

MATTER 2 - VISION AND OBJECTIVES

Issue 1: Whether the Spatial Visions for the Bradford City Centre and Shipley and Canal Road Area Action Plan are justified, locally distinctive and appropriate, reflecting community views and issues raised during the preparation of the Plan; are the Objectives appropriate, effective, justified and soundly based and will they help to deliver the spatial vision of the Plan.

Q13. Are the objectives and visions of the sub areas consistent with those of each AAP and the emerging CS? Are the policies sufficiently detailed to be effective in realising the distinctive visions of each of the defined sub areas within the plans?

1 The Visions and Objectives

Bradford City Centre Area Action Plan

1.1 The legacy of buildings associated with the period in which Bradford was one of the World's main manufacturers of cloth play a major role in defining the distinctive identity of its City Centre. These heritage assets and the extensive use of sandstone - a building material which is used consistently across the area - help to give the City Centre an identity distinct from other cities in the north. In terms of our areas of interest, therefore, we consider that the proposed overarching Vision that is set out on page 16 of the BCCAAP, together with all but one of the various sub-area Visions are justified, locally distinctive and appropriate.

1.2 Given the wealth of historic buildings and structures across the City Centre, we also consider that the proposed Objectives that relate to the management of the area's heritage assets (especially Objectives 1, 2, and 3) to be appropriate, effective, justified and soundly based and will help to deliver the spatial Vision of the Plan insofar as it relates to the management of change to the historic environment of this part of Bradford.

Shipley and Canal Road Corridor Area Action Plan

1.3 This area of the City lies at one of the principal gateways to the Saltaire World Heritage Site (indeed the northern part of the SCRCAAP lies within the Buffer Zone), it has Conservation Areas at its northern end, southern end, and also

along part of its western boundary, is close to two Registered Historic Parks and Gardens and has a number of Listed Buildings both within and adjacent to its boundary. These heritage assets make an important contribution to the distinct identity of this part of the District. In terms of our areas of interest, therefore, we consider that the proposed overarching Vision that is set out on page 18 of the SCRCAAP together with all but one of the various sub-area Visions are justified, locally distinctive and appropriate.

- 1.4 Given the heritage assets in and around this area, we consider that the proposed Objectives that relate to the management of the area's heritage assets (especially Objective 6, and (subject to the change proposed under DPM002) Objective 11) to be appropriate, effective, justified and soundly based and will help to deliver the spatial Vision of the Plan insofar as it relates to the management of change to the historic environment of this part of Bradford.

2 Are the Policies sufficiently detailed to be effective in realising the distinctive visions of each of the defined sub areas?

- 2.1 Whilst we would broadly endorse what is set out in the sub-area Visions we do, however, have concerns that neither AAP has a specific spatial Policy to ensure their delivery. The supporting text to each of the sub-area Visions sets out a number of proposals and design requirements which, it is presumed, are intended not only assist in their delivery but also are matters which those proposing development within the various parts of the City would need to take into account. Although some of these elements are incorporated (in a more generic form) within some of the Policies in Section 3 of the AAPs, a large proportion of the more detailed spatial aspects are not.

- 2.2 The requirements which are set out in this supporting text seems not only to set out how it is envisaged the sub-area Visions will be delivered but also to assist the decision-maker determine how they should react to a development proposal in those areas. If this is the case, then it seems that they ought to be incorporated into a specific spatial policy for that particular area.

Bradford City Centre Area Action Plan

Q14. In what way is the proposed modification provided by the Council (DPM004) necessary to ensure the soundness of the AAP?

3.1 Other Cities have demonstrated how the expansion of a university campus at their heart can be used to regenerate/revitalise other parts of that settlement. However, not only is the Learning Quarter completely divorced from the centre of the city but also has very little presence from City Park. Therefore, the full potential that the University could play in increasing footfall between the Learning Quarter and the City Centre (and, thereby, the role which it could play in assisting the vitality and viability of Bradford's retail core) may not be realised.

3.2 The connectivity between these two areas is a key issue that the BCCAAPP needs to address. However, whilst the Design requirements for Site B/1.6 (the former Bradford Odeon) does recognise the potential that this site offers to enhance connectivity between the Central Business and Leisure District and the Learning Quarter, and the sub-area Vision for the Learning Quarter also identifies the need for improvements in the links between these two areas, the corresponding sub-area Vision for the Central Business and Leisure District does not.

3.3 The proposed change ensures that the Plan is internally consistent.

Shipley and Canal Road Corridor Area Action Plan

Q15. In what way are the proposed modifications (DPM001 and DPM002) tabled by the Council required to ensure the soundness of the AAP?

Proposed Modification DPM001

4.1 The NPPF states that, when considering the impact of a development proposal upon the significance of a designated heritage asset, "great weight" should be given to the asset's conservation. The more important the asset, the greater the weight should be. The NPPF also makes it clear that World Heritage Sites are regarded as being in the category of designated heritage assets of the highest significance. Therefore, an approach that accepts some degree of harm to a designated heritage asset (especially one identified by the Government as being of the highest significance) does not accord with the advice set out in the NPPF.

- 4.2 The proposed Modification is necessary to reflect national policy guidance.

Proposed Modification DPM002

- 4.3 One of the intentions of the overarching Vision of the SCRCAAP is to improve this gateway into the World Heritage Site at Saltaire. Indeed, the potential offered by this part of the City to enhance this part of the setting of the World Heritage Site is something which would fully accord with NPPF Paragraph 137. However, the sub-area Vision for Shipley (the part of the AAP within which the World Heritage Site Buffer Zone lies) makes no mention, at all, of the World Heritage Site nor to the opportunities offered for improving its setting.
- 4.4 The proposed Modification ensures that the AAP is internally consistent.