City of BRADFORD METROPOLITAN DISTRICT COUNCIL

Statement of Consultation

- Including Schedule of Changes

South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC Planning Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

January 2022

Contents

This page is left intentionally blank

1. Part One

Introduction

1.1 This Statement of Consultation has been prepared for the Draft South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC Planning Framework SPD.

1.2 It is intended that the South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC Planning Framework will be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Its purpose will be to provide the information necessary to enable planning officers and developers to understand the necessary steps to ensure compliance with the Habitats Regulations 2017, as amended ('the Habitats Regulations'). The SPD also sets out a recommended developer contribution that would contribute to the avoidance or mitigation of adverse impacts on internationally protected species and habitats that arise from development within the Bradford District. The SPD is in support of policies in the adopted Local Plan Core Strategy / draft Local Plan.

1.3 Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) require that before adopting an SPD Local Planning Authorities must allow anyone to make representations on the document for a period of not less than 4 weeks, and that they must prepare a statement setting out:

- The people who were consulted.
- A summary of the main issues raised.
- How those issues have been addressed in the SPD.

1.4 The consultation process took place in two stages. The first stage involved early engagement with key stakeholders and groups. The second stage involved a formal six-week consultation period on the draft document. These are detailed below.

Stage 1 – Early Engagement

1.5 A workshop took place to inform the preparation of the draft guide including representatives from:

- **Landowners and managers**: including Yorkshire Water.
- **Statutory consultees**: including Natural England, RSPB and Historic England.
- **Special interest local groups**: such as walking groups and friends of the Moors.
- **Council officers from relevant departments**: including Planning, Legal, Countryside & Rights of Way, and Parks & Greenspaces.

1.6 The comments and viewpoints shared at the workshops fed into the preparation of the guide. Workshops also took place with officers from departments across the Council.

1.7 Following this engagement stage the consultants completed their final draft in January 2021 and this was the document which was subject to consultation.

Stage 2 Formal consultation

1.8 The formal six-week consultation period took place between 8th February and 24th March 2021, in tandem with the consultation for the Regulation 18 draft Local Plan and allowed members of the wider public and other organisations to have input into the content of the Framework. The following documents were made available for public comment:

- South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC Planning Framework– Consultation Draft
- Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) – Initial Screening Statement
- Equalities Impact Assessment (EIA) – Initial Screening Statement

1.9 Electronic versions of the consultation documents were published on the Council's website with a link provided from the homepage. It should be noted that The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 temporarily modifies Regulation 35 (availability of documents) up to 31st December 2021[1] to reflect the restrictions put in place due to the Coronavirus pandemic. These modified Regulations remove the requirement for Local Planning Authorities to place paper consultation documents at Council Offices and other appropriate locations such as libraries, and only requires consultation documents to be published on the authority's website. However, in order to provide opportunities for consultees unable to access the documents digitally, paper copies were made available on request.

1.10 The Council's online consultation system (JDi OpusConsult) allowed people to read the document and directly comment against individual elements of the document online.

1.11 Notifications of the consultation and details on where to view the document were given in a consultation letter/E-mail, in the Local Plan e-newsletter and on the Council's website. The Council's 'Stay Connected' consultation database was used to send notification of the consultation to those people who have specifically signed up to receive information on the preparation of the Local Plan, including SPDs.

1.12 Natural England, who are the key statutory consultee for this work, have been engaged with throughout the process and provided representations to the consultation. Natural England were generally positive about the guide stating "*Natural England welcomes the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which provides invaluable additional detail for the delivery of draft Policy SP11. We are*

[1] Regulation 3 of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning, Development Management Procedure, Listed Buildings etc.) (England) (Coronavirus) (Amendment) Regulations 2020 amends the "relevant period date' to 31st December 2021.

particularly pleased to see the change in emphasis from site based mitigation to a strategic approach."

1.13 Representations were received during the consultation from a range of individuals, community groups, business interests and other organisations (a full list is provided in Part Two of this document). There was some general support for the Framework along with specific suggestions on a variety of matters of how it could be improved.

1.14 The comments received from the public consultation have been incorporated into the document as far as possible. Whilst there have been no significant changes to the application or purpose of the SPD, further detail has been given around the technical aspects and the context in which the SPD operates.

1.15 A summary of the issues raised, the Council's response to them and the recommended changes is set out in Part Three of this document.

2. Part Two

List of respondents

2.1 A total of 22 people/organisations commented on the draft SPD. These submissions were broken down into 194 individual representations. The table below lists the respondents along with their own individual reference number which can be used to cross-reference with the summary of responses and the recommended changes in Part Three.

Organisation	Name / Position	Respondent ID
Clive Brook Planning	Mr Clive Brook	536
Keighley Town Council	Mr Peter Corkindale, Town Mayor	783
Menston Parish Council	Mr Philip Moore, Vice-Chairman	2682
N/A	Miss Teresa McDonell	3387
N/A	Mr & Mrs A & J Hardy	3531
N/A	Mr Bernard Poulter	2307
N/A	Mr Daren Murray	2518
N/A	Mr Mike Pope	1117
N/A	Mr Nick Jones	2891
N/A	Mr Paul Godwin	513
N/A	Mr Robin McDonell	3425
N/A	Mr Roger Wilson	538
N/A	Mrs Ann-Marie Orange	2376
N/A	Mrs Dawn Turner	3300
N/A	Ms Claire Ure	2743
N/A	Peter Bryson	6378
SHMS	Mr John Pickles, Consultant	3220
Craven District Council		28
Natural England		103
Lichfields on behalf of CEG	Suzanne Yates / Andrew Baker	6566
Lichfields on behalf of Persimmon Homes	Suzanne Yates / Andrew Baker	6564
BANDAG	Mrs Barbara Archer	503

3. Part Three

Summary of Representations & Schedule of Responses.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
Chapter 1				
1. The Supplementary Planning Document	536	The document as drafted does not give enough emphasis or positive support for bespoke on or near site mitigation proposals for both recreation and habitat improvements/linkages etc. (see Dorset Heathlands SPD for a much more positive approach).	Within the proposed housing allocations in the draft Local Plan, there will be relatively few opportunities where large scale development can deliver SANGs (on site mitigation), and land availability will be a constraint on the provision of any strategic SANGs. The SPD therefore proposes that, with the exception of any larger sites/urban extension sites coming forward in the future through the new site allocations, the mitigation strategy should focus on maximising opportunities for enhancing the capacity and recreation experience at existing greenspace sites.	None required.
	103	Natural England welcomes the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which provides invaluable additional detail for the delivery of draft policy SP11. We are particularly pleased to see the change in emphasis from site based mitigation to a strategic approach. Notwithstanding this we consider the document to be clear and detailed and to provide an appropriate and robust approach to the mitigation of impacts	The Council welcomes Natural England's supportive stance and input into the document's formation.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		from planning proposals on the South Pennine Moors SAC/ Phase 2 SPA. We recommend that it is adopted with the plan.		
	6378	There were a very large number of shenanigans with regards to developer CEG, and also their lawyers Freeth's, rewriting Bradford Council's Policy SC8 back in May 2016 (note: produced concurrently with the public hearings into the Core Strategy at Saltaire in May 2016). Therefore, the current 2021 consultation is still referring to the documents which were produced back in May 2016: especially Policy SC8 and thus the policy basis for this SPD. These both assume mitigation of the effects of more development is lawful. However, Bradford Council has not incorporated into their proposals all of Natural England's comments: those which were made in both June 2016 and Feb 2019. In particular, Bradford Council have NOT INCORPORATED into either policy SC8 nor this South Pennine Moor SPD document the legally-binding advice from Natural England: namely that Bradford Council have been formally advised that some development sites needed to be avoided: not mitigated. You have also been told that all developments should have a net gain in biodiversity Furthermore, in 2019 (see attached) Natural England advised Bradford Council that Habitats Regulation's policies have hardened up in the past three years. However, Bradford has nothing to change SC8 to incorporate this change in the law.	An SPD can only be linked to adopted policy therefore, as stated in this SPD, it will currently be linked to Policy SC8. This policy has been through examination and has been found sound. The comments from Natural England in this context referred to supporting text which has been removed. The Core Strategy and subsequent strengthening of national policy make it clear that a mitigation hierarchy exists where avoidance takes precedence over mitigation. In its response to this consultation Natural England have been supportive of the SPD, requesting one minor change which has been included in the final document. The SPD will help the Council as the competent authority in fulfilling its requirements under the Habitats Regulations.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		Therefore, this latest SPD is simply out-of-date and based on the wrong laws. Therefore, as Bradford Council policy SC8 has not been revised since May 2016, this current South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC Planning Framework Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is not compliant with what Natural England have said is now legal under the Habitats Regulations Accordingly, Natural England believe that this South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is illegal under the Habitats Regulations!	As part of the preparation of the new Local Plan, Core Strategy Policy SC8 is being reviewed and amended. The SPD will also be reviewed once the new Local Plan has been adopted.	
	6566	The SPD should make clear in its introduction that it will only apply to new planning applications validated after the adoption of the SPD in order to provide clarity as to the relevant regimes, and that where planning permission has been granted in the form of an outline planning permission the SPD will not apply to any subsequent application for approval of Reserved Matters. This is on the basis that the policy and its terms will have needed to be addressed prior to the grant of outline planning permission.	The adoption statement will make it clear when, and in what circumstances the SPD can be utilised. The SPD is introducing a tariff to fund a strategic mitigation strategy regarding recreational impacts, it does not introduce the need for the mitigation. Therefore, under policy SC8 and the findings of the HRA for the adopted Core Strategy, any development which results in a net increase in dwellings within the 7km buffer must adequately mitigate the recreational impacts on the SPA/SAC. Therefore, applicants who submit Reserved Matters applications following the adoption of the SPD may find that contributing towards the strategic mitigation strategy is the simplest and most effective way to	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
			satisfy the mitigation requirements of the Habitat Regulations and Policy SC8.	
	503	The SPD is applicable to developments across a large portion of Bradford District (within 7km of the SPA), and includes a large amount of HERITAGE including many conservation areas and listed buildings and natural environment designations (i.e. water mills on waterways that were engineered to speed up water flow (dams/weirs/fords etc - many still exists on the North Beck but are NOT FORMALLY PROTECTED even though they should be protected by separate policies in the Core Strategy and new draft Local Plan which should have been subject to assessment through a full Sustainability Appraisal. Keighley is older than Bradford and its heritage has as much right to be protected - particularly along the blue-green corridors! Q Why has Keighley (and Silsden) been cut off the map - Substantiate Q. Why was the conservation area of North Beck and Conservation Villages of Goose-Eye, Braithwaite and Laycock - Why was the Keighley Tarn taken off the map?	The SPD is related to impacts on the SPA/SAC. It does not cover heritage impacts; however, these are addressed in the Local Plan which is also subject to a sustainability appraisal. Keighley and Silsden are in the 7km boundary from the SAC/SPA in which the recreational tariff applies for any net new dwellings, they have not been left off the map. Likewise, whilst the other areas noted may not be named specifically on the illustrative map included in the SPD it is just what is represented at the scale of map to show the District. Once the SPD is adopted an interactive map will be made available online which allows people to see which zone (if any) a particular area falls within.	None required.
1.3 Purpose of this SPD	2307 3387 3425 2743	1.3 "In the absence of certainty, the plan should not proceed", yet at 1.4 you move immediately to mitigation. In 1.5 you identify additional recreation pressure, but	Noted – further explanation has been added to clarify this section and what is meant by ‘urban effects’.	Paragraphs expanded to give a clearer understanding

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
	2891 2376 3300	fail to mention the other Urban effects on the SPA/SAC such as Dumping, wild fires, pollution through traffic increases, noise levels, volumes of particulates given off from vehicles, domestic chemical runoff, mountain biking, dog walking and fouling ,and , most dangerous of them all, Cat predation. The deterioration and loss of supporting "Functional Habitats" is Key, especially after the devastating fires in 2019 & 2020		of the HRA process and mitigation measures. Paragraph 1.5 (now 1.8) has been expanded to clarify definition of urban effects.
	2518	It is wholly inaccurate relying on wrong assumptions and developer reports which should not be accepted due to a serious conflict of interest. Burley-in-Wharfedale development will have a significant impact on wildlife and this is not being fully investigated by either the council or developers.	Any ecological surveys undertaken by an applicant must be unprejudiced and carried out to recognised relevant CIEEM/BS42020 standards and code of conduct.	None required.
	538	1.2 states risks need to be addressed before planning permission is granted. Permission has been but this is yet to complete. This is a procedural breach. 1.3 In the absence of certainty, the plan should not proceed. You are very far from "certainty". In 1.4 you are already fully looking at mitigation as if this consultation and document are irrelevant and can be ignored. This is a procedural breach.	Paragraph 1.2 – The SPD will apply to all planning applications submitted after the adoption of the SPD rather than retrospectively. The SPD includes a strategic mitigation strategy which will provide greater certainty of effectiveness and delivery than piecemeal application by application mitigation. This document is not irrelevant to mitigation but	Paragraphs expanded to give a clearer understanding of the HRA process and mitigation measures. Paragraph 1.5 (now 1.8) has

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		Why is 1.5 only mentioning recreational pressure. What about the increase in traffic pollution, noise, the serious effects of pets on wildlife and domestically sourced pollution. What is described in this chapter is NOT the purpose of the SPD.	provides the delivery mechanism to achieve it. Paragraph 1.5 refers to 'urban effects' which include the things which you have listed – this paragraph (no numbered 1.9) has been expanded to clarify this.	been expanded to clarify definition of urban effects.
Chapter 2				
2.1 Legislation and Policy	3220	Support but policy should be further enhanced in hindsight should have been much stronger. Damage done by fires, vehicles and ramblers during Covid from urban area unfamiliar with need to protect habitats and ecology of the area.	The SPD identifies a number of risks and urban effects which can lead to harm to the SPA and SAC. The mitigation strategy seeks to mitigate these risks through a mixture of dedicated staff, promotion, education and interpretation, enhancement of existing greenspaces.	None required.
2.5 – 2.8 The Habitats Regulations	513	Maintaining the habitat for wildlife should be a key objective. I am concerned that it seems based on the vagaries of developer contributions.	The tariff will be used to fund a strategic mitigation strategy which provides a cohesive mitigation package which will be delivered by the Council and will mitigate the quantum of proposed development within the 7km buffer.	None required.
	2307 3387 3425 2743 2891 2376 3300	In 2.5 You identify that an HRA should assess any "possible harm", yet the work continues to immediately support mitigation, rather than avoidance. Under 2.8 you identify that the NPPF refers to "providing net gains for Biodiversity", yet you do not give any details throughout the SPD of just how that	The purpose of SPD is to provide strategic mitigation measures should mitigation be required. In the first instance any development should avoid harm – but if the development is necessary and harm cannot be avoided, then mitigation will be required.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		should be measured? Are you planning on using the DEFRA Biodiversity Metric 2.0 in your assessment? Will the UK Biodiversity Indicators, produced by the JNCC be used, and how does the current work on indicator C1 'Protected Areas' tie in with your future plan?	The Council has revised policy EN2 in the draft Local Plan to ensure that development provides net gains in line with the NPPF and the draft Environment Bill. Although this SPD makes reference to biodiversity net gain it is not the purpose of the document. The Council may produce a separate Biodiversity Net Gain SPD in due course.	
	3220	Protection of habitats also links into climate change and pollution, activities experienced by farmers during the pandemic highlight more work is needed both with the Conservation of Habitats and species Amendment (EU exit) Regulations 2019 which should also link in with the Environment Bill and flood prevention measures (natural wetlands). A proactive approach rather than re-active when ecologically important species have been lost Which is particular important to rural areas in the Bradford District.	Comment noted. Bradford Council have declared a climate emergency and work is ongoing to strengthen policies and practice in terms of climate change, flood risk and biodiversity.	None required.
	538	2.8 mentions net gains for biodiversity. How is this measured? How can there be a net gain if the habitat of the deer, curlews, red kites, pheasant, barn owls is set to be destroyed? There might be a numerical gain but that ignores the unique status of the Sun Lane site for supporting rare wildlife.	The Council has revised policy EN2 in the draft Local Plan to ensure that development provides net gains in line with the NPPF and the draft Environment Bill. This policy requires developers to use the Defra Biodiversity Metric to calculate the baseline Although this SPD makes reference to biodiversity net gain it is not the purpose of the document to set out the mechanism for	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
			achieving net gain. The Council may produce a separate Biodiversity Net Gain SPD in due course.	
2.11 The Bradford Core Strategy and emerging Local Plan Review	2307 3387 3425 2891 2376 3300 2743	In 2.11" latest standard method for assessing local housing need" This is not correct. The ONS and the National Statistics office are currently reviewing the way in which their work has been misinterpreted by several councils, in view of the migration away from certain cities within the last 4 years. This has not been accurately reflected in housing Predictions. The Aireborough case highlighted that the use of Greenbelt land was unnecessary. You state that "With this scale of growth, there is likely to be a number of consequential risks to the moorland and other biodiversity features". All of Burley -in - Wharfedale is situated within 2.5km of the SPA/SAC, and therefore in the most delicate of zones of protection within the policy SC8.	As the SPD is linked to the adopted Core Strategy it is necessary at this point to use the adopted housing figures to calculate the tariff. Once the new Local Plan is adopted the SPD will be revised to incorporate the adopted housing figures which will be calculated using the latest standard method for assessing local housing need, and the tariff will be adjusted/recalculated accordingly See additional comment below.	None required.
	538	2.11 It is impossible to be using the latest standard method for assessing local housing need as the ONS is urgently reviewing how the published methods have been abused by some councils. BMDC's own study by Edge Analytics study, 2019 showed a far lower population increase projection, possibly even zero, out to 2037 mainly due to changes in migration. Bradford's very slight or zero population rise does not require the number of dwellings still being doggedly stuck to.	Any SPD must have links to existing adopted policy and is not permitted to create new policy. Therefore, the housing numbers used to calculate the tariff are from the existing, adopted Core Strategy. The calculation of housing numbers will need to be updated with new figures once the new Local Plan is formally adopted. The new plan includes an update to Policy SC8 for which this SPD provides the delivery	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		There wouldn't be "a number of consequential risks to the moorland habitats and other biodiversity features" if the Sun Lane development wasn't intended to be built on the moor. The whole of Burley-in-Wharfedale is within the 2.5Km zone of the SPA/SAC and so is in the most sensitive protection zone. The Aireborough ruling showed that Greenbelt land was not required especially when the reduced housing count is accepted.	mechanism. As there is an update and reordering of policies within the new Local Plan, current policy SC8 will be updated and referred to as *Strategic Core Policy SP11* (or similar number depending upon final adopted plan): *Protecting the South Pennine Moors SPA / SAC and their Zone of Influence*. The Sun Lane site has now been granted outline permission by the Secretary of State, the associated HRA, reviewed by Natural England and the Planning Inspectorate found there to be no adverse effect on the integrity of the designated sites. The Council has taken steps to ensure the most sensitive protection zone i.e. within 400m of the protected sites is largely not suitable for additional residential dwellings (this policy has been further strengthened in the new Local Plan).	
Chapter 3				
3. Enabling development: the strategy	2307 3387 3425 2891 2376 3300 2743	3.7: States "no credible risk" in following areas: 2nd bullet point should read Farm "BUILDINGS" 3rd & 4th: within 25m of settlement boundary (where you are trying in the Local Plan document, to tell us that B-i-W has no firm settlement boundaries) & within 25m of a main road. where is the evidence to	Point noted regarding missing word. If there is no defined settlement boundary, then there is a need for further evidence gathering. There is evidence of avoidance of roads and field edges by foraging Golden Plover (see table 2). Research indicates that species	Changed wording to 'farm buildings'. Footnote relating to arable land clarified.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		support this? Burley residents have ample metadata and photographic evidence that this is very wrong. 5th Arable: note1:"...arable CAN be used by SPA species, but BDMC its considered of its importance beyond 400m" Para 3.8: species stated. Curlew & lapwing are the two most seen types.	such as Golden Plover tend to avoid field edges and areas close to roads when foraging – see Appendix 2.	Footnote added in relation to 25m of a main road.
	536	The title chosen for section 3 "Enabling Development" requires clarification and a distinction in the following text between enabling development to take place via proposed mitigation and the positive enabling contributions which can be made by proactive and co-operative landowners/developers where significant habitat and other environment enhancements can be achieved via the master planning and release of large areas of land associated with enabling residential development.	Noted – the title has been changed to 'Overall Strategy' which is more suited to the document's purpose.	Title amended to Overall Strategy'.
3.1Overview	2307 2891	Again, in para 2, you state that "depending on these findings, ensure any impacts are addressed through mitigation..." and yet it is an accepted fact that mitigation cannot eliminate all the effects of development on the protected area when it is so close to the limit. The statement at Chap.1. para 1.3 is preeminent at this point: "A competent Authority should only give effect to a plan.....after having ascertained that it will not adversely affect the integrity of the European	The approach in producing a funded strategic mitigation strategy will provide cohesive mitigation for the level of housing required to ensure there are no likely significant effects (LSE) on the SPA / SAC. This process will be monitored, reviewed and, in the case that harm is in any way not mitigated, adapted and strengthened.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		Site. This means that in the absence of certainty, the plan/project should not normally proceed (subject to the further exceptional tests set out in legislation).		
	2307 3387 3425 2891 2376 3300 2743	There should also be a presumption against development within the 2.5 km zone unless it can clearly demonstrate through an independent HRA that there are no species affected. If the Developer carries this out, they use their own retained (and sometimes wholly owned) subsidiaries to carry out this work, primarily as a tick box, rather than as a true reflection of the species actually using a proposed site. This results in Functional land being wrongly categorised as suitable with mitigation.	Rather than ruling out all development in the 400m to 2.5km zone the SPD requires that land is checked to identify any supporting habitat that might be functionally linked to the SPA. The SPD also identifies types of site that would not generate credible risk. The Council considers that this offers a pragmatic approach that is compliant with the legislation.	None required.
	538	Why are you talking about mitigation again straightaway? The Sun Lane development is too close (within 2.5Km) and no amount of mitigation can reduce the damage to zero. In chapter 1, it states that an Authority can only approve a plan if it won't affect the integrity of the European site. Also in the absence of certainty, a plan / project should not normally proceed. Applying these criteria, the Sun Lane development should not proceed.	Text added to clarify role of mitigation and legislative requirements.	Minor changes made to clarify role of mitigation and legislative requirements. (Sections 1.7, 1.8, 3.1).
	6566	Within the SPD, there is brief reference (section 3.1 third bullet point) to the calculation of the financial contribution being the alternative (as per the policy) to the provision of a bespoke mitigation scheme provided pursuant to SP11 C 3 a. This should also	Where the applicant is not contributing to the mitigation strategy, then a full HRA will be required. Applicants will need to ensure adequate mitigation – in line with that set out in this strategy – is secured independently and supported with comprehensive	Text expanded in Section 3.1 to clarify the Council's position on

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		be made clearer in the introduction to the document by way of clarification. Section D links the policy to the SPD. It would be helpful for the sake of clarity if the section make specific reference to the specific part of the policy to which it applies. We suggest the follow text would be helpful. D. The South Pennine Moors SPD sets out a strategic mitigation scheme and a mechanism for the calculation of the financial contributions **under policy SP11, C, 3b** to mitigate recreational impacts on the SPA and SAC as a consequence of housing growth and subsequent population increases. This is on the basis of SP11 C 3 b relating to a calculated financial contribution, rather than bespoke mitigation provided pursuant to SP11 C 3 a.	evidence to inform an HRA. Advice from Natural England would be necessary. Comments relating to Policy SP11 of the draft Local Plan will be considered separately as part of responses to the Local Plan consultation.	bespoke mitigation schemes and the HRA process.
3.2 The zone approach	2307 3387 3425 2891 2376 3300 2743	The original work done on behalf of the council provided a secure area for wildlife recognised as threatened to feed & nest. The actions of the developer, CEG, then ended with the entire policy and its zones being re-written, and the protection that your maps so ably demonstrate as being needed, removed in favour of a developer funded mitigation. Even when Natural England agreed to the "final Draft", after expressing numerous concerns, this	The approach taken in the Core Strategy has been through examination and has been agreed by the Inspector and subsequently adopted. The mitigation package proposed in the SPD is deemed to be the most effective way to mitigate the quantum of development proposed in the adopted Core Strategy. This approach will be monitored and reviewed as necessary. A revised SPD will	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		was challenged further.... all with the specific aim of bringing the site BU/01 into play for CEG. As the schematic shows, there exists the narrowest of corridors between the Moor and the river, allowing for wildlife corridors. The mitigation proposed has all sides of the moor to defend, as well as the moorland above the Aire Valley. Too few resources are being proposed to competently deal with the potential damage. A sticking plaster on a crevasse, perhaps?	also be published following the adoption of the new Local Plan, this will take account of any changes to policy and housing numbers.	
	3220	Support but question whether this is working in practice, any mitigation appears to come along after development. Also have noticed issues with some ecology reports not being comprehensive enough, being picked up by council officers. Would question the practicality of not providing car parking identified in table 1 below. In addition several uncontrolled parking areas (rough ground) are common throughout the district This causes problems for enforcement and waste issues.	A key principle for mitigation delivery is to ensure mitigation is functioning prior to the completion of the development so that the mitigation is preventing an adverse effect from occurring. Therefore, the developer will be required to provide the funds on the commencement of development to ensure that mitigation can be put in place in a timely manner. The HRA of the Core Strategy identified that recreational pressure from the additional dwellings being built within 7km of the SPA/SAC would cause likely significant effects on the habitats sites, these type of development are identified in Table 1. Any application for new cars parks within the vicinity of the SPA/SAC would be subject to	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
			its own HRA to identify any likely significant effects. However, the mitigation strategy does include a strategic review of existing parking arrangements to consider potential changes and options for charging.	
	538	These maps are out of date. CEG re-wrote the original council funded work to provide a secure wildlife area.	The approach taken in the Core Strategy has been through examination and has been agreed by the Inspector and subsequently adopted. These zones are the most up to date. An additional visitor study was conducted in 2019 which supported the creation of the 7km buffer.	None required.
	28	Paragraph 3.1 sets out how it is proposed that protection for the South Pennine Moors SPA & SAC can be provided, and how mitigation from impacts of development can be implemented. It can be argued that the three bullet points here explain more clearly what types of development may be allowed under certain circumstances than those of the policy wording of SP11. For example, in the first bullet point, stating that “a presumption against certain types of development” gives the applicant an indication that some development types may be allowed under certain circumstances, where appropriate mitigations are potentially included. The flowchart (Figure 2 – necessary checks for residential planning applications) is welcome and	Noted this paragraph has been strengthened to indicate that as an exception, the development and/or its use would not have an adverse effect upon the integrity of the site. We welcome your support in terms of the flow chart.	Wording changed – updated bullet “•A clear presumption against any net increase in residential development within 400m of the South Pennine Moors European sites, unless as an exception, the

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		clear in its explanations to applicants. It provides a clear pathway for developers to follow, in terms of the process for applications within the different zones.		development and/or its use would not have an adverse effect upon the integrity of the site; “
	6564	There is no justification for the exclusion of development within 400m of the SPA/SAC. Neither the SPD nor the HRA presents any evidence of either ‘urban edge effects’ or ‘cat predation’. As suggested above this part of the policy should be removed and such reference to the policy in paragraph 3.1 of the SPD.	The 400m zone was established in the Core Strategy which has been subject to public examination and has support from Natural England. There is local evidence of instances of the tipping of garden waste onto SPA/SAC, invasive alien plant species from gardens, lighting effects, increased risk of wildfire, increased disturbance and erosion from properties adjacent to the SPA/SAC. The SPD must be prepared in accordance with the adopted policy base.	The Council will continue to log incidents of urban edge effects and include a body of further evidence in the next iteration of the HRA.
	6564	The second bullet point is incorrect as if fails to make clear that in order to be supporting habitat for the SPA any land must actually support SPA birds (also see comments above on policy SP11). Given that there is now increased evidence regarding the absence of use of land surrounding the SPA by SPA birds this part of the SPD should be deleted entirely.	In line with Chapman & Tyldesley (2016) functional linkage refers to the role of land outside the SPA in supporting populations of birds for which the SPA was classified.	Text amended to ensure clarity.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		If this policy is to remain then it must be reworded to reflect that fact that it is only land that is used by SPA birds which may be regarded as functionally linked land *not* simply habitat that may be used theoretically. *In Zone B it will be considered, based on such evidence as may be reasonably required, whether land proposed for development affects foraging habitat ~~for~~ used by ~~the qualifying species of the~~ SPA birds. Further guidance can be found in the South Pennine Moors SPD.*	The SPD refers to the need for both habitat and bird surveys to inform appropriate assessment. The habitat surveys simply provide an initial easy step to ensure sites that have no potential for functional linkage can be eliminated easily from the need for bird surveys. The SPD must be prepared in accordance with the adopted policy base. Comments relating to Policy SP11 of the draft Local Plan will be considered separately as part of responses to the Local Plan consultation.	No change as comment relates to policy.
3.3 Process for applications within different zones	1117	I believe the reinstatement of Burley in Wharfedale to a Local Growth Area was achieved in a way that contravenes Council rules regarding 'Conflict of Interest'. CEG Land Promotions were invited to meetings to discuss the Council's Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). At the time CEG already owned (or had an option to buy) Green Belt Land in the village. The changes made to the document at the meeting and signed by CEG (9/03/15), resulted in B in W being reinstated as a Growth Area and housing numbers in the village increasing. As purchasers of green belt land in B in W, CEG should not have been invited to the meeting as their sole intention was to ensure land they owned would be used for housing development. An investigation needs to be called to determine whether CEG	The Core Strategy was subject to a public examination and is now adopted policy. The points raised are not relevant to the SPD.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		declared an interest and whether their input affected decisions the council made.		
	2307 3387 3425 2891 2376 3300 2743	In the flow chart: Define "Exceptional Circumstances (box 2) 2.5Km = YES, then crucial that Initial check of Habitat MUST be done by a truly independent specialist to evaluate "supporting Habitat" AEOI ruled out alone or "in Combination" ...with what? "LSE likely due to impacts from recreation: " What about ALL other LSE's from development. If it's an elderly residential development, trampling is unlikely, but CAT predation is almost guaranteed. "Developer devises suitable mitigation...." Why is this not a Duty of the Planning Officers? The developer has no interest in creating any scheme that may be costly and effective, but the BDMC officers can stipulate what must happen. There is no overall firm policy that any development within 2.5km WILL provide substantial funding to your proposed mitigation strategy...and you even propose to allow them to.	The council agrees that any initial habitat checks must be undertaken to an agreed standard by a suitably qualified ecologist with experience of the relevant bird species will be necessary to identify whether a site is likely to provide suitable habitat. AEOI (adverse effects on integrity) need to be ruled out alone or in combination with other plans and projects so the cumulative impact of development is recognised.	The wording has been strengthened in paragraph 3.8 to reflect this. The meaning of 'in combination' effects and the considerations which must be made are outlined in paragraph 2.5.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
	6564	It should be noted that the flow chart (Figure 2) in paragraph 3.3 is not correct where it references supporting habitat. For the reasons set out above there can be no Likely Significant Effect if it can be demonstrated through empirical evidence that SPA birds are not present on a development site (see above). The flow chart does not allow for this possibility. It should also be made clear that the LSE test is not whether there are effect upon supporting habitat but rather whether there are effects on the interest features of the SPA birds as a result of effects on supporting habitat.	Bird surveys are necessary where there is habitat that could be important for the SPA bird interest. The screening for likely significant effects is a coarse filter and the presence of suitable habitat indicates that there is potential for functional-linkage. It is necessary for appropriate assessment to consider the survey design, context and implications of any field surveys, for example considering whether the presence of bird species that are qualifying features of the SPA indicates functional-links.	Flow chart amended for clarity.
	6566	It should be noted that the flow chart (Figure 2) in paragraph 3.3 is not correct where it references supporting habitat. For the reasons set out above there can be no a Likely Significant Effect if it can be demonstrated through empirical evidence that SPA birds are not present on a development site (see above). The flow chart does not allow for this possibility. It should also be made clear that the LSE test is not whether there are effect upon supporting habitat but rather whether there are effects on the interest features of the SPA birds as a result of effects on supporting habitat.	Bird surveys are necessary where there is habitat that could be important for the SPA bird interest. The screening for likely significant effects is a coarse filter and the presence of suitable habitat indicates that there is potential for functional-linkage. It is necessary for appropriate assessment to consider the survey design, context and implications of any field surveys, for example considering whether the presence of bird species that are qualifying features of the SPA indicates functional-links.	Flow chart amended for clarity.
	538	What are the "exceptional circumstances" mentioned in the first red box?	An explanation of ‘exceptional circumstances’ is given in paragraph 3.5.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		Again only recreational impact is being considered. Why have the effects of traffic, pollution, noise, impact of pets on wildlife not been included? This is a procedural breach. Why does the developer devise "suitable mitigation"? That guarantees the cheapest possible, superficial cosmetic proposal. Why isn't it BDMC's planning department personnel who devise any mitigation? Are the developers in control of the council now?	The SPD covers all impact pathways, however evidence indicates that for new dwellings which are within 2.5km and 7km of the SPA/SAC there will only be recreational impacts. This is part of the zonal approach. The flow chart first indicates that the developer pays a contribution to strategic mitigation (this is the best way to achieve effective mitigation and the purpose of the SPD) if this is not done then the developer can propose its own mitigation but this would have to be deemed appropriate and effective by the Competent Authority (the Council) with guidance from Natural England – if it is deemed unsuitable the development will not proceed.	
3.5 Exceptional circumstances within the 400m zone	28	Paragraph 3.5 discusses potential development types within the 400m zone, referring to 'exceptional circumstances'. The paragraph states that "instances of exceptional circumstances are very rare". With Classes C1, C2 and C3 allowed within the 400m zone, permitted development may be a little more common over the life time of the development plan than believed. Furthermore, the potential cumulative impacts of the development classes allowed within the 400m zone need further investigation. Paragraph 3.6 acknowledges that that there is a clear body of	The document does not state that these use classes are permitted but that they will need to be assessed by the competent authority on a case by case basis. This will include the provision of a project level HRA and associated Appropriate Assessment to determine any LSE. It is a requirement of the HRA to assess any LSE of the project alone or in combination with any other plans or projects i.e. the cumulative effects of a hotel in combination with any existing or proposed developments.	None required

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		evidence from other local authorities in England that the presence of other buildings between the European site and a proposal are not sufficient to rule out adverse effects on integrity from urban effects for residential development. The potential cumulative impacts for example need consideration if numerous guest houses and hotels come forward for permission, not only for the developments themselves, but the impacts of their guests on the adjacent SPA & SAC in terms of recreation usage. It is clear that there has been a lot of work in thinking and devising the zoning system as a suitable mechanism to address proposed development in the vicinity of the SAC & SPA. Figure 1 (Schematic summary of the zones in Policy SC8 of the Core Strategy) is a good example of the thinking behind this approach. With the different requirements and demands of applicants within such a precise distance approach however, inevitably there can be some developments that are proposed just outside each boundary (e.g. outside the 400m, 2.5km and 7km distance limits), so that applicants can try to avoid the more stringent demands where some land choice is available to them. Further consideration is likely to be required in this respect.	We appreciate the positive comments regarding the zonal approach. No system can be perfect but these zones are backed up by evidence as shown in the SPD. However, if a development were to be proposed on the edge of a zone which was still considered to have LSE the Council as competent authority would have the capability to act on a case by case basis to ensure the integrity of the SPA/SAC is protected. The potential for cumulative effects is recognised and picked up in the document and tourism proposals would only be granted permission within 400m under exceptional circumstances.	
3.8 – 3.14 Identifying sites within	6564	The SPD should be based on field survey evidence of the presence of SPA birds rather than just desk-based study and the modelling of habitat types. It is	The SPD needs to work for windfall development and as such an approach that relied solely on up front fieldwork would not	None required

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
2.5km where supporting habitat is present or potentially present		essential to first establish whether or not a potential development site supports SPA birds (i.e. birds which are actually associated with the SPA and are regularly moving between the SPA and the development site).	be feasible as it would require all land to be surveyed. The habitat checks provide an initial filter, and where there is potentially suitable habitat, the need for bird surveys is triggered. This ensures there is the necessary evidence to inform appropriate assessment.	
	6564	Section B refers to 'functionally linked land' as if it were part of the SPA in that it applies the likely significant effect test to functionally linked land. This is incorrect. The correct test is whether the effects on functionally linked land will have a likely significant effect upon the SPA (not the functionally linked land per se). In order to be compliant with the Habitat Regulations, 2017 (as amended) the text within the bracket '(or land functionally linked to the SPA)' must be deleted. The final paragraph of Section B further perpetuates this error and should be deleted in order to comply with the Habitats Regulations, 2017 (as amended).	A significant effect is any effect that would undermine the conservation objectives for a European site and can include development outside the European site which might cause direct or indirect effects to qualifying features within the site or when they are outside of it, for example with respect to functionally linked land used by foraging birds.	Text amended accordingly.
	6566	Section C2 relates to such evidence that may be reasonably required, as to whether land proposed for development affects foraging habitat for qualifying species of the SPA. The guidance in the HRA for the draft Local Plan (see below) and SPD does not adequately describe what evidence will be required to support mitigation measures. The HRA and SPD should be based on field survey evidence	The SPD has been updated to provide the link to the guidance which sets out survey requirements.	Link to guidance added

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		of the presence of SPA birds rather than just desk-based study and modelling of habitat types. For example, field evidence will clarify the range of supporting habitat, which at present is based on modelling of the South Pennines area and the research used is from a different area of the country.		
	6564	The SPD has provided a list of what is considered to be supporting habitat. The SPD gives no guidance regarding Improved grasslands that have been neglected. Will CBMDC consider such grassland as rough grazing?	The SPD states that habitat survey by a suitably qualified ecologist with experience of the relevant bird species will be necessary to identify whether a site is likely to provide suitable habitat. The SPD then lists some habitats that would be indicators of a credible risk as a guide - there will inevitably be some sites and locations that are hard to classify and hence the need for survey by a suitably qualified ecologist. The list is not exhaustive.	None required.
	6564	Paragraph 3.10: As set out above the basic premise of how functionally linked land is identified is incorrect. If this policy is to be retained reference to the 1% 'rule of thumb' should state that the breeding bird assemblage which is the interest feature of the site must be considered as a whole. The population is therefore, the number of SPA birds in the assemblage NOT the numbers of the individual species.	Functionally-linked land is clearly defined in the SPD (and has been further amended). Reference to the 1% rule of thumb is included in the bird survey guidance which refers to the population of the SPA.	Definition of functionally-linked land amended in the SPD to remove any confusion
	6564	Paragraph 3.11: The premise is incorrect, modelling will not establish if land is or is not supporting habitat	Paragraph 3.11 does not say that modelling will establish if land is or is not supporting	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		for the SPA, only the confirmed presence of SPA birds will determine where land is functionally linked or not. Evidence is now amassing to show that movements to and from the SPA are not frequent or regular.	habitat. It indicates that modelling will provide further information of areas of high risk and further clarification as to where bird surveys are necessary. No change required.	
3.14 Which developments are required to provide mitigation within 0.4-7km.	3531	We consider that seeking contributions from tourist accommodation as well as dwellings is a form of double-counting, as each resident will likely also at some point be a tourist and vice versa. It will also impact the viability of new tourist accommodation, a key component of post-pandemic economic recovery locally and nationally. We do not consider the impact from each space or unit of self-catering, caravan and touring holiday accommodation to be the same as that from a dwelling and the supporting text and documents do not evidence this. Assessing impact in this way appears not to account for the greater seasonality and likelihood of voids in self-catering and particularly caravan and touring holiday accommodation compared to dwellings (or hotel and guest house accommodation). Indeed, as paragraph 5.16 indicates, holiday makers are outliers in survey results, yet would comprise all of the users of self-catering, caravan and touring holiday accommodation.	It is unlikely that a resident in Bradford District will be also be an overnight tourist within Bradford District. The SPD was informed by visitor surveys to pick-up the nuances of local use. Therefore, we do not agree that there is a significant risk of double-counting. The fee has been structured at a level which considers viability and includes provisions for instalments, which will mainly be of relevance to larger developments. It is noted that traditionally tourism accommodation has been subject to seasonal variations but there is also a trend towards voids being made up of traditional 'out of season' bookings with visitors a feature of the local economy all year round.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
Chapter 4				
4.1 What is the developer contribution used for?	2307 3387 3425 2376 3300 2743	Whilst supporting the principle of developer contributions, there is no mention of use for minimising Fire Risks, and creating restricted access points/protected No-Go zones, banning of dogs off the lead, physical methods of disrupting and discouraging Cat Predation, and of creating new Bye-Laws to assist in the enforcement. Para 3.15; BDMC is shying away from insisting that all developers create SANG's, and also missing the opportunity to apply this retrospectively, either to those developments with current PP but not yet brought to market, or to existing homes developed over the past 20 years to be funded with a unique precept charge annually to assist in funding the strategy. The mitigation strategy needs a Governance Structure that allows Parish Councils & authorised bodies (Emergency services, Natural England, RSPB, Curlew Recovery partnership etc.)	Appendix 4 includes a list of possible mitigation measures which have been developed on behalf of the Council by appointed specialist consultants based upon practical experience and adapted for the Bradford context. The recreational mitigation strategy addresses recreational impacts, whereas some of the urban effects noted are addressed with the application of Zone A. The SPD cannot be applied retrospectively, and is being prepared to address future levels of development as set out in the adopted Core Strategy. Please see comments regarding SANGs and Governance below.	None required.
	2891	I support developer contributions, but as experienced in the Sun Lane case, they are insufficient and most gets consumed by BMDC to use in their own way rather than benefitting the areas which have been adversely affected by the development. As a result, developments in the Wharfe valley are being used politically to fund Bradford City and its Labour constituents. Is it a	The developer contributions will be taken as part of a Section 106 agreement and therefore will be ring-fenced and must be used to fund the mitigation strategy. The Council have considered the use of SANGs, which have been used in mitigation strategies elsewhere. Policy SC8 of the adopted Core Strategy (point i. under Zone	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		coincidence that the town most impacted, Burley has an MP who is of a different party and defeated the current leader of the Council when she tried to become an MP? Para 3.15; BDMC is shying away from insisting that all developers create SANG's, and also missing the opportunity to apply this retrospectively, either to those developments with current PP but not yet brought to market, or to existing homes developed over the past 20 years to be funded with a unique precept charge annually to assist in funding the strategy. The mitigation strategy needs a Governance Structure that allows Parish Councils & authorised bodies (Emergency services, Natural England, RSPB, Curlew Recovery partnership etc.)	C) indicates that the provision of accessible natural greenspace could be an effective mitigation measure. However, as explained in paragraph 4.5, there may be relatively few opportunities where large scale development can deliver SANGs in Bradford, and land availability will be a constraint on the provision of any strategic SANGs. It is therefore proposed that, with the exception of any larger sites/urban extension sites coming forward in the future through the new Local Plan site allocations, the mitigation strategy should focus on maximising opportunities for enhancing the capacity and recreation experience at existing greenspace sites. The need for an appropriately balanced governance structure is recognised, with details provided in paragraph 4.41.	
	536	It is necessary to include recognition of the opportunities to create/enhance SANGS and the equivalent of HIPS alongside enabling development which in a number of cases will inevitably be located in tracts of Green Belt close to the urban area and in the 400m-2.5km zone of the SPA/SAC (see again section 4 of the Dorset Heathlands SPD March 2020).	Representations submitted will be reviewed as part of the development of the Local Plan. It is noted in earlier comments that the vast majority of SANGs will be established green spaces, although it is noted that larger scale / strategic scale sites may present new opportunities.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		We have already submitted master plan and written proposals to Bradford Council on large sites to the east and west of Ilkley which involve residential development proposals but where the majority of the landholdings are proposed for environmental enhancement, habitat improvements and associated recreation provision. We will also be submitting a major opportunity combining recreation and environmental enhancements in association with the two proposed residential allocations at Addingham (AD3/H & AD4/H). The provision for the delivery of such opportunities should not be excluded from this SPD. Text and clear policy guidance should be included which indicate the circumstances where such initiatives will be supported (see Dorset Heathlands SPD paras 4.18 to 4.21).		
	538	Why isn't BDMC insisting on a SANG being created? The Sun Lane development is enormous compared with the size of Burley-in-Wharfedale. It will destroy habitat of rare species such as Curlew and Lapwing birds. Surely the lack of a SANG is a glaring omission? Why doesn't the council stand up to the developer?	See comments above.	None required
	6564	Section 4: The justification for a dedicated ranger service is reasonable given the need to stop unwanted behaviour and manage visitor pressure, however the justification is argued to be to prevent bird disturbance and/or displacement? There is no	The key test is ruling out adverse effects on integrity from future housing, therefore, there doesn't need to be evidence of impact now. There is however plenty of evidence	None required

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		evidence that the visitor levels to the South Pennine Moors SPA are having adverse effects upon the bird species that are the interest features of the site. The authors have relied upon experience of lowland heath habitats which are much more accessible as the terrain is generally flat and the ground underfoot is dry. Use of upland habitat is generally confined to established paths, because access to areas such as blanket bog (a habitat which covers a considerable proportion of the South Pennine Moors) is very difficult given the wet nature of this habitat type. Again, the authors reliance on evidence from lowland heaths exposes the flaws in the approach.	to highlight the risk caused by disturbance and table 3 in the SPD provides references. The South Pennine Moors Site Improvement Plan (Natural England) and supplementary conservation advice from the statutory conservation agency clearly indicate there is a risk (and the site improvement plan identifies it as a current pressure on the SPA). Furthermore, the impacts of recreation on our moors are not just on bird populations, the Site Improvement Plan cites recreation as a pressure and a threat to the SAC. Additional research can be found at: “Public Access and Disturbance Theme Plan: A strategic approach to identifying and addressing significant effects on the features of Natura 2000 sites ‘Improvement Programme for England’s Natura 2000 Sites – Planning for the Future’	
4.4 What is the developer contribution used for?	103	While we are broadly in agreement with the three mitigation streams for recreational pressures we recommend that the SPD acknowledges that the monitoring may identify the need for onsite (within the designated site) management and mitigation measures, such as footpath repair or remedial	Comments noted and text updated.	On site measures were included in the detailed table in the Appendices and text has

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		habitat management, which should play a role in the overall approach.		been modified so this is clear.
4.14 - 4.16 Enhancement of existing greenspaces	28	Paragraphs 4.14 to 4.16 put forward welcome detail on the enhancement of existing greenspaces, principally as alternatives for recreation to the SAC & SPA. In paragraph 4.15, it is stated that the mitigation strategy should focus on maximising opportunities for enhancing the capacity and recreation experience at existing greenspace sites. In relation to this, Map 4 (Greenspace outside the European sites), shows 'OS Open greenspace (public parks & gardens only)' and 'Other Bradford Council countryside sites'. In order to maximise these recreation opportunities, there needs to be awareness and promotion of any opportunities to link up these greenspace sites to provide suitable alternatives of reasonable size to the various patch areas of the SPA & SAC.	Comments noted. This is a good point and welcomed. The review of greenspaces will identify where mitigation money is best spent and that work can identify how such links might work and where.	None required.
4.18 – 4.21 Level of growth to be mitigated	783	There are two areas of brownfield identified within the village boundary Wide Lane and Providence Lane. The first has had several permissions on it though no development as yet the second is the site of the former Lower Providence Mill which has at present a mill chimney but no Mill. I suggest that greenfield is more important than an old chimney which if it is required to remain could form a feature on the site unless considered dangerous in which	As these comments do not directly relate to the application of the SPD they have been forwarded on to be included in the Local Plan Regulation 18 consultation.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		case it needs pulling down either way it would be a perfect place for homes.		
	2307 3387 3425 2891 2376 3300 2743	4.18: The single largest potential development in the Wharfe Valley Area affected by this plan is the Sun Lane development of 500 homes, recently approved by the SoS for MHCLG. Although NO WORK has started, the CIL agreement is supposed to cover the HUGE impact on the moor, with the accepted reality that BDMC will use the funds in areas of deprivation in the city centre. This should be re-addressed. 4.19: The Figures printed in the Local Plan Review you refer to are inaccurate. In Burley-in-Wharfedale they do not include the 92 Homes currently under initial construction at the Greenholme Mill site. 4.20: Should be a greater weighting for properties within the 2.5km zone. 4.21: The eventual number, after review & potential legal challenges, along with ONS reductions in forecast need, is likely to be more like 12,500. All funding formulae should use this figure to prevent having to repeat the exercise.	As stated this application has been approved by the SoS, the SPD can only address planning applications which are submitted once it has been adopted. The comments regarding the emerging Draft Local Plan have been forwarded for inclusion as part of the Regulation 18 consultation. It is not clear what is meant by weighting. The evidence shows this is an appropriate buffer to consider the impact on foraging birds. The SPD will be reviewed following the adoption of the new Local Plan to reflect the housing figures at that time.	None required.
	538	Presumably the CIL is supposed to pay for the mitigation of the Sun Lane development on the moor habitats. It will be taken by BDMC and spent elsewhere. It should be ring-fenced for its original purpose. Housing figures in the Local Plan Review are wrong. That is a fact. The most glaring omission is the 92	Once adopted the SPD will use a Section 106 agreement to obtain funds which will be allocated solely to funding the mitigation strategy which is set out in the SPD. The funds will not be available to be used for any other purpose. CIL will not be used for this strategy.	Paragraph 4.30 clarifies that Section 106 monies must be spent on their intended purpose.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		homes well-under construction at Greenholme Mills have not been included in the figures. Huge error. Similarly, the additional small scale developments of new homes (c. 20) in Burley-in-Wharfedale are not included. The number of homes on the Sun Lane development should at the very least be reduced to take account of the mathematical reality.	The comment regarding the Local Plan has been forwarded as part of the Regulation 18 consultation	
4.22 Cost of mitigation and per dwelling tariff	2307 3387 3425 2891 2376 3300 2743	4.23: Number should be based on 12,500 rather than 17,326 in light of reductions in targets. If no reductions, the scheme has more funding to use. 4.24: Using a base figure of 12,500 units, the required contribution is around £520 per residential unit. All of this is aimed at visitors, but they don't contribute. Whereas locals will use the access etc. outside warden employed hours.	The SPD will be reviewed following the adoption of the new Local Plan to reflect the housing figures at that time. On the contrary, primary research through visitor surveys informing the strategy has found that the vast majority of visitors to the SPA/SAC are local (within 7km) which is why the buffer has been set at this distance. The strategy will include measures to encourage positive behaviour change such as education programs and signage which will not be dependent on 'boots on the ground'.	None required.
	536	The document as drafted over-concentrates on the calculation of the recreation tariffs. Further guidance is required for landowners/developers on supporting habitat provision, habitat enhancement, linkages to biodiversity net gain, ecological networks.	This SPD is focusing on the mitigation strategy for all zones of the SPA although the tariff will be to address recreational impacts of additional dwellings between 0km and 7km from the SPA/SAC. With the forthcoming Environment Bill and the introduction of net gain, biodiversity is gaining significant weight in policy making.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
			The draft Local Plan includes more policy and strategy on how the District can improve its biodiversity and associated habitats by improving wildlife networks, tree cover, green infrastructure and the introduction of biodiversity net gain as part of new developments.	
	3531	We are concerned that a number of the items listed in Appendix 4 comprise activity for which the Council is already funded and which continue over far greater periods than the likely impacts related to the development that will be charged. We consider that a far more nuanced means of assessing cost per unit based on the real likelihood of residents or users entering the SPA/SAC or impacting it beyond its boundary is needed.	Mitigation measures are all additional to work the Council is already doing. Mitigation must last for the duration that the impacts will occur and there are precedents from around the country that – for housing growth – this will mean in-perpetuity	None required.
	28	Under paragraphs 4.22 to 4.27, there is a discussion on the total cost of mitigation measures, with the required contribution broken down per residential unit. The required contribution is applicable to any development with a net increase in residential units within 0.4 – 7km of the South Pennine Moors European wildlife sites. It would be useful to further explain if the specified use classes allowed within the 400m zone (in addition to the other two zones) are also subject to required contributions, and if so what form they would take. Table 1 provides some useful detail here (e.g. contribution for recreation	Any permissions within 400m will be exceptional and would require case-by-case assessment. Mitigation would need to address recreation impacts and also urban effects. Text relating to the extent of Zone C has been amended to clarify that is covers 0-7km. Further clarification on use class detail has been added to Table 1.	Amendments made to Table 1 with footnotes where required. Amendments made to clarify extent of Zone C.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		mitigation: 1 room = 1 residential unit), and perhaps there can be a little further explanation in the accompanying paragraphs for any commercial developments in terms of their contributions. This can provide further balance to the text on proposed contributions from residential developments in the vicinity of the SPA & SAC.		
4.28 The legal mechanism to secure developer contributions	2307 3387 3425 2891 2376 3300 2743	Agree with the use of S106 legal agreements to raise the funding. 4.28: Acknowledges that CIL was ineffective method of funding specific projects 4.29: Agree that "payment of the required funds on the commencement of the development" using the section 56 definition of the Town & country Planning Act 1990. 4.31: Agree with the insistence on using a Council Prepared "standardised unilateral Form" pursuant to section 106 of the act. Developers throw all sorts of reasons why this is unfair, unworkable, impossible to finance etc., but on this ONE THING, BDMC must remain firm. 4.36: No!! An instalments policy negates all the good done by the above paragraph. Disturbance to the SPA/SAC starts as soon as the first bulldozer arrives on site. To allow developers to delay paying for this upfront puts the burden back on the Council Tax Payers. This is markedly unjust.	The Council appreciated the supportive comments regarding the collection of the tariff. In terms of the instalment policies the instalment policy is only envisaged for use with significant developments and monies are to be paid prior to occupation. As the strategy is to mitigate recreational impacts of the residential occupiers this will still allow an appropriate level of mitigation to be put in place.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
	3531	We consider that the lack of proportional connection between the development from which contributions will be sought, the impacts sought to be mitigated and the measures intended to achieve that, is contrary to the national legal and policy tests for planning agreements and to Core Strategy policy ID3. In particular, account ought to be taken of existing funding, the real likelihood and scale of each impact and the effect that any requirement for contributions will have on the viability of businesses undertaking development during a period of extreme economic difficulty.	The Council considers the approach and charge indicated through the SPD as proportionate and evidenced. The SPD also links directly to Policy SC8 in the adopted Core Strategy. Similar approaches to mitigation have been successfully adopted in other parts of the Country operating within the same national planning and legislative framework. The mitigation Strategy is the most cohesive and effective way to mitigate the recreational impacts on the SPA/SAC from additional development. Without mitigation the required quantum of housing would not be able to go ahead due to Habitats Regulations. This mitigation is not a desirable element but a requirement which cannot be negotiated in terms of viability.	None required.
	3220	Support. CIL is not delivering the funding forecasted. However, consider any development in the 0-7km zone should be a last resort after development in towns and city on PDL sites. Concern that the headroom (profit margin) identified in the CIL viability appraisal and consultation, will allow for an additional S106 cost and developers could seek to override this in a site specific viability appraisal. Any needed funding for mitigation should be provided up	If the impacts on the SPA/SAC are not suitably mitigated, then the proposals will not be permitted to go ahead. The most effective way for a developer to achieve this will be to contribute towards the mitigation strategy as set out in this draft SPD. This is a requirement of the Habitats Regulations and cannot be circumvented via viability arguments. The tariff will generally be	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		front or in early stages of development to ensure mitigation measures are delivered in a timely manner (e.g. before specific site occupations) Also suggests developers are encouraged to contribute by incorporation of defensive hedgerows in preference to close boarding fencing, protect and supplement existing trees (1 fruit per garden minimum).	payable upon commencement and in some circumstances where an instalment plan may be permitted then it must be fully paid before occupation. The remaining comments are more applicable to the draft Local Plan and have been forwarded as part of the Regulation 18 consultation.	
	538	4.28 seems to accept the CIL is a poor way of trying to fund mitigation work. Why is it still being suggested then? 4.29 suggests the developer will have to pay at the start of work. This should most definitely happen. The council should stand-up to the developer when they try to renege. 4.36 is a disaster. There should not be any question of an instalment system. This would completely undermine the use of the Standardised Unilateral Form!	The change to section 106 payments as a more appropriate way to pay for mitigation on the SPA/SAC can only come into force once this SPD is adopted. 4.29 comment noted. 4.36 It is not unusual for an instalment system to be agreed for section 106 payments, and additional information on this approach has been set out in the SPD.	None required.
4.38 Hosting of staff and delivery oversight	2307 3387 3425 2376 3300 2743	The Vision of this aspect of the strategy is on the right track, but I feel that by concentrating solely on wardening and education, those that permanently avoid obeying the rules will continue to fly tip, poach, illegally develop, destroy barriers, light fires and remove eggs. There need to be a robust and enforceable suite of bye-laws, ready to be applied by the constabulary to	The mitigation strategy includes: Dedicated staff, promotion, education and interpretation, and enhancement of existing greenspaces, which should be sufficient to address these concerns. The mitigation measures will be monitored to ensure that are being effectively implemented.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		provide an adequate deterrent to support the wardening programme.		
4.41 Governance	2307 3387 3425 2891 2376 3300 2743	Governance is a crucial, and requires the active cooperation of local councils, landowners, organisations such as the Ramblers, the conservation volunteers, RSPB, Curlew Recovery Partnership, Natural England, CPRE, and others, so that this becomes a combined effort to support the mitigation structure, as well as identify where it is inappropriately applied. The recommendation of a "..small number of partners" is avoiding the reality of who actually uses the SPA/SAC areas.	Comments noted. The majority of those listed were invited to the stakeholder workshop to provide initial input about the direction of the SPD and the Council will support ongoing engagement and the involvement of these groups as the strategy is developed. The SPD is sufficiently flexible in wording (as revised) to allow for an appropriate governance structure to be agreed in conjunction with a wide range of partners and interest groups.	Removal of 'small number of partners'.
4.42 Monitoring	2307 3425 2891 2376 3300 2743	Monitoring is essential to ensure the effectiveness of the strategy. To that end, in addition to the operational monitoring that the staff would be involved in as part of their role, I would suggest an outside Monitoring of the overall impact on populations and Biodiversity as a consequence of the strategy. This would need distinct Performance Indicators that had been agreed by the Governance function. Its laudable to create something as positive as this proposed structure, but if it fails in its objectives of preserving the SPA/SAC from harm, then it must	Monitoring is important and has been included. The governance structure ensures oversight and the governing body will be informed by monitoring results. As such the feedback is established.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		have a mechanism built in by which it can be then be adjusted, & made suitable for purpose. This should be done on a regular timescale...three monthly first year, six monthly in the second year moving to annually.		
	28	Paragraphs 4.42 and 4.43 are very welcome in terms of how they set out monitoring indicators, and that they will inform the review of the strategy, which can include reviews on an annual basis. Monitoring is a key part of any such strategy which is often neglected.	Supportive comments noted.	None required.
Chapter 5				
5. References	2307 3387 3425 2376 3300 2743	Baines, in 1988, & Robson, in 1998 are both essentially out of date as reference works to Curlew populations. The Curlew Recovery Partnership should be approached as a matter of urgency for their input into this work. It is notable that DEFRA, MHCLG, and Natural England are actively involved, and funding this work. It would be a missed opportunity for this review to FAIL to take the latest information into consideration. To reference Hoskin, Panter & Lilley, and the HRA they produced this last year without it being published for the public to review its findings & see their appropriateness is not common practice.	The references are cited with respect to movement of birds (i.e. tracking studies) and use of supporting habitat, and despite being dated provide the necessary information and have not been superseded. One new reference has been added to highlight the particular plight and current focus on curlew. The Curlew Recovery Partnership was only launched in March 2021 as this document went out for consultation. The Council will seek to engage with the partnership where appropriate in the delivery of the strategy. The 2019 *Habitats Regulations Assessment of the Bradford District Core Strategy Partial Review—Preferred Options Stage (Reg 18)* document which is referred to as	Addition made to references.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
			unpublished is publically available on the Council's website. The 'unpublished' status is simply clarifying that the report doesn't have an ISBN or was formally published as a journal article or similar. This is however considered to be confusing and for the purposes of producing the Local Plan, the document was clearly published for public consultation.	
	2891	The references, Baines, in 1988, & Robson, in 1998 are both out of date and do not cover the recent situation regarding the Curlew. The Curlew Recovery Partnership should be approached to update yourselves and to provide input.	The Curlew Recovery Partnership was only launched in March 2021 as this document went out for consultation. The Council will seek to engage with the partnership where appropriate in the delivery of the strategy. The references are cited to refer to tracking studies and use of supporting habitat – and they are the most appropriate studies to cite for these data.	One new reference added in general text to ensure cross reference to on-going work on Curlew.
	538	Why isn't the Curlew Recovery Partnership involved as the definitive authority on Curlew populations. The Sun Lane site has a Curlew population.	The Curlew Recovery Partnership was only launched in March 2021 as this document went out for consultation. The Council will seek to engage with the partnership where appropriate in the delivery of the strategy.	None required.
	2307	The curlew population across the district is under extreme threat, along with those across the country. This has become so severe that the various bodies	Thank you for the information.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		involved have now launched the "Curlew Recovery Partnership" https://www.wwt.org.uk/news-and-stories/news/new-partnership-set-up-to-save-threatened-curlews/# Please have a read of the on line material newly published of the ways in which we can protect this threatened species. It's a great shame that whoever compiled your recent SPD of the SPC/ SPA used data compiled on Curlews from over 20 years ago....it is, sadly, in no way an accurate reflection of their current position or the way they use habitats, especially since the Moors fires.	The Curlew Recovery Partnership was only launched in March 2021 as this document went out for consultation. The Council will seek to engage with the partnership where appropriate in the delivery of the strategy.	
Appendices				
Appendix 2	2307 3387 3425 2376 3300 2743	Appendix 2 effectively highlights all of the dangers from developments taking place in close proximity to the SPA/SAC, and yet it then seems to rely on impact data gathered before the dreadful Moor Fires, before the Covid travel restrictions created an overwhelming volume of foot and vehicle traffic up onto the SPA/SAC, and ignores the devastating consequences for the wildlife populations and for the protected Flora species for which the area is listed. This is the Information that should have been at the Front of this review. This is the crucial part that sets the framework, that then identifies the proposed mitigation strategy as actively encouraging the horse to bolt, & then shutting the door, partially, behind it!	Text has been added to highlight the particular challenges and changes with respect to the COVID19 pandemic. The references cited relate to tracking studies and these are the best and most relevant sources for how far birds move from moorland breeding sites.	Text added to SPD in relation to COVID.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		Again, time and again, your authors refer to outdated reference works, undertaken 10years into the last century! For a document with potentially such a profound effect, this is simply not good enough.		
Appendix 2 2.1 Relevant impacts of development	2307 3387 3425	In 5.2 & 5.4 you recognise recreation and urban effects as separate issues, and yet the whole of your strategy is aimed at mitigating Recreational use. In 5.6, you recognise that development has the potential to undermine the conservation objectives, and yet, despite 2 years of these exact concerns playing out across the Moors, you still do not give them a higher priority. In 5.6, you recognise that the Supplementary conservation advice for the SPA refers directly to the importance of "Functional Land" to achieving the breeding objectives of the area, and yet this isn't given the same weight in decision making...it's simply handed over to the developer to carry out the survey to see if the land is functional. This is only ever a one-sided argument!	As stated in the draft SPD there are 3 zones which deal with distinct impact pathways on the SPA/SAC. The funded mitigation strategy deals with recreational impacts (Zone C – 0-7km) including disturbance from walkers / dogs and fire risk but Zone A restricts additional residential development in order to stop the urban edge effects from occurring. Land within 0-2.5km of the SPA/SAC may be functionally linked and the draft SPD sets out how this can be identified, any survey must be carried out by a qualified ecologist and to the relevant standard.	None required.
	538	The Urban Effects are wide-ranging and yet they aren't given the weight they should be in this report. There seems to be a blinkered view solely of Recreational effects. What are you trying to hide? Why are these issues not covered?	Urban effects are addressed through Zone A with the presumption of no development within 400m. This places a very strong emphasis on the impacts of development in close proximity and the purpose of the zone is due to the severity of the impact.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		Many of the references are out of date by many years, decades in some cases. This totally undermines the authority of the document.	It should be noted that the original intention of the SPD was only to deal with Zone C and the recreational impacts in terms of the strategic mitigation strategy. However, following discussion with DM colleagues it was clear that additional guidance on the application of Zones A and B would also be beneficial and therefore the SPD now refers to all Zones. Section 3 and Appendix 2 provide details of the urban edge effects.	
Appendix 2 5.2 – 5.6 Relevant impacts of development	2307 3387 3425 2376 3300 2743	In 5.2 & 5.4 you recognise recreation and Urban effects as separate issues, and yet the ENTIRETY of your strategy is aimed at mitigating Recreational use. In 5.6, you recognise that development has the potential to undermine the conservation objectives, and yet, despite 2 years of these exact concerns playing out across the Moors, you STILL do not give them a higher priority. In 5.6, you recognise that the Supplementary conservation advice for the SPA refers directly to the importance of "Functional Land" to achieving the breeding objectives of the area, and yet this isn't given the same weight in decision making...it's simply handed over to the developer to carry out the survey to see if the land is functional. This is so obviously akin to asking Turkeys to vote for Christmas!	See comments above.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
	538	The Urban Effects are wide-ranging and yet they aren't given the weight they should be in this report. There seems to be a blinkered view solely of Recreational effects. What are you trying to hide? Why are these issues not covered? Many of the references are out of date by many years, decades in some cases. This totally undermines the authority of the document.	See comments above	None required.
Appendix 2 5.8 Evidence to underpin the zones	2307 3387 3425 2376 3300 2743	There is countless metadata'd photographic evidence available from local residents to the planning officers for them to see if there are species listed, using the proposed areas as functional land. This then should trigger the commissioning of an independent HRA. 5.11 Fails to identify the residents of areas within the 2.5km zone as active walking users of the SPC/SAC areas. It is not factual to only identify those resident within 400m in this group. At least 50% of the population of Burley-in-Wharfedale, for example, will have walked from home to the moors. 5.14 Out-of-date references. 5.15,16,17,18,19: Visitor data is now 3years old and extremely unreflective of current usage. 5.21: Table 3 correctly identifies numerous impacts on the SPC/SAC areas, which should be divided into those that cannot be policed & those that can. If there is a high level of risk, development should not be given permission, regardless of mitigation.	Any evidence submitted to the Council will be used to inform the site allocation process. Further ecological surveys are currently being commissioned by the Council. The Council are the competent authority under the Habitats Regulations and therefore ultimately responsible for the HRA. The visitor survey evidence has shown that the most regular (i.e. daily or even multi times a day) visitors live in very close proximity to the moors. That's not to say that there are those living a little further away who are regular visitors. However, this is recognised in the 0-7km buffer (Zone C) to which the recreational mitigation strategy applies. It would not be proportionate to restrict any new residential dwellings to 2.5km as the 0.4km buffer to	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
			which this applies largely reflects the dangers of urban edge effects such as cat predation, fly tipping and noise/water/ air pollution. The visitor data was updated in 2019 and remained consistent with the previous visitor study (2013), whilst it is noted that usage may have changed during the pandemic this is an exceptional circumstance and the long term impacts are not fully defined. It would not have been safe or practical to conduct surveying during the pandemic. Visitor numbers and activities will be monitored as part of the mitigation strategy.	
	538	An independent HRA should be commissioned as many of the listed species live in or sufficiently close to the proposed development area. Burley-in-Wharfedale residents have been photographing the resident wildlife to provide proof of which species are there. The references in Table 2 are hugely out of date. They undermine the veracity of the document.	The Local Plan will be subject to an ongoing HRA as it is an iterative process. Further ecology studies are being commissioned as part of the plan development and once adopted further ecology studies will be required as part of the planning application process. Whilst some of the bird studies to determine likely foraging patterns were conducted some time ago the 2.5km foraging buffer they inform, is widely accepted and has been used in many other similar strategies which have been endorsed by Natural England.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
Appendix 3: Housing totals	2307 3387 3425 2891 2376 3300 2743	The figures are inaccurate for Burley-in-Wharfedale. You show 700 in the adopted Core Strategy, but then show 103 completions in the period 2013-2020. This figure is misleading. You then identify a figure of 597 as the remaining requirement. The Local Plan Review published in parallel with this SPD, and to which constant reference has been made throughout, shows Burley-in-Wharfedale as needing 610 houses, to be delivered via the notorious Sun Lane development, (500 units) and a site at Scalebor (110 units) [Table A para 5.16.33]. It wholly fails to include the 92 units being built at Greenholme Mills. None of the recent windfall sites within the Village are included, despite there being roughly 15 units under construction in various locations. This shows that BDMC are not putting the protection of the Functional land within 2.5km of the SPC/SAC above EXTRA development over target, purely for profit.	The figures relate to a slightly different reporting period and this has been clarified in the Appendix 3. The SPD also relates to the current adopted Core Strategy and not the emerging new Local Plan.	Footnote added to Appendix 3.
	2682	The numbers do not align with the Local Plan consultation.	Once the new Local Plan has been adopted this SPD will be updated to reflect the updated housing numbers and any changes to the linked policies.	None required.
	3220	Not really an objection (do not support the previous higher housing numbers). However taking into account the reduced housing need (numbers) now identified, should this chart be updated and pro rata	Once the new Local Plan has been adopted this SPD will be updated to reflect the updated housing numbers and any changes to the linked policies. At this stage the tariff	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		a higher rate per dwelling applied to ensure the same level of funding? To be able to deliver the SPA improvements required	and mitigation measures required will also be reviewed and updated.	
	538	The Burley-in-Wharfedale figures are wrong. The Local Plan Review fails completely to record the 92 dwellings already well-under construction at Greenholme Mills. Additionally, the small scale developments in Burley-in-Wharfedale (10-20) are also not included. The size of the Sun Lane and maybe Scalebor Park should be reduced accordingly. Otherwise BDMC is attempting to over develop a sensitive Greenfield site.	The figures relate to a slightly different reporting period and this has been clarified in the Appendix 3. The SPD also relates to the current adopted Core Strategy and not the emerging new Local Plan.	Footnote added to Appendix 3.
Appendix 4: Mitigation measures for recreation	2307 3387 3425	Item "BBQ guidance & Leaflet for shops": - This should include details of the current Bye Laws restricting fire on the Moor, and penalties for abusing it.	Comment noted.	This will be considered during the production of the leaflet.
	6564	Appendix 4: £510,000 is allocated to SANGs (Suitably Accessible Natural Greenspace) and included in the levy on households. While SANGs are widely used to divert walkers away from lowland heaths the authors have presented no evidence to show that SANGs would work to divert recreation pressure away from upland moors. The cost of SANG provision through the 'roof tax' is considerable however there is no evidence provided to demonstrate that it is necessary or that SANG will work.	SANGs are widely used for a range of habitats (not just heaths) and form a key component for a range of strategic mitigation schemes. Evidence is growing on their effectiveness. The measures proposed include a review of existing greenspace in order to identify the sites where enhancement could be focussed and will work best. It should be noted also that overall the relative proportion of mitigation	References for the effectiveness of SANGs added to the SPD.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
			money allocated to SANGs is less than other strategic mitigation schemes.	
Draft South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC Planning Framework SPD Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)				
Draft South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC Planning Framework SPD Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) - Initial Screening, Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) - Initial Screening	2307 3387 3425	I fundamentally disagree with item 5 and its conclusions. The screening process should have accepted that the SPD isn't an addition to the current policy SC8, it is designed as a complete replacement for it, and this is referred to in the SPD itself numerous times. The new policy is designated as SD11, according to the SPD. As the entire focus of the SPD is one of mitigation on the effects of Recreation on the SPA/SAC, it doesn't do anything to continue to protect from Urban effects. Other than brief mentions in the appendices of legislative requirements, it does nothing to reassure the reader that it will be an effective tool in protecting the SPA/SAC from further deterioration. Item (d): Is there likely to be a significant effect? if the answer isn't "YES", then the entire focus of the SPD is wasted! E) All new developments? Sun Lane?	The SPD cannot legally introduce new policy. The timing of the SPD and the draft Local Plan (Regulation 18) have caused some challenges/confusion as the SPD must be based on the existing adopted Core Strategy policies and housing numbers whilst these are altering in the new Local Plan. The Council has made changes throughout the document to better explain the situation. Please note that once the new Local Plan is adopted the SPD will be updated to bring it in line with the Local Plan including its housing figures and Policy SP11. Urban edge effects such as cat predation, tipping of garden waste, bonfires are dealt with by excluding any net new residential dwellings within 0.4km of the SPA/SAC, this is set out in the draft SPD.	The wording in the document has been altered to try and clarify the policy position.
	584	This is difficult so please add to the appropriate consultations! The SPD is applicable to developments across a large portion of Bradford District (within 7km of the SPA), and includes a large amount of HERITAGE	The Core Strategy, Core Strategy Partial Review and integrated Local Plan have all been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal.	None required.

Document section	Respondent ID	Full text	Council Response	Recommended Changes
		including many conservation areas and listed buildings and natural environment designations (i.e. water mills on waterways that were engineered to speed up water flow (dams/weirs/fords etc. - many still exists on the North Beck but are NOT FORMALLY PROTECTED even though they should protected by separate policies in the Core Strategy and new draft Local Plan which should have been subject to assessment through a full Sustainability Appraisal. Keighley is older than Bradford and it heritage has as much right to be protected - particularly along the blue-green corridors!	Comments noted in relation to heritage assets have been forwarded as part of the Local Plan Regulation 18 consultation, as they are not applicable to the SPD.	