

HAWORTH CROSS ROADS AND STANBURY PARISH COUNCIL

HAWORTH CROSS ROADS AND STANBURY NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT PLAN 2019-2030

BASIC CONDITIONS STATEMENT

JUNE 2019

CONTENTS

Section 1 – Legal Requirements

Section 2 – Introduction and Background

Section 3 – Regard to National Planning Policy

Section 4 – General Conformity with the Strategic Policies of the Bradford Local Plan

Section 5 – Contribution to Achieving Sustainable Development

Section 6 – Compatibility with EU Obligations and Legislation

Section 7 – Conclusions

Appendix 1 – Haworth Cross Roads and Stanbury Neighbourhood Development Plan Pre-Submission Draft – Strategic Environmental Assessment & Habitat Regulations Assessment: Screening Report

Appendix 2 – Haworth Cross Roads and Stanbury Neighbourhood Development Plan Submission Draft – Strategic Environmental Assessment & Habitat Regulations Assessment: Screening Report Update

Appendix 3 – Haworth Cross Roads and Stanbury Neighbourhood Development Plan 2019-2030 – Sustainability Assessment

1. LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

This Statement has been prepared by Haworth Cross Roads and Stanbury Parish Council to accompany its submission to the local planning authority, City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council (CBMDC), of the Haworth Cross Roads and Stanbury Neighbourhood Development Plan (“the Neighbourhood Plan”) under Regulation 15 of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (“the Regulations”).

The Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared by Haworth Cross Roads and Stanbury Parish Council, a qualifying body, for the Neighbourhood Area covering the parish of Haworth Cross Roads and Stanbury, as designated by CBMDC on 5th November 2013.

The policies described in the Neighbourhood Plan relate to the development and use of land in the designated Neighbourhood Area only. The plan period of the Neighbourhood Plan extends until the end of 2030 and it does not contain policies relating to excluded development in accordance with the Regulations.

This Statement addresses each of the five ‘basic conditions’ required by the Regulations and explains how the Neighbourhood Plan meets the requirements of paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Town & Country Planning Act.

The Regulations state that a Neighbourhood Plan will be considered to have met the basic conditions if:

- Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, it is appropriate to make the Neighbourhood Plan;
- The making of the Neighbourhood Plan contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
- The making of the Neighbourhood Plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area);
- The making of the Neighbourhood Plan is compatible with European Union (EU) and European Convention on Human Right (ECHR) obligations;
- The making of the Neighbourhood Plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.¹

¹ On 28 December 2018, the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018 came into force. Amongst other things, these Regulations amended the basic condition prescribed in Regulation 32 and Schedule 2 (Habitats) of the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) which stated:

- The making of the neighbourhood plan is not likely to have a significant effect on a European site or a European offshore marine site either alone or in combination with other plans or projects.

2. Introduction and Background

In 2012, Haworth, Cross Roads and Stanbury Parish Council took the decision to produce a Neighbourhood Development Plan in order to give the local community more of a say in the future development of the local area. A Neighbourhood Area application was subsequently made and the Haworth Cross Roads and Stanbury Neighbourhood Area designated by CBMDC on November 5th 2013.

A Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group was formed, comprising parish councillors and local community volunteers. From 2014 to 2018, extensive community engagement was undertaken, involving questionnaires, community drop-ins and public meetings, together with consultation with CBMDC and a range of statutory and non-statutory bodies. The key engagement stages were:-

- Initial public consultation meetings;
- Policy Intentions Document consultation;
- Informal Sites consultation.

Based on the results of this engagement, a Pre-Submission Draft Neighbourhood Plan was produced during 2018 and a Regulation 14 consultation undertaken from October until December 2018.

Responses from this consultation have been considered, and some changes made to the policies, evidence and supporting text in the plan as a result. It is now ready to be submitted to CBMDC, the Local Planning Authority, for further publicity and independent examination.

3. Regard to National Planning Policy

The Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared with regard to national policies as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) of July 2018 and to guidance subsequently issued by the Secretary of State. It is also mindful of the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG), published by the Government in November 2016 and last updated 22nd October 2018, in respect of preparing Neighbourhood Plans.

Table 1 below, is a summary of how each Neighbourhood Plan policy has regard to the policies of the NPPF. The particular paragraphs referred to in the table are those considered the most relevant to each policy but are not intended to be an exhaustive list of all possible relevant paragraphs.

Table 1: Neighbourhood Plan Policies Regard to NPPF Policies

| NDP Policy | NPPF paragraph | Comment on regard to policies |
|--|-------------------------|--|
| BHDD1: Haworth Conservation Area – Development & Design | 192, 195, 196, 200, 201 | The setting out of criteria for design and development within Haworth Conservation Area is in line with para 192 (what should be taken account of in determining planning applications in terms of heritage assets, local character and distinctiveness); para 195 (re substantial harm or total loss of significance of a heritage asset); para 196 (re less than substantial harm to a heritage asset); para 200 (re opportunities for sympathetic new development within conservation areas and the setting of heritage assets) and associated para 201. |
| BHDD2: Stanbury Conservation Area – Development & Design | 192, 195, 196, 200, 201 | The setting out of criteria for design and development within Stanbury Conservation Area is in line with para 192 (what should be taken account of in determining planning applications in terms of heritage assets, local character and distinctiveness); para 195 (re substantial harm or total loss of significance of a heritage asset); para 196 (re less than substantial harm to a heritage asset); para 200 (re opportunities for sympathetic new development within conservation areas and the setting of heritage assets) and associated para 201. |
| BHDD3: Local Heritage Areas | 184, 185, | The definition of Local Heritage Areas and encouragement regarding their sympathetic enhancement is in line with para 184 (conserving heritage assets – including sites/buildings of local historic value – in a manner appropriate to their significance); and para 185 (the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets). |
| BHDD4: Haworth Brow Local Heritage | 192, 195, 196, 197, 200 | The setting out of criteria for development within Haworth |

| NDP Policy | NPPF paragraph | Comment on regard to policies |
|---|-------------------------|---|
| Area | | Brow Local Heritage Area is in line with para 192 (what should be taken account of in determining planning applications in terms of heritage assets, local character and distinctiveness); para 195 (re substantial harm or total loss of significance of a heritage asset); para 196 (re less than substantial harm to a heritage asset); para 197 (weighing the effects of a planning application on a non-designated heritage asset's significance); and para 200 (re opportunities for sympathetic new development in the setting of heritage assets). |
| BHDD5: Haworth Coldshaw Local Heritage Area | 192, 195, 196, 197, 200 | The setting out of criteria for development within Haworth Coldshaw Local Heritage Area is in line with para 192 (what should be taken account of in determining planning applications in terms of heritage assets, local character and distinctiveness); para 195 (re substantial harm or total loss of significance of a heritage asset); para 196 (re less than substantial harm to a heritage asset); para 197 (weighing the effects of a planning application on a non-designated heritage asset's significance); and para 200 (re opportunities for sympathetic new development in the setting of heritage assets). |
| BHDD6: Cross Roads Centre Local Heritage Area | 192, 195, 196, 197, 200 | The setting out of criteria for development within Cross Roads Centre Local Heritage Area is in line with para 192 (what should be taken account of in determining planning applications in terms of heritage assets, local character and distinctiveness); para 195 (re substantial harm or total loss of significance of a heritage asset); para 196 (re less than substantial harm to a heritage asset); para 197 (weighing the effects of a planning application on a non-designated heritage asset's significance); and para 200 (re opportunities for sympathetic new development in the setting of heritage assets). |
| BHDD7: Murgatroyd Local Heritage Area | 192, 195, 196, 197, 200 | The setting out of criteria for development within Murgatroyd Local Heritage Area is in line with para 192 (what should be taken account of in determining planning applications in terms of heritage assets, local character and distinctiveness); para 195 (re substantial harm or total loss of significance of a heritage asset); para 196 (re less than substantial harm to a heritage asset); para 197 (weighing the effects of a planning application on a non-designated heritage asset's significance); and para 200 (re opportunities for sympathetic new development in the setting of heritage assets). |
| BHDD8: Protection | 197 | The identification of a list of Non-Designated Heritage |

| NDP Policy | NPPF paragraph | Comment on regard to policies |
|---|-----------------------|--|
| & Enhancement of Non-Designated Heritage Assets | | Assets, the framing of a policy to ensure that their heritage significance is taken account of in any development affecting them, plus support/encouragement for their sympathetic enhancement is in line with para 197 (weighing the effects of a planning application on a non-designated heritage asset's significance). |
| GE1: Green Infrastructure | 171, 174 | The identification and protection of Green Infrastructure, together with the promotion of its enhancement and extension, is in line with para 171 (taking a strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure) and para 174 (identifying/mapping/safeguarding components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks, including wildlife corridors). |
| GE2: Local Green Space | 99, 101, 143-7, 83 | The designation of areas of Local Green Space is supported and guided by paras 99 and 101 (see Neighbourhood Plan Appendix 5). It is regulated by paras 101, together with 143-47. It is also in line with para 83 (retaining accessible local services and community facilities such as sports venues and open space in rural areas). |
| GE3: Local Green Space Enhancement | 91, 92, 97 | Local Green Space enhancement is in line with para 91 (aiming to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which are safe and accessible – e.g. high quality public space where active and continual use is encouraged – and which enable and support healthy lifestyles – e.g. through green infrastructure, sports facilities, allotments, layouts that encourage walking and cycling); para 92 (planning positively for use of open space); and para 97 (access to high quality open spaces is important for the health and well-being of communities). |
| GE4: Provision of New Open Space | 91, 92, 97, 83 | Provision of new open space is in line with para 91 (aiming to achieve healthy, inclusive and safe places which are safe and accessible – e.g. high quality public space where active and continual use is encouraged – and which enable and support healthy lifestyles – e.g. through green infrastructure, sports facilities, allotments, layouts that encourage walking and cycling); para 92 (planning positively for use of open space); para 97 (access to high quality open spaces is important for the health and well-being of communities); and para 83 (developing accessible local services and community facilities such as sports venues and open space in rural areas). |
| GE5: Land at Sugden Reservoir | 91, 92, 97, 170, 174 | Promoting the opportunity for new open space at Land at Sugden Reservoir is in line with para 91 (aiming to achieve |

| NDP Policy | NPPF paragraph | Comment on regard to policies |
|---|--|---|
| | | healthy, inclusive and safe places which are safe and accessible – e.g. high quality public space where active and continual use is encouraged – and which enable and support healthy lifestyles – e.g. through green infrastructure, sports facilities, allotments, layouts that encourage walking and cycling); para 92 (planning positively for use of open space); para 97 (access to high quality open spaces is important for the health and well-being of communities); para 170 (contributing to and enhancing the natural/local environment...by enhancing sites of biodiversity value); and para 174 (pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity). |
| CF1: Protection & Enhancement of Community Facilities | 92, 83 | The policy to protect and enhance existing facilities is in line with para 92 (guarding against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services; ensuring that established facilities and services are able to develop and modernize and are retained for the benefit of the community) and 83 (retaining and developing accessible local services and community facilities in rural areas). |
| CF2: Provision of New Community Facilities | 92, 83 | The policy to support the provision of new community facilities is in line with para 92 (planning positively for the provision of community facilities – such as meeting places, cultural buildings and places of worship – and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments) and para 83 (developing accessible local services and community facilities in rural areas). |
| CF3: High Speed Broadband | 112 | The policy supporting the development of superfast broadband and promoting its provision in new residential and business space development is in line with para 112 (policies supporting the expansion of electronic communications networks; policies prioritizing full fibre connections to new developments). |
| H1: Worsted Road, Cross Roads | 61, 102, 104, 174, 184, 185, 192, 195, 196, 197, 200 | The identification of locally-specific development requirements for this potential housing site is in line with para 61 (reflecting in planning policies the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community); paras 102 c) & 104 d) (re promoting sustainable transport, i.e. walking); para 102 a) & d) (considering transport issues at an early stage); para 174 (safeguarding components of local wildlife-rich habitats); and paras 184, 185, 192, 195, 196, 197 & 200 (re design in relation to local character, distinctiveness and heritage |

| NDP Policy | NPPF paragraph | Comment on regard to policies |
|--|--|---|
| | | assets). |
| H2: Lees Lane North, Cross Roads | 174, | The identification of locally-specific development requirements for this potential housing site is in line with para 174 (safeguarding components of local wildlife-rich habitats); and para 192 (re design in relation to local character and distinctiveness). |
| H3: Baden Street, Haworth | 174, 102, 104, 106 | The identification of locally-specific development requirements for this potential housing site is in line with para 174 (safeguarding components of local wildlife-rich habitats); paras 102 c) & 104 d) (re promoting sustainable transport, i.e. walking); para 102 a) & d) (considering transport issues at an early stage); and para 106 (setting of maximum parking standards where there is clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network). |
| H4: Ebor Mills, Ebor Lane, Haworth | 174, 171, 102, 104, 155-165, 184, 185, 192, 195, 196, 197, 200, 189 | The identification of locally-specific development requirements for this potential housing site is in line with para 174 (safeguarding components of local wildlife-rich habitats); para 171 (re maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure); paras 102 c) & 104 d) (re promoting sustainable transport, i.e. walking); para 102 a) & d) (considering transport issues at an early stage); paras 155-165 (re planning for flood risk); paras 184, 185, 192, 195, 196, 197 & 200 (re design in relation to local character, distinctiveness and heritage assets); and para 189 (requiring developers to submit desk-based assessments/field evaluations re heritage assets with archaeological interest). |
| H5: New Housing Development – Key Guiding Principles | 174, 171, 170, 102, 104, 184, 185, 192, 195, 196, 197, 200, 201, 106, 92 | The setting out of key guiding principles in relation to new housing development is in line with para 174 (safeguarding components of local wildlife-rich habitats); para 171 (re maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats and green infrastructure); para 170 a) and b) (re protecting valued landscapes and sites of biodiversity, and recognizing the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside); paras 102 c) & 104 d) (re promoting sustainable transport); para 102 a) & d) (considering transport issues at an early stage); paras 184, 185, 192, 195, 196, 197, 200 & 201 (re design in relation to local character, distinctiveness and heritage assets); para 106 (setting of maximum parking standards where there is clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network); and para 92 (planning positively for the provision of community facilities – such as meeting places, cultural |

| NDP Policy | NPPF paragraph | Comment on regard to policies |
|--|------------------------|--|
| | | buildings and places of worship – and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments). |
| H6: New Housing Development on Non-Allocated Sites | 102, 103, 92, 170, 184 | The policy setting out ‘sustainability tests’ re the acceptability of new housing development on non-allocated sites is in line with para 102 (considering transport issues from the earliest stages of plan-making); para 103 (actively managing patterns of growth; focusing significant developments on locations which are or can be made sustainable); para 92 (planning positively for the provision of community facilities – such as meeting places, cultural buildings and places of worship – and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments); para 170 (protecting valued landscapes and sites of biodiversity); and para 184 (conserving heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance). |
| H7: Housing Density | 125 | The policy promoting high density housing is in line with para 125 (Neighbourhood Plans playing an important role in identifying the special qualities of each area and explaining how this should be reflected in development). |
| H8: Housing Mix | 61 | The policy re housing type and mix is in line with para 61 (reflecting in planning policies the size, type and tenure of housing needed for different groups in the community). |
| E1: Hotel Development | 83 | The policy identifying an opportunity for hotel development, subject to constraints, is in line with para 83 c) (planning policies enabling sustainable rural tourism which respect the character of the countryside). |
| E2: Visitor Accommodation | 83 | The policy encouraging the retention and development of visitor accommodation is in line with para 83 c) (planning policies enabling sustainable rural tourism which respect the character of the countryside). |
| HT1: Haworth Centre Public Parking | 80, 81 | The maintenance of existing car parking capacity and the encouragement of additional is in line with para 80 (creating the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt; allowing each area to build on its strengths); and para 81 (seeking to address potential barriers to investment such as inadequate infrastructure). |
| HT2: Protection of Private Non-Residential Parking Areas | 80, 81 | The maintenance of existing car parking capacity and the encouragement of additional is in line with para 80 (creating the conditions in which businesses can invest, expand and adapt; allowing each area to build on its strengths); and para 81 (seeking to address potential barriers to investment such as inadequate infrastructure). |

| NDP Policy | NPPF paragraph | Comment on regard to policies |
|---|-----------------------|---|
| HT3: Primary School Parking & Drop-Off Areas | 127 | The encouragement of development providing new off-road car parking/drop-off areas at the area's primary schools is in line with para 127 (ensuring that developments function well...over the lifetime of the development). |
| HT4: Car Parking Standards for New Housing Development at Baden Street, Haworth | 106 | The policy setting parking standards for potential housing development at Baden Street, Haworth is in line with para 106 (setting of maximum parking standards where there is clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network). |
| HT5: Improved Public Transport | 102, 103, 104 | The policy seeking development contributions to public transport improvements is in line with paras 102 c), 103 & 104 d) (re promoting sustainable transport). |
| HT6: Improved Walking, Horse Riding and Cycling Provision | 102, 104 | Policy to improve cycling, walking and equestrian provision is in line with para 102 (identifying opportunities to promote walking and cycling); and para 104 (providing for high quality walking and cycling networks). |
| HT7: Keighley & Worth Valley Cycleway | 102, 104 | Policy protecting the route of the proposed Keighley and Worth Valley Cycleway and encouraging development that would contribute to its delivery is in line with para 102 (identifying opportunities to promote walking and cycling); and para 104 (providing for high quality walking and cycling networks). |

In conclusion, it can be seen that all of the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan have clear regard to national planning policy as it relates to those policies.

4. General Conformity with the Strategic Policies of the Development Plan

The development plan for Haworth, Cross Roads and Stanbury comprises the Bradford Core Strategy (CS) adopted in 2017 and the saved policies (NB saved 2008) of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan (RUDP), originally adopted in 2005.

The Neighbourhood Plan has been prepared to ensure its general conformity with the above applicable components of the adopted development plan.

Table 3 below sets out how each policy is in general conformity with the development plan.

Table 3: Conformity of Neighbourhood Plan Policies with Development Plan

| NDP Policy | Development Plan Policy | Comment on Conformity |
|--|-------------------------|---|
| BHDD1: Haworth Conservation Area – Development & Design | Core Strategy (CS) EN3 | BHDD1 adds Haworth-specific detail to the generic provisions of the development plan policy in respect of the historic environment (EN3 – clauses C-6 & G), while remaining clearly in conformity with that policy. This detail is based on the contents of the Haworth Conservation Area Appraisal approved by City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council (CBMDC) in 2007. |
| BHDD2: Stanbury Conservation Area – Development & Design | CS EN3 | BHDD2 adds Stanbury-specific detail to the generic provisions of the development plan policy in respect of the historic environment (EN3 – clauses C-6 & G), while remaining clearly in conformity with that policy. This detail is based on the contents of the Stanbury Conservation Area Appraisal approved by City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council (CBMDC) in 2008. |
| BHDD3: Local Heritage Areas | CS EN3 | BHDD3 is in conformity with development plan policy in respect of the historic environment (EN3 – clause F) by identifying/defining local non-designated heritage assets, the heritage significance and setting of which is to be protected and enhanced. |
| BHDD4: Haworth Brow Local Heritage Area | CS EN3 | BHDD4 is in conformity with development plan policy in respect of the historic environment (EN3 – clause F) by protecting and enhancing the heritage significance and setting of a locally identified non-designated heritage asset. |

| NDP Policy | Development Plan Policy | Comment on Conformity |
|---|---|--|
| BHDD5: Haworth Coldshaw Local Heritage Area | CS EN3 | BHDD5 is in conformity with development plan policy in respect of the historic environment (EN3 – clause F) by protecting and enhancing the heritage significance and setting of a locally identified non-designated heritage asset. |
| BHDD6: Cross Roads Centre Local Heritage Area | CS EN3 | BHDD6 is in conformity with development plan policy in respect of the historic environment (EN3 – clause F) by protecting and enhancing the heritage significance and setting of a locally identified non-designated heritage asset. |
| BHDD7: Murgatroyd Local Heritage Area | CS EN3 | BHDD7 is in conformity with development plan policy in respect of the historic environment (EN3 – clause F) by protecting and enhancing the heritage significance and setting of a locally identified non-designated heritage asset. |
| BHDD8: Protection & Enhancement of Non-Designated Heritage Assets | CS EN3 | BHDD8 is in conformity with development plan policy in respect of the historic environment (EN3 – clause F) by protecting and enhancing the heritage significance and setting of locally identified non-designated heritage assets. |
| GE1: Green Infrastructure | CS Strategic Core Policy SC6 | GE1 is in conformity with SC6 (Green Infrastructure), particularly clauses A and C, by both defining Green Infrastructure at the neighbourhood level and supporting and encouraging the maintenance, enhancement and extension of Green Infrastructure – as an integral part of the urban fabric and to improve urban/rural connectivity. |
| GE2: Local Green Space | CS EN1 Replacement Unitary Development Plan (RUDP) OS2, OS3, OS6, OS7 | Policy GE2's designation of Local Green Space is in conformity with a range of development plan policies, notably Clauses A & D of EN1 (Protection and Improvements in provision of Open Space and Recreation Facilities). Clause D specifically states that CBMDC will work with local communities to identify areas of Local Green Space in neighbourhood plans. |
| GE3: Local Green Space Enhancement | CS EN1 | Policy GE3's encouragement of development which would result in Local Green Space enhancement is in conformity with EN1's provisions re the improvement of open space and recreation facilities (Clause B). |
| GE4: Provision of New Open Space | CS EN1 | Policy GE4's encouragement of development to provide new open space, particularly of types in which the area is locally deficient, is in conformity with EN1's provisions re new open space and recreational facilities, including the addressing of identified local deficiencies – ref Clauses B and C. |

| NDP Policy | Development Plan Policy | Comment on Conformity |
|---|--|---|
| GE5: Land at Sugden Reservoir | CS EN1 | Policy GE5's identification of a site-based opportunity to provide new natural/semi-natural space (in which the area is locally deficient – ref Policy GE4), is in conformity with EN1's provisions re new open space and recreational facilities, including the addressing of identified local deficiencies – ref Clauses B and C. |
| CF1: Protection & Enhancement of Community Facilities | N/A | Both Core Strategy and RUDP policy are silent on the subject of retaining existing community facilities. |
| CF2: Provision of New Community Facilities | CS PN1 RUDP CF7A, CF7B | CF2's encouragement of development to provide new facilities, with associated criteria, is in conformity with development support for such provision, in particular PN1 Clause B's "provision will be made for associated community facilities". |
| CF3: High Speed Broadband | CS EC1, PN1, PN2 | CF3's support for the development of superfast broadband and promotion of its provision in new residential and business space development is in conformity with development plan support for such provision, particularly in rural/peripheral areas. |
| H1: Worsted Road, Cross Roads | CS HO2, SC8, DS2-5, HO8, TR3, EN3, EN5 | H1 is in conformity with development plan policies covering delivery of new homes in Haworth (HO2) and the protection of the South Pennine Moors SPA and SAC (SC8). In terms of delivery requirements, it is conformity with the following policies:- DS2-5 – re design matters HO8 – re housing mix TR3 & DS4 – re walking infrastructure EN3 – re heritage assets EN5 – re trees |
| H2: Lees Lane North, Cross Roads | CS HO2, SC8, DS2, EN5 | H2 is in conformity with development plan policies covering delivery of new homes in Haworth (HO2) and the protection of the South Pennine Moors SPA and SAC (SC8). In terms of delivery requirements, it is conformity with the following policies:- DS2 – re design matters EN5 – re trees |
| H3: Baden Street, Haworth | CS HO2, SC8, EN5, EN2, TR3, DS4, TR2 | H3 is in conformity with development plan policies covering delivery of new homes in Haworth (HO2) and the protection of the South Pennine Moors SPA and SAC (SC8). In terms of delivery requirements, it is conformity with the following policies:- EN5 – re trees EN2 – re biodiversity matters |

| NDP Policy | Development Plan Policy | Comment on Conformity |
|--|---|---|
| | | TR3 & DS4 – re walking infrastructure TR2 (Clauses B & C) re parking provision & congestion /on-street parking DS4 – re highway design |
| H4: Ebor Mills, Ebor Lane, Haworth | CS HO2, SC8, EN3, EN5, EN7, SC6, TR3, DS4 RUDP OS7 | H4 is in conformity with development plan policies covering delivery of new homes in Haworth (HO2); the protection of the South Pennine Moors SPA and SAC (SC8); and village greenspace provisions (OS7). In terms of delivery requirements, it is conformity with the following policies:- EN3 – re heritage assets EN5 – re trees EN7 – re flood risk SC6 – re Green Infrastructure TR3 & DS4 – re footpath/bridleway/cycleway provision & highway design |
| H5: New Housing Development – Key Guiding Principles | CS EN1, EN2, EN4, EN3, TR2, DS4, PN1, PN2, EN5, DS2-5, TR1, TR3-5 | The policy setting out key guiding principles for new housing development is in conformity with the following development plan policies:- EN1 re open space; EN2 re nature conservation assets; EN4 re landscape assets; EN3 re heritage assets; TR2 re parking provision, congestion and on-street parking; TR3 & DS4 re footpaths, bridleways & cycleways and re highway design; TR3, PN1 & PN2 re public transport improvement; EN5 re trees; DS2-5 re design matters; TR1, TR3, TR4 & TR5 re location of social infrastructure relative to new development. |
| H6: New Housing Development on Non-Allocated Sites | CS P1, SC1, SC4 | The policy setting out ‘sustainability tests’ regarding the acceptability of new housing development on non-allocated sites is in conformity with policies P1 (re sustainable development); SC1 (re overall spatial priorities); and SC4 (expectations re planning decisions in local service centres). |
| H7: Housing Density | CS HO5 | The policy promoting high density housing is in conformity with HO5 (Density of Housing Schemes) and the minimum density it espouses. |
| H8: Housing Mix | CS HO8 | The policy re housing type and mix is in conformity with HO8 (Housing Mix), notably Clause D (re meeting strategic housing priorities), Clause B (re a basis of robust local evidence/information), and Clause C (re setting out specific mix guidance in Neighbourhood Plans). |

| NDP Policy | Development Plan Policy | Comment on Conformity |
|---|--------------------------|--|
| E1: Hotel Development | CS EC4, PN1, EC1, PN2 | The policy identifying an opportunity for hotel development, subject to constraints, is in conformity with EC4 (re its encouragement of tourism-based economic enterprise); PN1 (re the promotion of sustainable tourism); EC1 (re the delivery of non-business class sectors such as tourism); and PN2 (re encouraging initiatives that develop sustainable tourism that respects the character of the south Pennines). |
| E2: Visitor Accommodation | CS EC4, PN1, EC1, PN2 | The policy encouraging the retention and development of visitor accommodation is in conformity with EC4 (re its encouragement of tourism-based economic enterprise); PN1 (re the promotion of sustainable tourism); EC1 (re the delivery of non-business class sectors such as tourism); and PN2 (re encouraging initiatives that develop sustainable tourism that respects the character of the south Pennines). |
| HT1: Haworth Centre Public Parking | CS TR2, TR4 RUDP TM17 | The maintenance of existing car parking capacity and the encouragement of additional is in conformity with TR2 Clause B (recognizing that the provision/ management of car parking must be related to traffic congestion); TR2 Clause C (supporting a reduction in on-street parking); TR4 Clause A (areas of tourist, cultural & heritage significance should not be adversely affected by the impact of transport); and TM17 (protecting car/coach parking in tourist areas & providing for compensatory provision in the event of loss to development). |
| HT2: Protection of Private Non-Residential Parking Areas | CS TR2 | The maintenance of existing car parking capacity and the encouragement of additional is in conformity with TR2 Clause B (recognizing that the provision/ management of car parking must be related to traffic congestion); and TR2 Clause C (supporting a reduction in on-street parking). |
| HT3: Primary School Parking & Drop-Off Areas | CS TR2 | The encouragement of development providing new off-road car parking/drop-off areas at the area's primary schools is in conformity with TR2 Clause B (recognizing that the provision/ management of car parking must be related to traffic congestion); and TR2 Clause C (supporting a reduction in on-street parking). |
| HT4: Car Parking Standards for New Housing Development at Baden Street, Haworth | CS TR2 | The policy setting parking standards for potential housing development at Baden Street, Haworth is in conformity with TR2 (Clauses B & C) re parking provision & congestion /on-street parking. |

| NDP Policy | Development Plan Policy | Comment on Conformity |
|---|---|---|
| HT5: Improved Public Transport | CS TR3, TR4, PN1, PN2 | The policy seeking development contributions to public transport improvements is in conformity with TR3 (Clauses A, B & C support such improvements); TR4 (highlighting the need to provide improved sustainable transport access to existing tourist destinations); and PN1 & PN2 (highlighting the need for bus improvements within the south Pennines, with routes to Bradford & Halifax as investment priorities and Haworth explicitly referenced in PN2 Clause A). |
| HT6: Improved Walking, Horse Riding & Cycling Provision | CS TR3, TR4, SC6, PN1 RUDP TM8, TM10 | Policy to improve cycling, walking and equestrian provision is in conformity with TR3 (safeguarding & improving walking & cycling infrastructure/services); TR4 (supporting improved sustainable transport access to existing tourist destinations & supporting the development of 'transport-based' leisure attractions such as cycle & walking trails and bridleways); SC6 (Green Infrastructure); PN1 (improving cycling & walking access between the south Pennine towns & villages); TM8 (re new pedestrian & cycle links); and TM10 (re the national and local cycle network). |
| HT7: Keighley & Worth Valley Cycleway | CS TR3, TR4, SC6, PN1 RUDP TM8, TM10 | Policy protecting the route of the proposed Keighley and Worth Valley Cycleway and encouraging development that would contribute to its delivery is in conformity with TR3 (safeguarding & improving walking & cycling infrastructure/services); TR4 (supporting improved sustainable transport access to existing tourist destinations & supporting the development of 'transport-based' leisure attractions such as cycle & walking trails and bridleways); SC6 (Green Infrastructure); PN1 (improving cycling & walking access between the south Pennine towns & villages); TM8 (re new pedestrian & cycle links); and TM10 (re the national and local cycle network). |

In conclusion, it can be seen that all of the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan are clearly in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan as they relate to its policies.

5. Contribution to Achieving Sustainable Development

Although a formal sustainability appraisal is not a requirement for a Neighbourhood Plan, an informal sustainability assessment has been undertaken (March 2019 – see Appendix 3) in order to take account of the need for the Neighbourhood Plan to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development.

The policies of the Neighbourhood Plan are derived directly from the vision statement and aims of the plan which have sustainability at their heart. The sustainability assessment assesses each of the plan's thirty three policies against twelve benchmark criteria derived from the plan's aims and covering the three dimensions of sustainability, namely environmental, social and economic. The assessment 'scores' the impact of each policy against the criteria, on a scale from 'significant positive impact' through 'some positive or negative impact' or 'no overall impact/non-applicability' to 'significant negative impact'. It also records uncertainty as to impact.

Table 4 below, reproduced from the sustainability assessment, summarises:-

- The impact/contribution of policies as a whole in relation to the twelve individual benchmark criteria;
- The impact/contribution of individual policies on sustainability/benchmark criteria as a whole.

It shows that there will be positive impacts overall, in terms of policies and benchmark criteria collectively.

Further analysis indicates some overall minor negative impacts in relation to individual policies (in 3 cases) and benchmark criteria (in one case), but outweighed overall by positive impacts.

The overriding conclusion is that the policies of the Neighbourhood Plan will make Haworth, Cross Roads and Stanbury a more sustainable area.

Table 4: Assessment of Sustainability of Neighbourhood Plan Policies

| NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICY NUMBERS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-------------------------|
| BENCHMARK CRITERION | BHDD1 | BHDD2 | BHDD3 | BHDD4 | BHDD5 | BHDD6 | BHDD7 | BHDD8 | GE1 | GE2 | GE3 | GE4 | GE5 | CF1 | CF2 | CF3 | | |
| Biodiversity | +? | +? | +? | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | +/-? | + | ++ | 0 | +? | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Landscape | ++ | ++ | +? | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | ++ | 0 | +? | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Heritage | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | 0 | ++ | 0 | 0 | +? | +/-? | 0 | 0 | | |
| Natural Resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | +? | +? | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Movement | 0 | 0 | + | -? | -? | 0 | + | +? | + | 0 | 0 | +? | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Open Spaces | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | +? | + | ++ | ++ | ++ | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Community | -? | -? | -? | -? | -? | -? | -? | +/-? | 0 | + | +? | +? | + | ++ | ++ | + | | |
| Housing Provision | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Safety /Security | 0 | 0 | 0 | -? | -? | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | +? | +? | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |
| Social Inclusion | 0 | 0 | 0 | -? | -? | 0 | 0 | +? | + | + | 0 | + | + | ++ | ++ | + | | |
| Businesses | -? | -? | -? | -? | -? | -? | -? | +/-? | 0 | +/-? | 0 | +? | +? | - | + | + | | |
| Jobs/Training | -? | -? | -? | -? | -? | -? | -? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +? | +? | 0 | +? | 0 | | |
| SUMMARY IMPACT 2 | +ve | |
| NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN POLICY NUMBERS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BENCHMARK CRITERION | H1 | H2 | H3 | H4 | H5 | H6 | H7 | H8 | E1 | E2 | HT1 | HT2 | HT3 | HT4 | HT5 | HT6 | HT7 | SUMMARY IMPACT 1 |
| Biodiversity | -? | 0 | -? | -? | 0 | -? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +ve |
| Landscape | -? | 0 | -? | -? | 0 | -? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +ve |
| Heritage | 0? | 0 | 0 | +? | 0 | -? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +ve |
| Natural Resources | - | - | - | - | +/-? | +/-? | 0 | 0 | -? | -? | -? | 0 | -? | 0 | + | + | + | -ve |
| Movement | -? | - | -? | -? | +? | 0 | 0 | 0 | -? | -? | 0 | + | +? | + | + | + | + | +ve |
| Open Spaces | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | -? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +ve |
| Community | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +? | +? | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +ve |
| Housing Provision | + | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | ++ | ++ | ++ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +ve |
| Safety /Security | - | - | -? | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | +? | -? | -? | 0 | + | +? | + | + | + | + | +ve |
| Social Inclusion | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | + | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | 0 | + | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | +ve |
| Businesses | +? | 0 | 0 | + | ++ | ++ | ++ | -? | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | +? | 0 | 0 | +ve |
| Jobs/Training | +? | 0 | 0 | + | + | + | + | 0 | + | + | + | + | 0 | 0 | +? | 0 | 0 | +ve |
| SUMMARY IMPACT 2 | -ve | -ve | -ve | +ve |

significant positive impact = ++/some positive benefit = +/no overall impact or not applicable = 0/some negative impact = -/significant negative effects = --/uncertain as to benefits/effects/impact = ?

6. Compatibility with EU Obligations and Legislation

The Neighbourhood Plan has regard to the fundamental rights and freedoms guaranteed under the European Convention on Human Rights and complies with the Human Rights Act.

A screening determination was issued by the parish council's Neighbourhood Plan consultants (Directions Planning Consultancy) in September 2018 (attached as Appendix 1 to this statement) which advised that:-

Based on the preliminary screening opinion prepared by the parish council in July 2018 and having considered the consultation responses from the statutory environmental bodies, the parish council and the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council determine that the Haworth, Cross Roads and Stanbury Neighbourhood Plan is unlikely to result in significant environmental effects and therefore does not require a strategic environmental assessment. The council also determines that the Neighbourhood Plan is not likely to result in significant effects on any European site.

A Habitat Regulations Assessment screening report update was issued in May 2019 (attached as Appendix 2 to this statement) which further advised that:-

It is considered that none of the policies in the Haworth Cross Roads and Stanbury NP are likely to have a significant effect on the South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC, and therefore the NP does not give rise to, or include, any mitigation measures. Bearing in mind the conclusions of the HRA of the Bradford Core Strategy, it is concluded that there are no LSEs in combination with other plans or projects.

The Council has considered the Bradford HRA Assessment and the contents of the NP and it is satisfied that measures intended to avoid or reduce the harmful effects of the plan have not been relied on in order to screen out the neighbourhood plan under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 and that the draft plan meets the revised Basic Condition.

7. CONCLUSIONS

This Haworth, Cross Roads and Stanbury Neighbourhood Development Plan Basic Conditions Statement addresses each of the four 'basic conditions' required by the Regulations and demonstrates that the Haworth, Cross Roads and Stanbury Neighbourhood Development Plan meets the requirements of paragraph 8 of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act.

In line with the Regulations, this Basic Conditions Statement explains how the Haworth, Cross Roads and Stanbury Neighbourhood Development Plan:-

- Has regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
- Is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for Bradford;
- Contributes to the achievement of sustainable development;
- Does not breach and is otherwise compatible with EU obligations.

It is therefore respectfully suggested that the Haworth, Cross Roads and Stanbury Neighbourhood Development Plan complies with Paragraph 8(1) (a) of Schedule 4B of the Act and subject to Examination can proceed to a Referendum.