_RSO1155, DLP_RSO1162, DLP_RSO1225, DLP_RSO1275, DLP_RSO1314, DLP_RSO1338, DLP_RSO1389, DLP_RSO1392, DLP_RSO1395, DLP_RSO1413, DLP_RSO1422, DLP_RSO1424, DLP_RSO1439, DLP_RSO1469, DLP_RSO1480, DLP_RSO1487, DLP_RSO1501, DLP_RSO1515, DLP_RSO1529, DLP_RSO1533, DLP_RSO1547, DLP_RSO1561, DLP_RSO1569, DLP_RSO1574, DLP_RSO1589, DLP_RSO1597, DLP_RSO1604, DLP_RSO1640, DLP_RSO1659, DLP_RSO1662, DLP_RSO1675, DLP_RSO1679, DLP_RSO1706, DLP_RSO1731, DLP_RSO1741, DLP_RSO1753, DLP_RSO1762, DLP_RSO1771, DLP_RSO1781, DLP_RSO1806, DLP_RSO1851, DLP_RSO1867, DLP_RSO1872, DLP_RSO1877, DLP_RSO1909, DLP_RSO1954, DLP_RSO1995, DLP_RSO2053, DLP_RSO2073, DLP_RSO2126, DLP_RSO2138, DLP_RSO2202, DLP_RSO2222, DLP_RSO2231, DLP_RSO2248, DLP_RSO2252, DLP_RSO2276, DLP_RSO2293, DLP_RSO2636, DLP_RSO2700, DLP_RSO2813, DLP_RSO2850, DLP_RSO2949, DLP_RSO2966, DLP_RSO3117, DLP_RSO3132, DLP_RSO3318, DLP_RSO3364, DLP_RSO3375, DLP_RSO3608, DLP_RSO4035, DLP_RSO4050, DLP_RSO4208, DLP_RSO4259, DLP_RSO4360, DLP_RSO4449, DLP_RSO4520, DLP_RSO4532, DLP_RSO4547, DLP_RSO4840, DLP_RSO5030, DLP_RSO5035, DLP_RSO5090</p>				
<p>Encourages commuting. Road congestion - especially at peak times, narrow lanes. Particular issues on Penistone Road, Manor Road/Farnley Road junction, Manor Road, St Helens Gate, route through Almondbury village, Woodsome Road, Storthes Hall Lane, Rowley Lane, Fenay Lane, North Road, Station Road, narrow lane between Almondbury and Farnley Tyas, Woodsome Road/Field Lane junction, difficulties in winter weather. Road safety issues - risk for children walking to school, numerous car accidents. Public transport inadequate and frequency issues. Transport solutions proposed for Penistone Road area. Visibility splays can be achieved from single site access on to Farnley Road subject to reduction in speed limit to 30 mph. Increased flood risk including surface water flood risk. Drainage capacity insufficient. Sewage infrastructure will not cope. Water supply will not cope. Increased air pollution due to standing traffic Wildlife would be affected. Negative impact on character. Negative impact on Farnley Tyas Conservation Area. Protect Castle Hill and its environs. Impact on Grade II Listed Buildings. School capacity insufficient (infant/junior and secondary) Health provision insufficient. Loss of farmland.</p>	No change			<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Major impact on the Farnley Tyas Conservation Area and listed buildings with no mitigation possible. The site lacks a defendable boundary to the south and is poorly related to the existing settlement pattern. It would result in an incursion of built form into the countryside to the detriment of openness and contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted. Support for the site in relation to the Country Park noted but the site has been rejected due to impacts on the green belt and historic environment.</p>
<p>Development of the site would lead to urban sprawl and the start of merging settlements. Site boundary provides a defendable green belt boundary. Exceptional circumstances demonstrated with creation of country park. Land not required to be kept permanently open. Unacceptable impact on landscape. Proposals would impact on an area of natural outstanding beauty. Physical infrastructure would not cope. Negative impact on community. Disproportionate level of development to existing settlement size. Cumulative impact of development would be unacceptable on character. Lack of local amenities. Masterplan submitted. Housing mix would not meet needs in the area. Loss of green belt. Site is close to the existing settlement but maintains sufficient surrounding green space and would help to fund and maintain a country park. Support for new housing linked to the country park proposal.</p>				

Summary of comments

Council Response

Development will fund a country park to benefit future generations.
 Potential for this site to be used for housing.
 Proposals for a country park should not be linked to or used to justify new housing developments.
 Should use Brownfield land first.
 Do not use Greenfield sites.
 Negative impact on tourism.
 Bring vacant houses back into use instead of building new ones.
 Site represents sustainable development.

H253 Land west of, Field Lane, Farnley Tyas
 DLP_RSO161

Support 79 Conditional Support Object 2 No Comment

Road congestion especially at peak times, narrow lanes. Particular issues on Penistone Road, Manor Road/Farnley Road junction, Manor Road, narrow lane between Almondbury and Farnley Tyas, Woodsome Road/Field Lane junction, Storthes Hall Lane, Rowley Lane, Fenay Lane, Woodsome road, North Road, Station Road
 Road safety issues - numerous car accidents, dangerous for horse riding.
 Public transport frequency issues.
 Sewage infrastructure will not cope.
 Increased flood risk including surface water flood risk.
 Increased air pollution due to standing traffic
 Wildlife would be affected.
 Negative impact on character.
 Negative impact on Farnley Tyas Conservation Area.
 Protect Castle Hill and its environs.
 School capacity insufficient.
 Health provision insufficient.

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Major impacts on Farnley Tyas Conservation Area and several listed buildings with no mitigation possible.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted. Some support noted but this site has been rejected due to impacts on the historic environment.

Development of the site would lead to urban sprawl.
 Physical infrastructure would not cope.
 Disproportionate level of development to existing settlement size.
 Cumulative impact of development would be unacceptable on character.
 Negative impact on community.
 Lack of local amenities.
 Loss of green belt.
 Negative impact on tourism.
 Should use Brownfield land first.
 Do not use Greenfield sites.
 Proposals for a country park should not be linked to new housing developments.
 Potential for this site to be used for housing.

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Major impacts on Farnley Tyas Conservation Area and several listed buildings with no mitigation possible.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted. Some support noted but this site has been rejected due to impacts on the historic environment.

Road congestion especially at peak times, narrow lanes. Particular issues on Penistone Road, Manor Road/Farnley Road junction, Manor Road, narrow lane between Almondbury and Farnley Tyas, Woodsome Road/Field Lane junction, Storthes Hall Lane, Rowley Lane, Fenay Lane, Woodsome road, North Road, Station Road
 Road safety issues - numerous car accidents, dangerous for horse riding.
 Public transport frequency issues.
 Sewage infrastructure will not cope.
 Increased flood risk including surface water flood risk.
 Increased air pollution due to standing traffic
 Wildlife would be affected.
 Negative impact on character.
 Negative impact on Farnley Tyas Conservation Area.
 Protect Castle Hill and its environs.
 School capacity insufficient.
 Health provision insufficient.

Development of the site would lead to urban sprawl.

Summary of comments

Council Response

Physical infrastructure would not cope.
 Disproportionate level of development to existing settlement size.
 Cumulative impact of development would be unacceptable on character.
 Negative impact on community.
 Lack of local amenities.
 Loss of green belt.
 Negative impact on tourism.
 Should use Brownfield land first.
 Do not use Greenfield sites.
 Proposals for a country park should not be linked to new housing developments.
 Potential for this site to be used for housing.

H254	Land east of, Thurstonland Road, Farnley Tyas	Support 166	Conditional Support	Object 19	No Comment
DLP_RSO16, DLP_RSO42, DLP_RSO45, DLP_RSO47, DLP_RSO50, DLP_RSO65, DLP_RSO70, DLP_RSO82, DLP_RSO91, DLP_RSO104, DLP_RSO117, DLP_RSO139, DLP_RSO149, DLP_RSO152, DLP_RSO154, DLP_RSO162, DLP_RSO173, DLP_RSO181, DLP_RSO184, DLP_RSO188, DLP_RSO198, DLP_RSO202, DLP_RSO208, DLP_RSO221, DLP_RSO226, DLP_RSO230, DLP_RSO240, DLP_RSO245, DLP_RSO249, DLP_RSO275, DLP_RSO288, DLP_RSO296, DLP_RSO304, DLP_RSO332, DLP_RSO341, DLP_RSO348, DLP_RSO365, DLP_RSO372, DLP_RSO373, DLP_RSO377, DLP_RSO391, DLP_RSO397, DLP_RSO442, DLP_RSO463, DLP_RSO479, DLP_RSO486, DLP_RSO511, DLP_RSO527, DLP_RSO532, DLP_RSO541, DLP_RSO552, DLP_RSO563, DLP_RSO622, DLP_RSO654, DLP_RSO659, DLP_RSO666, DLP_RSO672, DLP_RSO678, DLP_RSO687, DLP_RSO700, DLP_RSO713, DLP_RSO721, DLP_RSO736, DLP_RSO739, DLP_RSO746, DLP_RSO767, DLP_RSO803, DLP_RSO820, DLP_RSO824, DLP_RSO830, DLP_RSO835, DLP_RSO844, DLP_RSO853, DLP_RSO887, DLP_RSO892, DLP_RSO898, DLP_RSO912, DLP_RSO925, DLP_RSO948, DLP_RSO950, DLP_RSO956, DLP_RSO1019, DLP_RSO1024, DLP_RSO1035, DLP_RSO1043, DLP_RSO1047, DLP_RSO1072, DLP_RSO1081, DLP_RSO1089, DLP_RSO1103, DLP_RSO1108, DLP_RSO1143, DLP_RSO1150, DLP_RSO1154, DLP_RSO1163, DLP_RSO1201, DLP_RSO1229, DLP_RSO1276, DLP_RSO1316, DLP_RSO1324, DLP_RSO1339, DLP_RSO1391, DLP_RSO1414, DLP_RSO1421, DLP_RSO1427, DLP_RSO1440, DLP_RSO1468, DLP_RSO1482, DLP_RSO1489, DLP_RSO1500, DLP_RSO1517, DLP_RSO1530, DLP_RSO1534, DLP_RSO1546, DLP_RSO1560, DLP_RSO1570, DLP_RSO1575, DLP_RSO1580, DLP_RSO1584, DLP_RSO1591, DLP_RSO1595, DLP_RSO1605, DLP_RSO1611, DLP_RSO1635, DLP_RSO1641, DLP_RSO1661, DLP_RSO1663, DLP_RSO1676, DLP_RSO1681, DLP_RSO1695, DLP_RSO1708, DLP_RSO1732, DLP_RSO1743, DLP_RSO1755, DLP_RSO1763, DLP_RSO1773, DLP_RSO1782, DLP_RSO1793, DLP_RSO1808, DLP_RSO1849, DLP_RSO1866, DLP_RSO1871, DLP_RSO1878, DLP_RSO1912, DLP_RSO1955, DLP_RSO1996, DLP_RSO2014, DLP_RSO2054, DLP_RSO2074, DLP_RSO2090, DLP_RSO2125, DLP_RSO2139, DLP_RSO2233, DLP_RSO2247, DLP_RSO2251, DLP_RSO2277, DLP_RSO2295, DLP_RSO2504, DLP_RSO2635, DLP_RSO2701, DLP_RSO2776, DLP_RSO2815, DLP_RSO2951, DLP_RSO2968, DLP_RSO3116, DLP_RSO3133, DLP_RSO3320, DLP_RSO3366, DLP_RSO3376, DLP_RSO3609, DLP_RSO4036, DLP_RSO4052, DLP_RSO4207, DLP_RSO4258, DLP_RSO4448, DLP_RSO4522, DLP_RSO4534, DLP_RSO4549, DLP_RSO4969, DLP_RSO5029, DLP_RSO5034, DLP_RSO5091					

Encourages commuting.
 Road congestion especially at peak times, narrow lanes, dangerous bends, parking issues. Particular issues on Penistone Road, Woodsome Road/Penistone Road junction, Manor Road/Farnley Road junction, Manor Road, St Helens Gate, Woodsome Road, Storthes Hall Lane, Rowley Lane, Fenay Lane, North Road, Station Road, narrow lane between Almondbury and Farnley Tyas, Woodsome Road/Field Lane junction.
 Road safety issues – risk for children walking to school, danger for horse riders.
 Public transport inadequate and frequency issues.
 Site access can be achieved.
 Potential pedestrian links to public right of way.
 Encourages commuting.
 Increased flood risk including surface water flood risk.
 Drainage capacity insufficient.
 Sewage infrastructure will not cope.
 Water pressure issues.
 Potential to incorporate SuDS features.
 Increased air pollution due to standing traffic.
 Wildlife would be affected.
 Negative impact on character.
 Impact on the historic setting of the village.
 Negative impact on Farnley Tyas Conservation Area.
 Protect Castle Hill and its environs.
 Impact on Grade II Listed Buildings (St Lucius Church) and its historic setting.
 Area adjacent to the church could be kept open.
 School capacity insufficient (primary and secondary).
 Health provision insufficient.
 Site connected the urban green space to the green belt beyond.
 St Lucius Church and graveyard would be surrounded by development on all sides.

No change.
 The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.
 Major impact on the adjacent listed church and Farnley Tyas Conservation Area with no mitigation possible.
 The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted. Support for housing noted including a heritage impact assessment but the impacts on the historic environment have resulted in the rejection of this site option.

Development of the site would lead to urban sprawl and the start of merging settlements.

Summary of comments

Council Response

Site boundary provides a strong defined urban edge.
 Exceptional circumstances demonstrated with creation of country park.
 Green belt assessment for this site should be more negative.
 Unacceptable impact on landscape.
 Proposals would impact on an area of Natural Outstanding Beauty.
 Physical infrastructure would not cope.
 Negative impact on community.
 Disproportionate level of development to existing settlement size.
 Cumulative impact of development would be unacceptable on character.
 Lack of local amenities.
 High standard of design should be required from new homes.
 Housing mix would not meet needs in the area.
 Loss of green belt.
 Green belt land is required for new housing.
 Support for new housing linked to the country park proposal.
 Development will fund the creation and ongoing maintenance of a country park
 Potential for this site to be used for housing.
 Proposals for a country park should not be linked to or used to justify new housing developments.
 Should use Brownfield land first.
 Do not use Greenfield sites.
 Negative impact on tourism.
 New homes are needed.
 Bring empty properties back into use instead of building new ones.
 Masterplan submitted for the site.

H255 Land south east of, Arkenley Lane, Almondbury
 DLP_RSO755, DLP_RSO930, DLP_RSO1118, DLP_RSO4836, DLP_RSO5060

Support 5 Conditional Support Object No Comment

General support for rejection of this housing option.

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

This is an extensive area of green belt that over washes both the Almondbury conservation area and the open countryside south of Huddersfield. The site sits in an area of urban fringe where there are numerous existing residential and other properties. The green belt designation prevents the intensification of built form in this area and helps to preserve the setting of the conservation area. The southern boundary of the site borders an open watercourse and its important wildlife habitats. The best means of protecting these countryside features and to prevent further intensification of built development is retaining the green belt designation. Removal of this site from the green belt would create an isolated pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

H256 Land noth of, Woodsome Road, Fenay Bridge	Support 223	Conditional Support	Object 16	No Comment
<p>DLP_RSO17, DLP_RSO51, DLP_RSO64, DLP_RSO67, DLP_RSO71, DLP_RSO92, DLP_RSO131, DLP_RSO141, DLP_RSO155, DLP_RSO166, DLP_RSO183, DLP_RSO189, DLP_RSO203, DLP_RSO213, DLP_RSO218, DLP_RSO236, DLP_RSO255, DLP_RSO268, DLP_RSO278, DLP_RSO285, DLP_RSO289, DLP_RSO301, DLP_RSO309, DLP_RSO312, DLP_RSO317, DLP_RSO339, DLP_RSO354, DLP_RSO360, DLP_RSO385, DLP_RSO409, DLP_RSO423, DLP_RSO429, DLP_RSO443, DLP_RSO464, DLP_RSO478, DLP_RSO488, DLP_RSO512, DLP_RSO534, DLP_RSO542, DLP_RSO551, DLP_RSO564, DLP_RSO568, DLP_RSO620, DLP_RSO623, DLP_RSO627, DLP_RSO630, DLP_RSO634, DLP_RSO636, DLP_RSO642, DLP_RSO648, DLP_RSO655, DLP_RSO660, DLP_RSO663, DLP_RSO673, DLP_RSO679, DLP_RSO686, DLP_RSO707, DLP_RSO714, DLP_RSO716, DLP_RSO733, DLP_RSO740, DLP_RSO745, DLP_RSO747, DLP_RSO756, DLP_RSO768, DLP_RSO797, DLP_RSO804, DLP_RSO816, DLP_RSO831, DLP_RSO836, DLP_RSO845, DLP_RSO850, DLP_RSO854, DLP_RSO861, DLP_RSO866, DLP_RSO875, DLP_RSO881, DLP_RSO895, DLP_RSO897, DLP_RSO901, DLP_RSO914, DLP_RSO917, DLP_RSO921, DLP_RSO928, DLP_RSO931, DLP_RSO935, DLP_RSO943, DLP_RSO952, DLP_RSO959, DLP_RSO965, DLP_RSO970, DLP_RSO1025, DLP_RSO1034, DLP_RSO1049, DLP_RSO1053, DLP_RSO1073, DLP_RSO1082, DLP_RSO1086, DLP_RSO1104, DLP_RSO1109, DLP_RSO1119, DLP_RSO1144, DLP_RSO1153, DLP_RSO1164, DLP_RSO1173, DLP_RSO1196, DLP_RSO1202, DLP_RSO1207, DLP_RSO1208, DLP_RSO1277, DLP_RSO1284, DLP_RSO1288, DLP_RSO1293, DLP_RSO1318, DLP_RSO1329, DLP_RSO1340, DLP_RSO1347, DLP_RSO1353, DLP_RSO1358, DLP_RSO1376, DLP_RSO1382, DLP_RSO1398, DLP_RSO1409, DLP_RSO1415, DLP_RSO1420, DLP_RSO1426, DLP_RSO1441, DLP_RSO1475, DLP_RSO1490, DLP_RSO1497, DLP_RSO1499, DLP_RSO1507, DLP_RSO1518, DLP_RSO1523, DLP_RSO1527, DLP_RSO1535, DLP_RSO1537, DLP_RSO1557, DLP_RSO1559, DLP_RSO1571, DLP_RSO1577, DLP_RSO1581, DLP_RSO1592, DLP_RSO1606, DLP_RSO1609, DLP_RSO1616, DLP_RSO1619, DLP_RSO1625, DLP_RSO1632, DLP_RSO1642, DLP_RSO1654, DLP_RSO1664, DLP_RSO1670, DLP_RSO1688, DLP_RSO1692, DLP_RSO1709, DLP_RSO1711, DLP_RSO1725, DLP_RSO1733, DLP_RSO1744, DLP_RSO1746, DLP_RSO1758, DLP_RSO1764, DLP_RSO1775, DLP_RSO1783, DLP_RSO1786, DLP_RSO1811, DLP_RSO1836, DLP_RSO1840, DLP_RSO1848, DLP_RSO1865, DLP_RSO1870, DLP_RSO1879, DLP_RSO1913, DLP_RSO1956, DLP_RSO1997, DLP_RSO2013, DLP_RSO2055, DLP_RSO2075, DLP_RSO2087, DLP_RSO2099, DLP_RSO2127, DLP_RSO2140, DLP_RSO2160, DLP_RSO2165, DLP_RSO2209, DLP_RSO2224, DLP_RSO2237, DLP_RSO2242, DLP_RSO2250, DLP_RSO2254, DLP_RSO2261, DLP_RSO2283, DLP_RSO2296, DLP_RSO2473, DLP_RSO2497, DLP_RSO2501, DLP_RSO2548, DLP_RSO2631, DLP_RSO2657, DLP_RSO2702, DLP_RSO2775, DLP_RSO2816, DLP_RSO2955, DLP_RSO2960, DLP_RSO2962, DLP_RSO2969, DLP_RSO3115, DLP_RSO3125, DLP_RSO3129, DLP_RSO3138, DLP_RSO3321, DLP_RSO3353, DLP_RSO3359, DLP_RSO3370, DLP_RSO3377, DLP_RSO3611, DLP_RSO4040, DLP_RSO4053, DLP_RSO4111, DLP_RSO4257, DLP_RSO4340, DLP_RSO4355, DLP_RSO4456, DLP_RSO4523, DLP_RSO4528, DLP_RSO4550, DLP_RSO4551, DLP_RSO4706, DLP_RSO4710, DLP_RSO4716, DLP_RSO4837, DLP_RSO4970, DLP_RSO5028, DLP_RSO5032, DLP_RSO5036, DLP_RSO5061, DLP_RSO5092</p>				
<p>The proposal would be detrimental to local highway and pedestrian safety and there is insufficient infrastructure. Road congestion especially at peak times, narrow lanes and pinch points, difficulties in winter weather. Local roads such as Woodsome Road are not capable of accommodating additional traffic. Public transport frequency issues. The proposal would support the improvement of transport links in the local area. A workable transport solution has been devised which can be delivered for the site. The Woodsome Valley represents a major flood risk. Increased flood risk including surface water flood risk this issue has been highlighted in the sustainability appraisal as having a significant negative effect. Drainage capacity insufficient. Sewage infrastructure will not cope Increased air pollution due to standing traffic. The proposal would have a detrimental impact on wildlife. The proposal would help to protect wildlife and allow it to be improved. Negative impact on character. School capacity insufficient (infant/junior and secondary). Health provision insufficient. The development of the site would support outdoor education and a healthy lifestyle by providing an outdoor education centre as well as being inclusive for people with disabilities. The Kirklees Director of Public Health Executive Summary 2014 also states that 'Every 10% increase in exposure to green space reduced the risk of expected health problems by five years.' The proposal would not lead to any improvements to access to open space as these already exist. The proposal would have a detrimental impact to local open space and Green Belt. There is sufficient greenspace in the surrounding area to ensure that open space is protected. The area forms good quality farmland which should be left to farming.</p>	<p>No Change.</p>	<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p>	<p>Removal of this site from the green belt would create an isolated area of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The site is countryside, and has a very long boundary with both Rushfield Dike and Fenay Beck, which along with their associated sensitive habitats are best protected from encroachment through the green belt designation. The site is very poorly configured and would introduce built form that would sprawl into open countryside to the significant detriment of the amenity of the wider green belt. There are potential impacts on Grade I listed Woodsome Hall to the south of this site although topography may minimise the impacts. Also, potential impacts on nearby Grade II, Grade II* listed buildings and major impact on Almondbury Conservation Area with no mitigation possible.</p>	<p>Comments are noted with regard to the local highway network and public transport.</p> <p>Comments are noted with regard to flood risk and surface water flooding issues.</p> <p>Comments are noted about negative impacts on wildlife and character of the area, encroachment into the Green Belt and landscape.</p> <p>Comments regarding lack of provision at local schools and doctor surgeries are also noted.</p> <p>Comments relating to the proposed Farnley Country Park are noted. The country park proposal (SGI2115) is proposed to be rejected in the Publication Draft Local Plan.</p>
<p>The proposal would lead to an encroachment into the Green Belt. Development of the site would lead to urban sprawl and the start of merging settlements. There is sufficient Green Belt area around the site to ensure that it is protected, and Green Belt land has to be released anywhere, so why not get the benefit of a country park. The development of the site will be detrimental to the character and appearance of the local landscape. Physical infrastructure would not cope. The development of the site would not meet the needs of local residents. Negative impact on community. Disproportionate level of development to existing settlement size. Cumulative impact of development would be unacceptable on character.</p>				

Lack of local amenities.

If the proposed housing allocation was allowed it would help to facilitate the Farnley Country Park which would benefit the local economy. Create 450 jobs, and support the ongoing maintenance of the park which would be of national if not international importance.

The proposal would support strategic growth of the local area and the rural economy.

There is no need for a new country park and the additional housing required to facilitate it, existing facilities are provided at Bretton Park 7.7 miles away.

Proposals for a country park should not be linked to or used to justify new housing developments.

Should use Brownfield land first.

Do not use Greenfield sites.

Bring vacant houses back into use instead of building new ones.

The development of the site will have a negative impact on tourism.

The site is one of the most unsuitable for housing as highlighted in the sustainability appraisal.

The site would help to deliver the housing requirement for the district and would form an urban extension in a sustainable location.

H257	Land west of, Penistone Road, Fenay Bridge	Support 226	Conditional Support	Object 17	No Comment
DLP_RSO20, DLP_RSO34, DLP_RSO55, DLP_RSO61, DLP_RSO74, DLP_RSO95, DLP_RSO96, DLP_RSO132, DLP_RSO142, DLP_RSO151, DLP_RSO158, DLP_RSO165, DLP_RSO182, DLP_RSO192, DLP_RSO206, DLP_RSO212, DLP_RSO219, DLP_RSO237, DLP_RSO254, DLP_RSO267, DLP_RSO277, DLP_RSO286, DLP_RSO292, DLP_RSO302, DLP_RSO310, DLP_RSO314, DLP_RSO318, DLP_RSO347, DLP_RSO355, DLP_RSO356, DLP_RSO376, DLP_RSO410, DLP_RSO417, DLP_RSO424, DLP_RSO444, DLP_RSO451, DLP_RSO465, DLP_RSO477, DLP_RSO493, DLP_RSO499, DLP_RSO513, DLP_RSO537, DLP_RSO543, DLP_RSO550, DLP_RSO565, DLP_RSO621, DLP_RSO624, DLP_RSO631, DLP_RSO635, DLP_RSO637, DLP_RSO638, DLP_RSO656, DLP_RSO661, DLP_RSO665, DLP_RSO674, DLP_RSO680, DLP_RSO681, DLP_RSO685, DLP_RSO706, DLP_RSO715, DLP_RSO719, DLP_RSO724, DLP_RSO734, DLP_RSO741, DLP_RSO742, DLP_RSO750, DLP_RSO757, DLP_RSO769, DLP_RSO807, DLP_RSO817, DLP_RSO826, DLP_RSO834, DLP_RSO841, DLP_RSO848, DLP_RSO851, DLP_RSO855, DLP_RSO862, DLP_RSO867, DLP_RSO876, DLP_RSO882, DLP_RSO893, DLP_RSO894, DLP_RSO896, DLP_RSO904, DLP_RSO915, DLP_RSO919, DLP_RSO922, DLP_RSO932, DLP_RSO936, DLP_RSO940, DLP_RSO953, DLP_RSO958, DLP_RSO966, DLP_RSO971, DLP_RSO1028, DLP_RSO1036, DLP_RSO1051, DLP_RSO1054, DLP_RSO1069, DLP_RSO1074, DLP_RSO1083, DLP_RSO1087, DLP_RSO1105, DLP_RSO1112, DLP_RSO1120, DLP_RSO1145, DLP_RSO1152, DLP_RSO1165, DLP_RSO1174, DLP_RSO1185, DLP_RSO1199, DLP_RSO1203, DLP_RSO1250, DLP_RSO1278, DLP_RSO1287, DLP_RSO1294, DLP_RSO1319, DLP_RSO1330, DLP_RSO1334, DLP_RSO1341, DLP_RSO1349, DLP_RSO1354, DLP_RSO1359, DLP_RSO1379, DLP_RSO1383, DLP_RSO1393, DLP_RSO1396, DLP_RSO1408, DLP_RSO1418, DLP_RSO1419, DLP_RSO1425, DLP_RSO1444, DLP_RSO1476, DLP_RSO1491, DLP_RSO1498, DLP_RSO1520, DLP_RSO1524, DLP_RSO1528, DLP_RSO1536, DLP_RSO1540, DLP_RSO1551, DLP_RSO1554, DLP_RSO1558, DLP_RSO1572, DLP_RSO1578, DLP_RSO1582, DLP_RSO1593, DLP_RSO1607, DLP_RSO1610, DLP_RSO1615, DLP_RSO1621, DLP_RSO1626, DLP_RSO1633, DLP_RSO1643, DLP_RSO1648, DLP_RSO1655, DLP_RSO1668, DLP_RSO1669, DLP_RSO1686, DLP_RSO1687, DLP_RSO1691, DLP_RSO1700, DLP_RSO1710, DLP_RSO1714, DLP_RSO1728, DLP_RSO1734, DLP_RSO1745, DLP_RSO1747, DLP_RSO1759, DLP_RSO1761, DLP_RSO1767, DLP_RSO1776, DLP_RSO1784, DLP_RSO1787, DLP_RSO1812, DLP_RSO1839, DLP_RSO1843, DLP_RSO1847, DLP_RSO1864, DLP_RSO1869, DLP_RSO1880, DLP_RSO1957, DLP_RSO1998, DLP_RSO2010, DLP_RSO2058, DLP_RSO2062, DLP_RSO2076, DLP_RSO2088, DLP_RSO2100, DLP_RSO2128, DLP_RSO2141, DLP_RSO2161, DLP_RSO2166, DLP_RSO2206, DLP_RSO2227, DLP_RSO2238, DLP_RSO2239, DLP_RSO2249, DLP_RSO2262, DLP_RSO2280, DLP_RSO2297, DLP_RSO2498, DLP_RSO2549, DLP_RSO2634, DLP_RSO2658, DLP_RSO2703, DLP_RSO2774, DLP_RSO2817, DLP_RSO2956, DLP_RSO2959, DLP_RSO2963, DLP_RSO2971, DLP_RSO3114, DLP_RSO3126, DLP_RSO3130, DLP_RSO3139, DLP_RSO3323, DLP_RSO3354, DLP_RSO3378, DLP_RSO3612, DLP_RSO4041, DLP_RSO4054, DLP_RSO4112, DLP_RSO4256, DLP_RSO4341, DLP_RSO4356, DLP_RSO4457, DLP_RSO4524, DLP_RSO4529, DLP_RSO4552, DLP_RSO4554, DLP_RSO4707, DLP_RSO4713, DLP_RSO4715, DLP_RSO4838, DLP_RSO4968, DLP_RSO4973, DLP_RSO5027, DLP_RSO5033, DLP_RSO5062, DLP_RSO5093					

Road congestion especially at peak times, narrow lanes and pinch points. Particular issues on Penistone Road, its junction Woodsome Road, Storthes Hall Lane, Rowley Lane, Fenay Lane, Woodsome Road, North Road, Station Road, Dogley Mills, Field Lane, Far Dene, Common End Lane, difficulties in winter weather.

Impact of traffic on Almondbury and Farnley Tyas villages

Road safety issues

Cumulative impact of traffic from other proposals in the area

Poor motorway access

Site is remote from services and facilities and would encourage car travel

Vehicular access can be gained via bellmouth on Penistone Road

Increased flood risk including surface water flood risk.

Drainage capacity insufficient.

Sewage infrastructure will not cope.

The site is in the flood plain

Site is at risk of flooding from confluence of Beldon Brook and Fenay Beck

Site Masterplan sets out public open space to incorporate SuDs with Fenay Beck floodplain developed as public open space

Increased air pollution due to standing traffic

Development of the site could increase light and noise pollution

Wildlife would be affected.

Wildlife Corridor linking Fenay / Woodsome Valleys to East of Lepton would be affected

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

One of the purposes of the green belt is to prevent the merger of settlements. This site lies within an extensive area of green belt but where locally it prevents the merger of Lepton with Highburton, although the nature of the settlement pattern means that there are a number of opportunities for small scale settlement extension without significantly harming this role. Penistone Road already has a degree of built form and the green belt designation prevents the intensification of built form and preserves the gaps that maintains the appearance of separation. This large site would result in the removal of two significant open areas west of Penistone Road. These areas are severely constrained by flooding and if development were prevented on the frontage the remainder of the site has very little relationship with either Lepton or Highburton. This is an area of countryside and development would result in significant encroachment. Removal of this site would therefore seriously harm the role and function of the green belt in this location. The development of this site would have an impact on several listed buildings. No mitigation possible. Particular issue with Woodsome Hall Grade I listed building to the north.

Comments supporting the rejection of this site are noted.

Summary of comments

Council Response

Impact on ancient woodland
 Negative impact on character.
 Protect Castle Hill and its environs.
 Site scores a 'red' against Historic Environment
 Impact on listed buildings at Woodsome Hall and Fenay Hall
 School capacity insufficient (infant/junior and secondary)
 Health provision insufficient.
 Development of this site will finance the country park, which will in turn support physical activity and health
 Loss of farmland.

Development of the site would lead to urban sprawl and the start of merging settlements.
 Would lead to ribbon development along Penistone Road
 The site would not be a practical extension into the Green Belt
 The site has high landscape value when viewed from different locations
 Masterplan seeks to link existing landscape features with green corridors
 Physical infrastructure would not cope.
 Disproportionate level of development to existing settlement size.
 Cumulative impact of development would be unacceptable on character.
 Lack of local amenities.
 Housing for older people and starter homes are needed
 Loss of green belt.
 Proposals for a country park should not be linked to or used to justify new housing developments.
 Should use Brownfield land first.
 Bring vacant houses back into use instead of building new ones.
 Other development taking place / has taken place in Highburton, e.g. Moxons Mill site
 Proposal can support tourism, as it would enable delivery of country park
 Development of the site will allow the Farnley Country Park proposal to go ahead
 The site scores poorly in the Sustainability Appraisal, in comparison with other sites.

H258 Land north of, Northgate, Honley
 DLP_RSO72, DLP_RSO435, DLP_RSO1048

Site access from Northgate would be dangerous.
 Traffic congestion.
 Development on the site would have a detrimental effect on Upper Wood Nature Reserve.

General objection to Farnley Country Park.
 Support for rejection of housing option.

Support 3 Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change.
 The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Although there is some urban fringe character in this area the site is totally unrelated to any inset settlement and removal of this site would create a small pocket of non green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

H259 Land west of, Brockholes Lane, Brockholes
 DLP_RSO2958, DLP_RSO3613

Rejection of site supported.

Support 2 Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change
 This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

Allocation of this site would breach the defendable green belt boundary currently defined by the railway. It is a significant tract of countryside and its removal from the green belt would undermine the purpose of the green belt which is to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. It is contained by woodland, roads and the line of the railway so there would be no risk of sprawl. However this is elevated ground where development could be prominent in long distance views to the detriment of the openness of the wider green belt.

No draft Local Plan consultation comments received.

Summary of comments		Council Response				
H260	Holly View Farm, Owler Lane, Birstall DLP_RSO4959, DLP_RSO4960, DLP_RSO4961	Support	3	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Proposals will significantly impact on the road network		No Change				
Proposals go against purpose of green belt. Rejection of site prevents sprawl within villages Birstall and Birkenshaw ward councillors support the rejection of the site		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. This is a small site associated with an existing residential property and its garden/paddock. Its release would have very limited impact on openness as it is already enclosed and different in character to the land immediately surrounding it. However, it is isolated from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.				
		Supporting comments for the rejection of this site have been noted.				
H261	Land east of, Brooklyn Road, Cleckheaton DLP_RSO1237	Support	1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Support the retention of the green belt boundary Support rejection of this site as it is an area of great character which is well used with public access close by the town centre		No Change				
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). The majority of the site lies within flood zone 3a with a proportion in flood zone 2. In accordance with the council's site allocation methodology, in the case of vulnerable uses such as housing, any part of the site which falls within flood risk zones 2, 3a or 3b has been excluded from the developable area. Where the remainder does not represent a deliverable site, the development option has been rejected. The Spen River runs along the east side of this proposed allocation, a UK BAP priority habitat. The developable area has been reduced by 0.13ha to 0.38ha as a consequence of the priority area. The site area therefore does not meet the threshold of 0.4ha to be included as an allocation.				
		Support for rejection of site H261 noted.				
H262	Land at, Springfield Farm, Hodgson Lane, Birkenshaw DLP_RSO3340, DLP_RSO4877, DLP_RSO4878, DLP_RSO4879	Support	4	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Support rejection of this site as its development would add to congestion on the A58 and A650		No Change				
Support rejection of this site as its development would completely close the green belt gap between Birkenshaw and Drighlington (Leeds City Council)		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).				
Support rejection of site as it should remain in green belt		The reasons for rejecting the site are This site lies within the boundary and/or within the setting of the Registered Battlefield at Adwalton. Historic England has objected to this option. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. National planning policy confirms that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. This option could lead to substantial harm to the registered battlefield and the inclusion of the site option in the plan is not justified. Notwithstanding this, it is a poorly configured site with only a limited relationship to the settlement. Development would encroach into the countryside contrary to the role and function of the green belt. The site is located within the area of Adwalton Moor historic battlefield which is best protected by its green belt designation and whose setting would be compromised by further development within and around it. Additionally, the site has no frontage to an adopted highway and therefore, third party land is required to achieve access.				

Summary of comments

Council Response

Supporting comment on the rejection of site H262 is noted		Support	23	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
H263	Land at, Monk Ings, Bradford Road, Gomersal					
DLP_RSO111, DLP_RSO223, DLP_RSO425, DLP_RSO426, DLP_RSO546, DLP_RSO785, DLP_RSO1063, DLP_RSO1130, DLP_RSO1189, DLP_RSO1217, DLP_RSO1297, DLP_RSO1302, DLP_RSO1371, DLP_RSO1458, DLP_RSO1792, DLP_RSO4196, DLP_RSO4263, DLP_RSO4343, DLP_RSO4847, DLP_RSO4929, DLP_RSO4930, DLP_RSO4931, DLP_RSO5024						
Road congestion, road capacity issues including impact on junctions at Gomersal Hill Top, Church Lane, Birstall Smithies and Birstall Coach and Six., road safety on Bradford Road and parking problems		No change				
Inadequate access on Monks Ing Avenue to support domestic and commercial traffic		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).				
Flooding issues - localised flooding on Monks Ing and Bradford Road from the stream from Church Wood		The size of this option would erode the size of the green belt gap separating Gomersal and Birstall. Although there are clear boundaries to the west and south, particularly along the beck and woodland, the northern extent of the option does not present a defensible new green belt boundary and would probably necessitate the removal of the frontage properties from the green belt in order to make Bradford Road the new green belt boundary. Open spaces, or the appearance of open space immediately behind frontage properties, are critically important in retaining a sense of separation between towns. The loss of the open spaces would significantly undermine the role and function of the green belt in this location.				
Support rejection of site as it has insufficient drainage capacity		The supporting comments for the site rejection is noted.				
Support rejection of site as its development would impact on air quality						
Support the rejection of the site as it will protect wildlife including bats, herons, owls, pheasants, foxes, rabbits, squirrels, badgers deer and birdlife. It will protect the wildlife habitat of Church Wood						
Support the rejection of the site as it will protect the historic environment including listed buildings, country park and established rights of way						
School capacity insufficient including no places at local primary school						
Health services/provision is insufficient						
Support the rejection of the site as a valuable amenity for walking including Brinte Walk and for health benefits						
Support the rejection of the site for housing or employment as it protects the green belt and will prevent further settlements from merging and urban sprawl which are now only separated by narrow strips of green belt						
Support not using green belt land as Brownfield or derelict buildings should be used first						
Support rejection of site as its development would lead to loss of trees						
Support site rejection due to historic mining concerns and ground stability						
Before any new commercial development is allowed in the area, Birstall should be assisted						
Further development may lead to increased crime						
H264	Land west of, Dewsbury Road, Gomersal					
DLP_RSO112, DLP_RSO228, DLP_RSO229, DLP_RSO548, DLP_RSO611, DLP_RSO615, DLP_RSO782, DLP_RSO1122, DLP_RSO1192, DLP_RSO1214, DLP_RSO1222, DLP_RSO1233, DLP_RSO1254, DLP_RSO3963, DLP_RSO4108, DLP_RSO4198, DLP_RSO4347, DLP_RSO4368, DLP_RSO4855, DLP_RSO4914, DLP_RSO4915, DLP_RSO4916, DLP_RSO5022						
Road capacity issues with access on to Dewsbury/Bradford Road or Oxford Road		No Change				
Road safety - junction of Summerbridge Crescent to Dewsbury Road		The site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local plan (November 2015).				
Support rejection as development would lead to air and noise pollution increases		The access point lies within a very narrow strategic gap along Dewsbury Road which already contains development. The access point represents the last open gap on the south side of that frontage. Introducing further urban features, including a major access point, would further erode the gap and contribute to the merger of Gomersal and Birstall. The land use pattern without field boundaries means that there is no scope for limiting the size of the option as there is no feature on the ground that a new green belt boundary could follow.				
Site unsuitable for development as it would require concrete raft foundations		This area adjoins the boundary of the Gomersal Conservation Area. The loss of this currently-open area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of this area. No evidence has been submitted which demonstrates any potential harm to the area could be mitigated against.				
Support rejection of site as it protects wildlife including bats, herons, hawks, owls and wild life birds some protected by law or on red endangered list		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted				
Support rejection of site as will protect historic environment including Oakwell Hall, Country Park, Red House Museum						
School capacity insufficient - classroom sizes above national average						
Protection of the site will provide open fields benefiting mental and physical wellbeing						
The footpath from Oxford Road, Gomersal to Dewsbury Road should be protected for amenity and health reasons						
Health services/provision insufficient						
Proposal goes against purpose of green belt/NPPF/NPPG						
Support rejection of the site as it is within green belt and to protect the identity of Gomersal, Birstall and Birkenshaw.						
Support rejection as it protects footpaths including Bronte Walk						
Mining concerns						
Brownfield and derelict sites should be used						
Loss of view and visual amenity						

Summary of comments		Council Response				
H264 mat be ideal for development but should perhaps be re-examined Whitley Mill, Cleckheaton should be used as an alternative						
H265	Land to west of, Field Head Lane, Drighlington DLP_RSO3341, DLP_RSO4892, DLP_RSO4893, DLP_RSO4894	Support	4	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Support rejection of site due to road congestion on the A58 and A650		No change				
Support rejection of the site as it would completely close the Green Belt gap between Birkenshaw and Drighlington.		The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.				
Support rejection of site on green belt grounds due to closing the strategic gap between Batley and West Ardsley and encroachment into the countryside towards Leeds (Leeds City Council)		<p>This site lies within the boundary and/or within the setting of the Registered Battlefield at Adwalton. Historic England has objected to this option. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. National planning policy confirms that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. This option could lead to substantial harm to the registered battlefield and the inclusion of the site option in the plan is not justified.</p> <p>The council considers that the site is not acceptable for development. One of the purposes of the green belt is to prevent towns from merging into one another and this site lies within an important area of green belt whose role is to maintain the open areas that separate Kirklees and Leeds. The A650 prevents any physical merger but the site would effectively be a major extension of Adwalton/Drighlington. Development of the site would erode the extent of the strategic gap and be unrelated to any settlement in Kirklees.</p> <p>This site lies adjacent to an area which is under consideration for inclusion within the boundary of the Registered Battlefield at Adwalton.</p> <p>The proposed allocation would lead to the establishment of an Air Quality Management Area.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted in particular Leeds City Council who consider that the allocation of the site would lead to closing the strategic gap between Birkenshaw and Drighlington and encroachment into the countryside towards Leeds.</p>				
H266	Land east of, Scholes Moor Road, Scholes	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.				
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.				
		This option is poorly related to the existing settlement and would result in the projection of built form into the countryside contrary to the purpose of the green belt which is to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. The land slopes down towards Oak Scar Lane which could make any development prominent in long distance views to the detriment of the openness of the wider green belt. There are no exceptional circumstances to remove this site from the green belt.				
H267	Land south of, Dark Lane, Almondbury	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change				
		The site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).				
		This is an extensive area of green belt that delineates the edge of the settlement in this location, and over washes both the Almondbury conservation area and open countryside south of Huddersfield. The site sits in an				

Summary of comments

Council Response

	<p>area of urban fringe where there are numerous existing residential and other properties. The green belt designation prevents the intensification of built form in this area and helps to preserve the setting of the conservation area. Removal of this site from the green belt would create an isolated pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p> <p>No representations were received for this site option.</p>
<p>H268 Land west of, Netherton Fold, Netherton DLP_RSO2943</p> <p>Site being promoted by Johnson Brook. Supporting statement. Planning application imminent. PP granted in 2009 for conversions and re-development of site.</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment</p> <p>No Change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>This site consists of a number of farm buildings, an industrial shed and surface infrastructure on an elongated site projecting along the valley side and screened from wider views by the presence of trees. Its configuration and location relative to the settlement edge would result in a poorly related projection of development into the valley side. National guidance allows for the redevelopment of Brownfield sites in the green belt provided that openness is maintained and given the location of this site any redevelopment should be assessed taking openness into account, which would not be possible should the site be removed from the green belt.</p> <p>Support for the allocation is noted.</p>
<p>H271 Land west of, Wells Green Gardens, Netherthong DLP_RSO43, DLP_RSO115, DLP_RSO455, DLP_RSO505, DLP_RSO558, DLP_RSO1991</p> <p>Access issues - Broomy Lea Lane (unadopted track) and park cars adjacent.</p> <p>Infrequent public transport</p> <p>Walking route to Holmfirth - lack of footways / steep road. Site drainage issues - localised flooding In heavy rain - the field drains and water flows down Broomy Lea Lane to Wells Green Gardens. Potential archaeological interest on the site. Impact on education school provision - Netherthong Primary School Impact on healthcare provision</p>	<p>Support 5 Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The extent and configuration of this option would have an unacceptable impact on the openness of the green belt as it would result in an unrelated projection of built form into the countryside.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>
<p>H272 Land at, Cartworth Road, Holmfirth</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site has a limited relationship with the settlement and would result in the significant sprawl of development along the steep and prominent valley side. The development of this site would result in the sprawl of built form to the south of Holmfirth, significant encroachment into the countryside and prominent development to the detriment of the openness of the green belt. Site access is not achievable. A heritage impact assessment would be required.</p>
<p>H273 Land east of Crosland Road, Crosland Road, Lindley</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is a rejected housing option. The site is covered by a larger accepted mixed use option.</p>

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H274	Land to the west of, Stretch Gate, Shelley DLP_RSO325, DLP_RSO470, DLP_RSO522, DLP_RSO793, DLP_RSO991, DLP_RSO1853	Support 6	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>Site has no highway access - so would require additional land. Inadequate highway infrastructure Impact on drainage systems / soak away function of field.</p> <p>Undermines role and function of the green belt Should use Brownfield land first. Development should be located close to facilities, e.g. in Huddersfield and Dewsbury</p>		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This area of green belt is considered to constitute a strategic green belt gap that separates Shepley from Shelley. The scale of the option and its location would significantly impact on this gap and undermine the role and function of the green belt in this location.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>			
H275	Land to the east of, Abbey Road, Shepley DLP_RSO326, DLP_RSO471, DLP_RSO520, DLP_RSO794, DLP_RSO989, DLP_RSO1861	Support 6	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>Access issues - visibility issues via narrow lane adjacent to railway embankment.</p> <p>Inadequate local highway infrastructure. Impact on drainage</p> <p>Land would diminish green belt role and function - providing separation of Shelley and Shepley. Would impact on character of settlement. Would impact on infrastructure of the settlement. Should use Brownfield land first. Development should be located close to facilities, e.g. in Huddersfield and Dewsbury</p>		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This area of green belt is considered to delineate a strategic green belt gap that separates Shelley from Shepley. The green belt overwashes the ribbon development along this part of Abbey Road to prevent intensification and to prevent the development of the gaps that help to maintain the appearance of separation. This is a very large option that is poorly configured in relation to this part of Shelley, would significantly impact on the strategic gap, would encroach into the countryside and would effectively merge development with The Knowle, all contrary to the role and function of the green belt in this location. Site access not achievable as there is only the opportunity for one access point but two access points would be required.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>			
H279	Land west of, Muffit Lane, Gomersal DLP_RSO4935, DLP_RSO4936, DLP_RSO4937	Support 3	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>Road congestion and road capacity issues. Acknowledge proposed improvements at Smithies Junction and Tong Street but this will not mitigate against impact of new development.</p> <p>Support rejection of site which should remain in Green belt and to prevent development merging. The area has had too much development in the past which has had an impact on the green belt and the quality of the area. Concerned about development in Bradford and Leeds and the impact on the area.</p>		<p>No Change</p> <p>This site is proposed as a rejected housing site. It formed a rejected housing site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). The site has also been proposed as an employment allocation (E1851) which has also been rejected.</p> <p>The reason for rejecting the housing allocation are: One of the purposes of the green belt is to preserve the countryside from encroachment. This is a poorly configured site unrelated to the settlement which would introduce an isolated residential area into the countryside. Part of the boundary does not follow a feature on the ground so a new defensible green belt boundary would need to be found, particularly at the south western extent of the site, if future encroachment were to be prevented.</p>			
H280	Land to the north of, Deep Lane, Milnsbridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>		<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>This is a narrow strip of land between the settlement edge and Deep Lane, which could present a strong new green belt boundary. However, the site slopes steeply up to Deep Lane and would sit at a significantly higher level than the development immediately to the north. There is a line of trees between the site and the settlement which further detaches the site from any relationship to Milnsbridge. Development would also reduce the narrow gap between Milnsbridge and Crosland Moor although Deep Lane would prevent any further sprawl to the</p>			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		south. The existing boundary is not well defined but the harm caused by the release of the site does not outweigh the benefit of a stronger boundary along Deep Lane. Site forms part of habitat network.			
H281	Land off, Old Bank Road, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Third party land required for access as no frontage onto highway. There does seem to be an access to the site from Old Bank Road, ownership needs to be clarified. This site has significant contaminated land issues, toxic industrial waste has been land filled and we know that other developments have stopped due to the issues associated with remediation.			
H282	Land to the east of, Cliff Road, Holmfirth	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The undeveloped gaps along Cliff Road are important in maintaining the appearance of openness and of retaining the character of the undeveloped prominent backdrop.			
H283	Land Adjacent, Bankfield Lane, Kirkheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Support rejection of the site. Support rejection of the site to prevent urban sprawl.		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		This site is separated from Kirkheaton by Bankfield Lane, which is in the green belt. Any development on this site would be very poorly related to the existing built form and would appear as an unrelated projection of development to the detriment of the openness of the green belt in this location.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
H285	Land north east of, Portal Crescent, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This is a relatively small site well related to the settlement edge. While it sits in a strategic gap its release could be accommodated without significantly compromising the role and function of the green belt in this location. However, the site is poorly configured in its southern extent and does not follow any features on the ground on its entire eastern edge.. This would leave adjacent land at significant risk from encroachment.			
H286	Land west of, Hanson Road, Meltham	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO399		No change			
Traffic congestion - Inadequate road infrastructure		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
Impact on flooding - increased run-off from hills		This area of green belt sits between the edge of Meltham and the boundary of the Peak District National Park.			
Impact on wildlife					

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
	<p>These open areas contribute to the immediate setting of the national park and are recognised for the role they play in maintaining landscape character beyond the boundary of the national park. The green belt in this location therefore plays an important role in maintaining this openness by protecting the areas from the encroachment of built form. Habitat Risk Assessment required for SPA. Site within 1000, of SSSI / SPA / SAC.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>
<p>H287 Land south of, Lane Side, Kirkheaton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is a rejected housing option. 7.44ha has been removed from the developable net area due to flood risk, high pressure gas pipeline and west Yorkshire ecology recommendations. This is an extensive site which is only loosely related to the edge of Kirkheaton and which would sprawl into open countryside to the detriment of the role and function of the green belt. The site is bisected by Ox Field Beck which is associated with important wildlife habitats, best protected by their green belt designation.</p>
<p>H288 Land at, Dunford Road, Hade Edge, Holmfirth,</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Note that there is a new option H288a covering most of the same area of land which is proposed as an accepted housing allocation.</p> <p>Development on that part of this option that is within the green belt would result in a very poorly related narrow projection of built form jutting out into the open land east of the settlement edge, to the significant detriment to the openness of the green belt in this location.</p> <p>No draft Local Plan consultation comments received on this option but comments received on SL2170 are relevant. These points have been addressed under SL2170.</p>
<p>H289 Land at, 6, Gomersal Road, Heckmondwike</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The reason for rejecting the proposed housing allocation is that it would be contrary to the role and function of the green belt.</p> <p>The green belt in this location over washes the properties fronting Gomersal Lane in order to prevent the intensification of built form and maintain the appearance of separation between Liversedge and Gomersal. There are very few undeveloped stretches of road frontage but the site presents one very narrow undeveloped gap east of Gomersal Lane, albeit behind a line of trees. Introducing urban features, including a major access road, would result in a wholly developed road frontage between Liversedge and Gomersal. The site includes priority habitats associated with marshy ground immediately north of the properties on Stubley Road. Protecting these areas would detach the site from the remainder of the settlement. These sensitive areas of wildlife are best protected by their green belt designation.</p>
<p>H290 Land south of, Hillside View, Linthwaite, Huddersfield,</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>This site forms part of a larger accepted housing option.</p>

Summary of comments		Council Response				
H291	Land to the south east of, Marsh Lane, Shepley DLP_RSO321, DLP_RSO466, DLP_RSO517, DLP_RSO986	Support	4	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>Traffic congestion</p> <p>Development would weaken the role and function of the Green Belt in this area. Impact on character of the area Should use Brownfield land first.</p>		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site is not well related to the settlement and would appear as an elongated sprawl of development along Marsh Lane, contrary to the role and function of the green belt.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>				
H292	Haughs Road, Quarmby, Huddersfield, DLP_RSO1228	Support		Conditional Support	Object	1 No Comment
<p>The above site was one of the rejected in the draft plan on the grounds of transport. The presumption in the draft was that the access would come off Haughs Road in fact the access to the site is from Hollyfield Avenue. This site received outline planning on 26th November 2015 Huddersfield Committee (application number ; 2015/60/91093/W). Could you please amend your plan to take account of the planning permission</p>		<p>Proposed Change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as an accepted housing allocation. This represents a change from the draft Local Plan (November 2015) where the site was rejected for housing. The reasons for the change are outlined below:</p> <p>The site was rejected in the draft plan on the grounds of transport. The presumption in the draft was that the access would come off Haughs Road in fact the access to the site is from Hollyfield Avenue. This site received outline planning on 26th November 2015 Huddersfield Committee (application number 2015/60/91093/W). The assessment has been amended to take account of the planning permission.</p> <p>The site has planning permission for 25 dwellings therefore the principle for the development of this site has been established.</p> <p>Comment noted re. planning application decision.</p>				
H295	Land south of, Back Lane, Clayton West DLP_RSO1449	Support	1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>Should use Brownfield land first.</p>		<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>This site is very poorly configured in relation to the settlement and would result in an encroachment of built form into the open countryside to the detriment of the openness of the green belt. The site is an area of environmental sensitivity and these wildlife habitats are best protected through their green belt designation. Site access is not achievable. Part of site forms mixed deciduous woodland. If this area is removed from net area, the site area falls below 0.4 hectares.</p> <p>No draft Local Plan consultation comments received.</p>				
H296	Land between, Hassocks Lane and Meltham Road, Honley DLP_RSO1267, DLP_RSO1304, DLP_RSO1367	Support		Conditional Support	Object	3 No Comment
<p>Public transport links (train station) should lead to more allocations in Honley. Site geology (sandy shale) is well draining. The site is marked down for environmental protection but site H588 which includes the site is not. SA comments regarding proximity of Honley Wood and disturbance is contrary to signage on the site welcoming people to use it for recreation purposes. The site receives an amber score for historic environment, potentially because of cairns at Honley Wood - though H664 has been accepted even though it encloses an ancient farmstead.</p>		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The northern extent of this site is on elevated ground which would impact in long distance views to the detriment of the openness of the wider green belt.</p>				

Summary of comments

Garner Lane would form a good green belt boundary.
 The site is not prominent in the same way as accepted site H664 is
 green Belt release here would allow for a settlement extension at an appropriate scale.
 Carefully designed site could mitigate visual impact.
 This site would be a sensible urban extension which would not undermine any of the purposes of the green belt.
 Site is in sole ownership - owner supports development.
 The site was considered favourably in the previous SHLAA assessment.

The site size is proportionate to the settlement

Allocation as Safeguarded Land may be appropriate to meet future needs.
 Honley is a sustainable location so more land should be allocated.
 Green belt required to meet housing needs.
 If arguments for development not accepted, consider use of site as safeguarded land.

H297 Land to the east of Ryecroft Lane, Scholes

No Representations received

Council Response

Comments supporting the allocation of this site have been noted. Settlement appraisal information for each settlement was set out in the local plan evidence base and it is acknowledged that this option may provide defensible green belt boundaries but in this case the impact on the green belt is unacceptable as set out above.

The Environmental Health information has been reviewed and a noise assessment is not required for this site. The assessment has been amended for this indicator.

It should be noted that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) is a high level assessment of sites and was undertaken on a policy neutral basis. It therefore did not assess the impact of this site on the green belt. The availability of this site for development is noted.

This site has been considered as a Safeguarded Land option as requested (SL2735) to determine whether this would be a suitable allocation.

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

Proposed change.

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan (although it was part of the larger accepted housing option H38 in the draft local plan). H297 has now been accepted as a housing option. Its allocation is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Site access achievable subject to achievement of sufficient visibility splays and surface water drainage will need to be managed to achieve greenfield run-off rates in line with local plan policies once adopted.

No draft Local Plan consultation comments received on this specific option, however, comments were received on the larger H38 housing option which includes this site. These are relevant to the consideration of this site and the comments have been addressed on H38.

H298 Land south and west of, Intake, Golcar
 DLP_RSO3640

Access can be achieved from Green Crescent - a limited amount of traffic would be generated from the site. It is considered that there will be no impact on Golcar conservation area.
 Whilst an amber assessment was received, if there is need for additional capacity this could be mitigated by financial contribution from the development
 The site is included within the UGS designation – but it does not fit the description of the Urban Greenspace. It is an unmanaged, untidy and unattractive site with limited amenity or biodiversity value.
 The site has no formal access and suffers from vandalism.

SHLAA indicates no constraints to development of site for housing. Site has willing owner.

H299 Huddersfield Road, Skelmanthorpe

No Representations received

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

The site will be retained as urban greenspace.

Comments from technical consultees note that there may be potential impact on listed buildings.

H300 Land west of, Hanson Road, Meltham
 DLP_RSO400

Traffic congestion - inadequate road infrastructure
 Impact on flooding - increased run-off from hills
 Impact on wildlife

Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
	<p>This area of green belt sits between the edge of Meltham and the boundary of the Peak District National Park. These open areas contribute to the immediate setting of the national park and are recognised for the role they play in maintaining landscape character beyond the boundary of the national park. The green belt in this location therefore plays an important role in maintaining this openness by protecting the areas from the encroachment of built form.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>
<p>H301 Gosling Hall Farm, POL, Greenhead Lane, Almondbury DLP_RSO2092</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment</p>
<p>Support for portion of site to be residential.</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The access to the site has been accepted as part of a larger Urban Greenspace allocation site which would prevent development of this site.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site to be allocated for housing are noted.</p>
<p>H302 Western part of POL, Tenter Hill Road, New Mill</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Required visibility splays cannot be achieved without third party land and no evidence that the access will be achieved using the access point shown on the option. Access can be achieved through the adjacent accepted housing option (H729) which covers all of this site apart from the access point.</p>
<p>H304 Land north of, Barnsley Road, Denby Dale</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Part of larger accepted housing option H634.</p>
<p>H305 Land to the north of, Wyke Lane, Oakenshaw, Bradford,</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>This site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its allocation is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site is on potentially contaminated land. Site falls within HSE middle zone. Planning Advice for Developments near Hazardous Installations (PADHI) suggest a maximum of 30 dwellings. Site area and number of dwellings proposed exceeds HSE advice.</p> <p>This site is allocated as an accepted safeguarded land SL2203.</p>
<p>H306 Land at, Yew Tree Road / Burn Road, Birchencliffe, Huddersfield,</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		The site is a rejected housing option. Access is possible, but road improvements may be required. The site is part of a larger accepted housing option.			
H308	Part of POL, Woodhead Road, Brockholes	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		This site is part of accepted housing option H129.			
H309	Land north of, Red Lane, Meltham DLP_RSO401	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Traffic congestion - inadequate road infrastructure Impact on flooding - increased run-off from hills Impact on wildlife		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Site is part of open areas contributing to the immediate setting of the national park and are recognised for the role they play in maintaining landscape character beyond the boundary of the national park. The green belt in this location therefore plays an important role in maintaining this openness by protecting the areas from the encroachment of built form. Due to the proximity to the Dark Peak SSSI/SPA/SAC, impacts would need to be assessed further. Not clear whether sufficient visibility splays could be achieved.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
H310	Land north of, Commercial Road, Skelmanthorpe, Huddersfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		The site forms part of accepted housing option H688.			
H311	Gomersal Primary School, Land to the north of, Oxford Road, Gomersal	Support 21	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO113, DLP_RSO604, DLP_RSO608, DLP_RSO614, DLP_RSO618, DLP_RSO784, DLP_RSO1127, DLP_RSO1190, DLP_RSO1219, DLP_RSO1461, DLP_RSO1471, DLP_RSO1959, DLP_RSO2022, DLP_RSO2030, DLP_RSO4264, DLP_RSO4844, DLP_RSO4853, DLP_RSO4920, DLP_RSO4921, DLP_RSO4922, DLP_RSO5026		No Change			
Road congestion, road capacity issues including impact on Bradford Road, Gomersal Hill Top (A643/A651), Birkenshaw roundabout (A58/A651), Gomersal Road (A62/A651), Church Lane (A643/A652), Birstall Smithies (A62/A652), Birstall "Coach & Six" (A62/A643). Monks Ings access is limited and inadequate to support further development. Acknowledge improvements at Smithies Junction and Tong Street but this will not mitigate against new development. Biodiversity/wildlife/woodland would be affected including bats, herons, owls, pheasants, foxes, rabbits, squirrels, badgers and deers. Existing tree would be lost. Impact on historic buildings and Oakwell Country Park School capacity insufficient Health provision/health services insufficient. Impact on public footpaths and bridleways which are required for amenity, recreation and health purposes. Need to retain existing opportunities for open space for better quality of life, health and well being.		This site is proposed as a reject housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
Support protection of the green belt. Protect natural and historic environment. Poor ground conditions resulting from previous mining. Loss of green belt which is required to prevent merging of settlements, urban sprawl, encroachment and to protect areas which are only separated by relatively narrow areas of green belt.		The reason for rejecting the site are: This site lies next to an area of mixed deciduous woodland UK BAP priority habitat which stretches to the east. Development will cause significant increases in disturbance to this habitat. Once a buffer to protect the treed area and priority habitat has been applied, the configuration of this site would be extremely poor resulting in an unrelated linear projection of development into the countryside. There would be little risk of sprawl or further encroachment because the site is almost entirely contained by woodland, with the school grounds to the south.			
		Additionally required visibility splays cannot be achieved without third party land.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			

Summary of comments	Council Response
<p>Brownfield first if development is required. The area has previously had too much development which has impacted on the green belt and the quality of the area. Concerned about the impact of development in Bradford and Leeds on the area. Area should be protected for future generations</p>	
<p>H312 Land north of, Longwood Edge Road, Salendine Nook DLP_RSO2744, DLP_RSO4652 Removal of option from larger urban greenspace will not have a significant impact. Land is surplus to requirements of the land owner. Site adjoins existing housing. Council can not demonstrate a five year housing supply.</p>	<p>Support 1 Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment No change. The site is a rejected housing option. The site is covered by an accepted Urban Greenspace designation. The assessment of the accepted Urban Greenspace designation assesses its value which has resulted in the conclusion that the site should be retained as Urban Greenspace.</p>
<p>H314 Land south-east of, Roaine Drive, Holmfirth No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment No change. The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. Third party land required for physical access to this site. The desirable route in the wider network is constrained due to width, alignment, gradient and on-street parking and is therefore considered unsuitable for the intensification of use proposed.</p>
<p>H315 Land at, 16, Manor Park Gardens, Gomersal DLP_RSO1269, DLP_RSO1345, DLP_RSO4904, DLP_RSO4905, DLP_RSO4906 Road congestion, road capacity including: A62, A58, A651, A652, A643, Smithies Junction, A650 Tong Street. Mitigation planned will not materially improve traffic flows or congestion and will not mitigate the impacts from development in Bradford, Kirklees and Leeds. Consider that access can be achieved - report submitted as evidence. Consider that contamination can be dealt with - report submitted as evidence. The site lies between an existing property and motorway and has little green belt value. The site is available for development. Support rejection of site as there has been significant development previously in the area which has impacted on the green belt and quality of the area. Proposals would result in a loss of green belt.</p>	<p>Support 3 Conditional Support Object 2 No Comment No Change The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). The site has been rejected for the following reasons: The configuration of this site and its location relative to the existing settlement edge means that it is not well related to the settlement. Some additional land would need to be released from the green belt between the site and the motorway to create a defensible new boundary. Additionally, there are noise, air quality and contamination issues associated with the site which would impact on residential amenity. Evidence submitted by the site promoter is not considered to address the issues and does not overcome concerns about environmental quality and the potential impact on residential amenity. Further constraints to development include third party land is required to provide access to the site and high voltage power lines.</p>
<p>H316 Land to the West of, 82-138, Mount Road, Marsden DLP_RSO790, DLP_RSO996, DLP_RSO1241, DLP_RSO4965 The site has good public transport links. Access could be improved as the lease on the sub-station expires in 2022 and there is scope for the reduction in plot of the sub-station to improve site access. Proposed site access is 5.5m wide with 1.5m footway Junction to Netherley Drive would have 6m dropped radius kerbs provided Sightlines from Netherley Drive to Mount Road are good. In accordance with NPPF a 'hierarchical' review of SUDS options have been considered for the drainage of the proposed development</p>	<p>Support 2 Conditional Support Object 2 No Comment No change This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected. Junction improvements required with Netherley Drive / Mount Road. Third party land would be required. Site within 300m of SSSI / SPA / SAC. Would require Habitat risk assessment. The application withdrawn as would have been refused for highway, drainage and ecology issues. It is not considered that the site would form a deliverable development site. The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>

Summary of comments

Council Response

Based on the outfall options, it is considered that on site attenuation and storage be considered, prior to discharge at an agreed rate to the existing surface water public sewer.
An ecological study has been undertaken on the site as part of recent planning application.

The habitat types present are amenity grassland, buildings, hard standing, semi-improved grassland, standing water and wall. There are no trees on the site.

There are a number of designated nature conservation sites within 2km of this site; however, these sites have received these designations due to the presence of certain habitat types, particularly heath moorland, which does not extend into this site

The site is not situated within the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network and desktop study revealed that there are no records of protected species within the site.

The site is adjacent to rural moors that have Special Area of Conservation status
Bank Top is a Grade II listed building situated to the East of Mount Road. We do not believe that the proposals will have an adverse effect on Bank Top as it isn't visible from the development

The site should be re-classified as Green Belt
The site forms an integral part of the natural green hillside.

The site can be viewed from South Pennine Moors and Peak District National Park
Development would be contrary to local character and pattern of development.
Should use Brownfield land first - e.g. mills in Marsden

H317 Land between, Rydal Grove and Moor View, Mirfield
DLP_RSO3500

Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment

Supports the rejection of the site for the reasons stated in the council report

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The location and extent of this site would close a strategic gap between Mirfield and Roberstown contrary to the role and function of the green belt.

Supporting comments have been noted.

H318 Land north of, Barnsley Road, Denby Dale

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

Site forms part of larger housing option H634.

H319 land to the rear of, 117, Westfield Lane, Wyke

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

While development of this site would narrow the strategic gap with the Bradford green belt, the overall function of the gap would not be compromised. The site has strong potential new boundaries so there is no risk of sprawl. However, the site is very poorly related to the existing built form and would project development well beyond the existing settlement edge resulting in encroachment into the countryside, contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		The site has therefore been rejected as both a housing allocation (H319) and safeguarded land option (SL2310).			
H320	Land to the east of, Balmfield Crescent, Roberttown	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan.			
		The reasons for rejecting the allocation are: This is a well contained site with only a limited relationship to the wider countryside. However, it also has only a limited relationship to the settlement and is poorly related to it. Development although screened to a degree would result in a poorly related projection of built form to the detriment of the openness of the green belt.			
		Additionally, access width onto Balmfield Crescent is only 4.3m. A suitable site access layout therefore, cannot be achieved to accommodate the development of the site.			
H321	Land at, Cherrywell Farm, New Popplewell Lane, Scholes	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		This site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The reasons for rejecting the allocation are: This is a poorly configured site relative to the settlement which would leave properties on New Popplewell Lane and the extensive area of protected trees within their grounds effectively cut off from the wider green belt. Removing this site would inevitably bring the garden under pressure for development, contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			
		The Prospect Mill great crested newt mitigation ponds for the newt translocation are only 25m from this site. Remove 1.09ha from the proposed allocation site leaving 0.27ha.			
H322	Land at, Wood Nook / Cumberworth Lane, Denby Dale DLP_RSO575, DLP_RSO580, DLP_RSO590, DLP_RSO591, DLP_RSO4675	Support 5	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Support for rejection of housing option.		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		This site is contained by woodland to the west and Cumberworth Lane to the east with existing development to three sides. The site slopes up from the south to the north and given its size would represent a prominent extension to the settlement that may undermine the role of the green belt in this location. Development would sever East Hill Beck and its associated woodland habitat from the wider countryside contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. Woodland protected by TPO comprising area of mixed deciduous trees,			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
H325	Land to the East of, Northstead, Ravensthorpe, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change.			
		The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The site has no frontage to the adopted highway. Access would need to be achieved through a accepted Urban Green Space allocation. Canker Dyke runs along the north east boundary of the site and 50% of the site is within flood zone 3 and 74% in flood zone 2. It could be a functional floodplain.			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.			
H326	Land north of, Longwood Gate, Longwood	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Site to be retained as urban greenspace. Significant topographical issues to be overcome to gain access to this site. Site forms part of habitat network and priority habitat.			
H327	Land between, New Hey Road and M62, Outlane	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Likely to be significant noise and air quality issues arising from close proximity of motorway. This forms part of an extensive area of green belt but is effectively separated from it by the M62 motorway. This is a steep banking immediately below the embankment of the motorway slip road.			
H328	Land south east of, Shillbank View, Mirfield DLP_RSO1131	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Close proximity to public transport route and in walking distance of local services Uncertain of reason for negative impact on historic asset Close proximity to schools Close proximity to health provision		No Change			
Removal would not conflict with the purposes of including land in the green belt. Urban fringe site, logical extension to the urban area, with clear physical boundaries. Site could be brought forward without removing green belt gap. Site is available and deliverable with willing landowner, interest from developers to purchase subject to allocation Accommodate housing pressure in Dewsbury and Mirfield area Brownfield site (Garden Centre). Could be put forward for safeguarded land		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This site lies 420 metres from Castle Hill motte and bailey castle. This site is designated a Scheduled Monument. The loss of this area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of this Scheduled Monument. This site sits within a strategic area of green belt that maintains separation between Mirfield and Ravensthorpe. Development of the option would completely isolate a large area of green belt to the south and west, significantly compromising the role and function of the green belt in this location.			
H329	Land at, Busk Farm, Northfield Lane, Highburton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The development of this proposals would have an unacceptable impact on the openness of the green belt and would lead to a narrowing of the green belt gap between Highburton and Lepton to the north. Site access is not achievable as the adjacent unadopted Northfield Lane is very narrow and unsuitable for the scale of development proposed.			
H330	Land north of, Red Lane, Meltham DLP_RSO402	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Traffic congestion. Surface water flooding issues. Wildlife would be affected.		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected			
Negative impact on landscape. General support for rejection of options to the west of Meltham.		This site is in the green belt, between the edge of Meltham, the Peak Park and the Dark Peak SSSI/SPA/SAC. Habitat Risk Assessment would be required. The site forms part of an open area that contributes to the			

Summary of comments

Council Response

					immediate setting of the national park and is recognised for its role in maintaining landscape character beyond the boundary of the national park.
					The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.
H331	Land off, River Holme View, Brockholes	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO1234					
	The site offers an important habitat. The site should continue to be designated as urban greenspace.				No change
					This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.
					The open space assessment has deemed this land to be suitable as an urban green space allocation. Potential impact on Local Wildlife Site, Habitats of Principal Importance and the Habitat Network would require further assessment.
					No draft Local Plan consultation comments received.
H332	Land west and south of, Leas Avenue, Netherthong	Support 6	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO44, DLP_RSO116, DLP_RSO458, DLP_RSO507, DLP_RSO559, DLP_RSO1326, DLP_RSO1992					
	Site access issues - often blocked by parking and unadopted lane (Broomy Lea Lane)				No change.
	Traffic congestion - New Road / surrounding roads				The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.
	Infrequent public transport				This is an extensive site which would significantly encroach into the countryside west of Netherthong. Development at the northern extent would be prominent on high ground impacting on the openness of the wider green belt.
	No footways to get to Holmfirth				The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted. The council is aware the site is available for development if required.
	Inadequate highway infrastructure in Netherthong Localised flooding in the area In heavy rain - the field drains and water flows down Broomy Lea Lane to Wells Green Gardens. Possible archaeological sites within the site boundary. Impact on education provision - Netherthong Primary School is at capacity. Impact on healthcare provision				
	The site is available for development. The site can provide an alternative to large scale green belt release around Huddersfield and Dewsbury.				
H336	East of Business and Industry allocation B8.1, Lindley Moor Road, Lindley Moor	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received					No change.
					This site is a rejected housing option. The north western part of the site is covered by an accepted mixed use option. The south eastern part of the site is developed.
H337	Part of POL, Dobb Top Road, Holmbridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO4442					
	Cannot understand why this site has not been allocated for housing when site H626 has.				No change
					The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.
					Site option cannot be accessed as Dobb Top Road is unsuitable to serve any additional development at the point the site adjoins the highway.
					This site has adjoins a different part of the road network than option H626 therefore the transport implications are different.

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H338	Land East of Birchencliffe Hill Road, Birchencliffe	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO1309 Site is bisected by a footpath. Site is in a sustainable location with no major constraints. Site is immediately available. Land to the west of the footpath is steeply sloping and heavily vegetated and could therefore be removed from site. Challenge to rejection of this site for housing.		No change. The site is a rejected housing option. Over half the site includes woodland that is UK BAP priority habitat and includes protected trees. The net developable area removing these constraints is 0.30ha. The current boundary is inappropriate for a housing allocation considering significant biodiversity constraints. The site constraints identified are noted.			
H340	Land to the north-east of, Busk Farm, Northfield Lane, Highburton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		None. The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. The site is unrelated to the settlement edge and could not be released from the green belt in isolation as it would create a small pocket of non-green belt surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. Access to the site is also not achievable due to the unsuitable nature of the local road network.			
H344	Land south east of, Shillbank View, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO1132 Red green belt issue can be overcome by removal of the site from green belt. Logical extension to the settlement for housing. Council should reassess the site's green belt role. Greenfield site		No Change The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. This site sits within a strategic area of green belt that maintains separation between Mirfield and Ravensthorpe. While the site is small in relation to the size of the gap it is very poorly configured in relation to the settlement it adjoins and would result in an unrelated projection of built form into the countryside, to the detriment of the openness of the green belt in this location.			
H347	Land to the north of, Cockley Hill Lane, Kirkheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object 2	No Comment
DLP_RSO1796, DLP_RSO5058 This site is a south facing slope so it provides a greater opportunity for use of solar panels and other means of reducing the use of carbon based heating. The site is a short distance from the medical centre. This site was rejected for 2 of the tests so there are 3 tests that are met. The review states that site does not follow any physical feature on the ground on its eastern boundary and is poorly related to the settlement. The eastern boundary of the site is demarcated by dry stone walls that have stood on the land for over 100 years and pre-date and are more permanent than many other structures that have been regarded as forming a physical feature. Kirkheaton is on the edge of Huddersfield and benefits from all of the facilities provided by a large town. It is important to allocate a range of sites and this is a medium size site that has a greater chance of being delivered by medium size local building companies than other larger sites, which rely on national house builders. The bus turnaround and adjacent parade of shops is close by. These include the mini market that is well used by villagers. This is a highly sustainable site.		No change. The site is a rejected housing option. This site is separated from the settlement of Kirkheaton by land that is in the green belt but which appears in part to be used as gardens. The site has little relationship with built form on the edge of the settlement so it appears to be detached from it although there is development on the south side of Cockley Hill Lane. Additional land would need to be released between the site and the settlement and this would result in an elongated pattern of development with a poor relationship to Kirkheaton. The site is elevated and prominent and development could significantly impact on the openness of the wider green belt.			
H348	Land east of, St Mary's Crescent, Netherthong	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			

Summary of comments

Council Response

	<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The site forms an integral part of the wider countryside and development would constitute significant encroachment into the countryside and unacceptable impact on openness.</p>										
<p>H349 Land to the south of Ravensthorpe Road, Thornhill Lees</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Support</th> <th>Conditional Support</th> <th>Object</th> <th>No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site is within a larger proposed accepted strategic housing allocation.</p> <p>No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment						
Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment								
<p>H350 Land to the west of, Cumberworth Road, Skelmanthorpe</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Support</th> <th>Conditional Support</th> <th>Object</th> <th>No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>The site forms part of larger accepted housing option H502.</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment						
Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment								
<p>H352 Land between, Scotland Beck and footpath, south of, Nutter Lane, Birstall</p> <p>DLP_RSO108, DLP_RSO544, DLP_RSO780, DLP_RSO1060, DLP_RSO1121, DLP_RSO1193, DLP_RSO1210, DLP_RSO1374, DLP_RSO1456, DLP_RSO1596, DLP_RSO2034, DLP_RSO4192, DLP_RSO4344, DLP_RSO4845, DLP_RSO4856, DLP_RSO4950, DLP_RSO4951, DLP_RSO4952, DLP_RSO5021</p> <p>Road congestion, road capacity issues including Dewsbury Road/Bradford Road and Oxford Road, A62, A58, A651, A652, A643 and A650.</p> <p>Road congestion - Junctions at Birstall Smithies and the A62/A643 Coach and Six.</p> <p>The accesses to Oakwell Country Park off Nutter Lane (top and bottom) and via Nova Lane should be maintained in character and Bridleway BAT/1/10.</p> <p>Acknowledge improvements at Smithies Junction and Tong Street but these will not mitigate against new development.</p> <p>Concerns about surface water drainage.</p> <p>Biodiversity/wildlife/woodland impact including impact on bats, herons, owls, pheasants, foxes, rabbits, squirrels, badgers, deer.</p> <p>Loss of trees.</p> <p>Protect Oakwell Country Park and local historic buildings in the area.</p> <p>School capacity insufficient</p> <p>Health services/health provision insufficient.</p> <p>Protect public footpaths and bridleways for amenity, recreation and health and well-being purposes including Bronte Way from Oakwell Hall to Monk Ings and Monks Ings to Red House.</p> <p>Protect green space for leisure activities, protection of nature and to protect quality of the environment.</p> <p>Essential to protect green frontage</p> <p>protect footpaths and walks</p> <p>Support protection of the green belt.</p> <p>Poor ground condition due to previous mining.</p> <p>Loss of green belt which should be protected to prevent urban sprawl and merging of settlements particularly Birstall and Gomersal.</p> <p>Protect green belt gap between Oxford Road and Dewsbury/Bradford Road.</p> <p>Brownfield land should be developed first if development is required.</p> <p>The area has had too much development in the past which has impacted on the green belt and the quality of the area.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Support</th> <th>19</th> <th>Conditional Support</th> <th>Object</th> <th>No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). The option form part of a larger overlapping option (H3).</p> <p>The reasons for rejection are: The site contains one open watercourse and there is another in very close proximity whose relationship with the countryside would be compromised by development of this site. Protection of the watercourse and its important wildlife habitat would detach the site from the remainder of the settlement. These features and their related important wildlife habitats are best protected by the green belt designation.</p> <p>Additionally, Oakwell Hall which is situated 160 metres to the north of this area is a Grade I Listed Building. The loss of this area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of this building. A medieval settlement (PRN8278) is also considered to be close to the area. No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the development of this site would not impact on heritage assets.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>	Support	19	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment					
Support	19	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment							

Summary of comments

Council Response

Concerned about impact of development in Bradford and Leeds.
 Area should be protected for future generations.
 Potential for crime to increase.
 Concerned about where additional people will gain employment.

H354 Land at, Coal Pitt Lane, White Lee

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing option. It formed a rejected housing option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

The reason for rejection is that the site is proposed to be allocated as part of a wider Urban Greenspace.

This site has value as open space in its own right and as part of the wider urban green space allocation UGS973. Comprises agricultural grazing land, assessed as part of a larger area of natural and semi-natural greenspace having high value as open space based on its structural and landscape qualities and its significant contribution to the amenity of the area and sense of place, as well as use and enjoyment for informal recreation along the public footpath network. Being similar in character and appearance to this adjoining open land, the site itself is viewed as an integral part of the wider open space that can be appreciated from different vantage points and plays a valuable role in providing an open aspect from the public footpath network adjacent the site and in the wider area. UGS973 is not deemed, in whole or part, to be surplus to requirements.

H355 Land to the north of, Longroyd Crescent, Slaithwaite

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

Development of the green belt part of this site would impact on the openness of the green belt as it occupies an elevated position on a very steeply sloping area of land. Access would be drawn from Hawthorn Road. This is an adopted highway but is a very poor standard, no footway provided.

H357 Land south and east of, Rumble Road, Bywell

Support Conditional Support Object 2 No Comment

DLP_RSO3063, DLP_RSO4822

Considered that background noise from adjoining business and industry uses would be above acceptable levels following standard noise mitigating measures within site layout and dwelling design. Natural buffer over 30m between area of site to be developed and industry to east.

No Change

Likely capacity issues can be addressed by suitable contribution. Schools within walking distance. PROW would be retained and linked to wider footpath network, areas of public open space included if site developed. New homes would be built to latest environmental standards. Development would be beneficial to public health.,

The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Site in private ownership, no public access except PROW.
 Site does not fulfil an 'essential' Urban Greenspace role, should be considered for development before Green Belt. Does not perform well against Council's Urban Greenspace criteria. Land does not offer opportunities for public recreation, does not fulfil function of valued landscape. Provision of public open space as part of residential development with new connecting footpaths would bring proportion of site into public use and biodiversity benefits. Should not be allocated as Urban Greenspace.

The site has a high risk for noise due to its close proximity to a freight distribution centre and a school. The site is a large area of natural/semi-natural greenspace off Rumble Road. Informal recreation use is restricted to the Public Right of Way on the eastern edge of site. It provides legitimate public access. The site has value in providing visual relief in urban area and provision of natural/semi-natural greenspace in Dewsbury East ward is below the standard. In addition, in terms of health the rates of respiratory emergency admissions in the ward are higher than the Kirklees average.

Should be put forward as housing allocation, site does not form part of Green Belt and is surrounded by housing.

The indicative layout submitted would have houses overlooking the bund that protects occupiers of existing houses from noise. This layout has the potential to cause noise problems which would result in putting undue restrictions on the companies in the area.

Site in urban area, close proximity to key local services - shops, health, schools, would make a contribution to undersupply of housing. Green spaces and natural areas throughout local area.
 Suitable, available and achievable housing site likely to accommodate up to 150 new homes. Site largely free from technical constraints, highways, flood risk/drainage, historic or ecological.

It is an Urban Greenspace allocation in the Unitary Development Plan and comprises of an area of natural greenspace surrounded by existing residential and business development. Assessed in the Kirklees Open Space Assessment as having high value as open space for the amenity of the area with informal recreation use along the public footpath on the eastern boundary. In view of the built-up surroundings, the open character of this site is important in providing visual relief as a buffer separating existing housing from the adjoining business

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
	<p>park, as well as for local residents and for users of the public footpath.</p> <p>There are existing quantity deficiencies in open space in the ward, particularly the provision of natural and semi-natural greenspace which is significantly below the benchmark standard. Protection of this site as urban greenspace could help support reduction in identified health inequalities in the area.</p> <p>Furthermore, the housing allocations in the draft local plan meet objectively assessed housing need.</p> <p>The impact of development on school place planning has been assessed through the infrastructure planning work between the Local Plan and School Place Planning Teams. This work is on-going to ensure school places are available to meet the needs of future growth.</p>
<p>H359 Land to the north of, Barnsley Road, Flockton, Huddersfield,</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan (November 2015) and remains rejected as it is part of a larger accepted housing option.</p> <p>Site access achievable. Other potential constraints identified in this site assessment can be overcome to deliver new housing during the plan period. This site is part of the larger accepted housing option H583.</p>
<p>H360 Land to the south of Morton Grove Thornhill Lees</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site is within a larger proposed accepted strategic housing allocation.</p> <p>No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan</p>
<p>H361 Land West of, Ouzelwell Lane, Thornhill Lees, Dewsbury</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site is within a larger proposed accepted strategic housing allocation.</p> <p>No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan</p>
<p>H362 Part of, Housing allocation H11.1, Grange Road, Soothill DLP_RSO3057</p> <p>The site should be allocated to address the current shortfall in housing set out in the draft Local Plan.</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The reasons for rejecting the site are: The majority of this option is within the settlement boundary of Soothill, albeit an undeveloped housing allocation. The northern section that extends into the green belt is an unrelated triangle of land that has no boundary on its eastern side. This would leave adjacent land vulnerable to encroachment contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The existing green belt boundary with</p>

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response				
				the housing allocation does not follow any feature on the ground but the option does not present any opportunity for improvement.	
				No evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the site could be satisfactorily accessed.	
H363	Land north and west of High Street & Challenge Way, Hanging Heaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
				This site is proposed as a rejected housing site. It formed a rejected housing site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.	
				Development of this site would result in the merger of Hanging Heaton with Dewsbury contrary to the purposes of the green belt which is to prevent the merger of settlements. The site is located on a steeply sloping hillside where development could be prominent and therefore detrimental to the openness of the green belt in this location. It would separate all the land to the west which extends over the steep Crackenedge slopes to Hanging Heaton golf course, all of which would need to be removed from the green belt.	
H364	Part of POL at, Wesley Avenue, Netherthong	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
				The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.	
				This site is part of a larger accepted housing option (H715) and has therefore been rejected.	
H365	Blackcat Fireworks Ltd, Standard Drive, Crosland Hill	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change.			
				This site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).	
				The part of this option that extends into the green belt would represent a poorly related projection of built form onto the plateau north of the factory site. While there is a small degree of built form and fixed surface infrastructure already present this is largely located close to the main body of buildings, with none projecting further northwards towards the top of the slope. This means that it is important that openness is assessed as part of any proposal for new development. This would be lost should the site be removed from the green belt. Features on the ground that could form a new green belt boundary while present are weak. This option forms part of larger accepted option MX1930.	
				No representations were received for this site option.	
H366	Land at, Lower Blacup Farm, Ashbourne Way, Cleckheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object 3	No Comment
DLP_RSO1624, DLP_RSO3547, DLP_RSO3892		No Change			
PROW located on site, SPE/94/10. presence of PROW does not mean that the site overall is recreation land.					
Site is in private ownership and consists of farm land. Site does not fulfil Urban Green Space role.					
Site located in a sustainable location.					
Site is available and achievable housing option. Development could add to the limited level of functions site holds as Urban Green Space.					
Constraints can be mitigated against.					
With regards to SA assessments H366 performs better than site H1747, MX1905, H2089.					
Site has also been considered as part of a larger housing allocation submitted by Denby Planning Consultants.					
				The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.	
				The reason for rejecting the site is that it is proposed to be allocated as part of a wider Urban Green space.	
				The site lies within a larger area defined as strategic urban green space, which comprises a large area of attractive open farmland with established trees and hedgerows defining field boundaries. It provides a green lung between Cleckheaton and Hightown, defining the separation of the two settlements.	

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response			
<p>H408 Land to the North East of, Varley Road, Slaithwaite</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>The green belt element of this site would represent a small scale settlement extension and would be reasonably well related to the existing settlement pattern. However, the land slopes steeply down to Bradley Brook and is treed. Development on the steep slope would be highly visible to the detriment of the openness of the wider green belt. Development on the Varley Road frontage would extend the ribbon type development and remove part of the open gap between the current edge of the settlement and the sporadic urban fringe area to the south. The gap maintains the appearance of separation. Part of the site overlaps with an Urban Greenspace site. Visibility splays from Varley Road cannot be achieved without third party land.</p>			
<p>H435 Land to the north of, Commercial Road, Skelmanthorpe, Huddersfield</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>This site is part of the larger accepted housing option H688.</p>			
<p>H437 Land east of, Huddersfield Road, Meltham</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>This option is separated from the edge of the settlement in this location by the line of Hall Dike and its important wildlife habitat. Development that left a buffer with the wildlife habitat would be poorly related to the settlement and would introduce development west of the stream into this narrow and environmentally sensitive valley setting.</p>			
<p>H438 Land to the north of, New Mill Road, Holmfirth</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Open space assessment provides evidence to support the allocation of part of this option site as urban green space in the local plan. The remainder of the site has been accepted as a housing option or has already been developed for residential uses. Stoney Bank Lane to the east is unsuitable for further intensification of use at this point.</p>			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
<p>H440 Land to the south of, Cockley Hill Lane, Kirkheaton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is a rejected housing option. At its north eastern part this option is reasonably well related to the settlement form and although elevated is contained by existing development on Cockley Hill Lane. However, the south and east of the option would project detriment to the countryside to the significant detriment of openness and contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The part of the site to the rear of Orchard Road is at a significantly higher level than the settlement it adjoins. The existing green belt boundary to the east of the adjoining safeguarded land site does not follow any feature on the ground and this option would represent an opportunity to create a stronger more defensible boundary. However, the benefits of the stronger boundary do not outweigh the harm to the openness of the green belt that could result from development of this site.</p>
<p>H441 Globe Mill, Bridge Street, Slaithwaite</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>The site has planning permission form mixed use development. Majority of the site is within flood zone 2.</p>
<p>H442 Land between, Richmond Park Avenue and Sunnyside Avenue, Roberttown</p> <p>DLP_RSO454, DLP_RSO456, DLP_RSO503, DLP_RSO600, DLP_RSO693, DLP_RSO968, DLP_RSO974, DLP_RSO1138, DLP_RSO1248, DLP_RSO1325, DLP_RSO1718, DLP_RSO1723, DLP_RSO1802, DLP_RSO1816, DLP_RSO1825, DLP_RSO1885, DLP_RSO1891, DLP_RSO1895, DLP_RSO1900, DLP_RSO1905, DLP_RSO1919, DLP_RSO1925, DLP_RSO1930, DLP_RSO1935, DLP_RSO1945, DLP_RSO1950, DLP_RSO1963, DLP_RSO1968, DLP_RSO1975, DLP_RSO1984, DLP_RSO1988, DLP_RSO2003, DLP_RSO2005, DLP_RSO2020, DLP_RSO2040, DLP_RSO2046, DLP_RSO2051, DLP_RSO2063, DLP_RSO2069, DLP_RSO2080, DLP_RSO2085, DLP_RSO2097, DLP_RSO2118, DLP_RSO2123, DLP_RSO2134, DLP_RSO2145, DLP_RSO2150, DLP_RSO2156, DLP_RSO2170, DLP_RSO2175, DLP_RSO2182, DLP_RSO2187, DLP_RSO2192, DLP_RSO2197, DLP_RSO2217, DLP_RSO2361, DLP_RSO2366, DLP_RSO2371, DLP_RSO2376, DLP_RSO2381, DLP_RSO2386, DLP_RSO2392, DLP_RSO2397, DLP_RSO2407, DLP_RSO2412, DLP_RSO2417, DLP_RSO2422, DLP_RSO2427, DLP_RSO2432, DLP_RSO2437, DLP_RSO2447, DLP_RSO2452, DLP_RSO2457, DLP_RSO2462, DLP_RSO2466, DLP_RSO2471, DLP_RSO2481, DLP_RSO2486, DLP_RSO2491, DLP_RSO2508, DLP_RSO2513, DLP_RSO2518, DLP_RSO2523, DLP_RSO2528, DLP_RSO2533, DLP_RSO2538, DLP_RSO2543, DLP_RSO2553, DLP_RSO2561, DLP_RSO2562, DLP_RSO2568, DLP_RSO2574, DLP_RSO2578, DLP_RSO2583, DLP_RSO2589, DLP_RSO2594, DLP_RSO2599, DLP_RSO2604, DLP_RSO2609, DLP_RSO2616, DLP_RSO2619, DLP_RSO2625, DLP_RSO2629, DLP_RSO2644, DLP_RSO2650, DLP_RSO2655, DLP_RSO2663, DLP_RSO2670, DLP_RSO2675, DLP_RSO2680, DLP_RSO2685, DLP_RSO2690, DLP_RSO2695, DLP_RSO2707, DLP_RSO2712, DLP_RSO2717, DLP_RSO2722, DLP_RSO2727, DLP_RSO2732, DLP_RSO2737, DLP_RSO2742, DLP_RSO2749, DLP_RSO2755, DLP_RSO2761, DLP_RSO2765, DLP_RSO2771, DLP_RSO2781, DLP_RSO2786, DLP_RSO2791, DLP_RSO2796, DLP_RSO2801, DLP_RSO2806, DLP_RSO2811, DLP_RSO2822, DLP_RSO2827, DLP_RSO2832, DLP_RSO2837, DLP_RSO2843, DLP_RSO2848, DLP_RSO2857, DLP_RSO2862, DLP_RSO2901, DLP_RSO2906, DLP_RSO2911, DLP_RSO2916, DLP_RSO2944, DLP_RSO2979, DLP_RSO2984, DLP_RSO2989, DLP_RSO2994, DLP_RSO2999, DLP_RSO3004, DLP_RSO3009, DLP_RSO3014, DLP_RSO3019, DLP_RSO3024, DLP_RSO3029, DLP_RSO3034, DLP_RSO3039, DLP_RSO3044, DLP_RSO3049, DLP_RSO3053, DLP_RSO3079, DLP_RSO3084, DLP_RSO3089, DLP_RSO3095, DLP_RSO3099, DLP_RSO3104, DLP_RSO3109, DLP_RSO3143, DLP_RSO3148, DLP_RSO3153, DLP_RSO3158, DLP_RSO3288, DLP_RSO3324, DLP_RSO3349, DLP_RSO3385, DLP_RSO3390, DLP_RSO3395, DLP_RSO3400, DLP_RSO3405, DLP_RSO3410, DLP_RSO3415, DLP_RSO3420, DLP_RSO3425, DLP_RSO3430, DLP_RSO3435, DLP_RSO3437, DLP_RSO3445, DLP_RSO3450, DLP_RSO3455, DLP_RSO3460, DLP_RSO3465, DLP_RSO3470, DLP_RSO3475, DLP_RSO3480, DLP_RSO3485, DLP_RSO3492, DLP_RSO3497, DLP_RSO3507, DLP_RSO3512, DLP_RSO3517, DLP_RSO3522, DLP_RSO3527, DLP_RSO3532, DLP_RSO3538, DLP_RSO3552, DLP_RSO3557, DLP_RSO3562, DLP_RSO3567, DLP_RSO3572, DLP_RSO3577, DLP_RSO3582, DLP_RSO3587, DLP_RSO3671, DLP_RSO3689, DLP_RSO3872, DLP_RSO3896, DLP_RSO3909, DLP_RSO3914, DLP_RSO3919, DLP_RSO3924, DLP_RSO3930, DLP_RSO3936, DLP_RSO3945, DLP_RSO3950, DLP_RSO3959, DLP_RSO3967, DLP_RSO3973, DLP_RSO3985, DLP_RSO3994, DLP_RSO4000, DLP_RSO4005, DLP_RSO4010, DLP_RSO4015, DLP_RSO4020, DLP_RSO4025, DLP_RSO4030, DLP_RSO4057, DLP_RSO4062, DLP_RSO4067, DLP_RSO4072, DLP_RSO4077, DLP_RSO4082, DLP_RSO4087, DLP_RSO4092, DLP_RSO4097, DLP_RSO4102, DLP_RSO4118, DLP_RSO4123, DLP_RSO4140, DLP_RSO4153, DLP_RSO4164, DLP_RSO4169, DLP_RSO4174, DLP_RSO4202, DLP_RSO4217, DLP_RSO4222, DLP_RSO4227, DLP_RSO4232, DLP_RSO4237, DLP_RSO4269, DLP_RSO4274, DLP_RSO4287, DLP_RSO4292, DLP_RSO4297, DLP_RSO4303, DLP_RSO4308, DLP_RSO4313, DLP_RSO4318, DLP_RSO4323, DLP_RSO4329, DLP_RSO4365, DLP_RSO4373, DLP_RSO4385, DLP_RSO4392, DLP_RSO4404, DLP_RSO4414, DLP_RSO4423, DLP_RSO4428, DLP_RSO4438, DLP_RSO4462, DLP_RSO4467, DLP_RSO4477, DLP_RSO4493, DLP_RSO4503, DLP_RSO4508, DLP_RSO4513, DLP_RSO4568, DLP_RSO4573, DLP_RSO4577, DLP_RSO4582, DLP_RSO4597, DLP_RSO4658, DLP_RSO4663, DLP_RSO4683, DLP_RSO4689, DLP_RSO4722, DLP_RSO4734, DLP_RSO4744, DLP_RSO4750, DLP_RSO4754, DLP_RSO4759, DLP_RSO4769, DLP_RSO4774, DLP_RSO4779, DLP_RSO4784, DLP_RSO4789, DLP_RSO4794, DLP_RSO4799, DLP_RSO4804, DLP_RSO5013</p> <p>Traffic situation on Huddersfield Road is already difficult. The site is an unsustainable location poorly served by roads and public transport. It will result in gridlock. Roberttown cannot take any more traffic. Road congestion, road capacity issues including Roberttown Lane, A62, Roberttown Lane, Far Common Road, Child Lane, Sunny Bank Road, Church Road, Lumb Lane. Roads and footpaths currently inadequate. Road noise from Roberttown will be heard at Hartshead. Accidents on the motorway will increase transport problems in already congested area. Concern about whether access will be located. Drainage capacity insufficient - Support the rejection of the site.</p>	<p>Support 310 Conditional Support Object 2 No Comment</p> <p>Proposed Change</p> <p>This site is proposed as an accepted housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>While the strategic role of this parcel of green belt is not strong, as Roberttown and Liversedge are already merged to some extent south of the site, the green belt overwashes Roberttown Lane in order to include this area of open land within the green belt. This is a well contained site bounded by the existing settlement, Roberttown Lane and the cricket ground and so there is no risk of sprawl.</p>

Summary of comments

Sewerage system is at capacity.
 Maintain air quality by maintaining the green belt
 Proposals will increase noise pollution.
 Need to protect wildlife.
 School capacity insufficient including Roberttown Junior - Support rejection of the site.
 Health services/provision insufficient - Support rejection of the site.
 Public footpaths are well used and should be protected.
 Protect area for leisure.
 Area needs to be protected for leisure.
 North Kirklees has a shortage of green spaces so area should be protected.

The green belt review is unsound.
 Lovely rural aspect and distinct from other villages, green village on the edge of the West Yorkshire conurbation - support rejection of the site. Outlook from Lumb Lane will be destroyed.
 Infrastructure is at capacity.
 Support rejection of site as in an unsustainable location.
 Potential ground stability issues due to previous mining.
 Protect green belt now and for future generations.
 Loss of green belt and Greenfield unacceptable.
 Loss of green belt - support rejection of the site
 Loss of Greenfield sites and their development would undermine the council's Brownfield regeneration policies - Support rejection of the site.
 Should use Brownfield first.
 The area is busy enough without adding more people.
 Following approval of mixed use scheme at Teales garage, the area cannot take any more development.
 The area needs jobs not housing.
 Building on agricultural land will lead to the UK becoming reliant on imported food.
 Impact on privacy.
 Locally there are many Brownfield sites and empty warehouses which should be utilised before Greenfield sites.
 A larger site which covers this site and the cricket club has been submitted for consideration.

Council Response

Access is achievable from Roberttown Lane and possibly part of the site from Richmond Park Avenue and Stanley Road. 2.4m x 43m (30mph speed limit) visibility splays would be required on Roberttown Lane including the provision of a pedestrian footway along Roberttown Lane site frontage.

No objections have been received from technical consultees on drainage.

An air quality impact assessment would be required as part of a detailed planning application and mitigation measures could be addressed as part of the planning application process.

No objections have been received from West Yorkshire Ecology Service on this site.

There are no immediate needs for school places but it is acknowledged that this is increasing. This can be dealt with through ongoing discussions with School Place Planning colleagues and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

Health issues have been factored into the site assessment process for the local plan. Meetings have been held and discussions are on-going as part of the Local Plan infrastructure planning process with North Kirklees and Greater Huddersfield CCGs to plan for the impacts of allocations in the local plan and how it can influence NHS forward planning and investment including GP estates strategies and hospital infrastructure needs.

The Local Plan contains policies which require new housing development to provide or contribute towards open space, sport and recreation facilities in the district.

There is not sufficient housing capacity on brownfield sites to meet the local plan housing requirement.

H443	Land to the south of, Plane Street, Newsome	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO1630					

Support for rejection of option.

No change.

This site is a rejected housing option. 96% of the site is covered by an accepted Urban Greenspace option.

Support for site rejection noted.

H444	Land south of, Jill Lane, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
-------------	------------------------------------	---------	---------------------	--------	------------

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Third Party Land required for access and significant improvements would be required to the road width on Stoney Lane to accommodate this development. Lowland mixed deciduous woodland covers the whole of this site. The green belt over washes the existing properties on Shill Bank Lane and at Eastfield Road in order to prevent intensification and to help to maintain a degree of separation. The frontage to this site represents the last undeveloped gap north of Shill Bank Lane and as such performs an important role in helping to maintain an appearance of separation between Mirfield and Ravensthorpe. The site is poorly related to the settlement and would result in a projection of built form into the countryside to detriment of openness.

H445	Land to the north east of, Pavillion Way, Meltham	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
-------------	---	---------	---------------------	--------	------------

No Representations received

No change

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
	<p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Development on this site would project development into an area of open countryside beyond the existing well defined linear edge of the houses on Pavilion Way. This area of green belt is open countryside and development would be prominent on elevated ground to the significant detriment of the openness of the wider green belt and contrary to the role and function of the green belt which is to safeguard the countryside from encroachment.</p>
<p>H446 Land to the north of, 271, Cliffe Lane, Gomersal DLP_RSO6</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment</p>
<p>The site was rejected for the same reasons as it was accepted (H591). How can this be?</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site is contained by existing buildings to the south and partly to the east and by Ferrand Lane to the north. However, for some of its western edge it does not follow a feature on the ground and so does not present a defensible new green belt boundary. This would leave adjacent land at risk from encroachment contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p> <p>An alternative option, H591, encompasses this site but extends to a larger area. The boundary of this larger area forms a defensible green belt boundary and as such is proposed as an accepted housing allocation.</p>
<p>H447 Land north of, Upper Batley Lane, Upper Batley DLP_RSO3339</p>	<p>Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
<p>Road congestion on the A643 - Support the rejection of this site (Leeds City Council)</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>This site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015)</p> <p>The extent and location of this site would completely close the strategic gap that currently separates this part of Birstall and Batley, and would cut off a large area of green belt to the west, including Wilton Park, from the wider green belt.</p> <p>For this reason, the council considers that the site is not acceptable for development as this would form an unacceptable impact on the green belt.</p> <p>The supporting comment from Leeds City Council for the site rejection is noted.</p>
<p>H448 Land to the west of, Slipper Lane, Mirfield Moor DLP_RSO427</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment 1</p>
<p>Clarity required on amber score for public health</p> <p>Clarity required on amber score for environmental protection</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The proposed site is too prominent and doesn't relate well to the settlement. It projects out into the open green belt impacting on its openness.</p>
<p>H449 Land to the north east of, 1, Green Balk Lane, Lepton</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p>

Summary of comments	Council Response				
	This site is connected to Lepton only at the extreme northern end of the site. The site itself is more closely associated with the cluster of properties known as Little Lepton and its development would effectively merge Little Lepton with Lepton, contrary to the role and function of the green belt.				
<p>H450 Land to the south east of, Marsh Lane, Shepley DLP_RSO322, DLP_RSO467, DLP_RSO515, DLP_RSO984</p> <p>Traffic congestion</p> <p>Infrastructure will not cope with development Impact on the character of the settlement. Should use Brownfield land first.</p>	Support	4	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
	No change.				
	<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This very large site is poorly related to the existing settlement pattern of Shepley, would result in the sprawl of development to the south, significant encroachment into the countryside and would isolate green belt land between the site and the settlement edge, all contrary to the role and function of the green belt.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>				
<p>H451 Part of POL site, Ryecroft Lane, Scholes</p>	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>	No change.				
	<p>This site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation and was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan (although it was part of the larger accepted housing option H38 at that stage). H38 has now been rejected. H451 remains rejected. Note that H297 and H597 which were also part of H38 have been accepted.</p> <p>Significant improvements required to Ryecroft Lane to widen the road but as there is green belt land to the west these improvements would include using land from a current recreation ground or from residential properties in multiple ownership. As a result, there is a lack of evidence that sufficient access could be achieved during the local plan period for the site to be delivered.</p> <p>No draft Local Plan consultation comments received, however, comments were received on the larger H38 housing option which includes this site.</p>				
<p>H452 Land to the east of, Oakes Fold, Lepton</p>	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>	No change.				
	<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The Local Plan strategy does not include the removal of Lepton Thorn from the green belt and removing the site in isolation would create an area of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p>				
<p>H453 Land south west of, Quarry Road, Crosland Hill, Huddersfield</p>	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>	No Change				
	<p>The site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The larger accepted site option MX1930 covers this site.</p> <p>No representations were received on this site option.</p>				
<p>H456 Land between, New Hey Road and M62, Outlane</p>	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>	No change				

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
<p>H457 Land to the west of, 55, Near Bank, Shelley DLP_RSO22, DLP_RSO1436</p> <p>Traffic congestion: Near Bank and Far Bank Impact on drainage / sewerage infrastructure Land acts as a soakaway - Shepley Beck is unable to take extra surface water.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure. Should use Brownfield land / empty houses first. Smaller starter homes are required.</p>	<p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Significant noise and air quality issues arising from location adjacent to M62. Development would be prominent when viewed from New Hey Road and from within Outlane to the west. Development would be enclosed by New Hey Road and the M62 forming a defensible boundary, but the impact on openness would be a significant issue.</p> <p>Support 2 Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. Note that a safeguarded land option has been accepted covering most of this site and adjacent land (SL3356).</p> <p>National planning policy allows for the redevelopment of Brownfield sites in the green belt provided that openness is maintained. This abattoir site itself is poorly related to the edge of the settlement and should not be released in isolation.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted. The rejection of this development option will enable further investigation into the management of surface water for this site beyond the end of this plan period and in accordance with the adjacent site to the west.</p> <p>There is insufficient capacity on Brownfield sites to meet the local plan housing requirement. The council has a strategy to bring empty homes into use but this capacity cannot be guaranteed.</p>
<p>H458 Land to the west of, 55, Near Bank, Shelley DLP_RSO23, DLP_RSO1437</p> <p>Traffic congestion: Near Bank and Far Bank Impact on drainage / sewerage infrastructure Land acts as a soakaway - Shepley Beck is unable to take extra surface water</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure Should use Brownfield land / empty houses first. Smaller starter homes are required.</p>	<p>Support 2 Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Significant third party land required for access. Suitable access could only be achieved through the housing option to the east which has been rejected. Lack of evidence that access can be achieved to ensure a deliverable or developable site.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>
<p>H459 Land to the west of, 55, Near Bank, Shelley DLP_RSO24, DLP_RSO1438</p> <p>Traffic congestion : Near Bank and Far Bank Impact on drainage / sewerage infrastructure Land acts as a saokaway - Shepley Beck is unable to take extra surface water.</p> <p>Impact on infrastructure. Should use Brownfield land / empty houses first. Smaller starter homes are required.</p>	<p>Support 2 Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>If this development option was accepted, it would leave an area of land to the north between the site and Far Bank isolated from the wider green belt and therefore vulnerable to encroachment, contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted. The rejection of this development option will enable further investigation into the management of surface water for this site beyond the end of this plan period and in accordance with the adjacent site to the west.</p>

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		There is insufficient capacity on Brownfield sites to meet the local plan housing requirement. The council has a strategy to bring empty homes into use but this capacity cannot be guaranteed.			
H460	Land north and west of, 11 to 25, The Shearings, Hightown	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Site has been considered as part of a larger housing option submitted by Denby Planning Consultants.		No Change			
		This site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The reason for rejecting the site is that it is proposed to be allocated as part of a wider Urban Green space.			
		The site lies within a larger area defined as strategic urban greenspace which comprises a large area of attractive open farmland with established trees and hedgerows defining field boundaries. It provides a green lung between Cleckheaton and Hightown, defining the separation of the two settlements.			
H461	Land North of, Mill Lane, Hunsworth DLP_RSO30	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Support rejection of site as: - Road congestion and road capacity issues including Mill Lane and provision for HGVs. - Any access to the north cannot be achieved as the land is not available.		No Change			
Further development in Hunsworth would be detrimental.		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). An alternative site option for safeguarded land (SL2303) is also proposed as a rejected option on this site.			
		The configuration of this site at its extreme south western extent would significantly impact on the gap that allows the green belt to wash over land to the south, effectively separating it from the wider green belt. This would place the land at high risk of development pressure contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The site appears as a countryside setting to Hunsworth Little Wood and Hunsworth Great Wood which are areas of ancient woodland. Removing this site from the green belt would therefore result in encroachment of built form into the countryside.			
		Additionally, there is no site frontage to the adopted highway. Access could be provided via Mill Lane but this is a private road and a public right of way. Third party land would be required to make this track up to adoptable standard.			
		An alternative site option for safeguarded land (SL2303) is also proposed as a rejected option on this site.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
H462	Land to the south of, Helme Lane, Meltham, Holmfirth,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		This site option is part of a larger accepted housing option (H67).			
H463	Greenwood Farm, Barnsley Road, Upper Cumberworth	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		This site is located within an area of urban fringe where there is existing development within the green belt on the edge of the settlement. As such it could be developed without significantly impacting on openness. However, the site on its own would not represent a logical extension of the settlement as it is poorly configured and would leave adjacent land and property vulnerable to encroachment, contrary to the purposes of including land in the			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		green belt.			
H464	Land south of, 1-3, Moorside Paddock, Cleckheaton DLP_RSO3544	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
<p>Larger site located 1 mile from Cleckheaton Town Centre. Located in close proximity to surrounding transport network.</p> <p>No safety or efficiency issues.</p> <p>No flooding issues</p> <p>Not located within an AQMA, any noise can be mitigated.</p> <p>Protection of site will not achieve any improvements in the public health of local residents.</p> <p>PROW would be retained on larger site option. No PROW on H464</p> <p>SPE/92/10 runs along the edge of H482 & H1797</p> <p>Land is in private ownership and cannot be utilised for formal or informal sports activities. Site can only be crossed by members of the public by the use of PROW.</p> <p>This area of Cleckheaton has suitable levels of green space provision. Development will bring a substantial amount of public open space.</p> <p>Given the significant shortfall in the amount of housing land that has been identified in the Draft Local Plan it is considered that sites H1797, H482 and H464 should be allocated for residential development. Site could also be considered as a larger housing option including H1797, H464, H482, H1798, H366, H520, H460, H497, H546.</p>		<p>No Change</p> <p>This site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The reason for rejecting the site is that it is proposed to be allocated as part of a wider Urban Green space.</p> <p>The site lies within a larger area defined as strategic urban greenspace which comprises a large area of attractive open farmland with established trees and hedgerows defining field boundaries. It provides a green lung between Cleckheaton and Hightown, defining the separation of the two settlements.</p> <p>UGS1068 has been assessed as natural and semi-natural greenspace, having high value as open space based on its structural and landscape qualities and its significant contribution to the amenity of the area and sense of place, as well as use and enjoyment for informal recreation along the public footpath network. The whole of UGS1068 performs a strategic urban green space function meriting allocation as urban green space. The site itself is similar in character and appearance to adjoining open land and is viewed as an attractive and integral part of the wider urban green space that can be appreciated from many locations within the built-up area and along the public footpath network. The visual qualities of the site play a valuable role in providing relief from urbanisation. UGS1068 is not deemed, in whole or part, to be clearly surplus to requirements.</p>			
H465	Land to the north of, Meltham Greenway, Meltham	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Site is separated from the settlement by the Meltham Greenway and would result in an isolated and poorly configured projection of development into open countryside to the detriment of the openness of the green belt. Also, third party land required for access and surface water management solution required.</p>			
H466	Former White Lee Colliery, Leeds Road, Heckmondwike DLP_RSO4941, DLP_RSO4942, DLP_RSO4943	Support 3	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>Road congestion and road capacity issues including: A62, A58, A651, A643, A650. Acknowledge proposed improvements to Birstall Smithies Junction and Tong Street but this will not mitigate against the impact of new development.</p> <p>Support the rejection of the site and its retention as green belt.</p> <p>The area has had too much development previously which has had an impact on the green belt and the quality of the area.</p> <p>Concerned about development in Bradford and Leeds and the impact on the area.</p>		<p>No Change</p> <p>This site is proposed as a rejected housing site. It formed a rejected housing site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Being a former colliery this site is significantly different in character from the surrounding agricultural land, and the Brownfield element containing the former colliery buildings is mainly screened by trees. National planning guidance does allow for the redevelopment of Brownfield sites provided that openness is maintained. However, a significant proportion of the site is not currently developed. In isolation the site is poorly related to the settlement and would not present a sensible new green belt boundary.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>			
H467	Land to the north of, Meadow Park, Kirkheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is a rejected housing option. The site is within the HSE inner zone. This site would create a poorly related linear extension to the settlement of Kirkheaton. The site is on elevated ground and its scale would mean that it was increasingly prominent at its northern extent in long distance views to the detriment of the openness</p>			

Summary of comments

Council Response

H468 Land east of, Eastfield Road, Northorpe
DLP_RSO379

Site does not affect principal of green belt retention
Site is available
Site between Brownfield land and existing housing
H333 has been included in the plan.
Site fits into broader government objective

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

No site frontage to the adopted highway. Access could potentially be provided via Stoney Lane, a private road. Third party land would be required to make this road up to adoptable standard. This site is isolated from Ravensthorpe by the line of the former railway and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The site also sits within an area of green belt that forms a restricted gap between Mirfield and Ravensthorpe, and its release would undermine the role and function of the green belt in this area.

H469 Land east of, Eastfield Road, Northorpe
DLP_RSO380

Site does not affect principal of green belt retention
Site is available
Site between Brownfield land and existing housing
H333 has been included in the plan.
Site fits into broader government objective

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

No site frontage onto the adopted highway. Access could potentially be provided via Stoney Lane, a private road. Third party land would be required to make this road up to adoptable standard. This site is isolated from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The site also sits within an area of green belt that forms a restricted gap between Mirfield and Ravensthorpe, and its release would undermine the role and function of the green belt in this area.

H470 Land to the south of, Parkwood Road, Golcar, Huddersfield,
DLP_RSO4640

Support for rejection of the site.

Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change.

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

The site is part of a larger accepted housing option, H116.

No draft Local Plan consultation comments received.

H472	Land at junction of, Lower Denby Lane and Barnsley Road, Denby Dale	Support 201	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
<p>DLP_RSO437, DLP_RSO438, DLP_RSO439, DLP_RSO587, DLP_RSO704, DLP_RSO774, DLP_RSO906, DLP_RSO1260, DLP_RSO1265, DLP_RSO1327, DLP_RSO1512, DLP_RSO1651, DLP_RSO1940, DLP_RSO1979, DLP_RSO2106, DLP_RSO2110, DLP_RSO2114, DLP_RSO2221, DLP_RSO2267, DLP_RSO2272, DLP_RSO2304, DLP_RSO2305, DLP_RSO2314, DLP_RSO2318, DLP_RSO2323, DLP_RSO2326, DLP_RSO2331, DLP_RSO2334, DLP_RSO2338, DLP_RSO2342, DLP_RSO2346, DLP_RSO2353, DLP_RSO2357, DLP_RSO2403, DLP_RSO2869, DLP_RSO2873, DLP_RSO2877, DLP_RSO2881, DLP_RSO2885, DLP_RSO2889, DLP_RSO2893, DLP_RSO2897, DLP_RSO2923, DLP_RSO2928, DLP_RSO2932, DLP_RSO2936, DLP_RSO2940, DLP_RSO3122, DLP_RSO3164, DLP_RSO3167, DLP_RSO3171, DLP_RSO3175, DLP_RSO3179, DLP_RSO3183, DLP_RSO3187, DLP_RSO3191, DLP_RSO3195, DLP_RSO3199, DLP_RSO3203, DLP_RSO3207, DLP_RSO3211, DLP_RSO3215, DLP_RSO3219, DLP_RSO3224, DLP_RSO3228, DLP_RSO3232, DLP_RSO3236, DLP_RSO3240, DLP_RSO3244, DLP_RSO3248, DLP_RSO3252, DLP_RSO3256, DLP_RSO3260, DLP_RSO3264, DLP_RSO3268, DLP_RSO3272, DLP_RSO3276, DLP_RSO3280, DLP_RSO3284, DLP_RSO3288, DLP_RSO3292, DLP_RSO3296, DLP_RSO3300, DLP_RSO3304, DLP_RSO3308, DLP_RSO3312, DLP_RSO3316, DLP_RSO3320, DLP_RSO3324, DLP_RSO3328, DLP_RSO3332, DLP_RSO3336, DLP_RSO3340, DLP_RSO3344, DLP_RSO3348, DLP_RSO3352, DLP_RSO3356, DLP_RSO3360, DLP_RSO3364, DLP_RSO3368, DLP_RSO3372, DLP_RSO3376, DLP_RSO3380, DLP_RSO3384, DLP_RSO3388, DLP_RSO3392, DLP_RSO3396, DLP_RSO3400, DLP_RSO3404, DLP_RSO3408, DLP_RSO3412, DLP_RSO3416, DLP_RSO3420, DLP_RSO3424, DLP_RSO3428, DLP_RSO3432, DLP_RSO3436, DLP_RSO3440, DLP_RSO3444, DLP_RSO3448, DLP_RSO3452, DLP_RSO3456, DLP_RSO3460, DLP_RSO3464, DLP_RSO3468, DLP_RSO3472, DLP_RSO3476, DLP_RSO3480, DLP_RSO3484, DLP_RSO3488, DLP_RSO3492, DLP_RSO3496, DLP_RSO3500, DLP_RSO3504, DLP_RSO3508, DLP_RSO3512, DLP_RSO3516, DLP_RSO3520, DLP_RSO3524, DLP_RSO3528, DLP_RSO3532, DLP_RSO3536, DLP_RSO3540, DLP_RSO3544, DLP_RSO3548, DLP_RSO3552, DLP_RSO3556, DLP_RSO3560, DLP_RSO3564, DLP_RSO3568, DLP_RSO3572, DLP_RSO3576, DLP_RSO3580, DLP_RSO3584, DLP_RSO3588, DLP_RSO3592, DLP_RSO3596, DLP_RSO3600, DLP_RSO3604, DLP_RSO3608, DLP_RSO3612, DLP_RSO3616, DLP_RSO3620, DLP_RSO3624, DLP_RSO3628, DLP_RSO3632, DLP_RSO3636, DLP_RSO3640, DLP_RSO3644, DLP_RSO3648, DLP_RSO3652, DLP_RSO3656, DLP_RSO3660, DLP_RSO3664, DLP_RSO3668, DLP_RSO3672, DLP_RSO3676, DLP_RSO3680, DLP_RSO3684, DLP_RSO3688, DLP_RSO3692, DLP_RSO3696, DLP_RSO3700, DLP_RSO3704, DLP_RSO3708, DLP_RSO3712, DLP_RSO3716, DLP_RSO3720, DLP_RSO3724, DLP_RSO3728, DLP_RSO3732, DLP_RSO3736, DLP_RSO3740, DLP_RSO3744, DLP_RSO3748, DLP_RSO3752, DLP_RSO3756, DLP_RSO3760, DLP_RSO3764, DLP_RSO3768, DLP_RSO3772, DLP_RSO3776, DLP_RSO3780, DLP_RSO3784, DLP_RSO3788, DLP_RSO3792, DLP_RSO3796, DLP_RSO3800, DLP_RSO3804, DLP_RSO3808, DLP_RSO3812, DLP_RSO3816, DLP_RSO3820, DLP_RSO3824, DLP_RSO3828, DLP_RSO3832, DLP_RSO3836, DLP_RSO3840, DLP_RSO3844, DLP_RSO3848, DLP_RSO3852, DLP_RSO3856, DLP_RSO3860, DLP_RSO3864, DLP_RSO3868, DLP_RSO3872, DLP_RSO3876, DLP_RSO3880, DLP_RSO3884, DLP_RSO3888, DLP_RSO3892, DLP_RSO3896, DLP_RSO3900, DLP_RSO3904, DLP_RSO3908, DLP_RSO3912, DLP_RSO3916, DLP_RSO3920, DLP_RSO3924, DLP_RSO3928, DLP_RSO3932, DLP_RSO3936, DLP_RSO3940, DLP_RSO3944, DLP_RSO3948, DLP_RSO3952, DLP_RSO3956, DLP_RSO3960, DLP_RSO3964, DLP_RSO3968, DLP_RSO3972, DLP_RSO3976, DLP_RSO3980, DLP_RSO3984, DLP_RSO3988, DLP_RSO3992, DLP_RSO3996, DLP_RSO4000, DLP_RSO4004, DLP_RSO4008, DLP_RSO4012, DLP_RSO4016, DLP_RSO4020, DLP_RSO4024, DLP_RSO4028, DLP_RSO4032, DLP_RSO4036, DLP_RSO4040, DLP_RSO4044, DLP_RSO4048, DLP_RSO4052, DLP_RSO4056, DLP_RSO4060, DLP_RSO4064, DLP_RSO4068, DLP_RSO4072, DLP_RSO4076, DLP_RSO4080, DLP_RSO4084, DLP_RSO4088, DLP_RSO4092, DLP_RSO4096, DLP_RSO4100, DLP_RSO4104, DLP_RSO4108, DLP_RSO4112, DLP_RSO4116, DLP_RSO4120, DLP_RSO4124, DLP_RSO4128, DLP_RSO4132, DLP_RSO4136, DLP_RSO4140, DLP_RSO4144, DLP_RSO4148, DLP_RSO4152, DLP_RSO4156, DLP_RSO4160, DLP_RSO4164, DLP_RSO4168, DLP_RSO4172, DLP_RSO4176, DLP_RSO4180, DLP_RSO4184, DLP_RSO4188, DLP_RSO4192, DLP_RSO4196, DLP_RSO4200, DLP_RSO4204, DLP_RSO4208, DLP_RSO4212, DLP_RSO4216, DLP_RSO4220, DLP_RSO4224, DLP_RSO4228, DLP_RSO4232, DLP_RSO4236, DLP_RSO4240, DLP_RSO4244, DLP_RSO4248, DLP_RSO4252, DLP_RSO4256, DLP_RSO4260, DLP_RSO4264, DLP_RSO4268, DLP_RSO4272, DLP_RSO4276, DLP_RSO4280, DLP_RSO4284, DLP_RSO4288, DLP_RSO4292, DLP_RSO4296, DLP_RSO4300, DLP_RSO4304, DLP_RSO4308, DLP_RSO4312, DLP_RSO4316, DLP_RSO4320, DLP_RSO4324, DLP_RSO4328, DLP_RSO4332, DLP_RSO4336, DLP_RSO4340, DLP_RSO4344, DLP_RSO4348, DLP_RSO4352, DLP_RSO4356, DLP_RSO4360, DLP_RSO4364, DLP_RSO4368, DLP_RSO4372, DLP_RSO4376, DLP_RSO4380, DLP_RSO4384, DLP_RSO4388, DLP_RSO4392, DLP_RSO4396, DLP_RSO4400, DLP_RSO4404, DLP_RSO4408, DLP_RSO4412, DLP_RSO4416, DLP_RSO4420, DLP_RSO4424, DLP_RSO4428, DLP_RSO4432, DLP_RSO4436, DLP_RSO4440, DLP_RSO4444, DLP_RSO4448, DLP_RSO4452, DLP_RSO4456, DLP_RSO4460, DLP_RSO4464, DLP_RSO4468, DLP_RSO4472, DLP_RSO4476, DLP_RSO4480, DLP_RSO4484, DLP_RSO4488, DLP_RSO4492, DLP_RSO4496, DLP_RSO4500, DLP_RSO4504, DLP_RSO4508, DLP_RSO4512, DLP_RSO4516, DLP_RSO4520, DLP_RSO4524, DLP_RSO4528, DLP_RSO4532, DLP_RSO4536, DLP_RSO4540, DLP_RSO4544, DLP_RSO4548, DLP_RSO4552, DLP_RSO4556, DLP_RSO4560, DLP_RSO4564, DLP_RSO4568, DLP_RSO4572, DLP_RSO4576, DLP_RSO4580, DLP_RSO4584, DLP_RSO4588, DLP_RSO4592, DLP_RSO4596, DLP_RSO4600, DLP_RSO4604, DLP_RSO4608, DLP_RSO4612, DLP_RSO4616, DLP_RSO4620, DLP_RSO4624, DLP_RSO4628, DLP_RSO4632, DLP_RSO4636, DLP_RSO4640, DLP_RSO4644, DLP_RSO4648, DLP_RSO4652, DLP_RSO4656, DLP_RSO4660, DLP_RSO4664, DLP_RSO4668, DLP_RSO4672, DLP_RSO4676, DLP_RSO4680, DLP_RSO4684, DLP_RSO4688, DLP_RSO4692, DLP_RSO4696, DLP_RSO4700, DLP_RSO4704, DLP_RSO4708, DLP_RSO4712, DLP_RSO4716, DLP_RSO4720, DLP_RSO4724, DLP_RSO4728, DLP_RSO4732, DLP_RSO4736, DLP_RSO4740, DLP_RSO4744, DLP_RSO4748, DLP_RSO4752, DLP_RSO4756, DLP_RSO4760, DLP_RSO4764, DLP_RSO4768, DLP_RSO4772, DLP_RSO4776, DLP_RSO4780, DLP_RSO4784, DLP_RSO4788, DLP_RSO4792, DLP_RSO4796, DLP_RSO4800, DLP_RSO4804, DLP_RSO4808, DLP_RSO4812, DLP_RSO4816, DLP_RSO4820, DLP_RSO4824, DLP_RSO4828, DLP_RSO4832, DLP_RSO4836, DLP_RSO4840, DLP_RSO4844, DLP_RSO4848, DLP_RSO4852, DLP_RSO4856, DLP_RSO4860, DLP_RSO4864, DLP_RSO4868, DLP_RSO4872, DLP_RSO4876, DLP_RSO4880, DLP_RSO4884, DLP_RSO4888, DLP_RSO4892, DLP_RSO4896, DLP_RSO4900, DLP_RSO4904, DLP_RSO4908, DLP_RSO4912, DLP_RSO4916, DLP_RSO4920, DLP_RSO4924, DLP_RSO4928, DLP_RSO4932, DLP_RSO4936, DLP_RSO4940, DLP_RSO4944, DLP_RSO4948, DLP_RSO4952, DLP_RSO4956, DLP_RSO4960, DLP_RSO4964, DLP_RSO4968, DLP_RSO4972, DLP_RSO4976, DLP_RSO4980, DLP_RSO4984, DLP_RSO4988, DLP_RSO4992, DLP_RSO4996, DLP_RSO5000, DLP_RSO5004, DLP_RSO5008, DLP_RSO5012, DLP_RSO5016, DLP_RSO5020, DLP_RSO5024, DLP_RSO5028, DLP_RSO5032, DLP_RSO5036, DLP_RSO5040, DLP_RSO5044, DLP_RSO5048</p>					
Infrequent public transport		No change			
Road congestion		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
Parking problems					
Highway safety issues		This site is isolated from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create an area of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			
Development of the site could enable safety improvements to junction at the Dunkirk		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
The site is served by bus - Denby Dale, Huddersfield and Barnsley.					
The site is 2km from Denby Dale station					
<p>Site has safe pedestrian route to Denby Dale via Miller Hill Potential impact on drainage. Wildlife affected School capacity issues Impact on footpaths</p>					
Development would have a detrimental impact on role and function of the Green Belt.					
<p>Development of the site could demonstrate special circumstances as it could enable major highway works to take place at the Dunkirk junction. The greenfields in this area make an important contribution to rural landscape of the district. Physical infrastructure will not cope with development</p>					
The site is available for development.					
<p>Development of the site with H184 could provide junction improvements at The Dunkirk. Lack of local shops / facilities</p>					
Negative impact on quality of life / community					
Small scale housing may be appropriate (e.g. starter homes)					
H473	Land at, Quarry Hill Farm, 97 Crosland Hill Road, Crosland Hill	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change.			

Summary of comments

Council Response

	<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site is covered by larger accepted site option MX1930.</p> <p>No representation were received on this site option.</p>
<p>H474 Part of POL and additional land to the west, Miry Lane, Thongsbridge DLP_RSO107, DLP_RSO124</p> <p>The green belt boundary should be moved across the access road to Thongsbridge CC to allow all of this site to be developed.</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object 2 No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site is part of a new larger accepted housing option H727a. Site H727a includes land currently in the green belt to the west of H727.</p>
<p>H475 Land to the north of, Wood Nook, Denby Dale DLP_RSO1299, DLP_RSO4674</p> <p>Sustainable location close to Denby Dale centre. adjacent woodland could be offered for public use as part of development</p> <p>The site would represent a logical extension of the settlement, close to Denby Dale centre.</p>	<p>Support 1 Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment</p> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected</p> <p>This site is contained by woodland to the west and Cumberworth Lane to the east. The site slopes up from the south to the north and would be increasingly prominent to the north which may undermine the role of the green belt in this location. Development would sever East Hill Beck and its associated woodland habitat from the wider countryside contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. Woodland protected by TPO comprising area of mixed deciduous trees.</p>
<p>H476 Land to the west of, Slipper Lane, Mirfield Moor DLP_RSO3499, DLP_RSO4823</p> <p>Mirfield has good motorway links, and has the district's only direct rail link to London (2km from site). Excellent public transport links. 2 access points from Leeds Road. Site promoter's highways assessment demonstrates the impact is considered acceptable.</p> <p>Flood Risk assessment scoping report shows site does not lie within defined flood zones as delineated on the EA flood zone map. Three drainage strategies for the site are identified, if the site is brought forward additional work will confirm the most viable.</p> <p>Do not consider that proximity to sewage works and any associated potential odour issues as a reason for rejecting the site.</p> <p>No TPOs on site, protection order on trees to the south of the site. Phase 1 habitat survey states there will be impact on designated sites. Buildings outside of the development site have bat roost potential, however these would not be affected by the site.</p> <p>Not aware of any heritage constraints on site</p> <p>There are four schools within a 1km radius of site. Site promoter considers any capacity issues can be resolved via obligations or CIL.</p> <p>Persimmon do not believe that the protection of this site from development will achieve any improvements in public health of local residents. New homes would be built to latest environmental standard. The site would be linked to PROWs network for residents active exercise.</p> <p>PROW (MIR/23/10) creates a strong defensible boundary on the eastern edge. An independent review of the green belt has been undertaken by Pegasus Planning, concluding that: the green belt is of lower importance in checking unrestricted sprawl; site is part of extensive gap between settlements; site forms part of urban fringe and not open countryside; site plays no role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns or assisting regeneration. Site would be an appropriate extension to Mirfield and have minimal impact on purposes of including land in green belt.</p>	<p>Support 1 Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This is a large site that extends up the slope to the east where development would be increasingly prominent, although there is development immediately to the east of the option that is in the green belt. The extent and location of the option relative to the green belt area of Mirfield Moor would leave land to the south somewhat isolated and vulnerable to development pressure.</p>

Summary of comments		Council Response			
<p>Site is currently agricultural land. Site is partially screened from Leeds Road. Landscape statement notes that there are few constraints posed by landscape features, and that the site is influenced by adjacent residential development. The site is not situated in a sensitive landscape</p> <p>Site is suitable, available and achievable, should be allocated for housing, Persimmon Homes committed to the site</p> <p>Not aware of any utilities, contamination constraints</p> <p>The site will meet the shortfall in housing land identified in the local plan. Mirfield has a good range of service provision for residents. Mirfield town centre approx 1.6km to south.</p> <p>Support rejection for reasons in council report. Site often used for advertising boards, giving a sense of urban area. Indicative master plan provided 230 homes.</p>					
H477	Land to the south of, Tolson Street, Chickenley, Dewsbury,	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO871					
Support the decision of Kirklees not to allocate this site. Access to this site and the adjacent site H749 would appear difficult, especially considering a combined site capacity of 127 dwellings (Wakefield Council)		No Change			
		The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		There is no obvious access into the site. There is possible access off Chickenley Lane however third party land would be required to achieve suitable access layout. Visibility splays at the Chickenley Lane / Access Road junction are sub-standard to the right of the access. In addition, the narrow strip connecting the site to Chickenley Lane may be too narrow (approx 3.8m - 5.2m) to provide access to site.			
		Support for rejection of the site noted.			
H478	Cliffe End Business Centre, Dale Street, Milnsbridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		The site is operation for industry, so is unlikely to form a deliverable housing site.			
H479	Part of POL, Stoney Bank Lane, Thongsbridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Site access is achievable. This site has been rejected as it is part of a larger accepted housing option (H728)			
H480	Land to the north of, Meadow Park, Kirkheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is a rejected housing option.1.034ha removed due to HSE inner zone and high pressure gas pipeline. This site would create a poorly related linear extension to the settlement of Kirkheaton which would bring development into close proximity to the properties at Upper Heaton. One of the purposes of the green belt is to prevent the merger of settlements and development of this option would undermine the role and function of the green belt in this location. The southern extent of this site is constrained by the presence of a high pressure gas pipeline and if this prevented any development on the southern part of the site the new development would have no relationship with Kirkheaton but would appear as an isolated group of properties. Majority of site is in Health and Safety Executive inner zone. High pressure gas pipeline covers significant proportion of the site.			
H482	Springfield Farm, 15, Moorside, Cleckheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO3543					

Summary of comments

Larger site located 1 mile from Cleckheaton Town Centre. Located in close proximity to surrounding transport network.
 No safety or efficiency issues.
 No flooding issues
 Not located within an AQMA, any noise can be mitigated.
 Protection of site will not achieve any improvements in the public health of local residents.
 PROW would be retained on larger site option. No PROW on H464
 SPE/92/10 runs along the edge of H482 & H1797
 Land is in private ownership and cannot be utilised for formal or informal sports activities. Site can only be crossed by members of the public by the use of PROW.
 This area of Cleckheaton has suitable levels of green space provision. Development will bring a substantial amount of public open space.

Given the significant shortfall in the amount of housing land that has been identified in the Draft Local Plan it is considered that sites H1797, H482 and H464 should be allocated for residential development.
 Site could also be considered as a larger housing option including H1797, H464, H482, H1798, H366, H520, H460, H497, H546.

The site comprises agricultural land.

H483 Land east of, Colne Valley High School, Gillroyd Lane, Linthwaite
 DLP_RSO3887

The landowner has submitted a different site boundary to this - and one that is part of a wider selection of sites, with the intention of creating a defensible green belt boundary. This option will be assessed independently.

H484 Land to the east of, Woodhead Road, Brockholes, Holmfirth

No Representations received

H485 Land south of, Lindley Moor Road, Lindley Moor

No Representations received

H486 Land north of, Cliffe Lane, Cleckheaton

No Representations received

Council Response

No Change

This site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The reason for rejecting the site is that it is proposed to be allocated as part of a wider Urban Green space.

The site lies within a larger area defined as strategic urban greenspace which comprises a large area of attractive open farmland with established trees and hedgerows defining field boundaries. It provides a green lung between Cleckheaton and Hightown, defining the separation of the two settlements.

UGS1068 has been assessed as natural and semi-natural greenspace, having high value as open space based on its structural and landscape qualities and its significant contribution to the amenity of the area and sense of place, as well as use and enjoyment for informal recreation along the public footpath network. The whole of UGS1068 performs a strategic urban green space function meriting allocation as urban green space. The site itself is similar in character and appearance to adjoining open land and is viewed as an attractive and integral part of the wider urban green space that can be appreciated from many locations within the built-up area and along the public footpath network. The visual qualities of the site play a valuable role in providing relief from urbanisation. UGS1068 is not deemed, in whole or part, to be clearly surplus to requirements.

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

This site sits in an area of urban fringe which includes properties to the south of Church Lane, agricultural or industrial buildings and Colne Valley High School. The green belt over washes this area in order to prevent the intensification of ribbon development on Church Lane and to avoid prominent development on the elevated valley slope. The site could not be released in isolation and would require the removal of a significant amount of additional land from the green belt in order to avoid an intensification of built form in the green belt.

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

Site forms part of accepted housing option H129.

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change.

This site is a rejected housing option. The site is covered by a larger mixed use option.

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Change.

This site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

The developable area of this site is disassociated from the settlement to the west because of the course of Nann Hall Beck and its associated important wildlife habitat as well as by a significant change in levels. Development of the site would sever the stream from its wider countryside setting at this location. Although there is a distinct

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response			
<p>H487 Land to the west of, Leak Hall Crescent, Denby Dale DLP_RSO1261</p> <p>Highway safety issues - junction with Leak Hall Road and Wakefield Road, proximity of bus stop to junction, car parking for Doctors surgery. Cumberworth Road - visibility poor at this junction. Leak Hall Lane, narrow and heavily used for local school. Land is a natural soak away for surface water, with a small brook running through the field Impact on wildlife Impact on education provision Impact on healthcare provision - deterioration of GP service in Denby Dale and potential A&E closure</p> <p>Mining legacy</p>	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
	<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>The site forms part of the larger accepted housing option H690.</p>			
<p>H488 Land south of, Back Lane, Clayton West DLP_RSO1451</p> <p>Should use Brownfield land first.</p>	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
	<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Whilst access is achievable from The Royds, this is a narrow street - the width of which is reduced further by on street parking. Access from Back Lane is unsuitable. He configuration of the site however would be unlikely to deliver anything other than an unsatisfactory linear and cramped development form which could leave adjacent land vulnerable to development pressure contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>			
<p>H490 Land adjacent, Former Roundhill Mill, Cliffe Lane, Gomersal DLP_RSO305, DLP_RSO1231</p> <p>Road access and accessibility to public transport are considered good. This site is well drained on high ground and there is capacity for sustainable surface water drainage on adjacent land in the ownership of the landowner as provided for in the adjacent Roundhill Mill development. Biodiversity is supported by adjacent land use in the ownership of the landowners i.e. ancient woodland on one site boundary and some 15 acres of trees planted by the landowners following the remediation of a nearby site. School capacity is considered sufficient.</p> <p>Do not consider that green belt reason that the site is an isolated site justifies the rejection of the site for development. Development could be delivered quickly on this site. Object to the non-allocation of this site as it is adjacent to land being developed at Roundhill Mill and would merely add 19 houses. The council's technical assessments indicate green markers for public health, education, environmental protection, the historic environment and open space. The site is at present low quality grazing land. As part of the proposed site already has planning permission for allotments and a planning requirement to implement the allotments for a minimum of six years this would seem to comply with the stated aim of the policy 'The council will protect opportunities that support a healthy lifestyle by retaining and enhancing</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object 2	No Comment
	<p>No change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The reason for rejecting the site is: This site is remote from Gomersal and unrelated to any settlement. It is located immediately adjacent to a site where residential development has been approved but this was as a redevelopment of a Brownfield site and therefore could be accepted under the terms of green belt policy. The removal of this site from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p>			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
<p>sport and recreation facilities' as the allotments could be conditioned to remain in perpetuity. The site is less contentious than land at Cliffe Lane and Ferrands Lane. The development could be for affordable housing.</p>					
H491	Land North of, High Street, Hanging Heaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>This site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The reasons for rejecting the site are: This area of green belt is a habitat of principal importance (mixed deciduous woodland) which would be seriously compromised by the development of this site. West Yorkshire Ecology has objected to this site.</p> <p>The site represents the only open space along Mill Lane/High Street that allows the green belt to penetrate to the west. This protects the open area of Hanging Heaton golf course and the steep slopes of Crackenedge that form a backdrop to the heavily built up areas of Batley and Dewsbury. The northern boundary of the site does not follow a feature on the ground so a new green belt boundary would need to be identified.</p>			
H492	Land north of and south of High Street & Bromley Road, Hanging Heaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>This site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The wedge of green belt of which this site is a part separates the towns of Dewsbury and Batley. Development that would lead to the coalescence of settlements would be contrary to green belt policy. The green belt in this location protects the steep valley sides that forms a backdrop to the heavily built up area of Batley. Development on steep slopes could be prominent and therefore detrimental to the openness of the green belt.</p>			
H493	Land West of, Leeds Road, Soothill DLP_RSO3056, DLP_RSO3331	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Support rejection due to road congestion on the A653 (Leeds City Council)		No Change			
<p>Support the rejection of this site are the Green Belt due to reasons of closing the strategic gap between Batley and West Ardsley and encroachment into the countryside towards Leeds (Leeds City Council) The site should be allocated to address the current planned shortfall in housing set out in the draft Local Plan.</p>		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>This large site is poorly related to the settlement and would project development into open countryside resulting in encroachment and the appearance of sprawl. Undeveloped frontages along roads between settlements maintain separation and the option would result in continuous development from Soothill Manor to Woodkirk. This would significantly reinforce the appearance of merger contrary to the role and function of the green belt.</p> <p>The support for the rejection of the site by Leeds City Council is noted.</p>			
H495	Land east of, Colne Valley High School, Gillroyd Lane, Linthwaite DLP_RSO3890	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
		No change			
<p>The landowner has submitted a different site boundary to this - and one that is part of a wider selection of sites, with the intention of creating a defendable green belt boundary. This option will be assessed independently.</p>		<p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>This is an extensive area of green belt which locally is characterised as an area of urban fringe where there is existing development in the green belt, including Colne Valley High School and residential and other property to the north of the site on Church Lane. Its removal would necessitate the removal of a significant additional amount of land from the green belt in order to prevent it being developed in isolation. This is a prominent hillside</p>			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		and development would have a significant impact on the openness of the green belt being visible in long distance views. No frontage to adopted highway.			
H496	Land east of, Colne Valley High School, Gillroyd Lane, Linthwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		This is an extensive area of green belt which locally is characterised as an area of urban fringe where there is already a degree of built form, including Colne Valley High School. Its removal would necessitate the removal of a significant additional amount of land from the green belt in order to prevent it being developed in isolation. This is a prominent and elevated hillside forming the backdrop to this area of the Colne Valley where new development would have a significant impact on the openness of the green belt. Heath Road is adopted, but unsuitable to accommodate such intensification. Otherwise, site access would need to be drawn through adjacent sites.			
H497	Land east of, 706, Halifax Road, Hightown	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Site has been considered as part of a larger housing allocation submitted by Denby Planning Consultants.		No Change			
		This site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The reason for rejecting the site is that it is proposed to be allocated as part of a wider Urban Green space.			
		The site lies within a larger area defined as strategic urban greenspace which comprises a large area of attractive open farmland with established trees and hedgerows defining field boundaries. It provides a green lung between Cleckheaton and Hightown, defining the separation of the two settlements.			
		The rejected site forms part of the strategic urban greenspace but has an important role in its own right forming an important open frontage along Halifax Road. An array of public footpaths dissect the site and they are highly used with one footpath tarmaced in the central area of the site. The land performs a strategic urban green space function meriting allocation as urban green space. UGS1068 is not deemed, in whole or part, to be clearly surplus to requirements.			
H499	Land to the west of, Penistone Road, Fenay Bridge	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO759					
Support rejection of site to protect setting of Castle Hill.		No change.			
		The site is a rejected housing option. The site is covered by a larger accepted housing option.			
H500	Land West of, Leeds Road, Soothill	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO3059					
The site should be allocated to address the current planned shortfall in housing set out in the draft local plan.		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		This site is poorly related to the settlement it adjoins and would project development up the slope into open countryside resulting in encroachment and the appearance of sprawl. It would also significantly narrow the gap that allows the green belt to extend over land to the west.			
		Additionally, two access points are required for a development of this scale. There is no site frontage to the adopted highway. Although access could be provided from Grange Road and Sykes Lane which are private roads, it is likely that third party land would be required to make both roads up to adoptable standard. Leeds			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		Road is a 40mph dual carriageway road. Significant improvements would be required to the junctions where Grange Road and Sykes Lane to accommodate the development.			
H501	Land North and East of, Ullswater Road, Hanging Heaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
H503	Land to north and north west of, Batley Bulldogs RLFC, Heritage Road, Batley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>It has been rejected as it forms part of a larger urban green space option (UGS991) which is proposed as accepted.</p> <p>The site comprises an area of natural and semi natural greenspace, predominantly woodland, and has been protected as urban greenspace in accordance with the urban greenspace methodology.</p> <p>Provision of natural and semi-natural greenspace is below the benchmark standard within the ward.</p> <p>Further the woodland comprises lowland mixed deciduous woodland which is designated as a UK BAP priority habitat following former use as allotments.</p> <p>No comments have been received on this site.</p>			
H504	Land North and East of, Ullswater Road, Hanging Heaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>This site would join properties in Dewsbury and Batley contrary to the purpose of the green belt which is to prevent the merger of settlements. The area of green belt has an important role in protecting the steep valley side that forms a backdrop to heavily built up areas. Development on steep slopes could be prominent which would be detrimental to the openness of the green belt in this location. Development of this site option would isolate a significant area of green belt to the west which could no longer perform a green belt role.</p> <p>Additionally, the site cannot be satisfactorily accessed without third party land.</p>			
H505	Land West of, Leeds Road, Soothill DLP_RSO3058, DLP_RSO3332	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Support rejection due to road congestion and traffic on the A653.		No Change.			
Support rejection of this site due to Green Belt and closing the strategic gap between Batley and West Ardsley and encroachment into the countryside towards Leeds. The site should be allocated to address the current planned shortfall in housing set out in the draft Local Plan.		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The reasons for rejection are as follows: This area of green belt plays a key role in separating Kirklees and Leeds. This large site is poorly related to the settlement and would project development down the slope and into open countryside resulting in encroachment and the appearance of sprawl. Part of this site extends into the adjacent housing allocation, where there is no feature on the ground for the green belt to follow. Although this option would present the opportunity to create a new strong boundary to the settlement the impact on the role and function of the green belt would not justify the creation of a new short section of defendable green belt boundary. No site frontage onto the adopted highway can be gained without the use of third party land.</p>			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		Supporting comments received on this site have been noted.			
H506	Carters Farm, Hollins Lane, Slaithwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Development of this site would result in a visually prominent extension to Slaithwaite on the steeply sloping valley side. Whilst there is ribbon development alongside Manchester Road to the north of the site, this would not 'contain' development on the sloping site as its prominence on the slope would impact on the openness of green belt. The scale and configuration of the site would bring within Slaithwaite the historically separate area known as Top o' The Hill as well as leaving fields between Slaithwaite and site isolated from the wider green belt. 230m away from Lapwing Breeding site to the south. Site 2km from SPA / SAC / SSSI			
H507	Southern, Varley Road, Slaithwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		This is an extensive area of green belt which delineates the southern extent of Slaithwaite in this location and prevents development from intensifying the existing sporadic residential development on Varley Road. The site sprawls down the steep valley slope to Bradley Brook and would represent encroachment into the countryside. The removal of this site from the green belt would also necessitate the removal of land between the site and the settlement edge in order to avoid an isolated area of development unrelated to the settlement.			
H510	Land to the north of, Fenay Lane, Almondbury DLP_RSO2300	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Site is well screened from adjacent listed buildings and Council has not produced any evidence to suggest the setting of these buildings will be affected.		No Change			
Green Belt boundary should be drawn along the full stretch of Fenay Lane to exclude this site from the GB and drawn on a 'stepped approach' to the north of this site. Fenay Lane is the defensible GB boundary and should stretch along the full frontage of this site.		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		Removing this site would result in a large consequential change to the Green Belt boundary. Removing the site from the green belt would also isolate the land to the north between the site and Finthorpe Lane from the wider green belt leading to pressure for encroachment.			
		Listed building comments are noted, there is insufficient evidence to justify any potential impact or not on the setting of adjacent listed buildings.			
H511	Land east of, Cumberworth Lane, Lower Cumberworth	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected			
		This site is isolated from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			
H512	Part of POL, Stoney Bank Lane, Thongsbridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
<p>H513 Carters Farm, Hollins Lane, Slaithwaite DLP_RSO2941</p> <p>In terms of green belt review on this site - the review found this was marked 'black' due to a severe topographical constraint, however whilst acknowledged the site slopes it is not considered a barrier to development.</p> <p>The site is well contained with Manchester Road forming a defensible boundary.</p> <p>The removal of the site would represent a logical extension and rounding off of the settlement. The site could be developed at a lower density - taking the slope into account</p>		<p>This site is part of a larger accepted housing option (H728).</p> <p>Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment</p> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Development in this location would lead to a visually prominent extension to Slaithwaite on the steeply sloping valley side. Whilst there is ribbon development along Manchester Road to the north of the site, this would not contain development on the sloping site as the site is at a significantly higher level. Visually prominent development in this elevated location would impact on openness to the detriment of the green belt.</p> <p>The density is indicative, based on the average density from across the district.</p>			
<p>H514 Land west of, Parkwood Road, Golcar DLP_RSO4631</p> <p>Support for rejection of site.</p>		<p>Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>This is an extensive site which while contained by slope and tree cover to the north would appear as sprawl in its western extent and would encroach into open countryside to the detriment of the role and function of the green belt. While the site in the main follows features on the ground they are weak in places leaving adjacent land vulnerable to encroachment.</p> <p>No draft Local Plan consultation comments received.</p>			
<p>H515 Land at, Spa Green, Lepton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>		<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No Change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site forms part of an accepted Urban Greenspace allocation. This part of the site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>No representations were received on this site option.</p>			
<p>H516 Land east of, Cumberworth Lane, Lower Cumberworth DLP_RSO4678</p> <p>Support for rejection of site.</p>		<p>Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>The scale and location of this option would compromise the strategic role of the green belt by significantly impacting on the gap separating Denby Dale and Lower Cumberworth. This site is very poorly related to the existing settlement form and would sprawl to the east of the settlement and encroach into the countryside contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p> <p>No draft Local Plan consultation comments received.</p>			

Summary of comments		Council Response					
H517	Land West of, Leeds Road, Soothill	Support	1	Conditional Support	Object	1	No Comment
DLP_RSO3060, DLP_RSO3333							
Support rejection due to road congestion and traffic on A653.		No Change					
Support rejection of the site due to Green Belt reasons of closing the strategic gap between Batley and West Ardsley and encroachment into the countryside towards Leeds. The site should be allocated to address the current planned shortfall in housing set out in the draft Local Plan.		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing site. It formed a rejected housing site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The reasons for rejecting the site are as follows: This site lies within an area of green belt whose role is to prevent the coalescence of Kirklees and Leeds. The site lies entirely behind continuous ribbon development along Leeds Road and Soothill Lane and would not therefore result in the development of any important frontage gaps. However the land rises to the west to the rear of properties on Leeds Road and is clearly visible from the road between the houses. The development of the site would therefore significantly reinforce the appearance of merger. The site also has no relationship with any inset settlement and could not be released from the green belt in isolation.</p> <p>In addition, at least two access points will be required for a development of this scale. There is plenty of site frontage onto Soothill Lane where 2.4 x 43m visibility splays are required (30mph). However, third party land may be required for second access onto Leeds Road with 2.4 x 120m visibility splay (40mph).</p> <p>The support for the rejection of the site is noted.</p>					
H520	Lower Blacup Farm, Lower Blacup, Cleckheaton	Support		Conditional Support	Object	1	No Comment
DLP_RSO3546							
Site H520 should be allocated for housing. Site has also been put forward as a larger housing option by Denby Planning Consultants.		No Change					
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The reason for rejecting the site is that it is proposed to be allocated as part of a wider Urban Green space.</p> <p>The site lies within a larger area defined as strategic urban greenspace which comprises a large area of attractive open farmland with established trees and hedgerows defining field boundaries. It provides a green lung between Cleckheaton and Hightown, defining the separation of the two settlements.</p> <p>This site has value as open space in its own right and as part of the wider urban green space UGS1068. Comprises an extensive open tract of agricultural grazing land that forms the eastern part of UGS1068. The public footpath network adjoins and crosses the land. Part of the larger natural and semi-natural greenspace comprising the whole of UGS1068, assessed as having high value as open space based on its structural and landscape qualities and its significant contribution to the amenity of the area and sense of place, as well as use and enjoyment for informal recreation along the public footpath network. The whole of UGS1068 performs a strategic urban green space function meriting allocation as urban green space. The site itself is similar in character and appearance to adjoining open land and is viewed as an attractive and important integral element of the open area as a whole which can be appreciated from different locations within the built-up area and along the public footpath network. The visual and open qualities of the site play a valuable role for the amenity of the area and in providing relief from urbanisation. UGS1068 is not deemed, in whole or part, to be clearly surplus to requirements.</p>					
H521	Land north east of, Mona Street, Slaithwaite	Support		Conditional Support	Object	1	No Comment
DLP_RSO2942							
Olney Street could form access point - to land at rear of properties on Crimble Bank and Clough Road		No change					
With careful design - part of the site to rear of properties on Crimble Bank and Clough Road could be developed.		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.					
Site could be developed as a mixed use allocation, including recreation use and allotment gardens.		Access can be achieved from Meal Hill Lane, but road would need widening and pedestrian facilities would need to be included and junction improved at Meadow Lane. Olney St would need to be brought up to adoptable standard to provide access. Development on the green belt element of this site would lead to prominent					

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response			
	development on rising ground to the detriment of the openness of the green belt in this location. Much of the green belt part of this site has been removed from the developable area following comments from West Yorkshire Ecology concerning sensitive wildlife habitats. The best protection for these habitats is through the green belt designation. Overlap with urban greenspace.			
H522 Land to rear of, 141, Toftshaw Lane, East Bierley DLP_RSO1181, DLP_RSO4848, DLP_RSO4849, DLP_RSO4850	Support 3	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Road congestion, road capacity issues including the A62, A58, A651, A652, A643 and A650. Acknowledge proposed improvements at Birstall Smithies and Tong Street but these will not mitigate against the impact of further development.	No Change			
The site should remain in green belt. The area has already taken significant development in the past which has had an impact on the green belt and the quality of the area. Concerned about the impact of development in Bradford and Leeds on the area. Development should be allowed to enable the community to grow. The site should be allowed for affordable housing and other sites in East Bierley should be allowed for development to support the council's vision and the government's vision for growth.	The site is proposed as a rejected housing option. It formed a rejected housing option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
	The reasons for rejection are as follows: The release of this site would result in an unrelated settlement extension into the countryside. At its southern end it is very close to the edge of the settlement of East Bierley and would effectively result in the merger of the two settlements by a narrow strip of development through otherwise open countryside. There is also insufficient frontage to Toftshaw Lane to provide visibility splays and footways without the use of third party land.			
	Policy DP11 Housing Mix and Affordable Housing states that" exceptionally, planning permission may be granted for affordable homes in small freestanding settlements on land which would not normally be permitted for housing development, where there is little prospect of meeting identified local needs particularly for housing to rent by people who work locally. Such schemes must include arrangements for the homes to remain affordable in perpetuity". There is therefore, not a requirement to allocate sites for affordable housing as this can be addressed through the plan policies.			
H523 Land at, Fieldhead Farm, White Lee Road, White Lee DLP_RSO5071	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Site should not be part of larger urban greenspace. Planning Permission already granted on land adjacent to the site.	No Change			
	The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed rejected housing option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
	The site overlaps with housing option H612. This site was granted a reserved matters application for 24 dwellings in February 2015 (2014/61/93425/E). The principle of development has therefore, been accepted on this part of the site. This allocation however, extends the area into a wider urban green space area and for the reasons of the overlap with H612 and the UGS, H523 has been rejected.			
	This site has value as open space in its own right and as part of the wider urban green space allocation UGS973. Comprises agricultural grazing land and forms the north western part of UGS973. Assessed as part of a larger area of natural and semi-natural greenspace having high value as open space based on its structural and landscape qualities and its significant contribution to the amenity of the area and sense of place, as well as use and enjoyment for informal recreation along the public footpath network. Being similar in character and appearance to this adjoining open land, the site itself is viewed as an integral part of the wider open space that can be appreciated from different vantage points and plays a valuable role in providing an open aspect from the public footpath network adjacent the site and in the wider area. UGS973 is not deemed, in whole or part, to be clearly surplus to requirements.			
H524 Land at north west of, 15 - 19, Jail Road, White Lee	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No Change			
	The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (2015).			
	The reason for rejection is that the site is proposed to be allocated as part of a wider Urban Greenspace.			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response				
	<p>This site has value as open space in its own right and as part of the wider urban green space allocation UGS973. Site comprises attractive open grazing land fronting White Lee Road on the western edge of UGS973. Assessed as part of a larger natural and semi-natural greenspace having high value as open space based on its structural and landscape qualities and its significant contribution to the amenity of the area and sense of place, as well as use and enjoyment for informal recreation along the public footpath network. The site itself is as an integral and important part of the wider open space that can be viewed from different vantage points and plays a valuable role in giving an open aspect from White Lee Road. UGS973 is not deemed, in whole or part, to be clearly surplus to requirements.</p>				
H525	Land north of, 13 - 25, Mortimer Terrace, Healey	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing site. It formed a rejected housing site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The reason for rejection is that the site is proposed to be allocated as part of a wider Urban Greenspace.</p> <p>The site has value as open space in its own right and as part of the wider urban green space allocation UGS973. Comprises agricultural grazing land, assessed as part of a larger area of natural and semi natural greenspace having high value as open space based on its structural and landscape qualities and its significant contribution to the amenity of the area and sense of place, as well as use and enjoyment for informal recreation along the public footpath network.</p> <p>Additionally insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the site could be satisfactorily accessed without the need for third party land.</p>			
H526	Land south east of, Bankfield Lane, Kirkheaton, Huddersfield, DLP_RSO1622	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Site promoter states the site is available, suitable and deliverable as per SHLAA and has been promoted through various versions of Core Strategy with a master plan and habitat survey.		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site is covered by a larger accepted housing allocation H737.</p>			
H528	Land between, Garner Lane and Chandler Lane, Honley DLP_RSO1368	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Public transport links (train station) should lead to more allocations in Honley.		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Development of the site would introduce a block of urban land use in this essentially open agricultural landscape undermining the role and function of the green belt which is to safeguard the countryside from encroachment.</p> <p>Comments supporting this site as a housing option are noted. Settlement appraisal information for each settlement was set out in the local plan evidence base but it has been determined that development of this site would undermine the role and function of the green belt as set out above. This site has also been considered as a Safeguarded Land option as requested (SL2736) to determine whether this would be a suitable allocation.</p>			
This site would be a sensible urban extension which would not undermine any of the purposes of the green belt. Honley is a sustainable location so more land should be allocated. Green belt required to meet housing needs. If arguments for development not accepted, consider use of site as safeguarded land.					
H529	Service Reservoir, Gilroyd Lane, Linthwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change</p>			

Summary of comments

Council Response

<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Development of this site would lead to the expansion of Linthwaite in this location would effectively merge it with the properties at Blackmoorfoot, currently over washed by the green belt. The role of the green belt would be significantly weakened in this location if this land was removed.</p>
<p>H530 Former quarry, Holmfirth Road, Meltham</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Whole site covered by TPO and is lowland mixed deciduous woodland UK BAP priority habitat therefore development is not appropriate.</p>
<p>H531 Land south west of, Soureby Cross Way, East Bierley DLP_RSO1183, DLP_RSO1545, DLP_RSO4860, DLP_RSO4863, DLP_RSO4864, DLP_RSO5068</p> <p>Road congestion, road capacity issues including the A62, A58, A651, A652, A643 and A650. Acknowledge proposed improvements at Birstall Smithies and Tong Street but these will not mitigate against the impact of further development.</p> <p>Consider that transport issues can be mitigated against. School capacity issues can be addressed through the CIL</p> <p>The site should remain in the green belt.</p> <p>Disagree with the amber assessment on green belt and the reference to AE. The site is available now and is free from constraints.</p> <p>It is considered that CIL can address amber scores in relation to transport and education and this should not be an impediment to development. The area has already taken significant development in the past which has had an impact on the green belt and the quality of the area. Concerned about the impact of development in Bradford and Leeds on the area. There should be further opportunities for development in East Bierley in order to allow the community to grow.</p> <p>This site should be allocated for development.</p> <p>150 of the assumed dwellings from the allocation in Birkenshaw/East Bierley should be discounted due to ownership, technical, environmental or policy constraints.</p>	<p>Support 4 Conditional Support Object 2 No Comment</p> <p>Proposed Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as an accepted housing allocation. This represents a change from the draft Local Plan (November 2015) where the site was allocated as Safeguarded Land. The reasons for change are outlined below.</p> <p>This site is reasonably well related to the settlement and is contained by road, track and field boundaries. The extent of the site does not encroach onto Birkenshaw. It would join with ribbon development on Hunsworth Lane but there is already an existing access at this point and the recreation ground would maintain the existing open approach to the village, but which would need to be removed from the green belt. There are no significant constraints with the site which cannot be mitigated at the planning application stage.</p> <p>Third party land would be required to achieve suitable site access layout from Hunsworth Lane, 2.4m x 43m visibility splays required. Potential secondary / alternative / emergency access off Soureby Cross Way. There would be no significant impact on the mainline.</p> <p>The impact of development on school place planning has been assessed through the infrastructure planning work between the Local Plan and School Place Planning Teams. This work is on-going to ensure school places are available to meet the needs of future growth.</p> <p>The site is available and the site promoters have agreement to bring the site forward for development.</p> <p>Supporting comments noted.</p>
<p>H532 Land south west of, Quarry Road, Crosland Hill, Huddersfield</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site has been rejected as it now form part of a larger Mixed Use option MX1930.</p>
<p>H533 Land Off, Crosland Hill Road, Crosland Hill</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p>

Summary of comments	Council Response			
	The northern extent of the site option risks prominent ridge line development which would be detrimental to the openness of the green belt.			
H534 Former Mitchell Laithes Hospital, Long Lane, Earlsheaton DLP_RSO873	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Appear very difficult to establish defensible boundaries if site removed from green belt. Wakefield Council	No change Policy response required!			
H535 Land to the west of, Slipper Lane, Mirfield Moor	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No Change The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. Third party land would be required to achieve suitable site access layout and visibility splays. This site is very poorly configured in relation to the settlement it adjoins and would result in an isolated projection of built form to the detriment of the openness of the green belt.			
H536 Land to the south of, Church Street, Longwood, Huddersfield,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No change This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected. Accessing site from Church Street would require a larger frontage. The topography from Church Street does also not lend itself to accessing the site effectively. Dale Street could form an appropriate access but site currently has no site frontage to this.			
H537 Land east of, Springwood Road, Thongsbridge DLP_RSO967, DLP_RSO1268	Support	Conditional Support	Object 2	No Comment
Access from Springwood Road may result in removal of TPOs. Access to site from Springwood Road would enable traffic calming on this site. The site has no special wildlife. Land adjacent to New Mill Dyke could possibly be used to create a suitable wildlife habitat. The site is designated as urban greenspace. This is private land with no public access and offers no amenity other than to those living immediately adjacent to it. The site offers no recreational value to the public. Views limited because of high stone wall on Springwood Road. Site has support from the owner. Site has been identified as suitable for development.	No change. This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected. Site access can only be achieved using land which is UK BAP Priority Habitat parkland and difficulties achieving the necessary visibility splays. An open space assessment has also determined that this site is suitable for allocation of urban green space. The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted. Support for the allocation of this site for housing is noted but the site has been rejected for the reasons set out above.			
H539 Land at, Yew Tree Road / Burn Road, Birchencliffe, Huddersfield, DLP_RSO1566	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Support rejection of the site.	No change. This site is a rejected housing option. The site is covered by a larger accepted housing option. Support for the rejection of the site noted.			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H540	Kirkbridge Coal Yard, Kirkbridge Lane, New Mill	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site has limited links to the settlement and is separated from the settlement by New Mill Dike. Openness is best preserved and sensitive environmental habitats best protected through the green belt designation. Site access is not achievable. The majority of the site is within flood zone 3 which would leave limited scope for development of the remaining area.</p>			
H541	Land at junction of, Station Road and New Mill Road, Honley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>A significant part of the area is covered by protected trees and there are a number of listed buildings, the settings of which are best protected through the green belt designation. The green belt in this location prevents the intensification of built form and helps to maintain the appearance of openness.</p>			
H542	Land adjacent, Hagg Lane/Granny Lane, Lower Hopton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>An area of the site falls within Flood Zone 2 & 3a and High Pressure Gass Inner zone. Part of this site fronts Granny Lane and Hagg Lane which forms an area of urban fringe on the edge of Mirfield. Some limited development would be possible in the area fronting Granny Lane. However, this site also extends a significant distance to the south and includes a large area of ancient woodland at Briery Bank as well as having a boundary with Valence Beck. These countryside features and their sensitive wildlife habitats are best protected through their green belt designation.</p>			
H544	Land to the south of, Ravensthorpe Road/Lees Hall Road, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site is within a larger proposed accepted strategic housing allocation. Strategic highways have flagged this site as having a major impact on a priority junction. Multiple accesses along with significant improvements would be required to the surrounding road network to accommodate this development including improvements to Sands Lane and the bridge over the rail line, Steanard Lane and its junction with A644 and upgrade of bridge over River Calder.</p> <p>No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan</p>			
H545	Land to the south of, Cockley Hill Lane, Kirkheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO3533		No Change			

Site would not detract from openness of the Green Belt:

Summary of comments

the land's proximity to 5 adjacent properties (76, 78, 78a, 80 & 82) on Cockley Hill Lane, effectively screening the development from the road, the site's south and east facing slopes further obscuring sighting of the whole development from any view point, the land's proximity to the centre of Kirkheaton, the land's proximity to an adjacent development of mixed housing/bungalows in Cockley Meadows, whose boundaries extend in parallel to Cockley Hill Lane a similar distance from Kirkheaton centre – making it essentially just across the lane from the proposed development, A site visit would assist in the appreciation of the site's potential. Consideration is requested for a site visit and re-consideration of this site for housing or safeguarded land.

Council Response

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

This site is separated from the settlement of Kirkheaton by open fields and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. Additional land would need to be released between the site and the settlement but this would result in an elongated pattern of development in a prominent hillside location with little relationship to Kirkheaton.

H546 Land to the north-west of, 636-646, Halifax Road, Hightown
DLP_RSO4831

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

The site is well served by local transport, school, shop and is not affected by flooding. Consider that this site should be allocated for development. It serves no function as an important open space and has no sport or recreational value. Its development would not affect the adjacent footpath

No Change

Reducing the number of houses from 12 to 5-6 would allow a substantial amount of open space to be retained. Site has been considered as a larger housing option submitted by Denby Planning Consultants.

This site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The reason for rejecting the site is that it is proposed to be allocated as part of a wider Urban Green space.

The site lies within a larger area defined as strategic urban greenspace which comprises a large area of attractive open farmland with established trees and hedgerows defining field boundaries. It provides a green lung between Cleckheaton and Hightown, defining the separation of the two settlements.

The rejected site forms part of the strategic urban greenspace but has an important role in its own right forming an important open frontage along Halifax Road. An array of public footpaths dissect the site and they are highly used with one footpath tarmaced in the central area of the site. The land performs a strategic urban green space function meriting allocation as urban green space. UGS1068 is not deemed, in whole or part, to be clearly surplus to requirements.

H547 Land south of, Parkwood Road, Golcar, Huddersfield,
DLP_RSO4649

Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment

Support for rejection of site option.

No change.

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

Site forms part of wider H116 housing option.

No draft Local Plan consultation comments received.

H548 Land East of, Abbey Road North, Shepley

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

This site is covered by an accepted housing option (H652).

H552 Land to the north of, 271, Cliffe Lane, Gomersal

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

This site is proposed as a rejected housing option. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Summary of comments

Council Response

<p>H553 Land south west of, Cockley Hill Lane, Kirkheaton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>The site forms a smaller part of site option H591 which is proposed as an accepted housing allocation and lies adjacent to rejected housing option H446.</p> <p>This site option as presented on its own does not follow any feature on the ground on its eastern edge to form a long term defensible green belt boundary. While it is bounded by Ferrand Lane to the north and existing development to the south and west, it borders fields to the east which would be left between the site and the existing settlement which would be vulnerable to encroachment. This is an area of urban fringe but the site is not well related to the existing settlement pattern.</p> <p>This site has been accepted as part of larger housing allocation H591</p> <p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is a rejected housing option. That part of the option that is green belt is reasonably well related to the settlement form in its north eastern extent and although elevated is contained by existing development on Cockley Hill Lane. However, the south and east of the option would project development into the countryside to the significant detriment of openness and contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The part of the site to the rear of Orchard Road is at a significantly higher level than the settlement it adjoins. The existing green belt boundary to the east of the adjoining safeguarded land site does not follow any feature on the ground and this option would represent an opportunity to create a stronger more defensible boundary. However, the benefits of the stronger boundary do not outweigh the harm to the openness of the green belt that could result from development of this site.</p>
<p>H554 Land east of, Springwood Road, Thongsbridge DLP_RSO905, DLP_RSO1362</p> <p>Access from Springwood Road may result in removal of TPOs.</p> <p>Access to site from Springwood Road would enable traffic calming on this site. The site has no special wildlife. Land adjacent to New Mill Dyke could possibly be used to create a suitable wildlife habitat.</p> <p>The site is designated as urban greenspace. This is private land with no public access and offers no amenity other than to those living immediately adjacent to it.</p> <p>The site offers no recreational value to the public.</p> <p>Views limited because of high stone wall on Springwood Road.</p> <p>Site has support from the owner. Site has been identified as suitable for development.</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object 2 No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Biodiversity impacts on Habitats of Principal Importance (UK BAP priority habitat) unacceptable. Open space assessment justifies the allocation of this site as urban green space.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>
<p>H556 Land adjacent, The Old Dower House, Green Balk Lane, Lepton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>One of the purposes of the green belt is to protect the countryside from encroachment. The configuration of the site would project built form into the open countryside to the detriment of openness and contrary to the role and function of the green belt. The location of this site would leave a field between the site and the settlement edge relatively isolated from the wider green belt and therefore also vulnerable to development pressure.</p>
<p>H557 The Paddock, Sherborne Grove, Birkenshaw DLP_RSO10, DLP_RSO4880, DLP_RSO4881, DLP_RSO4882, DLP_RSO4985</p>	<p>Support 3 Conditional Support Object 2 No Comment</p>

Summary of comments

Road congestion and road capacity issues including A62, A58, A651, A652, A643, A650. Acknowledge proposed improvements at Birstall Smithies and Tong Street but these will not mitigate against new development.

Public transport accessibility is good with a bus stop within 400m of the site.

Pedestrian accessibility is excellent with links to footpaths on Sherburn Grove and Station Lane which in turn lead to Birkenshaw centre to the south.

Local amenities and school are within 1200m.

Cycle accessibility is very good with generally low trafficked routes.

The site is not in a flood risk zone so there is no significant environmental constraints to development. The site does not contain protected trees or wildlife, it is not in close proximity to a national park so there is no significant environmental constraints to development

Object to the identification of the site within the green belt.

The green belt assessment of the site implies a greater impact than will actually occur.

Test 2a

Existing field boundaries formed by walls and fencing will perform key roles in containing development. Development of the site will not lead to physical connection of adjoining settlements.

Test 2b

Development of the site would round off this part of Birkenshaw. The site is well connected to the existing built up area, the site's western boundary and main length adjoins the existing urban area and its eastern boundary is contiguous with the boundary of properties on Sherburn Grove. Development would be contained on three sides. The boundary between the site and the urban area to the west mainly comprises domestic gardens and would not set a precedent for sprawl.

Test 2c

The site does not perform a significant role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, or in providing access to the countryside. There are no protected trees or hedgerows in the site. There is little visual relationship between the proposal site and the more open countryside in the east, and that development would not seriously harm the character or appearance of the wider landscape. The present lack of development on this land is not considered to provide notable amenity benefits and any development would be sympathetic to its location on the edge of the urban area.

Test 2d

Development of the site would have no effect on any historic town or other heritage asset. The site is regarded as deliverable for housing development in the short term in order to enhance the number of homes proposed in this part of the Kirklees District. The site is not in a buffer zone for hazardous installations so there is no significant constraints to development. Object to rejection of site as a housing allocation.

Support rejection of site which should remain as green belt.

The area has taken too much development in the past which has had an impact on the green belt and the quality of the

The Technical Assessment fails to fully take into account the site's sustainability credentials. It is considered that the sustainability appraisal ignores evidence submitted at Call for Sites stage

It is considered that the plan does not meet the four tests of soundness.

Consider that there is a housing shortfall in this area and the reliance on windfall does not provide the certainty that the housing target can be met.

Council Response

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The reason for rejecting this site is on green belt grounds and impact on the Adwalton Moor historic battlefield.

This site lies within the boundary and/or within the setting of the Registered Battlefield at Adwalton. Historic England has objected to this option. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. National planning policy confirms that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. This option could lead to substantial harm to the registered battlefield and the inclusion of the site option in the plan is not justified.

This site is reasonably well contained by existing development and could result in limited rounding off. However, removal of the site from the green belt would somewhat isolate the adjacent allotments from the wider green belt, resulting in pressure for development. This is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The site lies within an area that is close to the historic Adwalton Moor registered battlefield whose setting is best preserved by the green belt designation.

Summary of comments

Council Response

The forecast delivery includes dwellings that already have planning permission in place and assumes 100% delivery. This is seldom the case and a discount of 10% should be to sites with planning permission to take account of non-implementation.

The council is placing too much reliance on the delivery of two large urban extensions H1747, H2089. Object to the current approach of distributing housing growth which is considered unsound as it does not provide for enough housing in North Kirklees and at the same time distributes larger housing numbers to those areas of the district where arguably housing sites are less deliverable. The Council should therefore seek to ensure enough housing sites are provided for in each area of Kirklees to ensure they match (or exceed) the targets outlined.

H558 Land adjacent to, 96, Old Lane, Birkenshaw
DLP_RSO4886, DLP_RSO4887, DLP_RSO4888

Road congestion and road capacity issues including A62, A58, A651, A652, A643, A650. Acknowledge proposed improvements at Birstall Smithies and Tong Street but these will not mitigate against new development.

Support rejection of site which should remain as green belt. The area has taken too much development in the past which has had an impact on the green belt and the quality of the area. Concerned about development in Bradford and Leeds and the impact on the area.

Support 3 Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

This site lies within the boundary and/or within the setting of the Registered Battlefield at Adwalton. Historic England has objected to this option. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. National planning policy confirms that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. This option could lead to substantial harm to the registered battlefield and the inclusion of the site option in the plan is not justified.

This area of green belt is part of the strategic gap that separates Kirklees from Leeds. Locally opportunities for settlement extension are extremely limited as the green belt is considered to play an important role in preserving the setting of the historic Adwalton Moor registered battlefield.

Additionally, there is no evidence to confirm that an acceptable site access is achievable. There is no site frontage to the adopted highway and no obvious point of access.

The site has therefore been rejected as both housing allocation and a safeguarded land option (SL2293).

Supporting comments on the rejection of the site noted.

H559 Land to the east of, Leeds Road, Chidswell
DLP_RSO869, DLP_RSO1818, DLP_RSO3073

Two internal layouts submitted showing different options - Option a primary accesses off Chidswell Lane, Windsor Road and Owl Lane and Option B Owl Lane
There are no listed buildings or historical interest associated with the site.

Objection is made to made the reasons for rejecting the site in the green belt technical assessment - see landscape and visual statement for evidence. Landscape and Visual Statement submitted which identifies the site as being suitable for development. The site is available and achievable as homes can be delivered on site in the next ten years. Wakefield Council supports the decision of Kirklees not to allocate this site. Wakefield has seen no evidence with regard to the role of the whole extent of this site in serving the purposes of the green belt or confirming it is possible to define robust, defensible new boundaries with the green belt should this site be deleted from it. It is notable Kirklees Council's Green Belt Edge Review considers the current green belt boundary on Windsor Road is 'strong'. The site could also be considered to play an important role in preventing the coalescence of Chidswell with Gawthorpe to the South. This consideration is supported by the Edge Review which concluded due to the nature of development to the south of the site in Wakefield

Support 2 Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

Proposed Change

The site is proposed as an accepted housing allocation. This represents a change from the draft Local Plan (November 2015) where the site was rejected for housing.

Site access is achievable. There are no constraints with this site that cannot be addressed through the detailed planning process and its allocation is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Comments received on this site have been noted.

Summary of comments

Council Response

there is a 'high risk of encroachment with potential to significantly harm the undeveloped gap'.

Support rejection of H559 as if allowed it would have provided a link to MX1905 and the principal highway network via Owl Lane.

Object to the non allocation of this site for housing.

The proposed development can enhance the eastern area of Dewsbury through a sensitive extension to the existing urban area, whilst importantly enhancing well defined, robust, boundaries in perpetuity to provide long term permanence to the Green Belt in this location of the District.

The council has previously considered Windsor Farm as suitable and there have been no changes which would alter its suitability.

The site will help the council meet its housing requirement and provide a significant number of economic and social benefits.

It is a suitable and highly sustainable location with no technical or environmental constraints.

H560	Land south east of, Bankfield Lane, Kirkheaton, Huddersfield,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This site is part of larger accepted option H737.			
H561	Part of, POL, Balderstone Hall, Mirfield DLP_RSO383, DLP_RSO452	Support	Conditional Support 1	Object 1	No Comment
Site is in close proximity to Mirfield and Ravensthorpe district centres and local services and facilities. Bus stops at Flash Lane/Shillbank Lane and Greenside Road. Mirfield railway station approx 1.5 miles away. Good car access to M62 and A62 Transport Assessment existing access from Woodward Court suitable to serve site. No adverse impacts to wider highways network. Mitigation works are deliverable and would allow safe access to site. Site in flood zone 1 not at risk of flooding. Surface water can be directed to soakaways. Foul sewer, Hepworth Lane has sufficient capacity to service site Extended Phase 1 Ecology Report, no ecological importance within site and within 2km of site. Phase 1 field survey habitats on site have no significant ecological value. No tree preservation orders on site Site within setting of Balderstone Hall, listed building. Heritage Report submitted, neutral impact on setting of listed building Old Bank and Crossley Fields primary schools in close proximity to site Health Centre in close proximity to site Steep slope from Balderstone Hall Lane to swings should be retained for public use with existing accesses.	No Change				
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Access can be achieved from an extension to the end of Woodward Court. However, the visibility splays at the junction of Woodward Court and Wellhouse Lane are sub-standard (to the left) and would require 3rd party land to provide the standard 2.4 x 43m visibility splays. The site frontage on to Hepworth Lane has sub-standard visibility splays and would require 3rd party land to provide the standard 2.4 x 43m visibility splays. I would note that the width of Hepworth Lane is also substandard (4.5m wide) and not suitable for intensification of use. Balderstone Hall Lane is unsuitable.			
H562	Land south of, Back Lane, Clayton West DLP_RSO1450	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
		No change.			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Should use Brownfield land first.

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

The western part of this option could represent a well related settlement extension and would have only limited impact on the openness of the green belt. However the eastern projection is poorly configured, has no eastern boundary and although field boundaries limit the risk of sprawl this would represent significant encroachment into this area of countryside contrary to the role and function of the green belt.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

H563 Land east of, Back Lane Recreation Ground, Back Lane, Clayton West
DLP_RSO1448

Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment

Should use Brownfield land first.

No change.

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

Overlaps with other housing option and urban greenspace, which will be retained.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

H565 Land between, Wakefield Road and Liley Lane, Grange Moor

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The configuration of this site would have an unacceptable impact on the openness of the green belt for the undeveloped parts of this site and the site is detached from the non-green belt area albeit by one small piece of land. The site has potential contamination issues and all of the site lies within a high risk coal referral area.

No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.

H566 Land off, Wickleden Gate, Scholes
DLP_RSO215

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

The land is unused (as green space) and uncared for.

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Open space assessment has determined that this site is suitable for allocation as urban green space (UGS1247).

Support for the development of this site is noted but the option has been rejected for the reasons set out above.

H568 Land to the west of, Leak Hall Crescent, Denby Dale
DLP_RSO798

Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment

The site should not be allocated as housing.

No change.

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

This site overlaps with H690, an accepted option.

H569 Land east of, Eastfield Road, Northorpe

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

Summary of comments

No Representations received

Council Response

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Lowland mixed deciduous woodland UK BAP habitat across much of site. Remove site from allocation but particularly the disused railway to the eastern side of the site. Removing this site from the green belt would breach the existing strong edge to the settlement formed by North Road and the former railway line. The narrow configuration would result in an unsatisfactory pattern of development and would leave green belt land between the site and settlement edge isolated from the wider green belt.

H570 Land south of, Tinker Lane, Lepton

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

This site forms part of the wider countryside, prevents the spread of Lepton to the south and helps to prevent merger with Little Lepton. The size of this site would result in a significant intrusion of built form into the open countryside with little relationship to the existing pattern of the settlement it adjoins. It would therefore result in a significant impact on openness of the green belt in this location.

H571 Land to the west of, New Road, Netherthong
DLP_RSO1301, DLP_RSO1364

Support Conditional Support Object 2 No Comment

The site is within walking distance to school, health centre and other services.

No change.

The site has good access to Holmfirth and Huddersfield

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Access is available from Thong Road and New Road.
The site is in flood zone 1.

The development of this extensive site which would significantly impact on the area of green belt that separates Netherthong from Holmfirth. Development would be prominent to the detriment of the openness of the green belt.

Netherthong is already connected to Holmfirth - which includes Thongsbridge.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted. Support for the allocation of this site for housing is noted but the site has been rejected due to unacceptable impacts on the green belt.

Thong Lane provides a permanent physical feature that would accommodate the revised green belt boundary.
The site has a willing landowner and is available for development, with the owner in discussions with a house builder.

The site is in an area where people would like to live.
The site could achieve a significant amount of housing development, negating the need to allocate smaller sites in less accessible locations.
The site is more suitable than some accepted options in the Holme Valley.

H572 Land to the south of, Ravensthorpe Road, Dewsbury

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

This site is within a larger proposed accepted strategic housing allocation.

No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan

H573 Land south of, Jagger Lane, Kirkheaton

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

Summary of comments

No Representations received

Council Response

No change.

The site is a rejected housing option. The site is in the HSE inner zone. This site sits in an area of urban fringe where there is already sporadic residential development close to the settlement edge. However, it is separated from the settlement by the line of the former railway and could not be released from the green belt in isolation, creating a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.

H574 Land to west of, Green Balk Lane, Lepton

No Representations received

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

No suitable access can be achieved to this site option.

H575 Land at junction of, Paddock Road and Moor Lane, Kirkburton

DLP_RSO333, DLP_RSO809, DLP_RSO1251, DLP_RSO1346, DLP_RSO2348, DLP_RSO3996, DLP_RSO4824

Road congestion.

Likely that additional development traffic can be adequately accommodated on the adjacent road network. Parking issues especially at school opening/closing times and along Riley Lane, Low Town, Paddock Road and Turnshaws Road.

Road safety - traffic problematic near children's playground.

Public transport frequency issues.

Transport assessment shows that the site is capable of accommodating the level of residential development proposed with two vehicular access points.

Sewer infrastructure cannot cope - drains blocking after heavy rain.

Viable options available for draining the site.

Wildlife would be affected.

Proposal would not have a significant detrimental effect on ecology.

Potential to enhance existing wildlife corridors.

Site can be developed without significant harm to the Grade II listed building to the south-east of the site.

School capacity insufficient (Kirkburton and Highburton first schools).

First and middle school are within walking distance of this site and site is within the priority admission areas of Shelley College.

Planning obligations can address capacity issues.

Loss of farmland - horse grazing.

Proposals go against the purposes of green belt.

Site would be an appropriate extension to Kirkburton and would have a minimal impact on the purposes of including land in the green belt.

Unacceptable impact on landscape - land rises significantly from Moor Lane in the direction of Paddock Road.

Potential to create new landscape planting.

Physical infrastructure cannot cope.

Electricity blackouts on a regular basis.

Disproportionate level of development to existing settlement size.

Only a small proportion of the site is within a high mining risk area.

Should use Brownfield sites first.

Proposal would merge Kirkburton and Highburton.

Site is suitable, available and achievable and should be allocated for housing in the Local Plan.

Support 5 Conditional Support Object 2 No Comment

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Although there is limited risk of sprawl from this site, the character and extent of this site are such that it is appears as part of the wider countryside and development would therefore constitute encroachment.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

H576 Land east of, Carr Lane, Cinderhills

No Representations received

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change.

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
<p>H577 Land east of, Carr Lane, Cinderhills</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The field pattern and landform to the east of the settlement in this location prevents excessive sprawl and provides an opportunity for some eastward expansion without undue impact on openness. Major concerns in relation to impacts on UK BAP Priority habitats. Physical site access achievable but beyond the site, the desirable route in the wider network is constrained due to width, alignment, gradient and on-street parking and is therefore considered unsuitable for the intensification of use proposed.</p> <p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The configuration of this option would result in a very poorly related projection of built form into the countryside which would have an unacceptable impact on the openness and undermine the purpose of the green belt which is to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Major concerns in relation to impacts on UK BAP Priority Habitat (unimproved grassland). Third party land would be required to obtain suitable access including potentially bringing Carr Lane up to adoptable standard. Beyond the site, the desirable route in the wider network is constrained due to width, alignment, gradient and on-street parking and is therefore considered unsuitable for the intensification of use proposed.</p>
<p>H578 Land north of, Longwood Edge Road, Salendine Nook</p> <p>DLP_RSO2745, DLP_RSO4646</p> <p>Arrangements are in place to achieve site access. Site does not currently perform any recreation function and do not have attributes to justify urban greenspace designation.</p> <p>Site is well related to existing housing / settlement. Area is surplus to owner's requirements and unused. Support for rejection of site.</p>	<p>Support 1 Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is a rejected housing option. Site requires 3rd party land for access. The site is covered by an accepted Urban Greenspace option.</p> <p>The site access has been considered using evidence available at the time.</p> <p>The site has been assessed for its value resulting in Urban Greenspace designation.</p>
<p>H579 Land south of, Jagger Lane, Kirkheaton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is a rejected housing option. Site access requires 3rd party land. The site is in the HSE inner zone. The site is affected by high pressure gas pipeline. This site sits in an area of urban fringe where there is already sporadic residential development close to the settlement edge. However, it is separated from the settlement by the line of the former railway and could not be released from the green belt in isolation.</p>
<p>H580 Land to the east and west of, Hardcastle Lane, Flockton</p> <p>DLP_RSO4825</p> <p>Support for rejection of the site.</p>	<p>Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The extent, location and configuration of this option would harm the purposes of the green belt as it would encroach into the countryside and lead to sprawl along Barnsley Road to the significant detriment of the openness of the green belt.</p> <p>Support for the rejection of this option has been noted.</p>

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H581	Land to the south east of, Hermitage Park, Lepton DLP_RSO3487, DLP_RSO3488, DLP_RSO5067	Support 2	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
<p>Rejected site H581 is same as H455 and H659, yet the Council have accepted the latter two sites. No apparent justification for this on the basis of the same reasons for rejection on H581. Redrow Homes object to the rejection of this site and have submitted a new site option with a slight change to southern boundary.</p>		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The proposed access through Hermitage Park can not sustain an intensification of use. The site is superseded by accepted site option H2730a which demonstrates a link to the adjacent accepted site option H2684a.</p>			
H582	Land south of, New Hey Road, Mount DLP_RSO4650	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>Support for rejection of housing option.</p>		<p>No change.</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>This site is only tenuously related to the settlement as it borders with gardens to the rear of houses on New Hey Road. The site is well contained by existing features but would result in backland development on the top of the steep side of Longwood Edge where development would impact on long distance views to the detriment of openness.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>			
H585	Land to the north of, Quarry Lane, Lascelles Hall DLP_RSO457	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>Fields are regulary flooded.</p> <p>Support for the rejection of this site.</p>		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The extent of this site would bring development into the cluster of properties at Lower Lascelles Hall Farm, a number of which are listed buildings. The merging of Lascelles Hall with this isolated grouping would result in the loss of a historically separate cluster of buildings. This would undermine the role of the green belt which is to prevent the merger of settlements.</p> <p>Supporting comments for the rejection of this site have been noted.</p>			
H586	Land off, Soothill Lane, Batley DLP_RSO3072, DLP_RSO3334	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
<p>Road congestion and road capacity on the A653.</p> <p>Support site rejections on Green Belt grounds due to the closing of the strategic gap between Batley and West Ardsley and encroachment into the countryside towards Leeds (Leeds City Council). No other site presently allocated within the Batley area can deliver a comprehensive landscape led development of market and affordable housing within the first 5 years of the plan, alongside the proposed substantial level of community and green infrastructure. The development proposals are situated in a suitable and highly sustainable location in respect of existing settlement form and there are no technical or environmental (built and natural) constraints that would preclude the development of the site. The proposed development can enhance the eastern area of Batley through a sensitive extension to the existing urban area, whilst importantly enhancing identified areas of landscape and habitat value in perpetuity to provide long term permanence to the Green Belt boundary in this location of the District.</p> <p>The development can help address the council's housing needs and can provide environmental benefits</p>		<p>No Change</p> <p>This site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The green belt in this location separates the three settlements of Soothill, Woodkirk and Chidswell. The extent of the site would result in significant and continuous development both along Soothill Lane and on land west of Leeds Road, thereby merging the three settlements contrary to the role and function of the green belt. The site as proposed does not in places follow features on the ground that could present a strong defensible new green belt boundary, most notably on its northern extent which is marked by a change in character of land use rather than any strong physical feature. This would leave neighbouring land vulnerable to encroachment. The option would also completely isolate a large area of green belt land to the west.</p> <p>Further to this, insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the site could be satisfactorily accessed without the need for third party land.</p>			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H587	Land south west of, Nursery Wood Road, Hanging Heaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		This site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site is at a significantly higher level than houses fronting Commonsides. Highly visible development would encroach into the hillside to the detriment of the openness of the green belt in this location. The eastern edge of this site does not follow any feature on the ground so a new boundary would need to be found. There does not appear to be any feature east of the site that could present a new boundary.			
H588	Land between, Hassocks Lane and Meltham Road, Honley DLP_RSO1369, DLP_RSO4827	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Public transport links (train station) should lead to more allocations in Honley. Part of this site is Meltham Road Rec which consists of a football pitch, children's play area and open play area - although it falls in the green belt it should be protected as Local Green Space.		No change.			
This site would be a sensible urban extension which would not undermine any of the purposes of the green belt. Growth should be proportionate to the scale of the settlement. Honley is a sustainable location so more land should be allocated. Green belt required to meet housing needs. If arguments for development not accepted, consider use of site as safeguarded land.		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The prominence of this site particularly at its northern extent would intrude into long distance views and would therefore have an unacceptable impact on the openness of the wider green belt.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted. Comments also noted supporting this option. Settlement appraisal information for each settlement was set out in the local plan evidence base but in this case the impact of developing this site has been judged to have an unacceptable impact on the green belt as set out above.			
		This site has been considered as a Safeguarded Land option as requested (SL2737) to determine whether this would be a suitable allocation. The Meltham Road Recreation area has been considered as a Local Green Space option as requested (LoCGS2722) to determine whether it meets the relevant criteria.			
H589	Land to the North West of, 330 - 342, Leymoor Road, Golcar DLP_RSO2773, DLP_RSO4648	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
The site is small-scale and would be unlikely to have a significant impact on the highway network.		No change			
Whilst site was assessed based on access through demolition of existing house, the site would now utilise access through planning approval 2013/92111.		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
This green belt edge is one of only two realistic areas around Golcar to be considered for release from the Green Belt.		Third party land required for access from Leymoor Road. May impact on setting of listed buildings to south east of the site. Impact on green belt, encroachment to Nettleton Hill / Longwood Reservoirs and lack of potential for strong boundary to be created to the west.			
Development would form a rounding off of the settlement. The site has a willing landowner.					
Indicative site layout shows low density development accessed from private drive - 2013/92111. Support for rejection of housing option					
H590	Land north of, 326, Vicarage Road, Longwood DLP_RSO4976, DLP_RSO5064	Support	Conditional Support	Object 2	No Comment
Objection to failure to allocate land at Lockwood / Quarmby (UGS site 1219). That part of the land closest to Thornhill Road / Vicarage Road where the footprint of the former mill is still evident, ought to be considered for development - given its urban credentials / sustainable location to public transport and historic Brownfield association.		No change.			
		The site is a rejected housing option. The site is made up of lowland mixed deciduous woodland and acid grassland UK BAP priority habitats forming part of Ballroyd Clough. Ballroyd Clough is a steeply incised valley cut into the sandstone ridge at Quarmby. This ridge and the clough support a mixture of heathland, acid broadleaved woodland and acid grassland. West Yorkshire Ecology recommend removing the whole site to			

Summary of comments		Council Response				
		retain the integrity of the corridor. The site is covered by an accepted Urban Greenspace option.				
H592	Land north of, Red Lane, Meltham	Support	1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO404						
Traffic congestion - inadequate road infrastructure Impact on flooding - increased run-off from hills Impact on wildlife		No change				
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.				
		This area of green belt sits between the edge of Meltham and the boundary of the Peak District National Park. These open areas contribute to the immediate setting of the national park and are recognised for the role they play in maintaining landscape character beyond the boundary of the national park. The green belt in this location therefore plays an important role in maintaining this openness by protecting the areas from the encroachment of built form. This site is also separated from the settlement by open fields and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. Site is within 1,000 metres of SPA, closely linked in terms of landform.				
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.				
H593	Land south of, Jill Lane, Mirfield	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change				
		This site is a proposed accepted housing allocation. The site was proposed as an accepted site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its allocation is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.				
		The green belt over washes the existing properties on Shill Bank Lane and at Eastfield Road in order to prevent intensification and to help to maintain a degree of separation. The Shill Bank Lane frontage to this site represents the last undeveloped gap north of Shill Bank Lane and as such performs an important role in helping to maintain an appearance of separation between Mirfield and Ravensthorpe. The site is poorly related to the settlement and would result in a projection of built form into the countryside to detriment of openness. The eastern extent of the site would effectively merge Mirfield with Ravensthorpe contrary to the role and function of the green belt.				
H594	Land south east of, Shillbank View, Mirfield	Support		Conditional Support	Object	1
DLP_RSO2845						
Access achievable from own Spring Place Park Development. Submitted STEN Architecture master plan SK01 shows two accesses into site on Spring Place Court, no third party consent required. Traffic Assessment, ARP Associates predicted on this basis. Transport assessment should be green. Only part of site may be contaminated, majority undeveloped. Adjacent Brownfield site successfully developed out. Env Health Tech Assessment should be green Impact on local designated heritage assets negligible, FDA Landscape report. Prospective development contained within extended urban area north of Canker Dyke, delivery is not prejudiced. Heritage assessment should be green Current capacity at Junior and Infants school, contribution towards secondary education through development process. No known constraints, should be green indication Accessibility to local recreational resources would be provided. Development could positively encourage physical activity, should be green indication Playing field use ceased many years ago. Prospective development would provide new open space. Site not in area of open space deficiency, good access to footpaths and nearby recreation areas. Should be green indication		No Change				
Site would be contained by existing defensible long term boundaries. Modest extension of existing urban area. Site not important to prevent merger of neighbouring towns. Not highly visible due to local topography, not important in protecting countryside from encroachment.		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.				
		This site sits within a strategic area of green belt that maintains separation between Mirfield and Ravensthorpe. While the site is reasonably well related to the settlement edge its northern most extent would result in built form that would further narrow the gap that allows the green belt to flow over land to the south. As such development would compromise the role and function of the green belt in this area. Although it is acknowledged that the gap is already narrow at this point, development of the site would significantly reduce the appearance of separation.				

Summary of comments		Council Response			
<p>Site does not contribute to 5 primary purposes of including land in the green belt, not necessary to keep site permanently open. Deliverable site which could be built out in short term No evidenced technical constraints to development</p>					
H595	Land to the east and west of, Hardcastle Lane, Flockton	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO1281					
<p>Landowner would like to make it clear that the land is available as a standalone residential site or part of a larger area.</p>		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The northern boundary is not delineated by any feature on the ground which means that adjacent land would be vulnerable to encroachment contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p> <p>The availability of this site for development has been noted.</p>			
H596	Land off, Windy Bank Lane, Hightown	Support	Conditional Support	Object 2	No Comment
DLP_RSO2474, DLP_RSO4819					
<p>There is an extensive public transport network in the local area. The site is not located within an AQMA or HSE inner or middle zone. The red score is inconsistent with adjacent sites. Detailed heritage assessment concludes that the development would have less than substantial harm to Thornbush Farm or St peters Church. Inconsistency in assessing education. School capacity has not stopped H198 coming forward.</p> <p>The site can be developed without affecting the role and function of the green belt.</p> <p>Inconsistency in green belt assessment - Site 1726 adjacent to site scored green.</p> <p>Windy Bank Lane and Hare Park Lane provide robust future green belt boundaries and would round off the settlement. Landscape assessment submitted which concludes n The site could be developed with two distinct character areas separated by the natural landscaping buffer created by Clough Beck. To the north the development could be medium/high density while to the south a moorland hamlet character area could be created. These character areas would respond to the local urban fringe context and help create a sense of place - see master plan. The council has not allocated sufficient land to accommodate its objectively assessed housing needs. The site should be allocated for residential development.</p> <p>Consider that part of the site up to the footpath in conjunction with H198 should be allocated for housing. Privately owned houses are needed to ensure the survival of the nearby school and improve social mix.</p> <p>The site is bordered by development.</p> <p>Key services within Hightown can be accessed from the site on foot or by cycle.</p> <p>The site can be designed to accommodate 140 new homes and areas of open space.</p> <p>The site could be developed alongside the proposed housing allocation on the former school site.</p>		<p>No Change</p> <p>This site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan.</p> <p>Only a small section of this site actually borders the existing settlement. Part of the north western edge does not follow any feature on the ground so a new boundary would need to be found. If Windy Bank Lane was used to form a new boundary additional large areas of open land would have to be removed from the green belt. If a new green belt boundary were created just around the site it would not be well related to the settlement. This would represent significant encroachment into the countryside to the detriment of the openness of the green belt.</p>			
H597	Land to the south of, Sandy Gate, Scholes	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		Proposed change.			

Summary of comments

Council Response

	<p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan (although it was part of the larger accepted housing option H38 in the draft local plan). H597 has now been accepted. Its allocation is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site access is achievable, potential odour source near the site to be considered, scheme design to take account of listed buildings to the north and west.</p> <p>No draft Local Plan consultation comments received on this specific option, however, comments were received on the larger H38 housing option which includes this site. These are relevant to the consideration of this site and the comments have been addressed on H38.</p>					
<p>H598 Land at, Hassocks Road, Meltham DLP_RSO405</p> <p>Traffic congestion - inadequate road infrastructure Impact on flooding - increased run-off from hills Impact on wildlife</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Support</td> <td>1</td> <td>Conditional Support</td> <td>Object</td> <td>No Comment</td> </tr> </table> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>This area of green belt sits between the edge of Meltham and the boundary of the Peak District National Park. These open areas contribute to the immediate setting of the national park and are recognised for the role they play in maintaining landscape character beyond the boundary of the national park. The green belt in this location therefore plays an important role in maintaining this openness by protecting the areas from the encroachment of built form. Site is within 1000m of South Pennine Moors SPA. Likely to be within functionally linked land for feeding SPA birds.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>	Support	1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Support	1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment		
<p>H600 Land North of, Hollin Hall Lane, Golcar DLP_RSO4647</p> <p>Support for rejection of housing option.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Support</td> <td>1</td> <td>Conditional Support</td> <td>Object</td> <td>No Comment</td> </tr> </table> <p>No change.</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>This site in isolation would represent a poorly related projection of development into open countryside and as such would undermine the purpose of the green belt which is to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. The site follows field boundaries which while not strong features would represent a new defensible green belt boundary.</p> <p>No draft Local Plan consultation comments received.</p>	Support	1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Support	1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment		
<p>H602 Land to the west of, Abbey Road North, Shelley DLP_RSO327, DLP_RSO472, DLP_RSO525, DLP_RSO994, DLP_RSO1857</p> <p>Traffic issues on Penistone Road,. A629 and B6116 at capacity at peak times. Road capacity and road safety - acute bend on A629 precludes access points there, lack of footpaths. Parking issues. Encourages commuting. Flooding issues - Shepley Beck runs through this site. Loss of soak away would create a serious flood risk. Proposals will bring problems of noise and air pollution. School capacity may be insufficient. Health services provision may be insufficient.</p> <p>Infrastructure funding focused on the Huddersfield and Dewsbury areas. Impact on character. Lack of local amenities. Use sites which already have planning permission first (e.g. the old Firth Mill site on Abbey Road). Do not use green belt.</p>	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Support</td> <td>5</td> <td>Conditional Support</td> <td>Object</td> <td>No Comment</td> </tr> </table> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>High flood risk areas covering almost half of the site (northern part) and therefore lack of evidence a suitable layout could be achieved with such a constraint on the site.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>	Support	5	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Support	5	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment		

Summary of comments		Council Response			
Unsustainable sites.					
H603	Part of POL to the east of, Far Bank, Shelley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Third party land required for access due to insufficient site frontage. Lack of evidence that such an access could be achieved.			
H604	Land to the west of, Dirker Bank Road, Marsden	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		No site frontage to adopted highway.. Functionally linked land with SPA / SSSI / SAC			
H605	Land to the east of, Upper Bank End Road, Holmfirth DLP_RSO5, DLP_RSO933	Support	Conditional Support 1	Object 1	No Comment
Consider site for future development if H335 becomes developed allowing suitable access to H605. Access can be achieved and no further access required from Bank End Road. Walking distance from local schools. Walking distance from health services.		No change.			
Site represents a reasonable rounding off of the settlement. Site would not have a detrimental impact on the purposes of including land in the green belt - it would have no greater impact than site H335. Site is not remote from any settlement and is a reasonable extension to the development it abuts. Close to local amenities. As site H335 has been accepted for development. Access to employment within local area. Site is in a sustainable location. Could use H605 and reduce the size of H38 (Scholes).		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The site extends in isolation into the green belt beyond a green belt edge with severe topographical constraints. The site itself is very poorly related to the settlement and would result in a prominent projection of built form to the significant detriment of the openness of the green belt. Third party land required for access and the desirable route in the wider network is constrained due to width, alignment, gradient and on-street parking and is therefore considered unsuitable for the intensification of use proposed.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
H606	Land to the south of, Cliffe Road, Shepley DLP_RSO323, DLP_RSO468, DLP_RSO518, DLP_RSO987	Support 4	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Road congestion (severe traffic at the Sovereign, Carr Lane, Marsh Lane). Increased flood risk - surface water flooding. Loss of agricultural land.		No change.			
Proposals go against the purpose of green belt. Physical infrastructure would not cope with development. Negative impact on character. Do not use green belt - use sites where planning approval has already been given such as the old Firth Street Mill on Abbey Road. Would be disproportionate level of development to existing settlement size.		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The southern extent of this site would result in the encroachment of built form into open countryside to the detriment of openness and contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The site would leave a parcel of land cut off from the wider green belt between the site and North Row. It is unclear how sufficient access could be achieved unless adjacent rejected housing options were to be accepted.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
H607	Land to the east of, Woodhead Road, Thongsbridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
<p>H608 Land to north and east of, Barnsley Road and Rowgate, Upper Cumberworth</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>The site lies within Hagg Wood Local Wildlife Site (ancient woodland) and the whole site is replanted ancient woodland. The green belt is the best protection for the sensitive environmental habitats and removal of the site from the green belt would also require the removal of a significant amount of additional land currently occupied by the sports facilities. While these are urban land uses their removal from the green belt to facilitate development on this inappropriate option would be unjustified.</p> <p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>This is a large site in relation to the existing settlement and would result in the sprawl of development down the north facing slope into open countryside. Where Rowgate meets Barnsley Road the land is elevated and development would be very prominent in long distance views to the significant detriment of the openness of the green belt.</p>
<p>H610 Land at Royds Hill, Gomersal Lane, Gomersal</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The reason for rejecting the site is: This site lies on an exposed hillside and would constitute sprawl and encroachment into the countryside contrary to the role and function of the green belt. This is a prominent hillside where development would intrude into long distance views to the detriment of openness.</p>
<p>H611 33, Lower Hall Lane, Hightown</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>This site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The reason for rejecting the site is that insufficient information has been received to demonstrate that a satisfactory access could be provided to the site. There is no site frontage to the adopted highway. Access could be achieved via Lower Hall Lane, a private road. However, third party land would be required to make this road up to adoptable standard. Further there is a requirement to provide 2.4m x 43m (30mph speed limit) visibility splays at the A649 / Lower Hall Lane junction which cannot be achieved without third party land.</p>
<p>H613 Land to south west of, 81 - 99, Enfield Drive, Carlinghow</p> <p>DLP_RSO5070</p> <p>The site is identified in the UDP and the draft local plan as Urban greenspace. It should be re-allocated for housing.</p> <p>Allocation of the site for housing would reduce pressure on the green belt. Development of the site would form a coherent and logical extension to the existing settlement. It is well related to the settlement and bounded by development.</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The reason for rejection is that the site has been allocated as an Urban Green Space.</p> <p>This site has value as open space in its own right and as part of the wider urban green space allocation UGS973. Comprises agricultural grazing land and forms the north western part of UGS973. Assessed as part of a larger area of natural and semi-natural greenspace having high value as open space based on its structural and landscape qualities and its significant contribution to the amenity of the area and sense of place, as well as use and enjoyment for informal recreation along the public footpath network. Being similar in character and appearance to this adjoining open land, the site itself is viewed as an integral part of the wider open space that</p>

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		can be appreciated from different vantage points and plays a valuable role in providing an open aspect from the public footpath network adjacent the site and in the wider area. UGS973 is not deemed, in whole or part, to be clearly surplus to requirements. The loss of the value of the Urban Greenspace is considered to outweigh all other material considerations, including the delivery of housing.			
H614	Land west of, Sands Lane, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Site access achievable, however Sands Lane is a narrow road with poor horizontal alignment and is not considered suitable for the intensification of use proposed. This field is located adjacent to Hagg Wood area of ancient woodland and Whitley Wood area of protected trees. Both are Local Wildlife Sites. The site appears to be an integral part of an attractive countryside setting and development would significantly encroach into the countryside, contrary to the role and function of the green belt. This site is isolated from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create an area of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			
H615	Land off, Oak Tree Road, Lepton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This site has been rejected as it is part of larger accepted option H684.			
H617	Land to the South of, 5 - 25, Clay Well, Golcar	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Site frontage to Brook Lane or potentially from site to west. Topography could be an issue in terms of site access			
H618	Land at junction of, Bellstring Lane and Hopton Hall Lane, Upper Hopton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This site is separated from the southern edge of Upper Hopton by a field which would also need to be removed from the green belt in order to avoid creating an isolated pocket of development land surrounded by green belt. The site would represent a large and poorly related extension to Upper Hopton and would encroach into the countryside contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			
		Site falls within High Pressure Gas Zone. Overhead power lines cross the site. Pylon located on site.			
H619	Land to the north of, Fulstone Hall Lane, New Mill	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			

Summary of comments	Council Response			
	This site is detached from the urban area and could not be released in isolation without significantly compromising the role and function of the green belt in this location.			
H620 Land at, Stockerhead Farm, Stockerhead Lane, Slaithwaite DLP_RSO4330, DLP_RSO4331, DLP_RSO4332, DLP_RSO4333, DLP_RSO4334	Support	Conditional Support	Object 5	No Comment
<p>The site has willing landowners. New Site for Consideration received promotign the eastern part of the site as a development site - with the eastern part as possible expansion.</p> <p>Appropriate landscaping and design will be required to minimise impact on amenity of existing dwellings on Tudor Street and Stockerhead Lane.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>No highway frontage. Third party land to achieve access required via a track into site from Stockerhead Lane, which is also a PROW. The western extent of this site is reasonably contained by physical features including the line of Bradley Brook, the playing field and some tree cover. The south and east of the site is increasingly prominent on elevated and rising ground and so would impact on long distance views to the detriment of the wider green belt.</p>			
H621 Land to the West of, Matthew Grove, Meltham DLP_RSO406	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>Traffic congestion - inadequate road infrastructure Impact on flooding - increased run-off from hills Impact on wildlife.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected</p> <p>This area of green belt sits between the edge of Meltham and the boundary of the Peak District National Park. These open areas contribute to the immediate setting of the national park and are recognised for the role they play in maintaining landscape character beyond the boundary of the national park. The green belt in this location therefore plays an important role in maintaining this openness by protecting the areas from the encroachment of built form. In addition, this site does not follow any boundary on its southern edge so could not create a new defensible green belt boundary without significant additional land release.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>			
H622 Land west of, Burn Road, Birchencliffe DLP_RSO1564	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>Support rejection of site.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is a rejected housing option. The site is part of a larger accepted housing option.</p> <p>Support for site rejection noted.</p>			
H624 Land north of, Lindley Moor Road, Outlane No Representations received	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is a rejected housing option. 0.396ha removed from the net developable area due to pylons on site. The site is site subject to unacceptable levels of noise due to its proximity to the M62.</p>			
H625 Land north west of, Primrose Lane, Liversedge No Representations received	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
	<p>No Change</p> <p>This site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation within the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The reasons for rejecting the site are: It is a very poorly configured site with no relationship to the settlement. Development would impact on the strategic nature of the green belt in an already restricted area and effectively join Liversedge to Cleckheaton along the Spen Valley greenway contrary to the purposes of including land in the</p>			

Summary of comments

Council Response

	<p>green belt. The configuration could leave adjacent areas vulnerable to encroachment and there are areas where the potential new boundary does not follow a strong feature on the ground.</p> <p>Further insufficient evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the site could be satisfactorily accessed without considerable third party land.</p>								
<p>H627 Land west of, High Road, Earlsheaton, Dewsbury</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Support</th> <th>Conditional Support</th> <th>Object</th> <th>No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>No change</p> <p>The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site access is not achievable. It is a steep site and the site topography (sloping down from road) would make access difficult from High Road. Access on to Wakefield Road would be too close to junction with High Road. In addition, the site is in an Air Quality Management Area and road traffic noise may affect new receptors. A buffer to Wakefield Road is needed due to noise and air quality.</p> <p>No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment				
Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment						
<p>H628 The north of, POL, Huddersfield Road, Meltham</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Support</th> <th>Conditional Support</th> <th>Object</th> <th>No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Development of housing here would be isolated from other residential development because of employment use to the south, south east and Green Belt on other sides of the development. Beck and woodland are UK BAP priority habitat, any development would be required to minimise disturbance to neighbouring habitats. Site access would require third party land to improve visibility and reduced traffic speeds on Huddersfield Road in this location. There is little prospect of third party land being acquired to achieve visibility splays and therefore for a deliverable housing site.</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment				
Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment						
<p>H629 Land east of, Netherton Moor Road, Netherton DLP_RSO3369, DLP_RSO4821</p> <p>Conclusions on the SA conflict with site specific environmental health concerns.</p> <p>Site promoter submitted master plan, landscape statement and transport appraisal. New site option generated to reflect changed boundaries to site.</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Support</th> <th>Conditional Support</th> <th>Object 2</th> <th>No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>This site is separated from the settlement of Netherton by open fields. Its removal from the green belt would create an isolated area of urban land uses surrounded by countryside which would undermine the role of the green belt which is to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Removing the fields between the site and Netherton would give the site a relationship with the settlement but would result in merger with properties at Magdale, contrary to the role and function of the green belt which is to prevent the merger of settlements.</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object 2	No Comment				
Support	Conditional Support	Object 2	No Comment						
<p>H630 Land to the south of, Lavender Court, Netherton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Support</th> <th>Conditional Support</th> <th>Object</th> <th>No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>No site access can be achieved. Development of this site would result in a projection of built form that is poorly related to the settlement edge and which would encroach into the countryside to the detriment of the openness of the green belt.</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment				
Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment						

Summary of comments		Council Response				
H632	Land west of, Burn Road, Birchenscliffe DLP_RSO1565	Support	1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Support for rejection of site.		No change.				
		This site is a rejected housing option. Access can be achieved from Burn Road which is part adopted. However 2.4m x 43m (30mph speed limit) visibility splays cannot be achieved without 3rd party land. 0.17ha removed due to West Yorkshire Ecology comments relating to woodland. The site is covered by a larger accepted housing option.				
		Support for site rejection noted.				
H635	Land to the east of, Reservoir Side Road, Blackmoorfoot	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.				
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.				
		This site is isolated from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. Impacts on Habitats of Principal Importance and Species of Principal importance sufficient to reject this site option.				
H636	Land to the west of, Mill Lane, Flockton	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.				
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.				
		Third party land would be required for site to be accessed from adopted highway and it is not clear how access could be achieved to deliver housing during the plan period.				
H637	Land to the south east of, Tudor Street, Slaithwaite DLP_RSO4335, DLP_RSO4336, DLP_RSO4337, DLP_RSO4338, DLP_RSO4339	Support		Conditional Support	Object	5 No Comment
The site has willing landowners. New Site for Consideration received promoting the site, along with land to the west as a development option		No change				
Appropriate landscaping and design will be required to minimise impact on amenity of existing dwellings on Tudor Street and Stockerhead Lane.		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.				
		Access from Linfit Lane has significant highway safety issues. Only other alternative access would be in conjunction with neighbouring site.				
H639	Part of POL	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change				
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.				
		Site access is not achievable, no site frontage onto the adopted highway. Site is also within a middle hazard zone.				
H640	Land Adjacent, South Parade, Cleckheaton	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		Proposed Change				

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		<p>The site is proposed as an accepted housing allocation. This represents a change from the draft Local Plan (November 2015) where the site was rejected for housing.</p> <p>Site access achievable from South Parade, Westgate and Wallroyd Road. There are no significant constraints with the site which cannot be mitigated against at the planning application stage.</p>			
H641	Land north of, New Hey Road, Salendine Nook	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is a rejected housing option. 3rd party land is required to gain access to the site as there is no site frontage to the adopted highway.			
H642	Land south west of Calder Bank Mills, Calder Bank Road, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>76% of the site is in flood zone 3 with the remainder in flood zone 2. There is a risk of surface water ponding in the north east section. Public combined sewer running through the site and a public surface water sewer in Calder Bank Road. The site is near multiple industrial sources of noise and odour as well as the railway. It is not considered a suitable residential site.</p> <p>No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan</p>			
H643	Bank Bottom Mills, Mount Road, Marsden	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Mixed use development option has been accepted on the majority of the site.			
H644	Land between, 1102 and 1132, Bradford Road, Birstall	Support	20 Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>DLP_RSO109, DLP_RSO613, DLP_RSO617, DLP_RSO645, DLP_RSO682, DLP_RSO776, DLP_RSO1059, DLP_RSO1115, DLP_RSO1212, DLP_RSO1272, DLP_RSO1306, DLP_RSO1455, DLP_RSO1472, DLP_RSO2478, DLP_RSO4346, DLP_RSO4854, DLP_RSO4947, DLP_RSO4948, DLP_RSO4949, DLP_RSO5016</p> <p>Road congestion and road capacity issues including Bradford Road, Birstall Smithies Junction and the A62/A643 Coach and six junction.</p> <p>Accesses to Oakwell Country Park off Nutter lane (top and bottom and via Nova Lane should be maintained and Bridleway BAT/1/10.</p> <p>Road safety issues due to increase in number of cars.</p> <p>Acknowledge proposed improvements to Birstall Smithies junction and Tong Street but these will not mitigate against new development.</p> <p>Concerned about surface water drainage.</p> <p>Consider the land to be contaminated.</p> <p>Protect the natural environment.</p> <p>Biodiversity/wildlife and woodland impact - area acts as a feeder and refuge for wildlife onto Oakwell Country Park.</p> <p>Loss of trees.</p> <p>The setting and special character of historic towns should be preserved.</p> <p>School capacity insufficient.</p> <p>Health services/health provision insufficient.</p> <p>Protect public footpaths and bridleways for amenity, recreation, health and well-being purposes.</p> <p>Important to protect the site due to potential impact on wildlife and Oakwell Country Park.</p>		No change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		Preventing the consolidation of frontage development along Bradford Road helps to maintain the gap between Birstall and Gomersal. Development of the site would result in the loss of one of only two remaining gaps to the north of Bradford Road. While local authorities should plan positively to improve damaged or derelict land in the green belt, this site has already been reclaimed and forms an attractive area of open land located within an important strategic gap.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Important green open frontage along road.

Poor ground quality resulting from previous mining.

Loss of green belt unacceptable as it would lead to merging, urban sprawl and the countryside should be protected from encroachment.

Brownfield land should be developed first if required.

Green belt corridor would be severed if development went ahead.

The area has taken too much development in the past which has impacted on the green belt and the quality of the area.

Concerned about development in Bradford and Leeds and impact on the area.

Support rejection of the site as it should remain in green belt.

Area should be protected for future generations.

The land has previously been refused for development.

H645 Land at, Three Valleys, Cold Hill Lane, New Mill

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

Coldhill Lane is narrow and is unsuitable for further intensification. No access from Huddersfield Road due to topography.

H646 Land to the south of, 10, Low House Fold, Hightown

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

This site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

The site has been rejected on the grounds that it does not front an adopted highway. Third party land is required to achieve access. No evidence has been provided that the site is deliverable or developable during the local plan period. There is however, a reasonable prospect that the constraints on this site could be overcome to allow the delivery of new homes beyond the end of the local plan period and for this reason a safeguarded land option (SL2181) covering a larger area is proposed as an accepted allocation.

H647 Land Adjacent, Tong Moor Side, East Bierley

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Site access is unachievable. There is no site frontage onto the adopted highway. Site is accepted as safeguarded land (SL2202)

H648 Land to the north east of Ossett Lane, Earlsheaton, Dewsbury

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

This site overlaps an accepted housing site.

No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H649	Land north of, Kitson Hill Road, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO1292					
Site has excellent transport links and is better located to the proposed employment allocations than alternative sites Site is not at risk of flooding unlike H40.		No Change			
Only Red traffic light score relates to site within green belt. The green belt needs to be reviewed to meet future housing need. The site represents a logical extension to the urban area without undermining any of the purposes of the green belt. Site is available and achievable. Mirfield is one of Kirklees larger settlements in a very sustainable location. Mirfield should provide more housing due to location and service provision.		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This is an extensive site which is poorly configured in relation to the area of settlement it adjoins and would isolate the group of buildings in its centre from the wider green belt. The site is bisected by a tract of trees which effectively separates the two halves of the site. The option would also leave land between the eastern edge of the site and the settlement somewhat isolated from the wider green belt.			
H650	Land north west of, Pond Lane, Lepton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This option is poorly related to the existing settlement form and would result in an extension of built form into the wider countryside to the detriment of openness and contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			
H651	Land at, Cliff Hollins Lane, Oakenshaw	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		This site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It forms a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		This site is unrelated to any settlement in Kirklees, although it appears as an area of urban fringe where there are a number of residential properties and associated buildings already present in the green belt. It borders with Bradford but is physically separated from the existing residential area by High Royd Beck and its treed edges, as well as by a significant change in levels. Development on Cliff Hollins Lane would be elevated and very prominent in views from Bradford to the detriment of openness. Development would sever High Royd Beck and its associated important wildlife habitats from their wider setting and leaving a buffer with the watercourse would give development a very poor relationship with any settlement.			
		Development would affect the setting of High Royd Beck which is a priority habitat, the best protection for which is its green belt designation.			
H653	Land north of, Kitson Hill Road, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO1365					
Site has excellent transport links and is better located to the proposed employment allocations than alternative sites. Site is not at risk of flooding unlike H40.		No Change			
Only Red traffic light score relates to site within green belt. The green belt needs to be reviewed to meet future housing need. The site represents a logical extension to the urban area without undermining any of the purposes of the green belt. Site is available and achievable. Mirfield is one of Kirklees larger settlements in a very sustainable location. Mirfield should provide more housing due to location and service provision.		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The option as presented does not follow any existing feature on the ground along much of its northern boundary and in addition bisects a tract of trees. Its eastern extent would leave land between the site and the settlement edge somewhat cut off from the wider green belt and therefore vulnerable to encroachment contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			
H654	Land north east of, Tenter Hill Road, Thongsbridge, Holmfirth,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response				
	This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.				
	Site part of accepted housing option H729.				
H655	Land to the west of, New Mill Road, Brockholes	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No change				
	This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.				
	Allocation of this site would result in the merger of Brockholes and Thongsbridge and so severely undermine the role and function of the green belt in this area. The site contains priority habitats that are best protected by their green belt designation. New Mill Dike and associated woodland are both UK BAP priority habitats				
H656	Land to the south of Ouzelwell Lane, Thornhill Lees, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No change				
	The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.				
	The site has been rejected on the basis that it is included in a larger strategic site option and as such has been rejected as a potential allocation. In addition, there is no site frontage to the adopted highway hence third party land is required. Potential access possible from Ouzelwell Lane, however, there is limit of adoption on Ouzelwell Lane adjacent to Plot 84. Beyond this point Ouzelwell Lane is unadopted.				
	No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.				
H657	Land south of, Ouzewell Lane, Thornhill Lees, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No Change				
	The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.				
	The site has been rejected on the basis that it is included in a larger strategic site option and as such has been rejected as a potential allocation. In addition, the site would require two access points for a development of this scale. No site frontage to the adopted highway hence third party land is required. Potential access possible from Ouzelwell Lane and King Edward Street. The limit of adoption on Ouzelwell Lane is adjacent to Plot 84. Beyond this point Ouzelwell Lane is unadopted. Access from King Edward Street could be achieved were the site to be developed along with land to the north of the site.				
	No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.				
H658	Land to the east of, Moorland Close, Linthwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO3888	No change				
The landowner has submitted a different site boundary to this - and one that is part of a wider selection of sites, with the intention of creating a defendable green belt boundary. This option will be assessed independently.	This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.				
	This is an prominent hillside at a significantly higher level than the residential area it abuts. Development would be highly visible in long distance views to the significant detriment of the openness of the green belt. Access is achievable from Heath Road, though this road is unsuitable for further intensification. Third party land would be required for widening this road and improving the junction with Blackmoorfoot Road.				

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H661	Land to the east of High Street, Batley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change.			
		The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Part of the northern boundary of the site does not present a strong defendable green belt boundary. A newly proposed accepted housing site H661a overlaps the majority of this site and has a strong green belt boundary.			
		No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.			
H663	Spennithorne Trading Estate, Spennithorne Lane, Gomersal DLP_RSO1169, DLP_RSO1232, DLP_RSO1958, DLP_RSO2023, DLP_RSO2032	Support	Conditional Support	Object 5	No Comment
It is a sustainable location with easy pedestrian access along the council owned viaduct bridgeway which could be improved as part of planning gain.		No Change			
Road safety - currently HGVs frequently access the site causing traffic nuisance problems and safety issues.		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
The site was previously rejected for housing in 2005 (2004/60/94774) on highway grounds but consider this could be overcome		This site lies within a reasonably extensive area of green belt that forms a strategic gap between Cleckheaton and Gomersal. It is unrelated to Cleckheaton being separated from it by the line of the former railway so would require a significant amount of additional land release to create a sensible settlement extension. Its removal from the green belt in isolation would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The site is occupied by a large industrial building and national planning guidance states that the redevelopment of such can be acceptable in the green belt subject to consideration of openness.			
Brownfield sites should be developed before green belt land. H663 is a Brownfield site and has been rejected. This should be developed before H591 is considered.					
Spennithorne Valley Civic Society strongly opposes the development of green belt sites on principle, but in this case the site comprises one massive transport warehouse, which is over 100 metres in length and approximately 14 metres tall. It is in a dilapidated state and is a real blot on the landscape, being visible right across the Spennithorne Valley. The building sits on a former rail bed and sidings, and the land includes the site of the London & NW Railway Company's Cleckheaton Spennithorne station. The site is therefore Brownfield within the green belt. Development would be within an existing footprint and would not exceed the height of existing buildings so would not result in a detrimental impact on the openness of the green belt. Provision of housing on site would be less visibly intrusive than the out of date and obsolete warehousing.					
H665	Land to the north of, Longwood Gate, Longwood	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Site overlaps with accepted urban greenspace site.			
H666	Land off, Carlinghow Lane, Batley DLP_RSO2298	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Access can be achieved from Carlinghow Lane and/or Lea Road.		No Change			
With regard to significant impacts on the SRN or highway network, the site is well located to feed into key the key arterial Bradford and Leeds Roads (and M62 beyond), which have significant capacity to handle existing traffic from wide surrounding areas. A Transport Assessment will need to be undertaken to assess impact on junctions and mitigation measures.		This site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
Sustainable development close to public transport		This large site is located within a wedge of green belt that helps to separate the urban areas of Birstall and Batley and as such plays an important green belt role. It is acknowledged that there is existing development along Ealand Road as well as to the east of Bradford Road so the settlements are to some extent already joined. The green belt over washes the existing ribbon development on the east side of Smithies Moor Lane which cuts the area off from the wider green belt to the west. The site is considered sufficiently important in its			
The site is located close to the A62 where the council plans to invest in core road/public transport.					

Summary of comments

Site is within flood zone 1 so there is no risk of flooding.
Part of the site is derelict land so has low environmental value.

The site is used for grazing so no risk of contamination.

The development is surrounded by residential development so there would be no adverse impacts.
Ant trees on site can be incorporated into the development
The site is not in a conservation area and contains no listed buildings.
Carlinghow Princess Royal JI & N school adjoins the eastern boundary of the site, allowing easy access to education.

The only key Green Belt purpose referred to by the Council when rejecting a boundary change in this location is that the land currently prevents two neighbouring towns from merging. However, the two settlements have already merged through a 300/ 500m wide area of development along Bradford Road corridor. The Council's logic to safeguard this land therefore involves imagining that this breach of the Green Belt, currently joining the two urban areas, doesn't exist. The physical link to the wider Green Belt has effectively been cut-off by the development on Smithies Moor Lane. The land consequently no longer functions as a contiguous part of the wider Kirklees Green Belt and the essential characteristic of openness has been lost.

Disagree with council green belt assessment. Carlinghow forms part of a wider urban mass containing Batley, Dewsbury, Heckmondwike and Liversedge. It is not a separate, distinct settlement.

Green belt surrounding Birstall has already been breached by development along Bradford Road corridor.

The site has firm defensible boundaries.

Release of this site from the green belt for housing would contribute to the council's targets.
The site is gently undulating and would not make development unviable.
The site is in single ownership and available for development.
The site forms an urban extension capable of development in accordance with the council's development strategy.
The site would make a significant contribution towards the council's housing requirement.

Development of this site would be infill.

The site has firm, defensible boundaries.

The site is accessible to local employment.

The proposal can make a contribution towards meeting affordable housing needs.

H667 Land at, 29, Miry Lane, Thongsbridge
DLP_RSO123

Green belt boundary at site H727 should be amended to access road of the cricket ground to allow development of H667.

H668 Land to the South of, 547 - 583, New Hey Road, Mount
DLP_RSO4641

Rejection of housing option is supported.

Council Response

role to warrant retention of the green belt designation which prevents reinforcement of the ribbon development and maintains a lack of depth to development along Smithies Moor Lane. Any sense or glimpse of open land to the rear of these properties does at least give the impression of the movement from one settlement to another which is important in retaining the sense of Birstall as a separate settlement. The site is also at a higher level than most of the surrounding areas and so could be intrusive in views to the detriment of the openness of the green belt.

Additionally, a minimum of two accesses are required for a development of this scale. The 180 metre site frontage along Carlinghow Lane is a sufficient length to provide two access points. However, due to size of site, these two access points located in such close proximity would be insufficient to serve the remainder of the site. No other points of access are achievable due to the site being land locked.

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

This site is part of a new larger accepted housing option H727a. Site H727a includes land currently in the green belt to the west of H727.

Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change.

Summary of comments

Council Response

<p>H670 Land to the north east of, Pavillion Way, Meltham</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>This is a well contained site where the track and properties at Upper Hirst and Ray Gate could present a new green belt boundary. The site is located on Longwood Edge where the steep slopes make development very prominent in long distance views. However, part of the site is situated between the properties fronting New Hey Road and the properties at Ray Gate and so could appear as infill. The western and southern extent would begin to merge the historically separate groups of properties at Upper Hirst and Lower Hirst. Third party land required to achieve access, no frontage to highway and not obvious where access could be drawn from.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p> <p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Part of this development option is within the settlement but most projects beyond the settlement edge into open countryside. This would be a prominent extension poorly related to the edge of Meltham and would result in encroachment into the countryside to the detriment of the openness of the green belt.</p> <p>No draft Local Plan consultation comments received</p>
<p>H671 Land to the north west of, Highfield Crescent, Meltham</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>This site is poorly related to the settlement edge and would appear as an encroachment of built form into the countryside to the detriment of openness and contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. No suitable access available.</p> <p>No draft Local Plan consultation comments received</p>
<p>H672 Sunny Bank Farm, Whitehall Road East, Birkenshaw DLP_RSO2842, DLP_RSO3342, DLP_RSO4895, DLP_RSO4896, DLP_RSO4897</p> <p>Support rejection of site on road capacity and congestion grounds. Acknowledge proposed transport improvements at Birstall Smithies junction and Tong Street but these will not mitigate against the impact of new development.</p> <p>Support rejection of this site as its development would contribute to congestion on the A58 and A650 (Leeds City Council). There is no justification for a negative impact to be recorded in the SA under SA5 Amenity. A noise survey has been undertaken which considers that noise levels are acceptable. There is no justification for a negative impact to be recorded in the SA under SA14 Biodiversity and geology</p> <p>The site should remain in the green belt.</p> <p>Support rejection of this site as its development would completely close the Green Belt gap between Birkenshaw and Drighlington (Leeds City Council). The site is suitable, available, achievable and deliverable for development. It is considered that this site performs better than other sites identified for housing within the Local Plan. The area has already been subject to a high level of development which has already had an impact on the green belt and the quality of the area. Concerned about the impact of development in Bradford and Leeds on the area.</p>	<p>Support 4 Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>This site lies within the boundary and/or within the setting of the Registered Battlefield at Adwalton. Historic England has objected to this option. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. National planning policy confirms that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. This option could lead to substantial harm to the registered battlefield and the inclusion of the site option in the plan is not justified.</p> <p>The site lies within an important strategic gap separating Kirklees and Leeds. The A650 prevents any physical merger but the site would effectively be a major extension of Adwalton/Drighlington. The extent of the site would undermine the role and function of the green belt as it would leave only a narrow strip of green belt performing an important strategic role, development would appear unrelated to any settlement in Kirklees, would sprawl down the slope and result in encroachment into the countryside.</p>

Summary of comments

Object to the site not being allocated for housing development.

The assessment of the site against the Sustainability appraisal - SA5 Amenity, SA10 Sustainable Transport, SA11 Efficient use of land, SA12 Landscape, SA14 Biodiversity and geodiversity and SA19 climate change is not correct and the site out performs other Local Plan identified sites.

Objection is made to the SA and Green belt review assessment.

H673 Land north of, Church Lane, Gomersal
 DLP_RSO547, DLP_RSO787, DLP_RSO1126, DLP_RSO1187, DLP_RSO1215, DLP_RSO1221, DLP_RSO1298, DLP_RSO1463, DLP_RSO4926, DLP_RSO4927, DLP_RSO4928, DLP_RSO5019

Support rejection of the site on road capacity and road congestion grounds. Acknowledge proposed improvements but these will not mitigate against the impact of new development.
 It is a habitat for a whole range of wildlife including bats, herons, owls, pheasants, foxes, rabbits, squirrels, badgers, deer, etc
 The protection of the site will help protect Oakwell Country park and other local historic buildings to maintain the wonderful mix of natural and historic environments.
 School capacity is insufficient.
 Protect the site from development in order to keep the network of public footpaths and bridleways which are all well used locally in Gomersal by people wanting to walk and enjoy the fields trees and wildlife.
 Kirklees promotes health and well being and these are all ways of providing open spaces for people to enjoy and have healthy lifestyles.

Health services/provision is insufficient.

Support the retention of the area within the green belt in order to prevent urban sprawl.
 There is a lack of infrastructure to support development.
 Poor ground quality from previous mining.
 The area has already been subject to significant development in the past which has had an impact on the greenbelt and the quality of the area.

Development should take place on Brownfield land.

Concerned about the impact of development in Bradford and Leeds on the area.
 The rejection of the site will protect it for future generations.

H674 Land at, Fieldhead Farm, White Lee Road, Batley
 DLP_RSO1623

Site should not be allocated as UGS. Site is not semi-natural greenspace. It is in private ownership and is agricultural

Council Response

Additionally, the site is near a DEFRA area of poor air quality.

Support	12	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Change				
This site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).				
This site is located within a restricted area of green belt that performs the strategic role of separating Gomersal from Birstall. Although development of the site itself would have little impact on this strategic role, it could not be released in isolation, and releasing other land to create a strong defensible new green belt boundary and to make the development relate to the existing settlement pattern would begin to impact on the strategic role of the green belt. There is no clear boundary to the north where the site meets Church Wood.				
Additionally, site access not achievable without significant third party land.				
The supporting comments for its rejection are noted.				

Support	Conditional Support	Object	1	No Comment
No Change				
The site is proposed as rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).				
The reason for rejection is that the site is proposed to be allocated as part of a wider Urban Greenspace.				
This site has value as open space in its own right and as part of the wider urban green space allocation UGS973. An extensive and attractive area of mainly agricultural grazing land covering the western half of UGS973, assessed as natural and semi-natural greenspace having high value as open space based on its structural and landscape qualities and its significant contribution to the amenity of the area and sense of place, as well as use and enjoyment for informal recreation along the public footpath network.				
The site itself is as an integral and important part of the wider open space that can be viewed from different vantage points and plays a valuable role in giving an open aspect from White Lee Road. UGS973 is not deemed, in whole or part, to be clearly surplus to requirements. The loss of the value of the Urban Greenspace is considered to outweigh all other material considerations, including the delivery of housing.				

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H675	Brownhill Farm Hilltop Farm and land east of Old Lane, Old Lane, Birkenshaw DLP_RSO3310, DLP_RSO3343, DLP_RSO4889, DLP_RSO4890, DLP_RSO4891, DLP_RSO4984	Support 4	Conditional Support	Object 2	No Comment
<p>Support the rejection of the site on road capacity and road congestion grounds. Acknowledge proposed road improvements but these will not mitigate against the impact of new development.</p> <p>Support rejection of the site as it would add to congestion on the A58 and A650 (Leeds City Council).</p> <p>The site should be retained as green belt.</p> <p>Support rejection of the site as it would completely close the Green Belt gap between Birkenshaw and Drighlington (Leeds City Council).</p> <p>Object to the non allocation of the site as it is highly sustainable and would make a strong future green belt boundary. The area has been the subject of previous development which has had an impact on the green belt and the quality of the area.</p> <p>Concerned about the impact of development in Bradford and Leeds on the area. Objection is raised to the dependency on two large allocations H1747 and H2089 which cannot be delivered in the plan timescales.</p> <p>Objection is raised to the non allocation of this site as it is highly sustainable and has a strong green belt boundary</p>		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>This site lies within the boundary and/or within the setting of the Registered Battlefield at Adwalton. Historic England has objected to this option. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. National planning policy confirms that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. This option could lead to substantial harm to the registered battlefield and the inclusion of the site option in the plan is not justified.</p> <p>The configuration and extent of this site would result in an unsatisfactory settlement extension which would leave only a very narrow gap between the built form of Birkenshaw and Adwalton/Drighlington in Leeds, contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. It would leave isolated pockets of land cut off from the wider green belt and significantly encroach into the countryside. Part of the site option, associated with Hill Top Farm, does not follow any feature on the ground. The area includes the registered battlefield of Adwalton Moor the site of which is best protected through its green belt designation.</p> <p>The support for the rejection of the site is noted.</p>			
H676	Land off, Woodhead Road, Honley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Site forms part of the larger accepted housing option H129.</p>			
H677	Land West of, Hall Bower Lane, Hall Bower DLP_RSO753, DLP_RSO3381, DLP_RSO3548	Support 3	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>Road access to the site is limited. Existing houses do not have garages and on street parking is an issue. Support rejection of site to protect the setting of Castle Hill Ancient Monument.</p> <p>Support rejection of site to preserve its green belt status. Support rejection of site to preserve setting of Hall Bower. A recent planning application No. 2015/92129 Land between 5 & 37 Hall Bower Lane which was to build on part of this site was rejected and rejected after appeal because it would have detrimental effect on the openness of the green belt. Development of the 1.7 hectares included in this site would have an even greater effect on the green belt.</p>		<p>No change.</p> <p>This site is a rejected housing option.</p> <p>The site is semi-improved acid grassland on sloping ground, likely to be UK BAP priority habitat near Castle Hill. West Yorkshire Ecology recommend removing the whole site. The site is a large site closely associated with the settlement of Hall Bower. The Local Plan strategy does not include the removal of Hall Bower from the green belt and the site would not represent infill for the purposes of national planning policy. Development would result in encroachment into the countryside to the significant detriment of openness. In addition the site lies in close proximity to Castle Hill, the setting of which is best protected through the green belt designation.</p> <p>Support for rejection of the site noted.</p>			
H678	Land west of, Gillroyd Lane, Linthwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Part of H712, an accepted housing option. Site has no highway frontage.</p>			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H679	Land off, Penistone Road, Shepley DLP_RSO324, DLP_RSO469, DLP_RSO516, DLP_RSO985	Support 4	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>Impact on local highway network Impact on drainage / sewerage infrastructure and potential for increased surface water run-off following development of the site.</p> <p>Impact on character of the settlement. Should use Brownfield land first.</p>		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site sits within an extensive area of green belt that maintains separation between villages. Development would appear as an isolated intrusion of built form into this countryside setting which would significantly undermine the role and function of the green belt which is to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Release of the site would create an isolated area of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>			
H680	Land to the South of, Top Road, Lower Cumberworth DLP_RSO4676	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>Support for rejection of housing option.</p>		<p>No change.</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Removal of this site from the green belt would result in the coalescence of Lower Cumberworth and Denby Dale contrary to the role and function of the green belt.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>			
H681	Land east of, 175 - 195, Cumberworth Lane, Lower Cumberworth DLP_RSO4677	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>Support for rejection of housing option.</p>		<p>No change.</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>This option in its south eastern extent would represent a poorly configured and poorly related projection of built form into the countryside landscape of which this site is a part to the detriment of openness. Removal of the site from the green belt would also necessitate bringing within the settlement the historically isolated grouping of dwellings at 187 - 197 Cumberworth Road, which abut and therefore contain the site on the southern boundary. This would also bring within the settlement the Lower Cumberworth park and playground.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>			
H683	Land off, Greenside Road, Mirfield,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>No site frontage onto the adopted highway, third party land required.</p>			
H685	Land at, Wentworth Drive, Emley, Huddersfield, DLP_RSO1230, DLP_RSO4685	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment 1
<p>Support for rejection of the site, along with smaller accepted option H358 - which is within site boundary.</p>		<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p>			

Summary of comments		Council Response				
		Site is overlapped by accepted housing option H358				
H686	Land to the South West of, Manor House Farm, Wakefield Road, Clayton West	Support	1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO1452						
Should use Brownfield land first.		No change				
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.				
		Site overlaps with other housing options.				
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.				
H687	Land to the South of, Huddersfield Road, Skelmanthorpe	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change				
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.				
		This forms part of the larger accepted housing option H502.				
H691	Land to the south of, Hartcliffe Mills, Barnsley Road, Denby Dale	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change				
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.				
		Site rejected, the location adjacent to Hartcliffe Mills would not be likely to yield a deliverable housing site. The site could potentially meet future needs of the company to the north of the site.				
H692	Land to the East of, Far Bank, Shelley, Huddersfield,	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.				
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.				
		Significant third party land required for access. Insufficient road frontage to gain access from Far Bank. Access could be achieved using a number of options to the east but these have been rejected for housing. Lack of evidence that access can be achieved to ensure a deliverable or developable site.				
H693	Land Adjacent, Westfield Road, Heckmondwike	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change to site option.				
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.				
		This site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.				
		No suitable site access can be achieved to this site option. This site is a council owned allotment site and has been designated as an Urban Greenspace option UGS848.				
H694	Land Adjacent, Norristhorpe Lane, Norristhorpe	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change				

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Third party land is required to achieve access.</p> <p>This site has been allocated as a accepted safeguarded land option (SL2175)</p>			
H695	Land to the rear of, Westgate, Almondbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>There are issues relating to potential site access. Third party land maybe required from no.1 and no.2. Helted Way. Third party land required to make up Broken Cross to an adoptable standard and also improve the junction with Kaye Lane.</p>			
H696	Land to the rear of, Greenhead Lane, Dalton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>No suitable access can be achieved. This site has been allocated as safeguarded land as it is not deliverable or developable during the Local Plan period. There is a reasonable prospect that the constraints on this site could be overcome to allow the delivery of new homes beyond the end of the Local Plan period.</p>			
H697	Land East of, UDP POL, Calder Drive, Newsome	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Part of the site contains well used allotments. This part of the site has been retained as Urban Greenspace. The remainder of the site is now part of accepted site option H1728a.</p> <p>No representations have been received on this site option.</p>			
H698	Land west of, Blagden Lane, Taylor Hill	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is a rejected housing option. This site is covered by a larger accepted housing option.			
H699	Land adjacent, Blackmoorfoot Road, Crosland Moor	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The site forms part of a wider accepted mixed use option MX1930.</p>			
H700	Land adjacent, Thewlis Lane, Crosland Moor	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		This site is a rejected housing option. 4.26 ha removed from net developable area due to presence of UK BAP priority habitat. The southern portion of the site is an accepted Urban Greenspace option, the northern part of the site is covered by a larger accepted housing option.			
H702	South of, Swallow Lane, Golcar	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		This site overlaps with accepted housing option H549			
H704	Land to the South of, Vicarage Road, Longwood	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		The site overlaps with accepted housing option H633			
H705	Land west of, Halifax Road, Birchencliffe	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is a rejected housing option. 0.184ha removed for pylon on site. Road traffic noise would affect the eastern portion of the site. The configuration of the eastern portion of the site is unlikely to allow viable development alongside the need to achieve access from the west past the existing pylon.			
H707	Land North of, New Hey Road, Salendine Nook	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is a rejected housing option. 3rd party land required for site access. No site frontage to the adopted highway.			
H709	Land to south and south east of, 17 - 43, Farfield Court, Hightown	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. It formed a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site has been rejected on the grounds that it does not front an adopted highway. Third party land is required to achieve access. No evidence has been provided that the site is deliverable or developable during the local plan period. There is however, a reasonable prospect that the constraints on this site could be overcome to allow the delivery of new homes beyond the end of the local plan period and for this reason a safeguarded land option (SL2181) is proposed as an accepted allocation.			
H710	Land to the West of, Back Lane, Grange Moor	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Site access not achievable.No site frontage to the adopted highway. No suitable site access layout can be achieved to serve the additional dwellings. Pond and lowland mixed deciduous woodland within the site.			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.			
H711	Land south-west of, Tudor Street, Slaithwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Site has frontage to Linfit Lane, but this is unlikely to form a safe access. Access from Stockerhead Lane may be possible, but would require third party land and would have to take account of PROW			
H713	Land to the north of, Dirker Drive, Marsden	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		No site frontage to adopted highway. Spring Head Lane would need a significant upgrade to form a suitable access. Site is 630m from SPA / SAC / SSSI and is functionally linked land to this.			
H714	Land to the north of, Helme Lane, Meltham, Holmfirth,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Part of accepted housing option H343			
H716	Land west of, Hoyle Ing, Linthwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		No suitable site access can be achieved, the surrounding road network is unsuitable for the intensification of the use proposed. One area of access at Hoyle Beck Close is now under construction for housing.			
H717	Land to the north of, Lingards Road, Slaithwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Site part of wider housing option H356.			
H718	Land to the East of, Upper Clough Road, Linthwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Site overlaps with accepted housing options H213 and H1709			
H719	Land to the north of, Netherley Drive, Marsden	Support 2	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO789, DLP_RSO981, DLP_RSO1242					
The site has good public transport links.		No change			

Summary of comments

Access could be improved as the lease on the sub-station expires in 2022 and there is scope for the reduction in plot of the sub-station to improve site access.

Proposed site access is 5.5m wide with 1.5m footway

Junction to Netherley Drive would have 6m dropped radius kerbs provided

Sightlines from Netherley Drive to Mount Road are good.

In accordance with NPPF a 'hierarchical' review of SUDS options have been considered for the drainage of the proposed development

Based on the outfall options, it is considered that on site attenuation and storage be considered, prior to discharge at an agreed rate to the existing surface water public sewer.

An ecological study has been undertaken on the site as part of recent planning application.

The habitat types present are amenity grassland, buildings, hard standing, semi-improved grassland, standing water and wall. There are no trees on the site.

There are a number of designated nature conservation sites within 2km of this site; however, these sites have received these designations due to the presence of certain habitat types, particularly heath moorland, which does not extend into this site

The site is not situated within the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network and desktop study revealed that there are no records of protected species within the site.

The site is adjacent to rural moors that have Special Area of Conservation status

Bank Top is a Grade II listed building situated to the East of Mount Road. We do not believe that the proposals will have an adverse effect on Bank Top as it isn't visible from the development

The site should be re-classified as Green Belt

The site forms an integral part of the natural green hillside.

The site can be viewed from South Pennine Moors and Peak District National Park

Development would be contrary to local character and pattern of development.

Should use Brownfield land first - e.g. mills in Marsden

Council Response

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

Site is within 250m of South Pennine Moors SSSI / SAC / SPA. The site is functionally linked to this, via footpaths. The site is a grassland site which has the potential to offer suitable off-site feeding habitat for SPA and SSSI birds. . Third party land would be required to gain access to the site. Junction improvements also required. Potential impact on Grade II listed buildings at the Gate House, Old Mount Road.

The application withdrawn as would have been refused for highway, drainage and ecology issues. It is not considered that the site would form a deliverable development site.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

H720	Land to the north of, 145 - 157, Mill Moor Road, Meltham	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO407					
	Traffic congestion - inadequate road infrastructure Impact on flooding - increased run-off from hills Impact on wildlife	No change			
			This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.		
			The site overlaps with accepted housing option H342		
			The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.		
H721	Land to the West of, Huddersfield Road, Meltham, Holmfirth,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
			This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.		
			The site is overlapped by accepted housing and employment sites.		
H722	Land to the West of, Robert Lane, Wooldale, Holmfirth	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Impact on Grade II listed church to the south and Wooldale Conservation Area. The site is accepted as a safeguarded land option.			
H723	Land to the South of, Upperthong Lane, Upperthong, Holmfirth,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Most of this site is covered by an accepted housing option (H284) which presents a more acceptable site boundary due to the change in levels on this site between the northern and southern sections.			
H724	Land to the west of, Laith Avenue, Holmbridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Direct access to site is achievable from Laithe Avenue however, the local highway network is considered to be unsuitable for a proposed intensification of use of this scale.			
H725	Land to the North of, Laithe Avenue, Holmbridge, Holmfirth,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Dobb Top Lane is narrow and steep and unsuitable for any intensification of use. Lack of evidence to show that sufficient access and visibility splays can be achieved to Laithe Avenue.			
H726	Land to the West of, Huddersfield Road, Thongsbridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO1291		No change.			
The site has a willing landowner and is available for development, with the owner in discussions with a house builder.		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Current access from Huddersfield Road unsuitable. Suitable access could be achieved through adjoining extensive options in the green belt but these have been rejected.			
		The council are aware that there is a willing landowner if this site was to be deemed suitable for housing.			
H731	Land at, Cold Hill Lane and Huddersfield Road, New Mill, Holmfirth,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Coldhill Lane is narrow and is unsuitable for further intensification. No access from Huddersfield Road due to topography.			
H732	Land to the West of, Cliff Road, Holmfirth	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment

Summary of comments		Council Response			
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Local highway network considered unsuitable for a development of this scale.			
H733	Land to the North of, Kemps Way, Hepworth, Holmfirth,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected. Note that this site forms part of a newly accepted mixed use option (MX1912a).			
		No site frontage to adopted highway. Access road to Dobroyd Mills could provide access but would require 3rd party land which appears to be in multiple ownerships and improvements are needed to bring site to adoptable standard. There is therefore not sufficient evidence that this site is deliverable. However, a larger option (MX1912a) also including land to the north has overcome the access constraints on this site.			
H735	Land to the north of, Knareborough Drive, Cowcliffe	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Site access is unachievable due to the retention of the bowling green. This site has been allocated as a safeguarded land option as it is not considered developable during the Local Plan period.			
H736	Land Adjacent, Bradley Mills Road, Rawthorpe	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The site falls within a HSE inner zone and a BAP priority habitat covers over 2ha of the site. The southern boundary adjoins Netherhall Barn which is an Ancient Scheduled Monument.			
H739	Land between, 43 - 57, Barnsley Road, Flockton, Wakefield,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site was proposed as a rejected housing option in the draft local plan (November 2015) and remains rejected. However, it forms part of the accepted housing option H583.			
		This site has been rejected as it is part of the larger accepted housing option H583. Site access achievable. Further surface water investigation will be required.			
		No comments received on this site in the draft local plan consultation.			
H740	Land to South of, Burton Acres Lane, Highburton, Huddersfield,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site was rejected as a housing option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) and remains rejected as there is an accepted housing option (H313) with a similar boundary on this land.			
		Site rejected because a similar option has been accepted on this land (H313) which excludes existing dwellings			

Summary of comments	Council Response			
	<p>around the site edge. This site is mostly surrounded by development and has limited constraints to development. Site access is achievable but limited surface water flooding to be addressed and impacts on the adjacent Kirkburton Conservation Area. A heritage impact assessment would be required.</p> <p>No draft Local Plan consultation comments received on this option.</p>			
<p>H741 Land to the West of, Turnshaw Road, Kirkburton, Huddersfield,</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>The site includes a small element of green space.</p> <p>Support for rejection of the site.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Lowland mixed deciduous woodland / TPOs on site. It would be difficult for the site to be developed / access to be gained because of the TPO trees.</p>			
<p>H742 Land at, Manor House Farm, The Village, Thurstonland, Huddersfield, DLP_RSO1075, DLP_RSO1820, DLP_RSO4695</p> <p>The site includes a small element of green space.</p>	Support 3	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>Support for rejection of the site.</p>	<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>Site part of larger housing option H1774.</p>			
<p>H743 Land to the south east of, 76 - 78, Town Moor, Thurstonland DLP_RSO1039, DLP_RSO1224, DLP_RSO1798, DLP_RSO1821, DLP_RSO2849</p> <p>Traffic congestion.</p> <p>Highway safety issues Site drainage issues Village school at capacity</p> <p>Water supply constraints.</p>	Support 5	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
	<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>No site frontage to adopted highway. Lowland mixed deciduous woodland accounts for 0.1 hectare of the site. Removing this from the net area would result in a site area that is below 0.4 hectares.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>			
<p>H744 Land off, Upper Batley Lane, Batley</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
	<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site access is not achievable for this site option.</p> <p>This site is not deliverable or developable during the Local Plan period. There is a reasonable prospect that the constraints on this site could be overcome to allow the delivery of new homes beyond the end of the Local Plan period.</p>			
<p>H745 Land Adjacent, Whitechapel Road, Cleckheaton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
	<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site access is not achievable for this site option. Site option has been incorporated into H508.</p>			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H746	Land west of, Heckmondwike Road, Dewsbury Moor, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The site lies within HSE hazardous installation zones (Inner, Middle and Outer), close to an existing industrial complex.</p> <p>No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.</p>			
H747	Land east of, Heckmondwike Road, Dewsbury Moor	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		<p>The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The site has been rejected on the basis that it overlies proposed accepted housing site option H1660 and as such has been rejected as a potential allocation.</p> <p>No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.</p>			
H748	Land to the west of Low Road, Earlsheaton, Dewsbury,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		<p>The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site access is not achievable. There is no adequate site frontage on to public highway to form suitable access for this number of dwellings. Steep site topography and retaining walls make forming any access unlikely.</p> <p>Although Middle Road is in the southern part of the site, it is not an acceptable access due to sub-standard junction, geometry and width. The site is adjacent to a number of existing industrial noise and odour sources and on a landfill site. It is also near an existing area of poor air quality. It is considered that the number and magnitude of barriers to development are insurmountable.</p> <p>No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.</p>			
H749	Land to the south of, Tolson Street, Chickenley, Dewsbury, DLP_RS0872	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Supports rejection. Access to this site and the adjacent site H477 would appear difficult, especially considering a combined site capacity of 127 dwellings. Wakefield Council		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>No suitable site access can be achieved. There is no site frontage onto a public highway.</p> <p>Support for rejection noted.</p>			
H750	Land between, Lees Hall Road and Ravensthorpe Road, Thornhill Lees, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment

Summary of comments

Council Response

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The site has no site frontage on to Ravensthorpe Road. Access can be achieved from Lees Hall Road, which is registered as adopted, however appears to be unadopted / private in the vicinity of the site frontage. 3rd party land may be required to make road up to adoptable standard along the site frontage and 100m leading up to the site.

No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.

H751 land to the south of, Lees Hall Road, Thornhill Lees, Dewsbury,

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The site has been rejected on the basis that it is included in a larger strategic site option and as such has been rejected as a potential allocation.

No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.

H752 Land Adjacent, Tong Moor Side, East Bierley

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Site access is not achievable. There is no site frontage onto the adopted highway. This site has been accepted as a safeguarded land option (SL2202)

H753 Land Adjacent, Wyke Lane, Oakenshaw

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Site access can be achieved, however the site is located within a HSE middle zone at this current time. Site is accepted as safeguarded land option, SL2203.

H757 Land to the rear, Bradley Road, Bradley

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

This site was rejected as it forms part of larger accepted option H1747.

H759 Land Adjacent, Common Road, Staincliffe

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

DLP_RSO2852

No change.

Summary of comments

Council Response

Indicative master plan submitted by site promoter. Site should be retained as a housing allocation as per UDP and should not be allocated as SL2275.

This site was a rejected housing option in the Draft Local Plan (November 2015). Following consultation this option is to remain as a rejected housing site for the following reason:

This site option is in two ownerships. Land to the east is owned by Kirklees Council who are not a willing land owner for either housing or safeguarded land. The remainder of the site - land to the west - is less than 0.4 ha and therefore too small to be included as an allocation. Site to become unallocated.

H765 Land adjacent, Bourn View Road, Netherton

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The intensification of Bourne View Road and its junction with Delph Lane would impact negatively on highways safety in the area.

H769 Land to the south of Providence Street, Dewsbury

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change

The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The site has been rejected on the basis that it overlies proposed accepted housing site H2148.

No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.

H770 Land to the west of Hollinroyd Road, Dewsbury

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change

The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The site requires 3rd party land for access which is possible via private road (Bank Street) and unadopted Hollinroyd Lane. Both would require making up to adoptable standards. However, the local highway network is poor therefore development is not acceptable.

No comments were received on this site in response to the draft local Plan.

H772 Land South of Ravensthorpe Road, Thornhill Lees, Dewsbury

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change

The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The site has been rejected on the basis that it is included in a larger strategic site option and as such has been rejected as a potential allocation. In addition, access to the site requires 3rd party land. Two access points are required for a development of this scale. Access is possible onto Ravensthorpe Road from the western end of the site. 2.4m x 43m visibility splays are required. A second access can be achieved from an un-named road off Ravensthorpe Road which passes Ravenshall School. The limit of adoption on the un-named road is Ravenshall School. Beyond this point the road becomes a bridleway (DEW/94/10). Third party land would be

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		required to make the road upto adoptable standard.			
		No comments were received on this site in the response to the draft Local Plan.			
H773	Land west of, Hebble View, Savile Town, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The site is an adult football pitch which is currently unused. The Playing Pitch Strategy recommends protection of the playing pitch due to current shortfalls in playing pitches in the area. It also recommends to explore reconfiguration of the pitch to provide for shortfalls in other pitch types.			
		No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.			
H774	Land to the east of Northstead, Ravensthorpe, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Canker Dyke runs along the north east boundary of the site and it is an Environment Agency main river. 62% of the site is in flood zone 3 and the remainder in flood zone 2. Although there are no surface water objections it could be a functional floodplain. In addition, part of the site is well used council allotments (not statutory) which are accepted as Urban GreenSpace.			
		No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.			
H775	Land to the south of Meadowbank, Dewsbury Moor, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Housing development on this site is largely complete and therefore allocation of this site is not justified.			
		No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan.			
H777	Land to the east of Burking Road, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO3113		No change			
Acceptable access could be achieved. Previously allocated and deemed suitable for residential development. No change in circumstances to justify removal from land supply.					
Flood Zone 1					
Site has not been developed, low risk of contamination. Not located in close proximity to any serious noise sources.					
Any health issue can be reasonably be mitigated.					
No further constraints. Appropriate layout to ensure no issues of overlooking or daylight.					
Site is suitable and available should be allocated.		The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Access points via Burking Road or Aston Manor are considered unsuitable due to their narrow road width and sub-standard visibility splays onto Boothroyd Lane. Third party land would be needed in order to achieve a suitable site access. Access via Chadwick Crescent is unsuitable as it is through an accepted Urban Greenspace allocation. Therefore the site has been rejected on access grounds. In addition, the accepted			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		housing allocations in the Draft Local Plan meet objectively assessed need.			
		School/Nursery noise may affect receptors therefore a noise assessment would be required. The site is on potentially contaminated land therefore a contamination assessment Phase 1 and 2 would be needed.			
		There are health issues within the ward which would require consideration and mitigation.			
H781	Land to the west of, Vicarage Road, Longwood	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Part of accepted housing option H633.			
H782	Land west of, St John's Road, Huddersfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is a rejected housing option. The site is covered by an accepted Urban Greenspace option.			
H788	Land to the North of, 1-8, The Green, Thurstonland DLP_RSO1076, DLP_RSO1819, DLP_RSO4694	Support 3	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Traffic congestion.		No change			
Highway safety issues Site drainage issues Village school at capacity		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
Water supply constraints.		Site part of larger accepted housing option H1774.			
H791	Land to the east and south east of, 4 - 12, Lands Beck Way, Hightown	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The site was previously identified in the Unitray Development Plan and there are no constraints with the site. The site has been rejected on the basis that it forms part of a larger site allocation which extends to the south (H278) which has been accepted.			
H792	Land South of, Hopton Drive, Upper Hopton, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Site access not achievable. No site frontage to the adopted highway. Access not possible via two private drives from Jackroyd Lane.			
H793	Land to the west of, Hurst Lane, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Site access cannot be achieved. There is no site frontage onto the adopted highway.			
H797	Land Adjacent, Lockwood Scar, Lockwood	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change.			
		The site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site has Village Green status and contains well used allotments. The site should be retained as Urban Greenspace.			
		This site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
H799	Moor Croft Close, Off Old Bank Road, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		No site frontage onto an adopted highway. There are significant contaminated land issues, toxic industrial waste has been land filled.			
H800	Land east of, Greenside Road, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
H801	Land north of, Occupation Road, Lindley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is a rejected housing option. The site has limited site frontage to the adopted highway (Occupation Road) hence third party land required. 2.4 x 43m visibility splays (30mph speed limit) not achievable without improvements to Occupation Road. Footway required on site side .Access possible via bridleway at the end of Talbot Avenue. This would need making up to adoptable standard which would require third party land. Presence of TPO trees prevents access onto Occupation Road. Ridgemount and Briarcourt either side of this area are a Grade II Listed Buildings. The loss of this area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of these buildings. This area lies within the Edgerton Conservation Area. The loss of this currently-open area and its subsequent development could harm elements which contribute to the significance of this area.			
H808	Land to the north of Greenfield Road, Holmfirth	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local			

Summary of comments	Council Response			
	<p>Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site access not achievable. There is no frontage to the adoptable highway and no evidence is available to show there is a reasonable prospect access could be achieved.</p>			
<p>H812 Long Lane, Dalton DLP_RSO5087</p> <p>The site is within 800m distance of local shops and services, which include Schools, Doctors, Public Houses, Health Centre, Newsagent, Post Office, Sports Facilities. The proximity of the site to public transport services provides access to nearby urban centres including Huddersfield, Kirkheaton, Mirfield, Outlane, Dewsbury, White Rose Centre and Leeds. Support for housing as part of a wider area of development of five land parcels. The five parcels should be allocated as housing sites and not Wildlife Habitat and Priority Employment Areas as proposed.</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
<p>H815 land Adjacent, White Lee Road, Batley</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>H820 Land at, 173a, Huddersfield Road, Holmfirth</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>H821 Land east of, Dathan Tool & Co Ltd, Mean Lane, Meltham</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>H822 Land to the west of, Southwood Avenue, Honley DLP_RSO2441</p> <p>The site is prone to flooding / water logging The site is crossed by PROW</p> <p>The land is Green Belt. Development would result in high visual impact across the valley</p>	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H1645	Land east of, Cowcliffe Hill Road, Cowcliffe	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is a rejected housing option. This site is largely covered by an accepted area of Urban Greenspace. Attractive local recreation ground with equipped play area, basketball pod and football goal. Reasonably used. Eastern part is natural/semi-natural area, including area of woodland, provides attractive setting to recreation ground. Well used footpath by dog walkers to the east of the site, provides link to recreation ground.			
H1646	Land south east of, Nethroyd Hill Road, Cowcliffe	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		A large proportion of the site contains mixed deciduous woodland which is a UK BAP Priority Habitat. Public footpaths run across the site and is used for informal recreation. The site has been assessed through the Local Plan Site Allocation Methodology and is justified for allocation as urban green space.			
		No representations have been received on this site option.			
H1648	Land west of, Ball Royd Road, Fartown	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is a rejected housing option. The site is covered by an accepted Urban Greenspace designation. Local recreation ground with equipped children's play area, skate park and mini-goals. Assessed as high value with high visual amenity value.			
H1649	Land west of, Hillside Avenue, Fartown	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is a rejected housing option. The site requires 3rd party land for access. The site is covered by an accepted Urban Greenspace option.			
H1650	Land south of, Bradley Boulevard, Bradley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is a rejected housing option. Part of site is well used council allotments (high value). Part of site is well treed and part unused. Area in part allotment use is 0.46 hectare.			
H1651	Land north west of, Ashbrow Road, Fartown	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site has elements of accepted Urban Greenspace and has been rejected for this reason. This site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		No representations have been received in relation to this site option.			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H1652	Land west of, Greave Close, Huddersfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change. The site is a rejected housing option. The site includes an area of ancient woodland to the north west which is a UK Biodiversity Action Plan priority habitat. Part of the site is overlapped by an accepted Urban Greenspace option, therefore allocating this site for housing would be in conflict with this.			
H1653	Land north east of, Bradley Boulevard, Sheepridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change. This is a rejected housing option. The site is covered by an accepted Urban Greenspace option. Various open space types:- (i) All Saints Catholic College: Football pitches and senior rugby league pitch standard quality. Used by school but not currently by community. PPS recommends investigate possibility of community use and protect, pitches could help to reduce shortfalls in the area. (ii) Deighton Centre Pitches: Various football pitches well used by community including six Deighton Juniors teams. PPS recommends protect well used club site. (iii) Our Lady of Lourdes Primary School - school site with playing field. (iv) Large continuous area of mature woodland Lower Fell Greave Wood/Bradley Gate Wood/Fell Greave farm/Screamer Wood/Dyson Wood (part TPO area). (v) Fell Greave Farm - agricultural land. High value with PROW used by dog walkers. (vi) New House Farm - Area of agricultural land lies between Bradley Gate Wood and Lower Fell Greave. Ungrazed meadows. Low value, no public access. No visual amenity benefits.			
H1655	Land est of, Wilton Avenue, Bradley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change. The site is a rejected housing option. The site is covered by an accepted Urban Greenspace option. Local park with equipped play area, mini goals and skate ramp. High value. Adult football pitch currently unused. The Playing Pitch Strategy recommends reconfiguring pitch to accommodate other shortfalls, e.g. 9v9 or youth 11v11. Protect and enhance, pitch has potential to reduce current shortfalls of youth pitches. School site with school playing field, including 5v5 mini football pitch not available for community use. The Playing Pitch Strategy recommends protecting the site for school use and strategic reserve. School site with school playing field.			
H1659	Land to the west of Scarr End Lane, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its allocation is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. Site access is not achievable. Access can only be achieved from Scarr End Lane. However, Scarr End Lane is sub standard and unsuitable for any intensification of use. It is a local recreation ground with mini goals. No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan			
H1660	Land east of, Heckmondwike Road, Dewsbury Moor	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		Proposed change The site is proposed as an accepted housing allocation. This represents a change from the draft Local Plan (November 2015) where the site was rejected for housing. The reasons for change are outlined below:			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
	It is considered that there are no significant constraints with the site which cannot be mitigated against at the planning application stage. There are 6 mine entrances located on this site however 5 of those are clustered in the north and only 7.9% of the site is within a high risk coal mining area. There is a children's playground on the site which could be incorporated into a housing layout.
H1661 Land to the south west of Park Road, Ravensthorpe	Support Conditional Support Object No Comment
No Representations received	No Change
	The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft local plan (November 2015). Its allocation is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.
	The site is heavily treed and represents a woodland fringe on the approach to the wider area of green belt that contains the country park. It is well related to the open area to the east and as such its removal from the green belt would undermine the role and function of the green belt in this location which is to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. There is an objection to development on surface water grounds and a culverted watercourse and public combined sewer crossing the site.
	No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan
H1662 Land to the east of Northstead, Ravensthorpe, Dewsbury	Support Conditional Support Object No Comment
No Representations received	No Change
	The site is proposed as an rejected allocation, The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.
	This is a restricted area of green belt that separates Dewsbury from Ravensthorpe. It over washes the route of the River Spen and its floodplain as well as Dewsbury Country Park. As such opportunities for settlement extension that do not undermine the role and function of the green belt are extremely limited. The site is predominately within flood zone 3a and is well used Council allotments.
	No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan
H1663 Land to the north of Field Lane, Ravensthorpe, Dewsbury	Support Conditional Support Object No Comment
No Representations received	No Change
	The site is proposed as an rejected allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.
	Grassed amenity space which provides visual amenity for local residents. The supply of amenity greenspace in the ward is below the standard and there are various public health issues in this ward which support the retention of this site as Urban Greenspace.
	No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan
H1665 Land to the south of Cravendale Road, Mirfield	Support Conditional Support Object No Comment
No Representations received	No Change
	The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.
	The site is part of a district park with equipped play area, multi-use games area (MUGA), 2 bowling greens and 2 adult football pitches used by local football club. The Playing Pitch Strategy recommends protection of pitches and bowling greens as local club sites. Ravensthorpe Junior School includes an adult and mini football pitch used by the school.

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan			
H1666	Land to the north of Lowfield Road, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Part of larger urban greenspace site predominately used for Rugby league, which includes two standard quality junior pitches and one standard senior pitch which are well used. Playing Pitch Strategy recommends protection.			
		No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan			
H1667	Land to the east of, Oak Road, Bradley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is a rejected housing option. The site is covered by an accepted Urban Greenspace option.			
H1668	Stocks Bank Road	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This site has been retained as Urban Greenspace. The allocation of this site as urban green space is justified based on evidence from the Kirklees Open Space Study 2015 and Kirklees Urban Green Space Review.			
		Site overlaps accepted Urban Greenspace option (UGS1090). Local recreation ground with equipped play area. Goal posts now removed.			
H1669	Meadow Bank Crescent, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This site has been retained as Urban Greenspace. The allocation of this site as urban green space is justified based on evidence from the Kirklees Open Space Study 2015 and Kirklees Urban Green Space Review.			
		Site has been retained as Urban Greenspace, UGS1271. Well used allotments, assessed as high value. Majority of site is amenity space, part grass, part semi-natural.			
H1670	Knowl Road, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This site has been retained as Urban Greenspace. The allocation of this site as urban green space is justified based on evidence from the Kirklees Open Space Study 2015 and Kirklees Urban Green Space Review.			
		Attractive local park with equipped children's play area and recent development of a skate park. Well used.			

Summary of comments		Council Response				
		Former youth football pitch. No longer marked out. Pitch is uneven; requires investment to bring back in to use.				
H1672	Crossley Lane, Mirfield	Support	1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO384						
Site preserves open space and should not be developed. This land should be retained for recreation use.		No Change				
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.				
		This site has been retained as Urban Greenspace. The allocation of this site as urban green space is justified based on evidence from the Kirklees Open Space Study 2015 and Kirklees Urban Green Space Review.				
		Site consists of local recreation ground with equipped play area and mini-football goals.				
H1673	Land off, Old Bank Road, Mirfield	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change				
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.				
		This site has been retained as Urban Greenspace. The allocation of this site as urban green space is justified based on evidence from the Kirklees Open Space Study 2015 and Kirklees Urban Green Space Review.				
		The quantity provision of parks/recreation grounds in Mirfield ward is well below the standard. Site needed to meet local needs.				
H1674	Jackroyd Lane, Mirfield	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change				
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.				
		This site has been retained as Urban Greenspace. The allocation of this site as urban green space is justified based on evidence from the Kirklees Open Space Study 2015 and Kirklees Urban Green Space Review.				
		Semi-natural greenspace used primarily for horse grazing. No public access, no mature trees abounding the site, low value. High scarcity value and provision of natural/semi-natural greenspace in the Mirfield ward is below the standard.				
H1675	Jackroyd Lane, Mirfield	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change				
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.				
		This site overlaps an accepted Urban Greenspace option. That consists of a well used recreation ground with play area and mini football pitch with no spare capacity and a cricket ground with 12 wickets played to capacity. Listed grade II church with churchyard in Hopton Conservation Area.				
H1676	Land east of, Tenter Hill Lane, Deighton	Support		Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.				

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		The site is a rejected housing option. The site requires 3rd party land for access. Lowland mixed deciduous woodland and lowland acid grassland covers all of this site both UK BAP priority habitats which West Yorkshire Ecology recommend retaining. The site is covered by an accepted Urban Greenspace option.			
H1678	Land east of, Woodlands Road East, Lepton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is a rejected housing option. The site is covered by an accepted Urban Greenspace option.			
H1680	Land south west of, Somerset Road, Almondbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is a rejected housing option. The site is covered by an accepted Urban Greenspace option.			
H1681	Land south west of, Finthorpe Lane, Almondbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is a rejected housing option. The site requires 3rd party land for access. While this is a reasonably well contained site and is located in an area of green belt where there is potential for rounding off, the boundaries appear to cut through areas of protected trees and a watercourse. As such the site encroaches onto countryside features contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			
H1682	Land east of, Bank End Lane, Almondbury DLP_RSO2093	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Site should be designated for housing.		No change.			
		This site is a rejected housing option. The site is covered by an accepted Urban Greenspace option. Large area of natural/semi-natural greenspace provides a green 'lung' within a densely built up area.			
H1683	Land at, Josephine Road, Cowlersley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Urban greenspace option retained.			
H1684	Botham Hall Recreation Ground, Rufford Road, Milnsbridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Urban greenspace designation retained.			
H1685	Land to the South of, Coombe Road, Milnsbridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Urban greenspace designation retained.			
H1686	Land west of, Dryclough Road, Crosland Moor	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		Proposed Change			

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. This represents a change from the draft Local Plan (November 2015) where the site was an accepted housing allocation.

The site is proposed as an accepted urban green space allocation. The reasons for change are the site has been reviewed in light of comments received on the draft plan and an Open Space Study assessment undertaken which justifies allocation as urban green space consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The site has been assessed through the council's Open Space Study as natural/semi-natural greenspace having high value as open space for the amenity of the area. The open character and visual qualities of the site enhance the appearance of the area forming a green wedge between existing housing and is beneficial in maintaining continuity with urban green space to the east of Dryclough Road. Provision of natural and semi-natural greenspace and amenity greenspace in the ward is significantly below the benchmarks standards.

No representations have been received on this site option.

H1689 Land off, Fern Lea Road, Lindley

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

The site is accepted as Urban Greenspace. This site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

No representations have been received on this site option.

H1690 Land Adjacent, Cliff Close, Quarmby

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change.

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

The site is to be retained as Urban Greenspace. Amenity greenspace in this area is below the recommended standard, therefore this area should be retained as Urban Greenspace.

Evidence from the Kirklees Open Space Study assessment undertaken for this urban green space identifies Quarmby Cliff/Ballroyd Clough as a prominent valley of open natural and semi-natural greenspace assessed as having high value as open space for:-

(i) ecological qualities - Ballroyd Clough includes Habitats of Principal Importance, namely lowland mixed deciduous woodland and acid grassland UK BAP priority habitats, and forms part of the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network;

(ii) cultural and heritage benefits - area includes Nab End Tower folly used for local community events, such as Longwood Sing;

(ii) the amenity of the area and sense of place - the attractive qualities and prominence Quarmby Cliff/Ballroyd Clough with steep valley sides and heathland form a strong visual feature that makes an important contribution to the appearance and character of the area.

(iv) use for informal recreation along public rights of way.

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		No representations have been received on this site option.			
H1692	Land Adjacent, Greenfield Avenue, Salendine Nook	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site should be retained as Urban Greenspace. The area is an informal recreation area forming part of the school grounds. Its allocation as Urban Greenspace is consistent with the Councils site allocation methodology.			
		No representations have been received on this site option.			
H1693	Land adjacent, Burfitts Road, Oakes	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site should be retained as Urban Greenspace. The area provides amenity space within a residential area. This site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		No representations were received on this site option.			
H1695	Land Adjacent, Roman Close, Salendine Nook	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site should be retained as Urban Greenspace. The site contains local recreation ground with equipped children's play area and teen provision.			
		This site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		No representations received on this site option.			
H1697	Land Adjacent, Healey Lane, Batley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Access to this site can be achieved however the site is a local park and has high visual amenity. This site has been retained as Urban Greenspace.			
H1699	Land Adjacent, North Bank Road, Batley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change to site option.			

Summary of comments

Council Response

		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>It has been rejected as it forms part of a larger urban green space option (UGS973) which is proposed as accepted.</p> <p>The site comprises an area of natural and semi natural greenspace, predominantly woodland, and has been protected as urban greenspace in accordance with the urban greenspace methodology.</p> <p>Provision of natural and semi-natural greenspace is below the benchmark standard within the ward.</p> <p>Access cannot be achieved to this site. Third party land is required.</p>			
H1700	Land Adjacent, Cross Bank Road, Batley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site access can be achieved from Cross Bank Road. However the site is a high value Urban Greenspace option and has been retained as part of a larger Urban Greenspace.</p>			
H1703	Land Adjacent, Nova Lane, Birstall	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The site includes a former recreational ground which is included within the Local Nature Reserve and Local Wildlife Site. Recreational ground has been retained as Urban Greenspace.</p> <p>Assessed through the Local Plan Site Allocation Methodology, it is considered the allocation of the site as urban green space is justified. This is based on evidence from the council's Open Space Study 2015 and Urban Green Space Review. The site comprises a local recreation ground including an equipped children's play area and facilities for informal recreation use, e.g. a ball wall, mini-goals and basketball pod. Assessed through the Open Space Study 2015 as being of high and medium value as open space important for meeting local recreational needs.</p>			
H1705	Land north of, Cleckheaton Cemetery, Whitechapel Road, Cleckheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site access not achievable. This area of green belt is part of a fairly extensive area that separates Kirklees from Bradford. This site is separated from the properties off Whitechapel Grove by a belt of trees belonging to the cemetery and so appears detached from the settlement even though it is in close proximity to it. As such it is considered to be unrelated to the settlement and would project development down the hillside to the detriment of openness in this location.</p>			
H1708	Land to the East of, Mona Street, Slaithwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		Urban Greenspace designation retained. The site makes a minor incursion into the green belt which would have a limited impact on openness, but the lack of features on the ground that the green belt boundary would follow as a result would leave adjacent land vulnerable to encroachment.			
H1710	Land to the east of, Stones Lane, Linthwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Site retained as urban greenspace.			
H1711	Land Adjacent, Easingwood Drive, Kirkheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The provision of amenity greenspace in the ward is below the standard the site should be retained as urban greenspace. This site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		No representations were received on this site option.			
H1713	Land Adjacent, Briarfield Gardens, Dalton DLP_RSO4956, DLP_RSO4957, DLP_RSO4958	Support 3	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Reps support rejection of the site.		No Change			
		The site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		No suitable site access to the site can be achieved. The site is also an existing recreation ground with equipped play area and teen shelter. The site includes adult football pitches and rugby league senior pitch.			
		This site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
H1714	Land Adjacent, Brown Royd Avenue, Rawthorpe	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		Site access is not suitable and all of site in UK BAP priority habitat. Kilner Bank provides important contiguous natural greenspace and woodland important to setting of Huddersfield,			
		This site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		No representations were received for this site option.			
H1715	Chickenley Recreation Ground, Mill Lane, Chickenley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		There is under provision in semi natural and natural urban greenspace and allotments in the area. There are also health concerns within the ward. The site is proposed as an accepted Urban Greenspace site.			
		No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan			
H1716	Land off, Rock House Drive/Hartley Street, Batley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		This site option has been retained as Urban Greenspace (UGS1004) Well used local park with range of facilities including equipped play area is located on this site.			
H1718	Land Adjacent, Heaton Gardens, Marsh	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing option. The site was proposed as a rejected housing option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site contains Gledholt Wood Local Nature Reserve. The site has high biodiversity value and should be retained as Urban Greenspace.			
		This site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
H1719	Land Adjacent, Dudley Road, Paddock	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site forms part of a larger Urban Greenspace allocation. The greenspace includes two well used council allotment sites, a large natural/semi-natural area, predominantly treed, a covered reservoir and local recreation ground. The site should be retained as part of the larger Urban Greenspace allocation.			
		This site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		No representations have been received on this housing option.			
H1720	Land Adjacent, Jim Lane, Marsh	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response												
	<p>The site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site is a well used attractive local recreation ground with equipped play area and mini-goals. Site should be retained as Urban Greenspace.</p> <p>This site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>No representations were received on this site option.</p>												
<p>H1722 Land adjacent, Bower Lane, Heckmondwike</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1090 422 1276 470">Support</th> <th data-bbox="1276 422 1556 470">Conditional Support</th> <th data-bbox="1556 422 1736 470">Object</th> <th data-bbox="1736 422 2163 470">No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="4" data-bbox="1090 470 2163 526">No Change</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4" data-bbox="1090 526 2163 837"> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site option has been accepted as an urban greenspace option.</p> <p>Assessed through the Local Plan Site Allocation Methodology, it is considered the allocation of the site as urban green space is justified. This is based on evidence from the council's Open Space Study 2015 and Urban Green Space Review. The site comprises amenity greenspace within a densely developed housing area, assessed through the Open Space Study 2015 as having high value as open space being important for informal recreational use, including children's play. Levels of obesity in the ward are higher than the Kirklees average and as such protection of this site as urban green space could help support reduction in health inequalities in the area.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment	No Change				<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site option has been accepted as an urban greenspace option.</p> <p>Assessed through the Local Plan Site Allocation Methodology, it is considered the allocation of the site as urban green space is justified. This is based on evidence from the council's Open Space Study 2015 and Urban Green Space Review. The site comprises amenity greenspace within a densely developed housing area, assessed through the Open Space Study 2015 as having high value as open space being important for informal recreational use, including children's play. Levels of obesity in the ward are higher than the Kirklees average and as such protection of this site as urban green space could help support reduction in health inequalities in the area.</p>			
Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment										
No Change													
<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site option has been accepted as an urban greenspace option.</p> <p>Assessed through the Local Plan Site Allocation Methodology, it is considered the allocation of the site as urban green space is justified. This is based on evidence from the council's Open Space Study 2015 and Urban Green Space Review. The site comprises amenity greenspace within a densely developed housing area, assessed through the Open Space Study 2015 as having high value as open space being important for informal recreational use, including children's play. Levels of obesity in the ward are higher than the Kirklees average and as such protection of this site as urban green space could help support reduction in health inequalities in the area.</p>													
<p>H1723 Land adjacent, Milton Road, Heckmondwike</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1090 837 1276 885">Support</th> <th data-bbox="1276 837 1556 885">Conditional Support</th> <th data-bbox="1556 837 1736 885">Object</th> <th data-bbox="1736 837 2163 885">No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="4" data-bbox="1090 885 2163 941">No Change</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4" data-bbox="1090 941 2163 1252"> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site was rejected as a large proportion of the site is located in Flood Zone 3. The site has been allocated as urban greenspace.</p> <p>Assessed through the Local Plan Site Allocation Methodology, it is considered the allocation of site as urban green space is justified based on evidence from the council's Playing Pitch Strategy 2015 and Urban Green Space Review. Site comprises an adult football pitch well used by Littletown FC. The Playing Pitch Strategy recommends protection of this well used club site which is important in meeting local sport and recreational needs. Levels of obesity in the ward are higher than the Kirklees average and as such protection of this site as urban green space could help support reduction in health inequalities in the area.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment	No Change				<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site was rejected as a large proportion of the site is located in Flood Zone 3. The site has been allocated as urban greenspace.</p> <p>Assessed through the Local Plan Site Allocation Methodology, it is considered the allocation of site as urban green space is justified based on evidence from the council's Playing Pitch Strategy 2015 and Urban Green Space Review. Site comprises an adult football pitch well used by Littletown FC. The Playing Pitch Strategy recommends protection of this well used club site which is important in meeting local sport and recreational needs. Levels of obesity in the ward are higher than the Kirklees average and as such protection of this site as urban green space could help support reduction in health inequalities in the area.</p>			
Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment										
No Change													
<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site was rejected as a large proportion of the site is located in Flood Zone 3. The site has been allocated as urban greenspace.</p> <p>Assessed through the Local Plan Site Allocation Methodology, it is considered the allocation of site as urban green space is justified based on evidence from the council's Playing Pitch Strategy 2015 and Urban Green Space Review. Site comprises an adult football pitch well used by Littletown FC. The Playing Pitch Strategy recommends protection of this well used club site which is important in meeting local sport and recreational needs. Levels of obesity in the ward are higher than the Kirklees average and as such protection of this site as urban green space could help support reduction in health inequalities in the area.</p>													
<p>H1724 Land to the south of, 40 - 64, Upper Lane, Gomersal</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1090 1252 1276 1300">Support</th> <th data-bbox="1276 1252 1556 1300">Conditional Support</th> <th data-bbox="1556 1252 1736 1300">Object</th> <th data-bbox="1736 1252 2163 1300">No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td colspan="4" data-bbox="1090 1300 2163 1356">No Change</td> </tr> <tr> <td colspan="4" data-bbox="1090 1356 2163 1482"> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected mixed use allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site has been retained as urban greenspace option UGS1052. Site comprises of pleasant parkland, mainly grass, in residential area.</p> </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment	No Change				<p>The site is proposed as a rejected mixed use allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site has been retained as urban greenspace option UGS1052. Site comprises of pleasant parkland, mainly grass, in residential area.</p>			
Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment										
No Change													
<p>The site is proposed as a rejected mixed use allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site has been retained as urban greenspace option UGS1052. Site comprises of pleasant parkland, mainly grass, in residential area.</p>													

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H1726	Urban Greenspace and land off, Windy Bank Lane, Hightown	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site access achievable. The small extension of this site to the south into the green belt provides the opportunity to create a new strong green belt boundary as there is no existing boundary on the ground where it meets the former school site. The track to the east would present a new strong defendable boundary, as would Windy Bank Lane to the west. However, the field boundary running south west from Hawthorne Lodge does not present a strong feature on the ground and would therefore be vulnerable to encroachment.</p> <p>Site overlaps with H198 which is considered to be the better more defendable alternative. In view of this option H1726 rejected.</p> <p>No comments received on this site option.</p>			
H1728	Land Adjacent, Newsome Road South, Newsome	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Part of this site contains allotments and this part of the site has been retained as Urban Greenspace.</p> <p>No representations have been received on this housing option.</p>			
H1729	Land north of, Blue Bell Hill, Newsome	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is a rejected housing option. The site requires 3rd party land for access. The site is made up of mixed deciduous woodland which is UK BAP priority habitat. The site is covered by an accepted Urban Greenspace option. The site is comprised of Lockwood Village Green, council allotments, adjoining woodland and Lockwood churchyard with mature TPO trees and former church listed grade II.</p>			
H1730	Land Adjacent, White Hart Drive, Newsome	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site forms part of Stile Common, an undulating parcel of grazing land, with fences and hedgerows around the fields. A network of local public footpaths criss-cross the site. The area forms an important part of local landscape and character, between Newsome, Ashenhurst and Primrose Hill. The site should be retained as Urban Green Space.</p> <p>This site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>No representations have been received on this housing option.</p>			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H1731	Land Adjacent, Primrose Street/Orchard Terrace, Newsome	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was a proposed rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>This site contains part of retained Urban Greenspace. The south west part of the site is an attractive local recreation ground with equipped play area..</p> <p>No representations were received on this site option.</p>			
H1732	Newsome Road Playing fields, Newsome Road, Lowerhouses	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Site part of larger accepted Urban Greenspace allocation. The site contains Newsome Road Playing Fields and provides amenity greenspace in the area. Site should be retained as Urban Greenspace.</p> <p>This site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>No representations have been received on this site option.</p>			
H1733	Squirrel Ditch, Land off, Wood Lane, Newsome	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was a proposed rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site forms part of larger accepted Urban Greenspace option. Most of site is a UK BAP priority woodland. The site should be retained as Urban Greenspace.</p> <p>This site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>No representations received on this site option.</p>			
H1734	Berry Brow Recreation Ground, Ladyhouse Lane, Berry Brow	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>This site is reasonably well contained by existing residential development to the east and the railway line to the west. A boundary feature to the south although not a strong feature, is present. However, the site is not well related to the existing settlement form and would project development along the valley bottom to the detriment of the openness of the green belt. The site is also an existing recreation ground that has been recommended for protection by the Councils Playing Pitch Strategy.</p> <p>No representations have been received for this site option.</p>			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H1738	Land to the north of, Highburton C of E First School, Northfield Lane, Highburton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		No site frontage to adopted highway. Northfield Lane unsuitable for any intensification of use. Poor junction at Northfield Lane / Moor Lane.			
H1739	Land to the South of, North Road, Kirkburton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Site retained as urban greenspace.			
H1740	Land to the east of, Fairfield Rise, Kirkburton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		Development of this site would leave the line of the open watercourse, its localised steep valley and associated habitats separated from the wider countryside. These countryside features are best protected by the green belt designation in order to prevent encroachment. Retaining the watercourse and its environs would render any new development poorly related to the settlement. Site impacts on open space provision.			
H1741	Land to the South of, Westerley Lane, Shelley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The open space assessment provides evidence to justify the allocation of this land as urban green space. Habitat records show that there are birds of conservation concern on this site with mitigation unlikely due to the range of species.			
H1742	Land to the South of, Shepley Methodist Church, Lane Head Road, Shepley DLP_RSO328, DLP_RSO473, DLP_RSO519, DLP_RSO988	Support 3	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Adverse impact on highway safety		No change.			
Development would weaken the role and function of the Green Belt boundary. Impact on village character.		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		The eastern extent of the option would project built form into the more open agricultural landscape resulting in poorly related encroachment into the countryside and a detrimental impact on the openness of the green belt in this location.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
H1744	Land to the South of, Royds Avenue, New Mill	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		The site overlaps with a recreation ground and play area, not designated as urban greenspace because they are within the green belt.			
H1746	Land adjacent, Haighs Lane, Quarmby	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO4645					
Support for the rejection of this site.		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected housing allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		It is considered Hayfield Avenue and Haughs Road are unsuitable for the intensification of the use proposed. The surrounding highway network in the vicinity of the site is very poor with narrow roads and poor horizontal and vertical alignment. The local network is considered unsuitable for a development of this scale.			
		Comments of support for rejection of this site are noted.			
H1749	Land to the west of, Meadowcroft, Honley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		This site would represent a small extension to Honley, but is not well related to the settlement pattern. While it has reasonably defensible boundaries it would leave land to the south vulnerable to encroachment and would project built form into the countryside, contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			
H1752	Land to the north of Edge Road, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSQ264					
Remove site from greenbelt as it would help housing allocation in Dewsbury South area and not be detrimental to existing residents on Edge Road or surrounding area. Housing with gardens will enhance area and stop residents on Edge Road and Judy Haigh lane over extending their properties.		No Change.			
		The site is proposed as an rejected housing option allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft local plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Suitable site access cannot be achieved due to site topography. Edge Road is sub standard and cannot be widened outside the site boundary without significant amounts of 3rd party land. The site is a habitat of principal importance. Unimproved lowland acid grassland UK BAP priority habitat with scattered scrub.			
		This is a relatively restricted area of green belt that separates Kirklees from Wakefield. It is characterised by steep slopes where development could be prominent, highly visible in long distance views which would impact on openness to the detriment of the role and function of the green belt.			
H1753	Land to the north of High Street, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as an rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as an rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its allocation is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Site access is possible from Edge Lane. However 2.4m x 43m (30mph speed limit) visibility splays cannot be achieved without 3rd party land. It is a habitat of principle importance. Unimproved lowland acid grassland UK BAP priority habitat with scattered scrub. This site lies on steeply sloping scarp and supports a range of acid			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response										
	<p>grassland and scrub habitat which will be valuable for birds, bats and invertebrates. It is an attractive escarpment edge with woodland and scrub areas. A defined green corridor with numerous public rights of way through site, links with Kirklees Way.</p> <p>No comments were received on this site in response to the draft Local Plan</p>										
<p>H1760 Land to the south of, Egypt Farm, Cliffe Lane, Cleckheaton DLP_RSO1405</p> <p>Well used with good public access close to town centre</p> <p>Proposals comply with purposes of green belt - support retention of green belt</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Support</th> <th>1</th> <th>Conditional Support</th> <th>Object</th> <th>No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This area of green belt forms part of a reasonably extensive gap between Cleckheaton and Gomersal and there are opportunities west of the line of the former railway for limited rounding off or infill development without compromising the strategic role of the green belt. However, this site is unrelated to any settlement and could lead to the sprawl of built form down a prominent slope to the detriment of openness. The site could not be released from the green belt in isolation and would also require the removal of the land between the site and the edge of Cleckheaton.</p> <p>Alternative options were considered for this site, Mixed use option MX1921, employment options E1858, both of which have been rejected.</p> <p>Comments received in support for the rejection of this site have been noted.</p>	Support	1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment					
Support	1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment							
<p>H1765 Land to the south west of, Southwood Avenue, Honley DLP_RSO2442</p> <p>Sites prone to flooding Area is crossed by public footpaths</p> <p>The site is in the green belt Development would have negative visual impact</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Support</th> <th>1</th> <th>Conditional Support</th> <th>Object</th> <th>No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site is very poorly configured in relation to the existing settlement pattern and would result in the sprawl of built form down a prominent hillside to the detriment of the openness of the green belt in this location.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>	Support	1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment					
Support	1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment							
<p>H1766 Land to the west of, Westwood Avenue, Honley DLP_RSO282, DLP_RSO2443</p> <p>Negative impact on local highway network site prone to flooding Area crossed by public footpaths</p> <p>The site is in the Green Belt Development would have negative visual impact</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Support</th> <th>2</th> <th>Conditional Support</th> <th>Object</th> <th>No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>The existing settlement pattern allows for some rounding off if a satisfactory configuration can be found. There are field boundaries in this location that could present defendable new green belt boundaries but the option as presented does not follow a feature on the ground. This would leave the remainder of the field vulnerable to sprawl and encroachment, contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p> <p>The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.</p>	Support	2	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment					
Support	2	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment							
<p>H1767 Land to the North and East of, Woodhouse Lane, Holmbridge</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Support</th> <th>Conditional Support</th> <th>Object</th> <th>No Comment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment						
Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment								

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		Access can be achieved from Woodhouse Lane, but this road is unsuitable for further intensification of use. This site is very poorly related to the existing settlement form and would result in an intrusive projection of built form up a prominent and steep slope to the considerable detriment of the openness of the green belt.			
H1769	Land to the east of, Moss Edge Road, Holmbridge DLP_RSO1332, DLP_RSO1525	Support	Conditional Support	Object 2	No Comment
The site is available for development The site should be allocated given the limited number of housing allocations.		No change This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected. Third party land required to gain access from Woodhouse Lane, however Woodhouse Lane unsuitable for further intensification of use. This parcel of land forms the steep valley side to Dobb Dike which is an open watercourse and its associated important wildlife habitats. Development would lead to significant encroachment of built form into the countryside severely undermining the role and function of the green belt in this location.			
H1770	Land to the South of, Moorvale, Marsden	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected. No suitable site access. This site is isolated from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			
H1771	Land adjacent to, Corrie Lynn, off Carrs Road, Marsden	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected. No suitable site access. This option is very poorly configured in relation to the edge of Marsden and would represent a prominent elevated extension to the settlement. This is an urban fringe area of sporadic residential and agricultural development, however the introduction of new residential development in this location would constitute significant encroachment into the countryside contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The site is 380m from SPA / SAC / SSSI. Records of curlew and ring ouzel close to site.			
H1773	Land south of, Spa Bottom, Fenay Bridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change. The site is a rejected housing option. The site has an accepted Urban Greenspace option covering it. Area removed to follow West Yorkshire Ecology comments and remove area of flood risk. Open Space assessment: Area of public open space with equipped children's play area, highly used by residents of the adjacent housing estate for ball games, walking by the river and dog exercising. A large level area of grass suitable for a variety of uses. Large area of natural/semi-natural greenspace adjoining Fenay Beck, with public access including 2 well used public rights of way. TPO trees along Fenay Beck. Good links with housing estate to supermarket and amenity space. Used by dog walkers. Includes section of dismantled railway line.			
H1775	Spennings House, The Coach House and No. 1, Spennings Lane and Gomersal Lane, Cleckheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response			
	One of the purposes of the green belt is to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another and this area of green belt forms a gap that separates Gomersal and Cleckheaton. There is already a considerable amount of built form fronting Spen Lane and the undeveloped frontages help to maintain the appearance of separation. The site is unrelated to any settlement and could not be released from the green belt in isolation.			
H1777 Holme Bank Mills, Station Road, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No Change			
	The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
	All of this site falls within Flood Zone 2, majority of the site falls within Flood Zone 3b.			
	No comments received on this site.			
H1785 Land south of, Blackmoorfoot Road, Crosland Hill	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No change.			
	This is a rejected housing site. This site is immediately adjacent to Moorfield Quarries, an active mineral extraction site. The narrow fields between Blackmoorfoot Road and the quarry should be protected from development in order to provide a buffer between new residential development and the quarry site. The best means of achieving this protection is through the green belt designation.			
H1792 Brownhill Farm, Old Lane and Station Lane, Birkenshaw DLP_RSO3311, DLP_RSO3312, DLP_RSO3344, DLP_RSO4883, DLP_RSO4884, DLP_RSO4885, DLP_RSO5063	Support 4	Conditional Support	Object 3	No Comment
Access appraisal submitted for smaller site. Consideration to drainage - surface water disposed of via onsite watercourse which forms the eastern boundary of the site. No trees on site.	No Change			
Boundary should be drawn to the eastern edge. Proposed change to the green belt boundary provides an opportunity to create a rational edge along a stronger natural physical boundary. Too much reliance on H1747 and H2089. H1792 is highly sustainable and would support the plan. Site suitable for specialised housing (custom build/self build/first time buyer homes) Smaller site option created.	The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
	This site lies within the boundary and/or within the setting of the Registered Battlefield at Adwalton. Historic England has objected to this option. When considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. National planning policy confirms that the more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. Significance can be harmed or lost through alteration or destruction of the heritage asset or development within its setting. As heritage assets are irreplaceable, any harm or loss should require clear and convincing justification. This option could lead to substantial harm to the registered battlefield and the inclusion of the site option in the plan is not justified.			
	The allocation of this site would be likely to harm the significance of this area. The extent of the option would significantly reduce the gap between settlement in Kirklees and settlement in Leeds and so compromise the strategic role of the green belt in this location. Development would significantly encroach into this open countryside landscape contrary to the purpose of including land in the green belt. As the site includes part of the registered historic battlefield at Adwalton Moor the site and setting is best protected by the green belt designation.			
	Comments from site promoter have been noted. The Access Appraisal has been reviewed by Kirklees Highways Department, who have concluded access is not acceptable from Old Lane.			
H1793 Land to the south west of, Hassocks Road, Meltham DLP_RSO408	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
Increase in traffic congestion. Impact on flow of water from hills.	No change.			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Impact on wildlife.

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

This area of green belt sits between the edge of the settlement of Meltham and the boundary of the Peak District National Park. These open areas contribute to the immediate setting of the national park and are recognised for the role they play in maintaining landscape character beyond the boundary of the national park. The site is within 950m of SPA / SSSI / SAC and SPA birds breed between proposed allocation and the SPA.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

H1794 Land to the west of, Wakefield Road, Clayton West

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

Wakefield Road presents a strong green belt boundary in this location and although already breached by industrial development further north of this site prevents the encroachment of further development into the flood plain. Landgley Lane could form a new settlement boundary to the north and would prevent the sprawl of development into the wider countryside. The north of this site is constrained by flood risk.

H1795 Primrose Hill Farm, Primrose Lane, Cleckheaton

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The site is on potentially contaminated land adjacent to significant potential contamination, very high risk of lateral migration. The site is wholly contained by Primrose Lane to the south, the Spen Valley Greenway to the west and by existing development to the east and north and could be developed without significantly impacting on the openness of the green belt. Primrose Lane and the Greenway would present a strong new defensible boundary. Development up to the proposed south eastern extent of the site where Primrose Lane meets the Greenway would leave only an extremely narrow gap connecting the green belt to the north with the green belt to the south (hence the inclusion of edge ref LV7 as influencing this green belt area). This would effectively sever these two areas of green belt and join Liversedge to Cleckheaton at this point, contrary to the role and function of the green belt.

H1796 Land between, Laverhills and Quaker Lane, Hightown

Support 3 Conditional Support Object No Comment

DLP_RSO1009, DLP_RSO1023, DLP_RSO3891

No Change

Proposals comply with purposes of green belt

Green belt should not be used

Support of rejected site

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Two access points are required to serve a development of this scale. Access is limited from Chiltern Way. The site is located in a restricted area of green belt that prevents the merger of major settlements. This site could be released with limited impact on this strategic role, although it is large in relation to the size of the strategic gap. Quaker Lane could provide a strong new eastern boundary but the northern boundary is less well defined on the ground and the option would leave a significant area of land to the west between the site and the settlement isolated from the wider green belt.. The site retains a countryside character and contains an open watercourse on its northern boundary. The loss of countryside would represent encroachment but impact is limited by the existing degree of containment.

Supporting comments have been noted.

H1797 Land off, Halifax Road, Cleckheaton

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

DLP_RSO3542

Summary of comments

Larger site located 1 mile from Cleckheaton Town Centre. Located in close proximity to surrounding transport network.
 No safety or efficiency issues.
 No flooding issues
 Not located within an AQMA, any noise can be mitigated.
 Protection of site will not achieve any improvements in the public health of local residents.
 PROW would be retained on larger site option. No PROW on H464
 SPE/92/10 runs along the edge of H482 & H1797
 Land is in private ownership and cannot be utilised for formal or informal sports activities. Site can only be crossed by members of the public by the use of PROW.
 This area of Cleckheaton has suitable levels of green space provision. Development will bring a substantial amount of public open space.

Given the significant shortfall in the amount of housing land that has been identified in the Draft Local Plan it is considered that sites H1797, H482 and H464 should be allocated for residential development.
 Site could also be considered as a larger housing option including H1797, H464, H482, H1798, H366, H520, H460, H497, H546.

H1798 Land to the north of, Halifax Road, Cleckheaton
 DLP_RSO3545

Site to be considered as larger housing option submitted by Denby Planning Consultants.

H1802 Land to the north west of, Mean Lane, Meltham

No Representations received

H1810 Whitechapel Road Recreation Ground, Whitechapel Grove, Scholes

No Representations received

Council Response

No Change

This site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The reason for rejecting the site is that it is proposed to be allocated as part of a wider Urban Green space.

The site lies within a larger area defined as strategic urban greenspace which comprises a large area of attractive open farmland with established trees and hedgerows defining field boundaries. It provides a green lung between Cleckheaton and Hightown, defining the separation of the two settlements.

UGS1068 has been assessed as natural and semi-natural greenspace, having high value as open space based on its structural and landscape qualities and its significant contribution to the amenity of the area and sense of place, as well as use and enjoyment for informal recreation along the public footpath network. The whole of UGS1068 performs a strategic urban green space function meriting allocation as urban green space. The site itself is similar in character and appearance to adjoining open land and is viewed as an attractive and integral part of the wider urban green space that can be appreciated from many locations within the built-up area and along the public footpath network. The visual qualities of the site play a valuable role in providing relief from urbanisation. UGS1068 is not deemed, in whole or part, to be clearly surplus to requirements.

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

No Change

This site is a proposed rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The reason for rejecting the site is that it is proposed to be allocated as part of a wider Urban Greenspace.

The site lies within a larger area defined as strategic urban greenspace which comprises a large area of attractive open farmland with established trees and hedgerows defining field boundaries. It provides a green lung between Cleckheaton and Hightown, defining the separation of the two settlements.

This area of Urban Greenspace forms an extensive and attractive open tract of mainly agricultural grazing land, lying between the built-up areas of Liversedge and Cleckheaton. UGS1068 has been assessed as natural and semi-natural greenspace, having high value as open space based on its structural and landscape qualities and its significant contribution to the amenity of the area and sense of place, as well as use and enjoyment for informal recreation along the public footpath network. Performs a strategic urban green space function meriting allocation as urban green space. UGS1068 is not deemed, in whole or part, to be clearly surplus to requirements.

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

This is part of a wider site that has been accepted for housing.

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

This area of green belt is part of a fairly extensive area that separates Kirklees from Bradford. The land north of

Summary of comments	Council Response			
	Whitechapel Grove slopes down towards Whitehall Road so development risks being prominent There is a high pressure gas pipeline running east to west in close proximity to the edge of the settlement which severely constrains development, although there are limited minor opportunities for settlement extension. Site is less than 0.4ha.			
<p>H1812 Land between, Banks Road and, Woodhead Road, Honley DLP_RSO1797</p> <p>Development would allow better pedestrian connectivity to adjacent housing site.</p> <p>The site is immediately available. The site allows for more considered development of the surrounding area.</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
<p>H1813 Land adjacent, 192 and 196, Nab Lane, Birstall DLP_RSO1195, DLP_RSO4962, DLP_RSO4963, DLP_RSO4964</p> <p>Access can be gained from Nab Lane, there is scope to widen</p> <p>Proposals go against purpose of green belt Rejection of site prevents sprawl within settlements</p> <p>Site has green belt status Has been unused for many years and bears the remains of redundant agricultural buildings/stables Topography constraints will limit building potential Site is an extension of existing settlement Support for the rejection from local councillors Objection from local resident - site should be reconsidered.</p>	Support 3	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
<p>H1814 Land to the north of, Rutland Road, Flockton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>H1817 Land to the East of, Primrose Lane, Highburton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>H1818 Busk Farm, Northfield Lane, Highburton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
	<p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>No suitable access from adopted highway. This is an area of urban fringe where there is already an amount of built form in the green belt close to the settlement edge. However, the site itself is unrelated to the settlement and could not be released from the green belt in isolation as it would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p>
<p>H1819 Land to the north of, Eastfield Mills, The Knowle, Shepley</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>The site is overlapped by an accepted option.</p>
<p>H1936 Land adjacent to, Marsden Railway Station, Station Road, Marsden</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>The access to the site, via the canal bridge is constrained and it would be difficult for it to accommodate development of this scale. Site retained as UGS.</p>
<p>H1978 Land to the north of, Station Road, Meltham</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected</p> <p>Current access to the site from Station Road is not suitable for development of this scale. Part of the site is within the Green Belt The site boundary includes part of the former railway embankment which is covered in protected trees and forms part of the route of the Meltham Greenway. While it is acknowledged that development on this part of the site would not be possible because of the presence of the trees there is no justification for the removal of this small strip of land from the green belt.</p>
<p>H2091 Land to the rear of, United Reform Church, Chapel Lane, Heckmondwike</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site has been retained as urban greenspace (UGS1059). The site has a high open space value which is important for the amenity of the area, particularly in an area of densely developed housing. The open character of the land is valuable in relieving the built up surroundings of the area.</p>
<p>H2092 Land north and west of High Street & Challenge Way, Hanging Heaton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Development of this site would result in the merger of Hanging Heaton with Dewsbury contrary to the purposes of green belt which is to prevent the merger of settlements. The site is located on a steeply sloping hillside where development could be prominent and therefore detrimental to the openness of the green belt in this location.</p>

Summary of comments		Council Response			
H2095	Land to the east of, New Road, Netherthong	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The site contains protected trees and appears as part of the countryside, so development would represent encroachment contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. Its northern extent would leave the field to the north isolated from the wider countryside and possibly vulnerable to development pressure.</p>			
H2096	Land to the south of, Thong Lane, Netherthong	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This option is very poorly related to the existing settlement pattern and would result in a prominent incursion of built form onto this largely undeveloped slope. Development would result in encroachment into the countryside contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p>			
H2100	Bent Ley Farm, Bent Ley Road, Meltham	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change</p> <p>This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.</p> <p>The option as presented would represent an elongated extension to the built form of Meltham, with limited relationship to the settlement edge which would appear as sprawl along Huddersfield Road. It is separated from the settlement by the course of Hall Dike which along with its associated wildlife habitats are countryside features best protected by the green belt designation. The option includes the line of the former railway and its embankment which could screen any development from views along Huddersfield Road.</p>			
H2149	Brook House Mill, Balme Road, Cleckheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No Change</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected housing allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site access achievable. Site has been accepted as part of a larger housing option H590.</p>			

Gypsy and Traveller Site

GTTS1953	land to the north of, Nab Lane, Birstall	Support	Conditional Support	Object 7	No Comment
DLP_RSO2974, DLP_RSO3314, DLP_RSO4157, DLP_RSO4159, DLP_RSO4406, DLP_RSO4443, DLP_RSO4691					
M62 / M621 traffic causes congestion. J27 is heavily congested. A62 / Gelderd Road is busy. Any development would add to traffic congestion. The local schools have no capacity. There are no schools within walking distance of the site. Local doctors and dentists are oversubscribed. Site is 1.5 miles from doctors and travelling community will need good access to primary, secondary and specialist healthcare.		No Change			
There has already been too much development in the green belt in the area. Concern about impact on local amenity and facilities. Negative impact on overstretched infrastructure and emergency services. Objection to any planning permission for traveller site. Concern about impact on local amenity and facilities. Negative impact of waste. Negative impact of crime. Negative impact on West Yorkshire Retail Park and local businesses. There is already a well-established traveller site on the A62/Gelderd Road 2 miles away, therefore no reason for this site. Where will the funding for development of site and infrastructure come from?		The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. Site access is not achievable. Contaminated land, hazardous materials zone, high voltage power lines, landfill gas site (still being monitored), former refuse tip are cumulatively considered to be an outright constraint. Three mine entrances on site. This option does not follow any features on the ground on three sides. The existing green belt boundary does not follow a feature on the ground where it meets the undeveloped employment options either to the north or west, but the option as presented does not offer any opportunity to create a better boundary. There would be a risk of encroachment to the east unless additional land was released between the site and the field boundary.			
GTTS1954	Land east of, Park Road, Ravensthorpe	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received					
		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. Site access is not achievable, site falls within Flood Zone 3. Removing this site from the green belt would separate this part of the River Spen from its wider open setting. The River Spen and its associated habitats are best protected by their green belt designation. The site has no immediate relationship with a settlement edge and would appear as an isolated developed area.			
GTTS1955	Land north of, Ravensthorpe Road, Thornhill Lees	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received					
		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. No site frontage onto the adopted highway, no site access can be achieved. Environmental health concerns as site is within close proximity to industry.			
GTTS1956	Land north of, Lees Hall Road, Thornhill Lees	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO5077					
There is currently poor pedestrian and vehicular access to the site. However, this could be resolved as part of the redevelopment of the adjacent site (proposed housing allocation H269 Land north west of, Forge Lane, Thornhill Lees, Dewsbury). Site is allocated as urban greenspace and was formally a cricket ground. However, at present it does not contribute to sports or recreational provision in the area.		No Change			
The site is close to existing residential development. The site is sustainably located in terms of good access to services, schools, health facilities and public transport links. Subject to the adjacent housing allocation coming forward, no other constraints to development were identified and as such the site would be suitable residential use by travellers.		The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. Site access is not achievable. Site has been retained as an urban greenspace option (UGS1028)			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
GTTS1958	Land to the north of, Old Lindley Road, Lindley Moor	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site sits in a narrow strip of green belt land separated from the built up area of Lindley by the motorway. Without additional significant land release it would result in an isolated area of non green belt land surrounded by green belt, albeit the green belt to the immediate south would be the route of the motorway. One of the purposes of the green belt is to prevent the merger of towns and this site also sits on the boundary between Kirklees and Calderdale. Its development would introduce additional built form which could be detrimental to the appearance of separation in this location.</p> <p>No comments received on this site.</p>			
GTTS1959	Land to the east of, Windy Bank Lane, Hightown	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO5076					
There is good pedestrian and vehicular access to the site.		No Change			
<p>Removal of this site from the Green Belt has been demonstrated to be acceptable. The site is sustainably located in terms of good access to services, schools, health facilities and public transport links. The site is close to existing residential development. The site is located in the Green Belt and lies adjacent to an area which is designed in the UDP as urban greenspace. Both the site and adjacent greenspace is a draft housing allocation. No other constraints to development were identified and as such the site would be suitable residential use by travellers.</p>		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site overlaps an accepted housing option (H198). Therefore allocation of this site is no longer justified.</p>			
GTTS1960	Land to the south of, Lower Quarry Road, Bradley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site access is not achievable. All of the site is a BAP priority habitat. This site is isolated from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The site as presented does not appear to follow a feature on the ground on its western edge so would leave adjacent land vulnerable to encroachment.</p>			
GTTS1961	Cropper Gate Quarry, Barnsley Road, Grange Moor	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site is isolated from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p>			
GTTS1962	Land east of, Litherop Lane, Clayton West	Support 4	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO2308, DLP_RSO3648, DLP_RSO4246, DLP_RSO4252					
		No Change			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Support for rejection of the site.

The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

This site lies within the boundary of the Grade II Historic Park and Garden at Bretton Hall. The development of this area is likely to be incompatible with the conservation of this designated heritage asset. This site is isolated from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.

No comments were received on this site.

GTTS1963	Land north of, Denby Lane, Upper Denby	Support 207	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>DLP_RSO577, DLP_RSO583, DLP_RSO588, DLP_RSO595, DLP_RSO701, DLP_RSO801, DLP_RSO1040, DLP_RSO1200, DLP_RSO1257, DLP_RSO1262, DLP_RSO1322, DLP_RSO1511, DLP_RSO1636, DLP_RSO1937, DLP_RSO1976, DLP_RSO2036, DLP_RSO2103, DLP_RSO2107, DLP_RSO2111, DLP_RSO2218, DLP_RSO2264, DLP_RSO2269, DLP_RSO2301, DLP_RSO2309, DLP_RSO2311, DLP_RSO2315, DLP_RSO2319, DLP_RSO2327, DLP_RSO2328, DLP_RSO2328, DLP_RSO2335, DLP_RSO2339, DLP_RSO2343, DLP_RSO2347, DLP_RSO2350, DLP_RSO2354, DLP_RSO2400, DLP_RSO2866, DLP_RSO2870, DLP_RSO2874, DLP_RSO2878, DLP_RSO2882, DLP_RSO2886, DLP_RSO2890, DLP_RSO2894, DLP_RSO2919, DLP_RSO2925, DLP_RSO2929, DLP_RSO2933, DLP_RSO2937, DLP_RSO3119, DLP_RSO3161, DLP_RSO3168, DLP_RSO3172, DLP_RSO3176, DLP_RSO3180, DLP_RSO3184, DLP_RSO3188, DLP_RSO3192, DLP_RSO3196, DLP_RSO3200, DLP_RSO3204, DLP_RSO3208, DLP_RSO3212, DLP_RSO3216, DLP_RSO3220, DLP_RSO3225, DLP_RSO3229, DLP_RSO3233, DLP_RSO3237, DLP_RSO3241, DLP_RSO3245, DLP_RSO3249, DLP_RSO3253, DLP_RSO3257, DLP_RSO3261, DLP_RSO3265, DLP_RSO3269, DLP_RSO3273, DLP_RSO3277, DLP_RSO3281, DLP_RSO3285, DLP_RSO3592, DLP_RSO3596, DLP_RSO3600, DLP_RSO3604, DLP_RSO3619, DLP_RSO3621, DLP_RSO3627, DLP_RSO3628, DLP_RSO3638, DLP_RSO3643, DLP_RSO3649, DLP_RSO3654, DLP_RSO3659, DLP_RSO3663, DLP_RSO3667, DLP_RSO3676, DLP_RSO3677, DLP_RSO3685, DLP_RSO3694, DLP_RSO3695, DLP_RSO3699, DLP_RSO3703, DLP_RSO3707, DLP_RSO3711, DLP_RSO3715, DLP_RSO3719, DLP_RSO3723, DLP_RSO3727, DLP_RSO3731, DLP_RSO3735, DLP_RSO3739, DLP_RSO3743, DLP_RSO3747, DLP_RSO3751, DLP_RSO3755, DLP_RSO3759, DLP_RSO3763, DLP_RSO3767, DLP_RSO3771, DLP_RSO3775, DLP_RSO3779, DLP_RSO3783, DLP_RSO3787, DLP_RSO3791, DLP_RSO3795, DLP_RSO3799, DLP_RSO3803, DLP_RSO3807, DLP_RSO3811, DLP_RSO3815, DLP_RSO3823, DLP_RSO3827, DLP_RSO3831, DLP_RSO3836, DLP_RSO3837, DLP_RSO3844, DLP_RSO3847, DLP_RSO3852, DLP_RSO3856, DLP_RSO3860, DLP_RSO3864, DLP_RSO3869, DLP_RSO3877, DLP_RSO3881, DLP_RSO3885, DLP_RSO3901, DLP_RSO3905, DLP_RSO3938, DLP_RSO3955, DLP_RSO3970, DLP_RSO3978, DLP_RSO3987, DLP_RSO4104, DLP_RSO4125, DLP_RSO4132, DLP_RSO4139, DLP_RSO4145, DLP_RSO4149, DLP_RSO4176, DLP_RSO4177, DLP_RSO4184, DLP_RSO4188, DLP_RSO4239, DLP_RSO4247, DLP_RSO4253, DLP_RSO4276, DLP_RSO4280, DLP_RSO4351, DLP_RSO4370, DLP_RSO4375, DLP_RSO4388, DLP_RSO4396, DLP_RSO4407, DLP_RSO4416, DLP_RSO4469, DLP_RSO4473, DLP_RSO4481, DLP_RSO4485, DLP_RSO4489, DLP_RSO4557, DLP_RSO4561, DLP_RSO4585, DLP_RSO4590, DLP_RSO4594, DLP_RSO4602, DLP_RSO4606, DLP_RSO4610, DLP_RSO4614, DLP_RSO4618, DLP_RSO4622, DLP_RSO4626, DLP_RSO4630, DLP_RSO4635, DLP_RSO4639, DLP_RSO4665, DLP_RSO4669, DLP_RSO4696, DLP_RSO4700, DLP_RSO4724, DLP_RSO4728, DLP_RSO4737, DLP_RSO4761, DLP_RSO4809, DLP_RSO4811, DLP_RSO4815, DLP_RSO5042</p>					

Site would create increased pressure on road network and increase car dependency.
 The site is home to birds and wild animals. Site is close to Denby Delf nature reserve and site of scientific interest.
 Would create increased pressure on local schools.
 The site has footpaths running through it which are used by walkers, dog walkers, bird watchers, runners and families.

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The site is green field in the greenbelt and is remote from any settlement. Site received a red assessment from the council. Green belt should be preserved. Kirklees has been very strict on other developments in the green belt close by.
 Site would damage natural beauty of the area. Site forms part of rural countryside.
 Site would place strain on local resources and infrastructure. Increased pressures on local public services, schools, road networks, car dependency, access to shops. This part of Denby Lane has limited lighting, no footpaths on the highway, existing local housing has no gas or sewage services.
 Upper Denby has no local amenities to support such a site. Would cause disruption and nuisance to quiet village. Little or no natural protection from the weather.
 Support for rejection of site. Site would be urban sprawl. The site is 900 feet above sea level and exposed to wind and low temperatures. Development would affect local tourism and businesses. Denby Lane is used by cyclists. 'Upper and Lower Denby are historically small villages/hamlets and although there has been some localised housing expansion in Upper Denby in the last 50 years, they are both determined to protect this status quo.' Parking in some parts of the village is an issue.

This site is isolated from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.

GTTS1964	Piece Pit Depot, Piece Pit Lane, Huddersfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
----------	---	---------	---------------------	--------	------------

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response			
				methodology. Third party land is required to achieve access. Site falls within the middle hazard zone, is on potentially contaminated land and is close to multiple sources of noise.
GTTS2039 Lorry Park, Sands Lane, Dewsbury	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No Change The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. Third party land required for access. No site frontage onto the adopted highway.			
GTTS2042 Land south of, Dyon Wood Way, Bradley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	No Change The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. Site is accepted employment option E1836. Therefore the gypsy and traveller allocation is not justified.			
GTTS2043 Land to the south of, Laurel Drive, Batley DLP_RSO5072	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Site is allocated as urban greenspace but does not provide any playing pitches or other sports facilities. Adjacent to the site is an extensive area of Green Belt open space which has public access and offers a significant level of greenspace. The site is sustainably located in terms of good access to services, schools, health facilities and public transport links. The site is close to existing residential development. No other constraints to development were identified and as such the site would be suitable residential use by travellers.	No Change The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. Site overlaps accepted urban greenspace option UGS971 therefore, the gypsy and traveller allocation is no longer justified.			
GTTS2044 Land to the south of, Raikes Lane, Birstall DLP_RSO1337, DLP_RSO2975, DLP_RSO3313, DLP_RSO4156, DLP_RSO4158, DLP_RSO4401, DLP_RSO4444, DLP_RSO4692, DLP_RSO5073	Support 8	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
The A62/Gelderd Road is very busy. M62/M621/J27 junction create congestion problems. Site access would cause problems. There are no schools within walking distance and parking is a problem. Doctor and dentist capacity issues. The travelling community require Primary General and Specialist healthcare. Site is allocated as urban greenspace but does not provide any playing pitches or other sports facilities. Adjacent to the site is an extensive area of existing open space which has public access. The site is sustainably located in terms of good access to services, schools, health facilities and public transport links. The site is close to existing residential development. Lack of local facilities and impact on infrastructure. Local policing issues. Negative impact on established and settled communities. Objection to planning permission for a traveller site in Birstall. Cost of waste clearing. Site would have a detrimental effect on the surrounding area. Negative impact on West Yorkshire Retail Park. There is already a traveller site 2 miles away towards Leeds. Not clear where funding for extra infrastructure would come from. No other constraints to development were identified and as such the site would be suitable residential use by travellers.	No Change The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. Site is part of larger accepted urban greenspace option. Therefore the gypsy and traveller allocation is no longer justified.			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
GTTS2045	Tong Moor, Thorndene Way,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Site access is not achievable, no site frontage onto adopted highway. The whole of this site is a designated Local Wildlife site, allocation would be inappropriate. Site is part of accepted urban greenspace option UGS1267.			
GTTS2046	Station Lane,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Site overlaps accepted urban greenspace option UGS1269. Therefore the gypsy and traveller allocation is no longer justified.			
GTTS2047	Land to the west of, Upper Clough Road, Linthwaite DLP_RSO5082	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
There are good pedestrian and vehicular access to the site. Part of the site has tree cover. The area covered by trees could be retained as screening.		No Change			
The site is close to existing residential development. The site is sustainability located in terms of good access to services, schools, health facilities and public transport links. No other constraints to development were identified. As such part of the site would be suitable for traveller accommodation.		The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		One of the purposes of the green belt is to prevent the merger of settlements. The green belt over washes this area of urban fringe to prevent the intensification of urban land uses between Upper Clough and Blackmoorfoot and therefore to maintain the appearance of separation. Removing this parcel of land from the green belt would introduce additional built form to the west of Upper Clough Road and would also require the removal of the land between the site and the edge of the settlement in order to prevent this being an isolated parcel of non green belt land surrounded by green belt.			
GTTS2048	Land south of, Royd House Lane, Linthwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Site overlaps part of accepted urban greenspace option UGS875. Therefore, the gypsy and traveller allocation is no longer justified.			
GTTS2049	Land south west of, Cumberworth Lane, Denby Dale DLP_RSO578, DLP_RSO584, DLP_RSO589, DLP_RSO596, DLP_RSO963, DLP_RSO2310, DLP_RSO3650, DLP_RSO4105, DLP_RSO4248, DLP_RSO4254, DLP_RSO4673, DLP_RSO5083	Support 11	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
Large vehicles on the narrow roads would have a negative impact on road safety. There is good pedestrian and vehicular access to the site.		Landowner/site promoter has now withdrawn the site.			
Site is located within the Green Belt, but lies adjacent to existing development and does not contribute to purposes of the Green Belt.					

Summary of comments		Council Response			
<p>The site is close to existing residential development. The site is fairly well sustainably located in terms of good access to services, schools, health facilities and public transport links. Support rejection of option. The site would have an effect on the village. No other constraints to development were identified and as such the site would be suitable residential use by travellers.</p>		Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
<p>GTTS2051 Land south of, Intake, Golcar DLP_RSO5084</p> <p>There is good pedestrian and vehicular access to the site. Site is allocated as urban greenspace (forms part of a larger area).</p> <p>The site is close to existing residential development The site is sustainably located in terms of good access to services, schools, health facilities and public transport links. No other constraints to development were identified and as such the site would be suitable residential use by travellers.</p>		No Change	<p>The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site overlaps part of accepted urban greenspace option, UGS1214. Therefore the gypsy and traveller allocation is no longer justified.</p>		
<p>GTTS2052 Nunroyd, Dale Lane DLP_RSO5074</p> <p>There is good pedestrian and vehicular access to the site. Site forms part of a much larger urban greenspace allocation.</p> <p>The site is sustainably located in terms of good access to services, schools, health facilities and public transport links. The site is close to existing residential development. No other constraints to development were identified and as such the site would be suitable residential use by travellers.</p>		Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
<p>GTTS2053 Land north of, James Street, Liversedge DLP_RSO5075</p> <p>There is good pedestrian and vehicular access to the site. Site is allocated as urban greenspace.</p> <p>The site is sustainably located in terms of good access to services, schools, health facilities and public transport links. The site is close to existing residential development. No other constraints to development were identified and as such the site would be suitable residential use by travellers.</p>		No Change	<p>The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site is part of accepted urban greenspace allocation , UGS1055. Therefore the gypsy and traveller allocation is no longer justified.</p>		
<p>GTTS2054 Land east of, Homfirth Road, New Mill DLP_RSO5085</p> <p>There is good pedestrian and vehicular access to the site. Site is allocated as urban greenspace.</p> <p>The site is close to existing residential development The site is sustainably located in terms of good access to services, schools, health facilities and public transport links. No other constraints to development were identified and as such the site would be suitable residential use by travellers.</p>		Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
<p>GTTS2055 Land north of, Cinder Hill Road, Holmfirth DLP_RSO5086</p> <p>There is good pedestrian and vehicular access to the site.</p>		No Change	<p>The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>Site has been retained as accepted urban greenspace option, UGS894. Therefore the gypsy and traveller allocation is no longer justified.</p>		

Summary of comments

Site is within the Green Belt (on edge).
 The site is close to existing residential development The site is sustainably located in terms of good access to services, schools, health facilities and public transport links.
 No other constraints to development were identified and as such the site would be suitable residential use by travellers.

Council Response

The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

This site has a poor relationship to the existing settlement pattern and would appear as a somewhat isolated projection of development into the countryside, contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. Significant additional land would be required to be released in order to create a more acceptable settlement extension.

GTTS2056 Land north of, Pollard Avenue, Gomersal

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Site overlaps accepted urban greenspace option UGS1048. Therefore the gypsy and traveller allocation is no longer justified.

GTTS2057 Land south east of, Ridings Road, Earlsheaton

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

This site is isolated from any settlement and its removal from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. The site does not follow a feature on the ground on its southern boundary which would leave the field to the south vulnerable to encroachment.

GTTS2058 Land to the east of, Lynfield Drive, Hightown

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Site overlaps part of an accepted urban greenspace, UGS1069. Therefore, the gypsy and traveller allocation is no longer justified.

GTTS2059 Land to the south of, Woodend Road, Lower Hopton

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

This site sits in an extensive area of green belt but where existing properties and urban land uses create an area of urban fringe. It is physically separated from the settlement of Mirfield by the line of the railway to the north and by open fields to the east. This means that it has no existing relationship to the settlement, would require significant additional land release and would intensify the appearance of an urban fringe area close to the settlement edge.

Summary of comments		Council Response			
GTTS2060	Land to the south-west, Hagg Lane, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Site access is not achievable. The area to the south of Mirfield in this location is characterised as an area of urban fringe, where there is a significant amount of existing development in the green belt, including the ribbon development along Boathouse Lane and industrial and agricultural buildings. Release of this site would require the removal of the field between the site and the settlement edge from the green belt in order to avoid an isolated area of non-green belt land and would intensify the appearance of urban fringe in this area, leading to pressure for further encroachment.			
		No comments received on this site.			
GTTS2061	Land to south of, Woodsome Drive, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO5078					
There is good pedestrian access to the site. Vehicular access is via a track. Site is partly bounded by a public rights of way and is urban greenspace.		No Change			
The site is close to existing residential development The site is sustainably located in terms of good access to services, schools, health facilities and public transport links. No other constraints to development were identified and as such, Subject to the upgrading of the access track, the site would be suitable residential use by travellers.		The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Site overlaps accepted urban greenspace option UGS1086. Therefore the gypsy and traveller allocation is no longer justified.			
GTTS2062	Land south of, Lockwood Scar, Lockwood	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Third party land is required. Site overlaps accepted urban greenspace option, UGS1976. Therefore the gypsy and traveller allocation is unjustified.			
GTTS2063	Land east of, Newsome Road, Newsome	Support	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO5079					
There are good pedestrian and vehicular access to the site. Site forms part of a much larger urban greenspace allocation.		No Change			
The site is close to existing residential development. The site is sustainably located in terms of good access to services, schools, health facilities and public transport links. No other constraints to development were identified and as such the site would be suitable residential use by travellers.		The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Site is part of accepted urban greenspace option, UGS1190. Therefore, the gypsy and traveller allocation is no longer justified.			
GTTS2064	Land south west of, Fanny Moor Lane, Lowerhouses	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO4536, DLP_RSO5080					
There is good pedestrian and vehicular access to the site. Site is not allocated as urban greenspace. However, it does currently include some play equipment.		No Change			
Site is not within the Green Belt (though its inclusion is proposed in the Local Plan).		The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation			

Summary of comments

The site is close to existing residential development. The site is sustainably located in terms of good access to services, schools, health facilities and public transport links.
Support rejection of option.
No other constraints to development were identified and as such the site would be suitable residential use by travellers.

GTTS2065 Land south of, New Laithe Hill, Newsome
DLP_RSO934, DLP_RSO4537, DLP_RSO5081

There are good pedestrian and vehicular access to the site.
Site is crossed by public rights of way.

The site is close to existing residential development. The site is sustainably located in terms of good access to services, schools, health facilities and public transport links.
Support for rejection of option. Site would create waste issues. Site would be a blot on the area.
No other constraints to development were identified and as such the site would be suitable residential use by travellers if site layout design takes into consideration the public rights of way crossing the site.

Council Response

methodology.

Jackroyd Lane and New Laithe Hill would be unsuitable for intensification of use. Site to be added to the green belt through the local plan process.

Support 2 Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Fanny Moor Lane, Jackroyd Lane and New Laithe Hill would be unsuitable for intensification of use. Improvements are needed to the road widths, which would require 3rd party land. Site overlaps add land to the greenbelt option.

Mixed Use

MX1902 Land east of, Field Head Lane, Drighlington DLP_RSO1323, DLP_RSO4898, DLP_RSO4899, DLP_RSO4900	Support 3 Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment
<p>Road capacity and congestion including A62, A58, A651, A652, A643 and the A650 which runs along the north east border with Bradford & Leeds.</p> <p>An appeal decision on the site on 22nd June 1999 by the Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State appeal T/APP/Z4718/C/98/651551 states that the total site including currently undeveloped land was to be included in that appeal and the whole site was granted mixed use, residential purposes, stabling and grazing of horses, storage and transfer of pallets, material change of use of the land for the use of turning and parking area etc. Currently application for Classroom Training School for Driver Training is lodged with Kirklees - application number 2014/62/92648/E. This Training School will be creating minimum 360 qualified HGV drivers per annum as well as CPC Classroom training.</p> <p>The area has taken too much development in the past which has impacted on the green belt and the quality of the area. Concerned about impact of development in Bradford and Leeds on the area.</p>	<p>No Change</p> <p>This site is proposed as a rejected mixed used allocation. It formed a rejected mixed use site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site lies partly in Leeds. One of the purposes of the green belt is to prevent towns from merging into one another and this site lies within an important area of green belt which helps to maintain openness between Kirklees and Leeds. The A650 prevents any physical merger to the north but on its eastern extent the site borders with fields in Leeds which are in the green belt. Development of the site would erode the extent of the strategic gap contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt. Removal of the site from the green belt would create a small pocket of non-green belt land surrounded by green belt, which is contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.</p> <p>Supporting comments for the rejection of this site have been noted.</p>
MX1904 Grimescar Valley, Grimescar Road, Birchencliffe DLP_RSO9, DLP_RSO33, DLP_RSO125, DLP_RSO126, DLP_RSO127, DLP_RSO128, DLP_RSO225, DLP_RSO241, DLP_RSO247, DLP_RSO258, DLP_RSO306, DLP_RSO352, DLP_RSO353, DLP_RSO357, DLP_RSO375, DLP_RSO381, DLP_RSO1177, DLP_RSO1412, DLP_RSO1563, DLP_RSO1795, DLP_RSO1835, DLP_RSO1881, DLP_RSO2284, DLP_RSO2286, DLP_RSO2288, DLP_RSO2665, DLP_RSO2847, DLP_RSO3372, DLP_RSO4584, DLP_RSO4653, DLP_RSO4654, DLP_RSO4708, DLP_RSO4832, DLP_RSO5014, DLP_RSO5037, DLP_RSO5038, DLP_RSO5039, DLP_RSO5040, DLP_RSO5046, DLP_RSO5047, DLP_RSO5048, DLP_RSO5049, DLP_RSO5050, DLP_RSO5051, DLP_RSO5052, DLP_RSO5053, DLP_RSO5054, DLP_RSO5055, DLP_RSO5056	Support 47 Conditional Support Object 2 No Comment
<p>Ainley top, the A629 and other local roads are severely congested. Burn Road is unsuitable for an increase in traffic.</p> <p>Removal of trees and vegetation will exacerbate flooding. The site will affect drainage and create the possibility of flooding.</p> <p>More traffic would increase pollution. Air pollution at Ainley Top is the highest in Huddersfield. Site is rich in wildlife and an important wildlife corridor. Site contains old trees and hedgerows. Part of the site is designated as a site of wildlife significance in the Unitary Development Plan. Bluebells may be affected.</p> <p>Site may be of archaeological interest and should be investigated.</p> <p>Schools in the area are at capacity. Lindley Junior School would need extending further. A new school in this area will affect children's health.</p> <p>Site contributes to the physical and mental wellbeing of the local community. Doctors in the area are at capacity. Dentist capacity is an issue. A new school in this area will affect children's health.</p> <p>Support rejection of option due to impact on local green spaces. Site is a valued area of recreation for walking, running and riding horses. Grimescar Valley is a green lung for local people. Remaining green space has greater importance in light of recent developments and planning permissions in the area.</p> <p>The greenbelt review is inaccurate as it fails to consider technical information previously sent to the Council about the development of the site. Support for retention of the greenbelt. Parts of site in Wildlife Corridor should be added to the greenbelt. Greenbelt exists to prevent urban sprawl. Grimescar Valley is of outstanding natural beauty.</p> <p>The Lindley / Bichencliffe area do not have enough schools, doctors or road improvements to take the huge increase in housing.</p> <p>The site performs better than other sites in the draft Local Plan; H334, Land to the south east of Hermitage Park, H1747 and H351, Land north of Bradley Road, Bradley, MX1905, Land east of 932-11- Leeds Road, H2089, Land to the south of Ravensthorpe Road.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal is too negative against Objectives SA5 Amenity, SA11 Efficient Use of Land, SA12 Landscape, SA14 Biodiversity and Geodiversity. In assessing the site the site assessment has not paid due regard to the detailed submissions made. Support for rejection of the option.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is a rejected mixed use option. This is an area of attractive and prominent countryside with countryside features including Grimescar Dike and its associated important wildlife habitats, a significant number of protected trees which define the edge of the settlement and Grimescar Wood and Gernhill Wood areas of ancient woodland. Although the site is large enough to maintain a buffer with the areas of ancient woodland, development that respected the watercourse and its habitats would have a poor relationship with the existing settlement form, being effectively detached from it. The extent of the site on its northern edge on steeply rising ground would impact significantly in long distance views and therefore be detrimental to the openness of the wider green belt.</p> <p>The site has been rejected based on its individual planning constraints.</p> <p>The Sustainability Appraisal methodology is deemed sound.</p> <p>Support for site rejection noted.</p>
MX1908 Land between, Nutter Lane and Bradford Road, Gomersal DLP_RSO110, DLP_RSO683, DLP_RSO777, DLP_RSO1041, DLP_RSO1114, DLP_RSO1211, DLP_RSO1307, DLP_RSO1464, DLP_RSO1513, DLP_RSO4944, DLP_RSO4945, DLP_RSO4946, DLP_RSO5017	Support 13 Conditional Support Object No Comment

Summary of comments

Road congestion already a problem including A62, A58, A651, A652, A643 and by the A650 which runs along the north east border with Bradford & Leeds.
 Acknowledge proposed improvements at Smithies Junction and Tong Street but these will not mitigate against the impact of new development.
 Drainage capacity insufficient.
 Support rejection of site as it is a habitat for bats, herons, owls, pheasants, foxes, rabbits, squirrels, badgers and deer.
 Existing trees would be lost if development were to go ahead.
 Need to protect Oakwell hall and other historic buildings.
 School capacity insufficient.
 Health services/provision insufficient.
 Open spaces should be protected to promote health and well-being and for amenity use.
 It is important that any green space (sites H3, H352, H644 and MX1908) to the east, south and west is protected so that the Park and it's wildlife is not "developed" into a tiny space within a built up area. The accesses to the Park off Nutter Lane (top and bottom) and via Nova Lane should be maintained in character as should access via Bridleway BAT/1/10.
 Protect the green frontage.

Support protection of green belt in order to prevent urban sprawl
 Green belt land should be protected in order to keep the network of public footpaths and bridleways locally.
 Should use Brownfield first.
 Loss of view and amenity.
 Where will all additional people be employed?
 Poor ground stability due to previous mining
 The area should be protected for future generations.
 The area has taken too much development in the past which has impacted on the green belt and the quality of the area.
 Concerned about development in Bradford and Leeds and impact on area.
 Need to protect the identity of existing communities.

Council Response

No change

The site is proposed as a rejected mixed use allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

Preventing the consolidation of frontage development along Bradford Road helps to maintain the gap between Birstall and Gomersal. Development of the part of the site proposed for residential use (equivalent to H644) would result in the loss of one of the remaining gaps to the north of Bradford Road. While local authorities should plan positively to improve damaged or derelict land in the green belt this site appears to have revegetated and forms an area of open land located within an important strategic gap. The benefits of the creation of the country park are not considered sufficient to outweigh the harm caused to the green belt from the related housing development.

The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.

MX1909	Land to the North East of, Meltham Mills, Meltham Mills Road, Meltham	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
--------	---	---------	---------------------	--------	------------

No Representations received

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

This site contains ancient woodland / protected trees and a section of Honley Wood Local Wildlife Site. It extends into the green belt, a designation which helps protect sensitive wildlife habitats.

MX1912	Dobroyd Mills, Hepworth Road, Jackson Bridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
--------	--	---------	---------------------	--------	------------

No Representations received

No change.

This site was a rejected mixed use option in the draft local plan and remains rejected but note that a smaller mixed use option (MX1912a) has been accepted on part of this land.

In addition to the previously development element of this site, the site also includes Dean Dike and its important associated wildlife habitats which are countryside features best protected by their green belt designation. Immediately north of the mill site Dean Dike and its treed valley meets the road and this maintains a narrow degree of undeveloped separation between the mill site and the 'centre' of Jackson Bridge, which would be of critical importance if the mill site were to be removed from the green belt.

MX1913	Land at, Spinksmire Mill, Huddersfield Road, Meltham	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
--------	--	---------	---------------------	--------	------------

No Representations received

No change

This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		The site is part of accepted option E1866.			
MX1915	Manor House Farm, POL, Wakefield Road, Clayton West	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change			
		This site was a rejected housing option in the draft local plan and remains rejected.			
		This site is part of an accepted housing allocation.			
MX1918	Former North Bierley WWTW, Cliff Hollins Lane, Cleckheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		Change			
		This site was allocated as a mixed use site in the draft Local Plan. However, following further re-assessment of the site the site has been rejected for mixed use for the reasons outlined below. The use of the site for employment has been accepted.			
		This site is separated from any settlement in Kirklees by major roads, including the M62 and M606 motorways. On its northern end it abuts Cliffe Lane which borders with Bradford.			
		This site is separated from any settlement in Kirklees by major roads, including the M62 and M606 motorways. On its northern end it abuts Cliffe Hollins Lane which borders with Bradford. One of the purposes of the green belt is to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another and although it is acknowledged that there is development on the west of Bradford Road, undeveloped frontages help to maintain the appearance of separation. The extent of this site would therefore reinforce merger with Bradford contrary to the purposes of including land in the green belt.			
		All the site lies within an outer hazard zone. 60% of the site falls within a high pressure pipeline buffer. A high pressure gas pipeline runs north/south through the site.			
MX1921	Land to the south of, Egypt Farm, Cliff lane, Cleckheaton	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
DLP_RSO1406		No change			
Support the retention of the green belt boundary.		The site is proposed as a rejected mixed use allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
Support the rejection of this site as it is within an area known locally as Cleckheaton Bottoms which is an area of great character with well used public access close to the town centre.		This area of green belt forms part of a reasonably extensive gap between Cleckheaton and Gomersal and there are opportunities west of the line of the former railway for limited rounding off or infill development without compromising the strategic role of the green belt. However, this site is unrelated to any settlement and could lead to the sprawl of built form down a prominent slope to the detriment of openness. The site could not be released from the green belt in isolation and would also require the removal of the land between the site and the edge of Cleckheaton.			
		The supporting comments for the site rejection are noted.			
MX1922	Land east of, Boundary Street, Heckmondwike	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		The site is proposed as a rejected mixed use allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
		Site access is achievable. Site overlaps accepted housing allocation H1772.			
MX1923	Holme Bank Mills, Station Road, Mirfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment

Summary of comments

No Representations received

MX1924 Land east of, Naomi Road, Newsome
DLP_RSO476, DLP_RSO4499

Site is in a sustainable location with no public health, transport, education, flood risk, environment protection, biodiversity or historic environment constraints and in close proximity of a wide range of shops, community facilities, jobs, key services and public transport infrastructure. Site offers a suitable location for new housing development and is achievable within a period of five years. The site provides an opportunity to strengthen the role of the Church Lane Local Centre through the delivery of retail and commercial units that will meet the day-to-day needs of local residents in the immediate vicinity. Site is part Brownfield, available now, and has a willing land owner. Site is an eyesore and should be housing.

MX1925 Land off, Soothill Lane, Batley
DLP_RSO3062, DLP_RSO3336

Support rejection on ground of road congestion and traffic on the A653 (Leeds City Council)

Support rejection of the site on the grounds that it closes the strategic gap between Batley and West Ardsley and represents encroachment into the open countryside towards Leeds (Leeds City Council). The site should be allocated to address the current shortfall in housing identified in the draft local plan.

MX1926 Land south of, Lindley Moor Road, Lindley

No Representations received

MX1927 Land north of, Whitehall Road, Scholes

No Representations received

Council Response

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected mixed use allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

The site is located within Flood Zone 3.

Support Conditional Support Object 2 No Comment

No change.

This site is a rejected mixed use option. The site of former allotment gardens is unused rough land with bramble scrub and some shrubs and trees. This part is too small as Urban Greenspace on its own. There is a TPO area on the western boundary, The overall open space assessment is made on the basis of the appeal dismissed on the former allotments site (2008/92072) as the site provides valuable visual relief in otherwise densely developed area and development would have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the area. Site includes mill tanks with no biodiversity or protected species impact at time of appeal.

Support 1 Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected gypsy and traveller allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

HA have indicated impact of development on this scale here would require additional mitigation beyond that already planned for in the area. Site also affects an area where safety is an issues, although it is acknowledged that development could help bring about highways improvements that could improve safety. The green belt in this location separates the three settlements of Soothill, Woodkirk and Chidswell. The extent of the site would result in significant and continuous development both along Soothill Lane and on land west of Leeds Road, thereby merging the three settlements contrary to the role and function of the green belt. The site as proposed does not in places follow features on the ground that could present a strong defensible new green belt boundary, most notably on its northern extent which is marked by a change in character of land use rather than any strong physical feature. This would leave neighbouring land vulnerable to encroachment. The option would also completely isolate a large area of green belt land to the west.

Supporting comments have been noted.

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No change.

This site is a rejected mixed use option. The site is covered by another larger accepted mixed use allocation in the plan.

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected mixed use allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

This site has no relationship to any settlement, although the ribbon development along Whitechapel Road gives

Summary of comments

Council Response

the appearance of merger with Scholes. The properties fronting Whitechapel Road are overwashed by the green belt in order to prevent intensification. Development of the site frontage would result in almost continuous development between Scholes and Cleckheaton and impact on the strategic gap between the two settlements, although the presence of the M62 will prevent physical merger.

No comments received.

MX1928 Land south of, Lindley Moor Road, Lindley

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change.

This is a rejected mixed use option. The north west of this site is covered by another accepted mixed use allocation. The south east portion of the site has been developed for housing.

MX1931 Northgate, Cleckheaton

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No Change

The site is proposed as a rejected mixed use site. It formed a rejected mixed use site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

No significant constraints, however, 2 other options also proposed for the site (E1984 & H1983). Housing option (H1983) to be accepted as the preferred option therefore MX1931 to be rejected.

Summary of comments		Council Response			
Local Wildlife Site					
LWS94	Bradley Golf Course Pond	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>This site was proposed as a rejected Local Wildlife Site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) and remains rejected.</p> <p>Site has been surveyed and assessed for Local Wildlife Site designation. However, there is insufficient evidence of an established population of protected species to justify designation as a Local Wildlife Site.</p>			
LWS95	Clough House Lane Pond, Slaithwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>This site was proposed as a rejected Local Wildlife Site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) and remains rejected.</p> <p>Site screened out as very unlikely to meet the Local Wildlife Site selection criteria. There is therefore insufficient evidence at this stage to meet the Local Wildlife Site selection criteria.</p>			
LWS96	Mill Shaw Grove, Hepworth	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>This site is was a proposed rejected Local Wildlife Site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) and remains rejected.</p> <p>The reasons for change are the site has been surveyed and assessed for Local Wildlife Site designation but does not meet the criteria.</p>			
LWS97	Oakcliff Hill Knoll, Denby Dale	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>This site is a proposed rejected Local Wildlife Site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) and remains rejected.</p> <p>Insufficient justification to meet the criteria for designation as a Local Wildlife Site.</p>			
LWS98	Wither Wood, Denby Dale	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>This site is a proposed rejected Local Wildlife Site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) and remains rejected.</p> <p>Site has been surveyed and assessed for Local Wildlife Site designation but does not meet the criteria.</p>			
LWS99	Woodsome Lees, Farnley Tyas	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>This site was proposed as a rejected Local Wildlife Site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) and remains rejected.</p> <p>Site has been surveyed and assessed for Local Wildlife Site designation but does not meet the criteria.</p>			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
LWS100	Blackmoorfoot Reservoir, Huddersfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site was proposed as a rejected Local Wildlife Site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) and remains rejected.			
		Site does not meet the criteria for Local Wildlife Site designation.			
LWS101	Holme Styes Heathland, Holmfirth	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site was proposed as a rejected Local Wildlife Site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) and remains rejected.			
		Site screened out as very unlikely to meet the Local Wildlife Site selection criteria. There is therefore insufficient evidence at this stage to meet the Local Wildlife Site selection criteria.			
LWS102	Dogley, Penistone Road, Kirkburton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site was proposed as a rejected Local Wildlife Site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) and remains rejected.			
		Site has been surveyed but has no qualifying features to meet the Local Wildlife Site selection criteria. There is therefore insufficient evidence at this stage to meet the Local Wildlife Site selection criteria.			
LWS103	Smith Wood/Jenkinson Wood, Stocksmoor	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site was proposed as a rejected Local Wildlife Site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) and remains rejected.			
		Site has been surveyed but has no qualifying features to meet the Local Wildlife Site selection criteria. There is therefore insufficient evidence at this stage to meet the Local Wildlife Site selection criteria.			
LWS104	Boshaw Whams Reservoir, Hade Edge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site was proposed as a rejected Local Wildlife Site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) and remains rejected.			
		Site does not meet the criteria for Local Wildlife Site designation.			
LWS105	Merry Dale Clough, Slaithwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site was proposed as a rejected Local Wildlife Site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015) and remains rejected.			
		Site screened out as very unlikely to meet the Local Wildlife Site selection criteria. There is therefore insufficient evidence at this stage to meet the Local Wildlife Site selection criteria.			

Minerals Extraction Site

ME1973 Honley Wood, Honley
DLP_RSO1238

Support Conditional Support Object 1 No Comment

Object to the rejection of this site as in terms of the sustainability appraisal it received the same score as the other accepted mineral extraction sites.

No change.

This option was rejected in the Draft Local Plan (November 2015) and remains as a rejected minerals extraction site in accordance with the site allocation methodology. The site has been rejected for the following reason:

Site is significantly constrained due to the entire site falling within a Local Wildlife Site (formally SSI), the Wildlife Habitat Network, Ancient Woodland and a TPO area.

Major Development in Green Belt

MDGB2003	Land at Stothes Hall, Storthes Hall Lane, Kirkburton, Huddersfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected MDGB option. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology. A larger site option has been accepted which includes this area (MDGB2134).			
		No draft Local Plan consultation comments received but comments received on MDGB2134 are also relevant to this site..			

Safeguarded Land

SL2162	Land south of Whitcliffe Road	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected safeguarded land allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site has been retained as Urban Greenspace. The allocation of this site as urban green space is justified based on evidence from the Kirklees Open Space Study 2015 and Kirklees Urban Green Space Review.</p> <p>UGS2156 is a natural and semi-natural greenpace including woodland and grassland. Assessed through the Kirklees Open Space Study as having high value as open space based on its ecological importance due to the presence of lowland mixed deciduous woodland UK BAP priority habitat and acid grassland. Identified as part of the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network.</p> <p>Forming an important wider section of the Spen Valley Greenway corridor and close to Cleckheaton Town Centre, the site has the potential for enhancement for informal recreation use as public open space.</p>			
SL2174	Land north of Westfield Road	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change to site option.			
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected safeguarded land allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>This site is justified as urban green space based on evidence set out in the council's Open Space Study (2015) and/or Playing Pitch Strategy (2015) and/or the Urban Green Space Review methodology. Its allocation as urban green space is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>No suitable site access can be achieved to this site option. This site is a council owned allotment site and has been designated as an Urban Greenspace option UGS848.</p>			
SL2270	Land north of, Caldercliffe Road, Berry Brow	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No Change			
		<p>The site is proposed as a rejected safeguarded land allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected safeguarded land site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The site is part accepted Urban Greenspace allocation and part accepted housing allocation.</p>			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
Urban Greenspace					
UGS849	Fanny Moor Lane Open Space, Lowerhouses	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>This site is proposed as an accepted add land to the green belt option AGB2074.</p>			
UGS855	Kirkroyds Lane Allotments, New Mill	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site is below the site limit of 0.4 hectares and therefore too small for designation as urban green space.</p>			
UGS871	Land west of Broad Oak, Linthwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Part of open valley slope indistinguishable from adjacent land and no definable boundaries. hillside There is insufficient justification for allocation of this site as urban green space.</p>			
UGS873	Linthwaite Hall WMC Bowling Club, Linfit Lane, Linthwaite	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The bowling green is below the size limit of 0.4 hectares for allocation as urban green space and there is insufficient justification for the allocation of remainder of site.</p>			
UGS905	Former Carters Playing Fields, New Mill Road, Brockholes	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Proposed accepted employment allocation E1829 for this site requires replacement playing pitch provision or mitigation measures of equivalent value.</p>			
UGS913	Land at Barnsley Road, Flockton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>There is insufficient justification for the allocation of this site as urban green space. Part of the site is used horse</p>			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		grazing and the remainder of the site comprising protected trees is below the size limit of 0.4 hectares and therefore too small for allocation as urban green space.			
UGS981	Former Soothill Cricket Club, Grace Leather Lane, Batley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		Site has the benefit of full planning permission for 34 dwellings and 4 apartments. Development has commenced and therefore the allocation of this site as urban green space is not justified.			
UGS1026	Car Park, Thornhill Street, Savile Town	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected urban green space allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site is an existing car park not suitable for allocation as urban green space.			
UGS1071	Former RM Grylls Middle School, Second Avenue, Hightown	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		Education site no longer required. Insufficient justification for allocation as urban green space.			
		No comments were received on this part of the plan			
UGS1143	Former Allotments, Bracken Hall Road, Sheepridge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		Disused allotment site no longer required. There is insufficient justification for the allocation of this site as urban green space.			
UGS1241	Open Land, Weatherhill Crescent, Lindley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		There is insufficient justification for allocation of this site as urban green space.			
UGS1277	Land north of Lancaster Lane, Brockholes DLP_RSO1235, DLP_RSO4828	Support	Conditional Support	Object 2	No Comment
		No change.			
Urban Green Space allocation has not been carried forward. Former allotment gardens, presumably too small to meet the criteria for designation. Lack of allotments in Kirklees and demand for allotments in Brockholes. Site would be an ideal location for the Brockholes Allotment Society and should be designated		The site is proposed as a rejected urban green space allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation			

Summary of comments

as Local Green Space to allow this to be possible and to prevent housing development. The council has refused planning permission for housing (June 2015) and appeal dismissed by the Planning Inspector (Dec 2015), therefore its green space designation should be continued.

Council Response

methodology.

The site is a former allotments site which has been disused for over 15 years. It has now reverted to an open area of natural/semi-natural greenspace comprising overgrown scrubland and brambles.

The site is 0.4 hectares in size and is therefore of sufficient size to be considered for allocation as urban green space. However, the site has been assessed through the Kirklees Open Space Study as having low value as open space with no scarcity value. There is sufficient provision of natural/semi-natural greenspace in the area and the site has therefore been identified as surplus to requirements.

The appeal decision against the refusal of outline planning permission for residential development (2014/93549) was dismissed on the basis of the lack of affordable housing rather than the value of the site as open space.

As recognised in the appeal decision, there is no realistic prospect of this privately owned land being brought back into allotment use in the future, despite demand for allotments in the area.

UGS1294	Land at the junction of Craven Road/Mavis Street, Scout Hill	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
----------------	--	---------	---------------------	--------	------------

No Representations received

No change.

The site is proposed as a rejected urban green space allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

This site has planning permission for the erection of a sports centre (application 2013/92649). Therefore, the principle for the development of this site has been established and allocation as urban green space is not justified.

UGS1305	Land west of Binn Road, Marsden	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
----------------	---------------------------------	---------	---------------------	--------	------------

No Representations received

No change.

This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

The majority of the site is in use as private gardens and the remainder is overgrown and unused. There is insufficient justification for the allocation of this site as urban green space.

UGS1508	Taylor Hill Road Allotments, Newsome	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
----------------	--------------------------------------	---------	---------------------	--------	------------

No Representations received

No change.

This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

There is insufficient justification for the allocation of this site as urban green space. The area of allotments is below the site limit of 0.4 hectares and therefore too small to designate.

UGS1735	Land off Hood Street/Lady House Lane, Berry Brow	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
----------------	--	---------	---------------------	--------	------------

No Representations received

Site now excluded as originally created to compensate for loss of recreation ground and playing pitch and recreation ground associated with housing option H1734. The housing option is now rejected and consideration as urban green space is no longer relevant. There would be no need to remove land from the green belt to accommodate playing fields if very special circumstances could be shown.

UGS1820	Birkenshaw Park & St Paul & St Luke Church, Birkenshaw	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
----------------	--	---------	---------------------	--------	------------

No Representations received

No change.

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
	<p>This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Birkenshaw Park and St Paul & St Luke Church are proposed as accepted urban green space sites UGS1045 and UGS1804. Existing house and curtilage have been removed from urban green space allocation. There is insufficient justification for the allocation of the whole of this site as urban green space.</p>
<p>UGS1822 St Patrick's Sports Club & Smithies Moor, Birstall</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected urban green space allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Proposed accepted housing allocation H138 on this site requires replacement playing pitch provision.</p>
<p>UGS1934 St Patrick's Sports Club, Mill Street, Birstall</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>This site is proposed as an accepted housing allocation H138 with the requirement for replacement playing pitch provision.</p>
<p>UGS1977 Southfield Road Open Space, Almondbury</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected urban green space allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The area of the site covered by trees is below the size limit of 0.4 hectares for allocation as urban green space. The remainder of site includes a number of garages which do not perform an urban green space function. Therefore, there is insufficient justification for allocation of this site as urban green space.</p>
<p>UGS1980 Land at the junction of Newsome Road/Hart Street, Newsome DLP_RSO475</p> <p>Support assessment that there is insufficient justification for the designation of the site as urban greenspace.</p>	<p>Support 1 Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected urban green space allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p> <p>The site includes two mill tanks and a small area of former allotments now unused. There is insufficient justification for allocation of the whole of this site as urban green space.</p> <p>No comments were received on this part of the plan.</p>
<p>UGS1981 Russell House Children's Hospice, Huddersfield</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected urban green space allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p>

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		This site has been developed as children's hospice and is not therefore suitable for allocation as urban green space.			
UGS1998	Land at Hollin Hall Lane, Golcar	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected urban green space allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site has planning permission for 20 dwellings (2014/92878) and therefore the principle for the development of this site has been established. There is therefore no justification for the allocation of this site as urban green space.			
UGS1999	Land at Bankfield Park Avenue, Taylor Hill, Huddersfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected urban green space allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site comprises a large area of natural/semi-natural greenspace comprising mainly rough grassland with small treed areas. There is insufficient justification for allocation of this site as urban green space.			
UGS2000	Land at Leak Hall Lane, Denby Dale	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		There is insufficient justification for allocation as urban green space.			
UGS2001	Land adjacent River Dearne, Off Wakefield Road, Denby Dale	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site includes private gardens not suitable for allocation as urban green space. The remainder of site is below the size limit of 0.4 hectares and therefore too small for allocation as urban green space.			
UGS2004	Land at Dunford Road, Holmfirth	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		There is insufficient justification for allocation of this site as urban green space. The site is more appropriately identified as part of the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network.			
UGS2005	Land at Burton Acres Lane, Highburton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		There is insufficient justification for the allocation of this site as urban green space.			
UGS2006	Land at Turnshaw Road, Kirkburton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		Large area of mainly unused land assessed as having low value as open space. Not required to meet open space needs or meet deficiencies. There is insufficient justification to allocate this site as urban green space.			
UGS2007	Land at Riley Lane, Kirkburton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site comprises a private garden and curtilage not suitable for allocation as urban green space.			
UGS2009	Land at Holme Avenue, Dalton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected urban green space allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site has outline planning permission for residential development (application 2014/92369) and therefore the principle for the development of this site has been established. There is therefore no justification for the allocation of this site as urban green space.			
UGS2010	Land at Bank End Lane, Dalton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site has the benefit of outline planning permission for residential development. Therefore the principle of the development of the site has been established and allocation as urban green space is not justified.			
UGS2011	Tenter Hill, Tenter Hill Road, New Mill	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The school playing fields and land off Stoney Bank Lane are proposed as accepted urban green space allocations UGS888 and UGS889. The site also includes proposed accepted housing option H729 and part has now developed for housing. There is insufficient justification for the allocation of the whole area as urban green space.			
UGS2084	Clayton Fields, Edgerton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response
	<p>This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site has the benefit of outline planning permission for 41 houses (application 2014/93014) granted on appeal 11/09/2015. Therefore, the principle for the development of this site has been established and its allocation as urban green space is not justified.</p>
<p>UGS2119 Highfields Community Centre, Edgerton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected urban green space allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>This site is occupied by Highfields Community Centre building and associated car parking and is therefore not suitable for allocation as urban green space.</p>
<p>UGS2120 Land at junction of Queens Road/Murray Road, Edgerton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site is below the size limit of 0.4 hectares and therefore too small for designation as urban green space.</p>
<p>UGS2121 Land at Queens Road, Edgerton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected urban green space allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site is below the size limit of 0.4 hectares and therefore too small for allocation as urban green space.</p>
<p>UGS2122 Clayton Fields Allotments & Land south of Clayton Dike, Edgerton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected urban green space allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The northern part of this site covering Clayton Fields Allotments is already proposed for allocation as urban green space as proposed accepted urban green space option UGS1105.</p> <p>The southern part of the site, however, extends into land that has outline planning permission for 41 houses. As such, the allocation of the whole of this site as urban green space is not justified.</p>
<p>UGS2123 Highfields Community Orchard, Wentworth Street, Edgerton</p> <p>No Representations received</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site is below the size limit of 0.4 hectares and therefore too small for allocation as urban green space.</p>

Summary of comments		Council Response			
UGS2145	Land adjacent Healey Lane Junior, Infant & Nursery School, Healey	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected urban green space allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Former education site no longer required. There is insufficient justification for allocation of this site as urban green space.</p>			
UGS2147	Cleckheaton Bowling Club, Park View, Cleckheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site has planning permission for the erection of 23 dwellings (application 2015/90022) granted 16/11/2015. Therefore the principle for the development of this site has been established and allocation as urban green space is not justified.</p>			
UGS2153	Land adjacent The Coombs, Hall Lane, Thornhill	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected urban green space allocation. The site was proposed as a rejected site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Unused land assessed as having low value as open space with no scarcity value. Site not required as open space. There is insufficient justification for allocation of this site as urban green space.</p>			
UGS2157	Former Hartshead Moor Junior School, Hartshead Moor	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		<p>No change.</p> <p>This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Education site no longer required. There is insufficient justification for the allocation of this site as urban green space.</p>			
UGS2334	Meltham Moor Primary School, Meltham DLP_RSO4446, DLP_RSO4447	Support	Conditional Support	Object 2	No Comment
<p>Incorrect area assessed under UGS2334. Suggests site is extended to the west to include the whole site of Meltham Moor Primary School. This meets the urban green space criteria because it is green space of identifiable value within Meltham. There is no reason why, using the same criteria in the UDP (para 2.11), the school sites is identified in the UDP as Urban Green Space but not in the draft Local Plan. No additional buildings or extensions have been built since the UDP was adopted in 1999.</p>		<p>Proposed change to re-instate urban green space allocation.</p> <p>This site is a proposed accepted urban green space allocation. This represents a change from the draft Local Plan (November 2015) where the site was rejected as an urban green space allocation.</p> <p>The reasons for change are the site has been reviewed in light of comments received and considered to merit allocation as urban green space.</p> <p>The north western part of Meltham Moor Primary School site is appropriately proposed to be designated within the green belt in the publication draft Local Plan.</p> <p>The remainder of the school site includes the school building and grounds and was shown as urban green space in the adopted UDP (1999). The majority of the land comprises open space uses associated with the</p>			

Summary of comments

Council Response

school, including the school playground area, playing fields and sports facilities. As such, UGS2334 merits allocation as urban green space and it's allocation is considered to be consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.

UGS2508 Land rear of Whitacre Street, Deighton

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change.

This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

The site is below the size limit of 0.4 hectares and is therefore too small for allocation as urban green space.

UGS2511 Land at Back Lane, Upper Denby

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change.

This is a proposed rejected urban green space site. It was proposed as a rejected urban green space site in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

The site is below the size limit of 0.4 hectares and is therefore too small for allocation as urban green space.

Summary of comments

Council Response

Local Green Space

LocGS2127	Land at the junction of, Queen's Road and Murray Road, Edgerton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected Local Green Space designation. It was proposed to be shown without specific allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site is not demonstrably special when assessed against the Local Green Space criteria and does not therefore merit designation as Local Green Space. Its rejection is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
LocGS2128	Land at, Queen's Road, Edgerton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected Local Green Space designation. It was proposed to be shown without specific allocation in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site is not demonstrably special when assessed against the Local Green Space criteria and does not therefore merit designation as Local Green Space. Its rejection is consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.,			
LocGS2129	Clayton Fields Allotments & Land south of Clayton Dike, Clayton Fields, Edgerton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected Local Green Space designation. The majority of the site was proposed as accepted urban green space allocation UGS1105 in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). UGS1105 is proposed to remain as an accepted urban green space site in the publication draft Local Plan. The remainder of the site, south of Clayton Dike, extends into proposed accepted housing allocation H215.			
		The site is not demonstrably special when assessed against the Local Green Space criteria and does not therefore merit designation as Local Green Space. Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
LocGS2130	Land adjacent Clayton Dike, Clayton Fields, Edgerton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected Local Green Space designation. The manority of the site was proposed as part of an accepted urban green space site UGS1105 in the draft Local Plan (November 2015). UGS1105 remains as an accepted urban green space allocation in the publication draft Local Plan. The remainder of the site, south of Clayton Dike, extends into proposed accepted housing allocation H215.			
		The site is not demonstrably special when assessed against the Local Green Space criteria and does not therefore merit designation as Local Green Space. Its rejection is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			

Strategic Green Infrastructure

SGI2109	Land to west of, Penistone Road, Fenay Bridge	Support 70	Conditional Support	Object 20	No Comment
DLP_RSO27, DLP_RSO48, DLP_RSO63, DLP_RSO75, DLP_RSO200, DLP_RSO262, DLP_RSO330, DLP_RSO340, DLP_RSO415, DLP_RSO433, DLP_RSO445, DLP_RSO504, DLP_RSO514, DLP_RSO609, DLP_RSO640, DLP_RSO662, DLP_RSO667, DLP_RSO762, DLP_RSO771, DLP_RSO920, DLP_RSO973, DLP_RSO1321, DLP_RSO1342, DLP_RSO1350, DLP_RSO1360, DLP_RSO1474, DLP_RSO1494, DLP_RSO1521, DLP_RSO1573, DLP_RSO1608, DLP_RSO1617, DLP_RSO1628, DLP_RSO1631, DLP_RSO1644, DLP_RSO1735, DLP_RSO1749, DLP_RSO1760, DLP_RSO1790, DLP_RSO1845, DLP_RSO1874, DLP_RSO1920, DLP_RSO2065, DLP_RSO2091, DLP_RSO2162, DLP_RSO2235, DLP_RSO2475, DLP_RSO2697, DLP_RSO2818, DLP_RSO3131, DLP_RSO3367, DLP_RSO3379, DLP_RSO4037, DLP_RSO4043, DLP_RSO4113, DLP_RSO4352, DLP_RSO4514, DLP_RSO4526, DLP_RSO4553, DLP_RSO4556, DLP_RSO4719, DLP_RSO4977, DLP_RSO4978, DLP_RSO4979, DLP_RSO4980, DLP_RSO4981, DLP_RSO4982, DLP_RSO4983, DLP_RSO4987, DLP_RSO4988, DLP_RSO4989, DLP_RSO4990, DLP_RSO4991, DLP_RSO4992, DLP_RSO4993, DLP_RSO4994, DLP_RSO4995, DLP_RSO4996, DLP_RSO4997, DLP_RSO4998, DLP_RSO4999, DLP_RSO5000, DLP_RSO5001, DLP_RSO5002, DLP_RSO5003, DLP_RSO5004, DLP_RSO5007, DLP_RSO5009, DLP_RSO5010, DLP_RSO5011, DLP_RSO5012					

Site based: Increased traffic will impact on traffic flow and add to congestion on busy Penistone Road. Road. Capacity, increased accidents and road safety issues at junctions of Penistone Road/Woodsome Road and Penistone Road/Rowley Lane. No traffic assessment or indication if sufficient parking provision can be accommodated.

Flooding issues - Land is floodplain, high flood risk area (zone 3b). Increased risk of flooding due to new development, car parks and roads and will impact flooding downstream. Flood attenuation measures can be accommodated on site. Car park could be used as floodplain to help protect future housing downstream. Increased air pollution from traffic.

Impact on biodiversity, wildlife habitats, wildlife corridor and fragile ecosystem. Habitat fragmentation. Close to nature reserve.

Negative impact on special character, the environment and countryside. Impact on openness of Castle Hill from south and east.

Country Park is not deliverable and does not have support of landowners. Visitor centre/hub not needed and not required to enjoy the countryside. Hub gateway is critical to the plans for the Country Park and required to make it happen to provide parking, facilities for users, rural businesses and education facilities. Loss of green belt land, prevents spread of urban development. Improved access to greater outdoor recreation opportunities comprise exceptional circumstances to allow development. Unnecessary and unsound. Unsuitable location for a hub. Most suitable location for the entrance hub, flat site to provide facilities and primary access into the park. Impact on local small businesses if Farnley Estates were to develop an out of town retail estate. Insufficient master planning, market research and assessment undertaken. Country Park provides the opportunity to create an outdoor facility which provides significant health, education, leisure and economic benefits. Remove from the green belt and allocate for mixed use.

No change.

This is a proposed rejected Strategic Green Infrastructure proposal. It was proposed as a rejected Strategic Green Infrastructure proposal in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

The site has been promoted for a mix of leisure and commercial uses as the visitor hub for a proposed country park. Also see mixed use options MX2681 and MX3371 for this site.

This is an extensive area of green belt that washes over the open countryside south of Huddersfield. The area includes sensitive environmental habitats, the Fenay Beck and numerous historic assets. Penistone Road and the route of the former railway line currently delineate the edge of Lepton and this site would breach this very strong boundary, introducing built form west of Penistone Road. The route of the Fenay Beck would prevent further sprawl to the west but as a countryside feature the river and its setting it best protected by its green belt designation so as to prevent encroachment into the countryside. Most of the northern part of the site lies in flood zone 3b functional floodplain. The majority of the site also lies in 3a with only the southern part of the site located in flood zone 1.

Support for this option is noted. However, this has been rejected for the reasons above.

Support for the rejection of this option are also noted.

Summary of comments

Council Response

Remove from Green Belt

Reference	Location	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
RGB2077	Land between, Slaithwaite Gate and Pike Law Road, Scapegoat Hill				
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		Reason: There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.			
RGB2078	Hill Top, Linthwaite				
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		Reason: There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.			
RGB2079	21 - 27, Cliffe Lane, Gomersal				
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		Reason: There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.			
RGB2080	Holt Farm, Holt Lane, Holmfirth				
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		Reason: There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.			
RGB2081	Totties Holmfirth				
Totties should be inset within the green belt. There is no explanation as to why some settlements are washed over by the green belt whilst others are inset. Such an approach severely constrains controlled growth and potentially threatens sustainability. Totties should be inset within the green belt to allow for a level of affordable housing and to ensure that the settlement is sustained.		No change.			
		This site is proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		Reason:			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.			
RGB2082	Land north and west of, Ward Bank Road/Cartworth Road, Holmfirth	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		Reason: There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.			
RGB2136	913, Halifax Road, Hartshead Moor	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		Reason: There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.			
RGB2137	Barcliffe Mills, Near Bank, Shelley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		Reason: There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.			
RGB2138	Former, Spenborough Waste Water Treatment Works, Smithies Lane, Heckmondwike	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		Reason: There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.			
RGB2139	Armitages Garden Centre, Huddersfield Road, Shelley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		This site is proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected			

Summary of comments

Council Response

remove land from the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

Reason:

There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.

RGB2141 Land at, Ponderosa, Norristhorpe Lane, Liversedge

Support Conditional Support Object No Comment

No Representations received

No change.

This site is proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected remove land from the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).

Reason:

There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.

Summary of comments

Council Response

Removal from Urban Greenspace

RUGS2103	Land rear of Springfield Mills, Springfield Lane, Kirkburton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and therefore remains part of proposed accepted urban greens pace allocation UGS1282. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site is a well established natural/semi-natural greenspace, contiguous with adjoining protected trees, identified within the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network and is an integral part of the wider green space. Its allocation is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
RUGS2104	Heckmondwike Bowling Club, Green Avenue, Heckmondwike	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and remains part of proposed accepted urban greens pace allocation UGS1058. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		This site is within the curtilage of Heckmondwike Bowling Club adjoining an existing bowling green. It merits urban green space allocation as part of the bowling club which is recommended to be protected in the council's Playing Pitch Strategy 2015. Its allocation is considered consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
RUGS2105	Land rear of Armitages Garden Centre, Birchencliffe Hill Road, Birchencliffe	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and remains part of proposed accepted urban greens pace allocation UGS1231. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site comprises an established woodland area with informal footpath access and is identified as part of the Wildlife Habitat Network. Its allocation as urban green space is considered to be consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
RUGS2106	Land adjacent Ashenhurst Student Accommodation, Athene Drive, Huddersfield	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and remains part of proposed accepted urban greens pace allocation UGS1161. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site forms part of a wider natural/semi-natural greenspace covering Ashenburst Plantation and Oaken Bank Plantation and is identified within the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network. Its allocation as urban green space is considered to be consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
RUGS2107	49, Moorside, Clekcheaton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and remains part of proposed accepted urban greens space allocation UGS1068. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			

Summary of comments		Council Response			
		The site is an integral part of wider of natural/semi-natural greenspace which performs a strategic open space function. Its allocation as urban green space is considered to be consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
RUGS2490	Land rear of 13, Paris Road, Scholes, Holmfirth,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and remains part of proposed accepted urban greens space allocation UGS1247. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site is an integral part of wider of natural/semi-natural greenspace assessed as having high value as open space in the council's Open Space Study based on ecological benefits and scarcity value. Its allocation as urban green space is considered to be consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
RUGS2491	Land adjacent 1, Cow Gate, Longwood, Huddersfield,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and remains part of proposed accepted urban greens space allocation UGS1218. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site is an integral part of wider of natural/semi-natural greenspace of Longwood Edge which is a prominent and mainly well treed quarry edge, identified within the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network. Its allocation as urban green space is considered to be consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
RUGS2492	Land adjacent 64, Brow Wood Road, Birstall, Batley,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and remains part of proposed accepted urban greens space allocation UGS970. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site is within the grounds of Batley Girls High School and its allocation as urban green space is considered to be consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
RUGS2494	Land adjacent 509, New Mill Road, Brockholes, Holmfirth	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and remains part of proposed accepted urban greens space allocation UGS908. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			
		The site is an integral part of Scar Wood comprising protected trees and is identified within the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network. Its allocation as urban green space is considered to be consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.			
RUGS2495	Land east of, 1 Clough Hey, Manchester Road, Marsden, Huddersfield,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received		No change.			
		The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and remains part of proposed accepted urban greens space allocation UGS1306. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).			

Summary of comments	Council Response			
	<p>The site is an integral part of a larger area of natural/semi-natural green space and includes mature trees. It performs an urban green space function in relation to adjacent woodland and is identified as part of the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network.</p> <p>Its allocation as urban green space is considered to be consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p>			
RUGS2496 Land rear of, 2 & 4, Warwick Mount, Batley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and remains part of proposed accepted urban greens space allocation UGS991. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site is an integral part of a larger area of natural/semi-natural green space. Its allocation as urban green space is considered to be consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p>			
RUGS2498 Land rear of, 1-27, Slant Gate, Linthwaite, Huddersfield,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and remains part of proposed accepted urban greens space allocation UGS1304. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site is an integral part of a larger area of natural/semi-natural green space identified within the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network. Its allocation as urban green space is considered to be consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p>			
RUGS2499 3, Miller Hill, Denby Dale, Huddersfield,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and remains part of proposed accepted urban greens space allocation UGS949. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site is an integral part of a larger area of natural/semi-natural corridor adjoining the River Dearne and is identified within the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network. Its allocation as urban green space is considered to be consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p>			
RUGS2500 Land east of, 11A, Sunny Mead, Waterloo, Huddersfield,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and remains part of proposed accepted urban greens space allocation UGS1154. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site is part of a larger area of natural/semi-natural greenspace which includes Round Wood designated as a Local Wildlife Site. Its allocation as urban green space is considered to be consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p>			
RUGS2501 Land rear of, The Slip Inn, Longwood Gate, Longwood, Huddersfield,	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and remains part of proposed</p>			

Summary of comments

Council Response

	<p>accepted urban greens space allocation UGS1218. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site is part of a larger area of woodland, includes some protected trees and is identified within the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network. Its allocation as urban green space is considered to be consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p>
<p>RUGS2503 Land rear of, 778, Halifax Road, Hightown, Liversedge,</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and remains part of proposed accepted urban greens space allocation UGS1068. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site is part of wider of natural/semi-natural greenspace which performs a strategic open space function and has been assessed as having high value as open space. Its allocation as urban green space is considered to be consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p>
<p>RUGS2504 Land adjacent, Meltham Dike, Meltham, Holmfirth,</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and remains part of proposed accepted urban greens space allocation UGS1249. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site is part of wider of natural/semi-natural greenspace corridor adjacent Meltham Dike and is identified within the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network. Its allocation as urban green space is considered to be consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p>
<p>RUGS2513 Land east of 30 Cuckstool Road, Denby Dale, Huddersfield</p>	<p>Support Conditional Support Object No Comment</p>
<p>No Representations received</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>The site is proposed as a rejected remove from urban green space option and remains part of proposed accepted urban greens pace allocation UGS949. The site was rejected as a remove from urban green space option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>The site is an intrinsic part of a wider natural/semi-natural greenspace which is a prominent woodland hillside forming a backdrop to Denby Dale Cricket Ground and is identified as part of the Kirklees Wildlife Habitat Network. Its allocation as urban green space is considered to be consistent with the council's site allocation methodology.</p>

Summary of comments

Council Response

AddtoGreenBelt

AGB2067	Field south of, Manor Road, Farnley Tyas	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>The protection afforded this land by virtue of it being within the conservation area and therefore important to its open setting has proved inadequate as part of the site has been given approval for development. The views of previous planning inspectors on the importance of this site should be taken into consideration.</p>		<p>No change.</p> <p>Reason: When considering the application for residential development the Council acknowledged that the site forms an important gap which needs to be maintained, but judged that the impact on the heritage asset, which is Farnley Tyas Conservation Area as a whole, would be minimal. A previous appeal decision was taken into consideration in arriving at the decision. The importance to the setting of the Conservation Area of the remainder of the site will be judged through any future Conservation Area appraisal. Given the significance of the undeveloped part of this site, the Council still maintains that the land is afforded sufficient protection from development through its inclusion within the Conservation Area boundary. There is therefore no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn nor any overriding necessity to change the position of the boundary. As such exceptional circumstances do not exist to change the green belt boundary in this location.</p> <p>This site is proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p>			
AGB2068	Land north and south of, North Road, Kirkburton	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>		<p>No change.</p> <p>This site is proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Reason: There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.</p>			
AGB2069	Employment and Housing allocations, Grange Road, Batley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>		<p>No change.</p> <p>This site is proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Reason: There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.</p>			
AGB2070	Northgate, Honley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>		<p>No change.</p> <p>This site is proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Reason: There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.</p>			
AGB2071	Employment and housing allocations, Lindley	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
<p>No Representations received</p>		<p>No change.</p>			

Summary of comments

Council Response

Summary of comments	Council Response				
	<p>This site is proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Reason: There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.</p>				
AGB2072	Land to the east of, Dunford Road, Hade Edge	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
The assessment is supported. The site does not perform any green belt purpose and there is no need to keep the land permanently open.	<p>No change.</p> <p>This site is proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Reason: There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.</p> <p>Support for the rejection of the option to add this site to the green belt is noted.</p>				
AGB2073	Land between Newsome Road and Jackroyd Lane, Newsome	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	<p>No change.</p> <p>This site is proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Reason: There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.</p>				
AGB2075	Land east of, Ryecroft Lane, Scholes	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	<p>No change.</p> <p>This site is proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Reason: There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.</p>				
AGB2076	Rear of, 330 to 342, Leymoor Road, Golcar	Support	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
No Representations received	<p>No change.</p> <p>This site is proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option. The site was proposed as a rejected add land to the green belt option in the draft Local Plan (November 2015).</p> <p>Reason: There has been no change in circumstances and no evidence to suggest that the green belt boundary is incorrectly drawn. Exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify an amendment to the green belt boundary in this location.</p>				

Kirklees Draft Local Plan: Summary of comments and the Council's Responses

Paragraphs contained within the Rejected Sites consultation consultation

This report provides the number of comments made (Support, Conditional Support, Object and No Comment) on the Draft Local Plan Consultation (November 2015 - February 2016) and summary of these comments and the Council's response, including proposed changes to the Local Plan. Comment references are listed - full details of each comment are available at www.kirklees.gov.uk/localplan

Summary of comments	Council Response				
General Comment	Support	3	Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment 1
DLP_RSO3, DLP_RSO351, DLP_RSO773, DLP_RSO1682, DLP_RSO2273					
Support the local plan and applaud the non-use of green belt land for building. Green belt is critical in supporting wildlife and stopping the merging of villages into one urban sprawl. Brownfield sites should be developed first or re-developed and all green belt protected and preserved.	No Change				
	The comment has been noted.				
The Rejected Site Options Report is considered unsound and would not result in a plan that has been positively prepared and is not consistent with National policy . The text in the introduction of the Rejected Site Options Report states that: 'The decision about whether to reject each option is based on a cumulative judgement of technical assessments and consultee responses about each site'. This statement is vague and does not provide sufficient information of how the assessment findings result in the sites being rejected. For example, does one red score result in automatic rejection of a site or are the constraints weighted differently so that in some circumstances more than one red score is required to result in rejection. This information is required in order for the plan to demonstrate that it has been positively prepared and that the decisions made are justified.	Change.				
	To supplement the 'traffic light' assessments of rejected sites, the assessments for accepted sites will be published to allow for comparison and a justification will summarise the reasons for why sites have been accepted or rejected, which will be published in a separate technical paper.				
A methodology and explanation should be provided to inform how the assessment matrix has been applied and if some constraints are weighted differently to others. The assessment should be applied to all sites so that both rejected and accepted sites can be considered and compared using the same evidence base. Categories should also be re-assessed to ensure that categories do not include a number of different scenarios. The assessment should include a category to consider the benefits associated with the development of sites.	Change.				
	To supplement the 'traffic light' assessments of rejected sites, the assessments for accepted sites will be published to allow for comparison and a justification will summarise the reasons for why sites have been accepted or rejected, which will be published in a separate technical paper.				
Greater clarity and more robust evidence should be provided in relation to Green Belts in the rejected site options report. The various scenarios currently included in the red category should be split so that it is clear how the sites have been considered.	Change.				
	To supplement the 'traffic light' assessments of rejected sites, the assessments for accepted sites will be published to allow for comparison and a justification will summarise the reasons for why sites have been accepted or rejected, which will be published in a separate technical paper.				
The Rejected Options Report is an exceedingly comprehensive and useful document which aids comparison of sites.	No Change				
	The comment has been noted.				
It seems as though a sensible balance between the need to build and develop and the protection of green spaces and green belt has mostly been met.	No Change				
	The comment has been noted.				
There is insufficient information provided (just a map and no narrative) as to why these sites have been rejected whilst other neighbouring sites have been accepted.	No change.				
	The rejected site options report provides an overview of why sites have been rejected.				
Comment relates to a number of sites - Traveller Site - rejected options (pages 15-17)	Support		Conditional Support	Object 1	No Comment
DLP_RSO1328					
The comment related to a number of sites. The summary is included in the relevant site in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report	The response to the representation(s) received is included in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report				

Summary of comments	Council Response			
Comment relates to a number of sites - Shepley sites DLP_RSO3075	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
The comment related to a number of sites. The summary is included in the relevant site in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report	The response to the representation(s) received is included in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report			
Comment relates to a number of sites - Rejected Sites South East (S7) Kirkburton Ward DLP_RSO13	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
The comment related to a number of sites. The summary is included in the relevant site in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report	The response to the representation(s) received is included in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report			
Comment relates to a number of sites - Rejected Housing Options in Farnley Country Park DLP_RSO46	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
The comment related to a number of sites. The summary is included in the relevant site in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report	The response to the representation(s) received is included in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report			
Comment relates to a number of sites - Kirklees South East (S7) DLP_RSO14	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
The comment related to a number of sites. The summary is included in the relevant site in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report	The response to the representation(s) received is included in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report			
Comment relates to a number of sites - Kirklees Rural area DLP_RSO4975	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
The comment related to a number of sites. The summary is included in the relevant site in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report	The response to the representation(s) received is included in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report			
Comment relates to a number of sites - Kirkburton Ward DLP_RSO5008	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
The comment related to a number of sites. The summary is included in the relevant site in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report	The response to the representation(s) received is included in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report			
Comment relates to a number of sites - Introduction DLP_RSO4826, DLP_RSO4830	Support 1	Conditional Support 1	Object	No Comment
The comment related to a number of sites. The summary is included in the relevant site in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report	The response to the representation(s) received is included in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report			
Comment relates to a number of sites - Denby Dale DLP_RSO727	Support 1	Conditional Support	Object	No Comment
The comment related to a number of sites. The summary is included in the relevant site in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report	The response to the representation(s) received is included in the Rejected Site Options Consultation report			