

Replacement UDP – Pre Inquiry Changes

Introduction

The Council published its revised deposit plan in July 2002. Following consideration of the objections to the revised plan, the Council consider it appropriate to propose further amendments. These are required to address issues raised by objectors, take account of new national guidance such as PPG17 'Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation', and correct drafting errors.

Representations to the proposed amendments will be considered by the recently opened Public Inquiry into the replacement Plan.

How to read the revised deposit Plan

The proposed modifications should be read in conjunction with the revised deposit plan. This is available in all libraries and Council Planning Offices and can be viewed through the Council's web site at www.bradford.gov.uk/udp.

The document is arranged in the same structure as the revised plan, considering first the changes in the policy framework, followed by each proposal report. Within each document changes are set out in the same topic order. Only the paragraph or policy text, which is the subject of the change, has been reproduced, it is therefore important that the proposed amendments should be read in conjunction with the revised deposit plan. Proposed amendments to the wording of policies or lower case text is set out in full, with the whole policy being reproduced; similarly whole paragraphs of lower case text are reproduced. Where there are changes interspersed with unchanged paragraphs the latter are not reproduced.

The proposed revisions are highlighted using the following conventions:

- All changes to text are shown in **bold**
- Text to be deleted is enclosed in square brackets and begins with the word delete i.e. **[Delete:.....]**
- Additional text is shown in italics

The changes are shown as changes from the deposit plan.

The reason why changes have been proposed is set out below the details of the relevant change.

Where changes to proposals cannot be identified from the Deposit proposal maps or from the revised plan, maps have been included at the end of the relevant parliamentary constituency.

Contact the UDP team if you require further information on (01274) 434050

Policy Framework

Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

Policy amendment UR4 sequential approach

“Policy UR4

DEVELOPMENT ON UNALLOCATED SITES (INCLUDING SITES UNDER 0.4 Ha) WITHIN THE DEFINED URBAN AREAS AND OTHER WELL LOCATED SETTLEMENTS WILL BE PERMITTED WHERE IT REUSES PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED LAND. DEVELOPMENT NOT ON PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED SITES IN THESE LOCATIONS WILL ONLY BE PERMITTED IF THERE IS AN OVERRIDING REASON FOR THE DEVELOPMENT IN THAT PARTICULAR LOCATION WITHIN THESE GENERAL PRINCIPLES;

HOUSING DEVELOPMENT WILL BE PREFERRED EXCEPT IN EMPLOYMENT ZONES **OR WHERE PROPOSALS WOULD CONFLICT WITH EITHER POLICY E3 OR POLICY E4,**

WITHIN MIXED USE AREAS HOUSING WILL BE PREFERRED PROVIDED IT IS WITHIN THE PARAMETERS SET FOR THE AREA IN THE PROPOSALS REPORT.

ON UNALLOCATED PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED SITES (INCLUDING SITES UNDER 0.4 Ha) IN THE REST OF THE DISTRICT ONLY DEVELOPMENTS WHICH MEET A LOCAL NEED WILL BE PERMITTED.

DEVELOPMENTS WHICH MEET A LOCAL NEED WILL BE PERMITTED ON GREENFIELD SITES ONLY IF THERE IS NO SUITABLE PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED SITE AVAILABLE OR THE GREENFIELD SITE IS CLEARLY MORE SUSTAINABLE THAN ANY OF THE PREVIOUSLY DEVELOPED ALTERNATIVES.

Reason

Clarify the implementation of the policy in relation to employment policy

Text amendment 4.45a Area Based Regeneration

- 4.45a Within the above SRB areas, Estate Action Areas and the New Deal (Trident) area defined on the proposals maps and where adopted village design statements exist ***which have been prepared in the proper manner and are consistent with the Plan*** proposals for new development [~~will~~] should accord with [~~the~~] *these* approved planning frameworks. [~~for these initiatives, where such approved frameworks exist.~~]

Reason

To clarify the role and status of supplementary planning guidance in these areas

Chapter 5 Economy and Employment

Text amendment 5.30a –5.30f and policy amendment E3A Office Development

[delete: 5.31] 5.30a The Government's objectives on the location of employment proposals for office development are most recently set out in Regional Planning Guidance for Yorkshire and the Humber (RPG12) (2001). **[Delete: and the government's consultation document on proposed changes to the use classes order of January 2002.]**

[delete: 5.32] 5.30b This document makes clear the Government's concern that uses falling within B1a of the Use Classes order ("pure offices") in out of centre locations, can undermine the vitality of existing main centres. Such locations also are not convenient for employees who do not have access to a car. Neither do they help encourage and provide people with the option of using modes of transport other than the car.

[delete: 5.33] 5.30c The Government in RPG12 (Policy E4b), **[delete: and the Use Classes consultation document]** states that it wishes to promote and focus office development in city, town and district centres and near to major urban public transport interchanges. In this metropolitan district there are no major urban public transport interchanges outside the City and town centres. The Government also requires such development to reflect the scale and character of the centre to which it relates (policy E1a of RPG12). Therefore:

Policy E3A

PROPOSALS FOR OFFICE DEVELOPMENT SHOULD **WHEREVER POSSIBLE** BE LOCATED IN THE CITY, TOWN AND DISTRICT CENTRES AND REFLECT THE SCALE AND CHARACTER OF THE CENTRE. **OFFICE** DEVELOPMENTS ON SITES OUTSIDE THESE CENTRES WILL **[Delete: BE PERMITTED ONLY IF ALL OF THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA ARE SATISFIED]** BE ASSESSED AGAINST THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

[Delete:

- (1) **THE DEVELOPER IS ABLE TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THERE ARE NO ALTERNATIVE SITES WHICH ARE PRACTICAL TO DEVELOP IN THE DEFINED CENTRES, OR FAILING THAT, ADJACENT TO THE CENTRES AFTER HAVING BEEN FLEXIBLE WITH REGARD TO FORMAT, SCALE, DESIGN AN CAR PARKING;]**

[Delete: (2) THE SCALE OF THE PROPOSAL IS COMPATIBLE WITH THE ROLE OF THE NEAREST CITY, TOWN OR DISTRICT CENTRE]

[Delete:(3)]

- (1) THE DEVELOPMENT TOGETHER WITH RECENT AND POTENTIAL DEVELOPMENT ARISING FROM UNIMPLEMENTED PLANNING PERMISSIONS FOR OFFICE DEVELOPMENT WOULD BR UNLIKELY TO HAVE AN ADVERSE EFFECT ON FUTURE PRIVATE INVESTMENT IN THE CITY, TOWN AND DISTRICT CENTRES;

[delete:(4)]

- (2) THERE WOULD BE CONVENIENT ACCESS TO THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT FOR THE WORKFORCE BY A RANGE OF TRANSPORT MODES;

[Delete:(5)]

- (3) THE DEVELOPMENT WOULD NOT LEAD TO AN INCREASE IN THE NEED TO TRAVEL AND RELIANCE ON THE PRIVATE CAR;

[Delete: (6)]

- (4) THE DEVELOPMENT WOULD NOT UNDERMINE THE STRATEGY FOR THE CITY AND TOWN CENTRES STATED IN THE PLAN.

[Delete: 5.34] 5.30d This policy does not apply to proposals for employment developments where the offices are ancillary to the prime use such as the offices of a factory whose function is incidental and ancillary to the factory use.

[Delete: 5.35] 5.30e The strategy for the City and town centres is stated in Part One policy UDP 6 and in Part Two of the Plan where it is articulated in more detail in the retail and leisure sections of the Centres Chapter and the vision statements for each centre in the Proposal Reports.

[Delete: 5.36] 5.30f It is possible under the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 for employment uses within class B1 to change to a pure office use without the need for any subsequent planning permission. In order to ensure the effective implementation of this policy any planning permissions granted for development falling within class B1b and class B1c on sites outside the City and town centres will be conditioned to ensure the development cannot later change to a pure office use without being the subject of further consideration by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To bring the policy into line with RPG and address the consequences of the unresolved review of the Use Classes order.

Chapter 7 Town Centres, Retail and Leisure

Text amendment 7.75

- 7.75 Major development proposals should be steered towards the City and town centres. These centres provide the widest range of shopping facilities to meet the needs of the District's population. They offer good access, particularly to those with no or limited access to a car, since these centres are at the hub of the public transport network as well as the highway network. They also allow for the opportunity to combine shopping trips and combine them with other activities. Encouraging the grouping of developments in centres therefore enables one journey to serve several purposes, thereby minimising polluting emissions. The Plan provides for a possible exception **[Delete: s]** to the strategy at **[Delete: Odsal and]** West Bowling Golf Course if other objectives of the Plan can be achieved.

Reason

Consequential change following deletion of Odsal action area

Text amendment 7.93 Retail Strategy

- 7.93 Expansion Areas have not been identified **[Delete: for the]** at district *centres* to accommodate new large convenience retail development. **[Delete: as the Plan's retail strategy only promotes the expansion of the City and town centres in accordance with the aims of PPG6.]** Four of these centres (Mayo Avenue, Five Lane Ends, Girlington and Thornbury) already have large modern food superstores. Whilst the other two (Tong Street and Great Horton) do not have such facilities, no sites could be identified that were likely to be suitable and available in the Plan period, and that were appropriate to designate as Expansion Areas.

Reason

To eliminate the inconsistency of the existing text of paragraph 7.93 with the Plan's retail strategy stated at paragraph 7.74 of the Policy Framework.

Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

Text amendment 8.6a: Transport Problem

8.6a Some of the consequences of growth in car ownership and use can be summarised as follows:

- Economic Impacts
- Congestion affecting the ability of firms to obtain and make deliveries and to attract a workforce;
- Discouraging inward investment in urban areas.
- Increased absenteeism due to traffic related ill health.

Social Impacts

- Affecting and limiting choices of non-car transport modes, such as cycling, walking and buses;
- Social & health problems (e.g. stress) resulting from long and difficult commuting times;
- Safety of vulnerable road users, in particular children and the elderly.
- Health problems due to air pollution.

Environmental Impacts

- Poor and deteriorating air quality and the consequent impact on public health;
- Noise & vibration;
- Severance and visual impact of transport, both directly and indirectly, on the form and appearance of places;
- Loss of non-renewable resources, e.g. oil;
- Effect on global warming through the release of green house gases, such as carbon dioxide. **More than a [delete:A] quarter (28%) of carbon dioxide emissions in the UK comes from road transport.**

Reason

Correct a factual error.

Policy amendment TM1 Transport Assessment

Policy TM1

WHEN CONSIDERING PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENTS LIKELY TO BE SIGNIFICANT GENERATORS OF TRAVEL THE COUNCIL WILL REQUIRE THESE TO BE SUPPORTED BY A DETAILED TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT (TA). THE TA SHOULD INCORPORATE PROPOSED TRAFFIC REDUCTION MEASURES BY THE DEVELOPER AND MEASURES TO PROMOTE SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL INCLUDING USE OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT, WALKING AND CYCLING **AS NECESSARY ARISING FROM THE TRAVEL GENERATION REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT.**

Reason

Clarify the application of the policy

Text amendment 8.32 Transport Assessment

- 8.32 Applications for developments likely to have a significant transport impact on the existing transport network should be accompanied a formal Transport Assessment (TA). **[Delete: PPG 13 defines ‘significant’ by setting thresholds for development size above which a transport assessment will be required. The thresholds are the same as those for maximum parking standards and are given in Appendix C.] PPG 13 does not refer to thresholds for assessments but refers to developments, which will have significant transport implications. Further Government guidance is awaited on this issue and in the interim, for the purpose of applying this policy ‘developments that are significant generators of travel’ are those above the thresholds specified in Appendix C for maximum parking standards.** The TA is a written statement setting out details of transport conditions both with and without a proposed development. The TA should cover all modes of transport including public transport, cycling and walking. If a planning application is not accompanied by a full Environmental Statement, then the effect of any additional traffic on air pollution and noise should also be included. The Government is currently preparing good practice advice on the content of Transport Assessments to be submitted alongside planning applications and this section will be revised and updated when this guidance becomes available. It would also be prudent to consult local sustainable transport users when assessing the transport impact of a development.

Reason

To accord with guidance in PPG13, which does not refer to thresholds for assessments but refers to developments, which will have significant transport implications.

Text amendment 8.32a Transport Assessment

8.32a *PPG13 advises that the coverage and detail of the Transport Assessment should reflect the scale of development and the extent of the transport implications of the proposal. For smaller schemes the Transport Assessment should simply outline the transport aspects of the application. For major applications (as defined by the thresholds in Appendix C), the assessment should illustrate accessibility to the site by all modes and the likely modal split of journeys to and from the site. It should also give details of proposed measures to improve access by public transport, walking and cycling, to reduce the need for parking associated with the proposal and to mitigate transport impacts.*

[Delete: For smaller developments below the specified thresholds, until further national or regional guidance becomes available, the Institution of Highways and Transportation Guidelines for Traffic Impact Assessments (TIA) should be used. These currently recommend that a TIA should be produced where one or other of the following thresholds are likely to be exceeded:

- traffic to and from the development exceeds 10% of the existing two way traffic flow on the adjoining highway, or
- traffic to and from the development exceeds 5% of the existing two way traffic flow on the adjoining highway in congested periods.]

Reason

Delete reference to Institution of Highways and Transportation guidelines to make it consistent with advice in PPG13.

Text Amendment new paragraph 8.32aa Impact of Traffic and its Mitigation

8.32aa *‘Both the Highways Agency and the Council will assess development proposals near trunk roads and the M606 motorway, but developers should bear in mind that in accordance with Highways Agency policy no new direct access to the M606 will be permitted’.*

Reason

The Highways Agency are supporting policy TM1 but have requested an additional paragraph to say that no new direct access to the M606 motorway will be permitted.

Text amendment New paragraph 8.32ab traffic Impact and its Mitigation

8.32ab *The following factors will be taken into consideration in applying this policy:*

- *impact on the highway network in terms of increased traffic generated and its ability to cater for any additional demand created;*
- *highway safety and any demand created for on-street parking;*
- *level of existing public transport services and infrastructure serving the site and its capacity to cater for additional demand created; and*
- *pedestrian and cycle movement and facilities in the vicinity of the site and the need to promote these two modes of transport.*

Reason

A new paragraph to be inserted before 8.32b to explain the factors to be considered in applying policy TM2 which will also explain the term 'adverse affect'.

Text amendment 8.32b Traffic Impact and its Mitigation

8.32b Where proposals have a detrimental impact on the transport network, planning permission will not be granted. However, where the Council considers that it would be possible to overcome these problems by implementing appropriate **highway network improvements**, public transport, walking and cycling schemes, contributions will be sought from developers through planning obligations.

Reason

Resolve a Revised Deposit objection by including highway network improvements as an option for overcoming transport problems.

Text amendment 8.34 Traffic Impact and its Mitigation

8.34 The Council will seek to reduce the impact of traffic by encouraging appropriate measures within development proposals. This will be primarily through requiring an appropriate level of parking provision in accordance with the Plan's parking policies, encouraging alternative methods of travel through the provision of a Travel Plan and seeking contribution to public transport, **walking and cycling** improvements where appropriate.

Reason

Clarify what the Council will seek contributions to.

Policy amendment TM4 Railway Stations

Policy TM4

THE UPGRADING OF EXISTING STATIONS AND FORMATION OF NEW STATIONS, AS IDENTIFIED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP, IS SUPPORTED. THESE SHOULD, INCLUDE:

- (1) THE DEVELOPMENT AND ENHANCEMENT OF PHYSICAL INTERCHANGES, INCLUDING INTEGRATION BETWEEN RAIL SERVICES, BUS SERVICES AND OTHER MODES (AND WHERE POSSIBLE PARK & RIDE FACILITIES);
- (2) DISABLED ACCESS FROM BUSES AND THE STREETS TO TRAINS;
- (3) ADEQUATE SECURE CYCLE PARKING FACILITIES;
- (4) **DESIGN APPROPRIATE TO THE SURROUNDINGS** IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PLAN'S DESIGN POLICIES; AND
- (5) GOOD LIGHTING **AND CCTV**.

Reason

Clarify a change at revised deposit which was not correctly shown in bold text.

Policy Amendment TM11 Parking and traffic restraint

Policy TM11

IN DETERMINING PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR PRIVATE NON RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS INCLUDING CHANGES OF USE THE COUNCIL WILL:

- (1) SEEK A LOWER LEVEL OF PARKING IN LOCATIONS WITH GOOD ACCESSIBILITY (SUCH AS CITY AND TOWN CENTRES AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT NODES) THAN THAT SET IN THE COUNCIL'S ADOPTED STANDARDS (SET OUT IN APPENDIX C OF THIS PLAN) **EXCEPT FOR RETAIL AND LEISURE DEVELOPMENTS IN TOWN CENTRES AND EDGE OF CENTRE SITES WHERE ADDITIONAL PARKING ABOVE MAXIMUM WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDED THAT THIS WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR GENERAL SHORT STAY PUBLIC PARKING;**
- (2) ONLY CONSIDER ALLOWING PROVISION UP TO THE FULL STANDARD WHERE THE DEVELOPER CAN DEMONSTRATE A NEED FOR PARKING TO THAT LEVEL; AND

- (3) ONLY CONSIDER ALLOWING PROVISION ABOVE THE STANDARD WHERE THE DEVELOPER CAN DEMONSTRATE THAT A HIGHER LEVEL OF PARKING IS NEEDED AND **[DELETE: THAT THE PROPOSED PROVISION WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR GENERAL SHORT STAY PUBLIC PARKING]** HAS TAKEN OTHER MEASURES TO MINIMISE THE NEED FOR PARKING.

Reason

Resolving an objection and bringing the policy into line with PPG13

Text amendment new paragraph 8.60ba Car Parking Standards

8.60ba The car parking standards given in Appendix C will be applied as a maximum and a minimum requirement will not normally be imposed unless under provision would result in road safety implications which cannot be resolved through the introduction or enforcement of on-street parking controls. In individual developments a need for parking in excess of the standards in Appendix C should be demonstrated preferably through a Transport Assessment. Applicants must also indicate the measures they are taking in the design, location or implementation of the scheme to minimise the need for parking.'

Reason

New paragraph to follow 8.60b which explains how the policy will be applied

Policy Amendment TM18 Parking For People With Disabilities

Policy TM18

THE COUNCIL WILL REQUIRE NEW DEVELOPMENTS TO PROVIDE APPROPRIATE PARKING **[DELETE: ARRANGEMENTS] PROVISION** FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES AND OTHERS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS SUCH AS PARENTS WITH YOUNG CHILDREN AND THE ELDERLY ***IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GUIDELINES IN APPENDIX C.***

Reason

Correcting an error at revised deposit.

Text amendment 8.80 Parking for People with Disabilities

- 8.80 In determining planning applications for non-residential development the Council will require dedicated car parking provision for people with disabilities and those with restricted mobility *in accordance with the guidance in Appendix C. [Delete: A minimum of 10% of any proposed parking spaces shall be provided to mobility standard (minimum width 3.6 metres). No less than half of these spaces shall be signed as being for the exclusive use of disabled people. Where less than 10 car parking spaces are to be provided, at least one space shall be provided to 'mobility standard'. These spaces should be provided in a safe and convenient location.]* This policy should be read in conjunction with Policy D3, which deals with access to buildings and their surroundings for people with disabilities. Developers will also be encouraged to provide conveniently located and signed spaces for single parents with young children and the elderly.

Reason

There is inconsistency between the new text in paragraph 8.80 and the new guidance in Appendix C because of an oversight in drafting

Chapter 9 Design

Text Amendment 9.44a landscaping

9.44a It is important to conserve and integrate within development important existing landscape features such as:

- rivers, canals and streams,
- ponds reservoirs and mill dams,
- wetlands,
- woodland, or parkland trees
- hedgerows
- stone walls including field patterns
- rock outcrops
- Natural valley (especially glacial) landforms
- ***Species rich grassland***

Reasons

List an additional landscape/natural feature found in the area which should be safeguarded.

Text amendment 9.52e Meeting The Needs Of Public transport Through Design

9.52e The planning of routes and location of stops needs careful consideration. Successful public transport relies upon:

- routes which follow principal roads and streets through the heart of an area
- stops located where activity is concentrated, near shops or road junctions
- clear walking routes to the stops.

Bus stops should be located and designed to be accessible both for pedestrians but also to enable close docking by buses. Particular care needs to ***be*** taken to ensure ***[delete: bus stops] that car parking [delete: are located away from car parking] is located so as not to cause inconvenience or obstacles to buses and their users [delete: which could inhibit bus access to stops].***

Reasons

Clarify intention and meaning of the text to give priority to bus infrastructure.

Policy Amendment D11 Gateways

Policy D11

ON CORRIDORS DEFINED AS 'GATEWAY ROADS' ON THE PROPOSALS MAPS DEVELOPMENT ALONGSIDE OR HIGHLY VISIBLE FROM THESE CORRIDORS SHOULD BE OF THE HIGHEST POSSIBLE STANDARD IN DESIGN, MATERIALS, LANDSCAPING AND BOUNDARY TREATMENT **[DELETE: AND SHALL TAKE ACCOUNT OF DETAILED GATEWAY DESIGN GUIDANCE WHERE APPLICABLE]**

Consequential Text Amendment 9.81 Gateways

- 9.81 Over the life of the Plan initiatives will be taken by the Council, in partnership with other bodies and the private sector, to improve the appearance of these important routes and points into the District. In order to create a unified and identifiable image for these routes the Council will take opportunities as resources allow to prepare gateway design guides and proposals, promote partnership agreements with the private and voluntary sectors and carry out environmental and other improvements. ***Any guidance produced would be subject to consultation and could be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance. The guidance would be a material consideration in determining planning applications.*** An initial scheme is under implementation on Manchester Road as part of the Manchester Road guided bus initiative. Other priorities include the M606 corridor and other principal routes and links into the District from the motorway system.

Reason

Remove reference to SPG in the policy to conform with national policy

Policy Amendment D12 & Text Amendment 9.92b Tall Buildings

Policy D12

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR TALL BUILDINGS WHERE THEY SIGNAL THE LOCATION OF AN INTERSECTION OF THE BRADFORD OUTER RING ROAD AND A PRIMARY RADIAL ROAD, THE CITY CENTRE, THE THORNTON ROAD CORRIDOR AND THE STAYGATE AREA SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

- (1) THE PROTECTION OF KEY VIEWS AND VISTAS AS MAY BE DEFINED
- (2) BE IN KEEPING WITH AND DO NOT DETRACT **FROM** OR DAMAGE IMPORTANT HERITAGE ASSETS
- (3) NOT CREATE UNACCEPTABLE OVERSHADOWING OF ADJOINING PROPERTY THROUGH LOSS OF DAYLIGHT OR SUNLIGHT

- (4) BE SHOWN NOT TO CREATE UNACCEPTABLE LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS INCLUDING WIND TURBULENCE.
- (5) BE OF AN APPROPRIATE FUNCTION FOR THE LOCALITY.
- (6) BE OF HIGH QUALITY DESIGN.
- (7) WHERE THE CONSTRUCTION OF A LOWER BUILDING WOULD BE INCONGRUOUS
- (8) BE LOCATED WHERE THERE IS GOOD PUBLIC TRANSPORT PROVISION AND WHERE OTHER NON-CAR MODES COULD BE ENCOURAGED
- (9) THE BUILDING SHOULD RELATE TO THEIR CONTEXT INCLUDING BOTH TOPOGRAPHY AND BUILT FORM, AND AFFECT ON THE SKYLINE.

9.92b Important heritage assets include conservation areas **[delete: as assessed]**, listed buildings and their settings, scheduled ancient monuments and the World Heritage site and its buffer zone.

Reason

Grammatical correction and clarification.

Text Amendment 9.113 Telecommunications

“9.113 Telecommunications systems have developed rapidly in the past decade and have become an essential element of modern life. Current planning guidance is set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 8 (**Revised**) “Telecommunications” (**[delete: December 1992] August 2001**), supplemented by Circular 04/99 ‘Planning for telecommunications’. The Government’s general policy on telecommunications is to facilitate the growth of new and existing systems, whilst at the same time protecting the amenity in both urban and rural areas, recognising the potential adverse effect of such developments.”

Reasons

Reflect revised PPG8.

Policy Amendment D16 & Text Amendment 9.116 Telecommunications

Policy D16

PROPOSALS FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE LIGHT OF TECHNICAL AND OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDED THAT THESE ARE NOT OUTWEIGHED BY:

- (1) ADVERSE EFFECT ON THE APPEARANCE OR CHARACTER OF ITS SURROUNDINGS IN TERMS OF ITS SCALE, DESIGN AND SITING;
- (2) ADVERSE EFFECT ON THE AMENITY OF ADJOINING RESIDENTIAL AREAS.

[Delete: 9.116] DEVELOPERS WILL HAVE TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THE AVAILABILITY OF AND THE BENEFITS AND IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVE SITES AND DEVELOPMENTS, INCLUDING MAST SHARING HAVE BEE INVESTIGATED.

[Delete: 9.117]

9.116 The policy seeks to balance the protection of amenity in urban and rural areas with the needs of telecommunications development.

[Delete: 9.118]

9.117 Under the policy, applicants will have to show evidence that opportunities for mast sharing and alternative sites have been fully explored; and siting and design have carefully been considered along with appropriate measures to avoid adverse impact; including landscaping and screening. ***The Council will also consider the suitability of the alternative sites with regard to technical and operational requirements***

[Delete: 9.119]

9.118 Major telecommunications installations will present particular problems when proposed in Countryside locations which have been identified as being high or highest quality landscape for example Special Landscape Areas. While having regard to the special needs and technical problems of telecommunications development: In such locations, proposals will need to show that, no more environmentally acceptable alternatives exist and that every attempt has been made to minimise obtrusiveness by siting and design.

[Delete: 9.120]

9.119 There is much public concern around the possible adverse health impacts of telecommunication development, in particular the effect of electro magnetic fields (EMFs) from masts. The Stewart Report published in May 2000 examined the health effects from the use of mobile phones, base stations and transmitters. In respect of base stations the report concluded that "the balance of evidence indicates that there is no general risk to the health of people living near to base stations on the basis that exposures are expected to be small fractions of the guidelines." However, gaps in current

scientific knowledge led the group to recommend a precautionary approach to the use of mobile phone technologies. In line with the approach recommended by the report, all mobile phone base stations will have to meet the guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) for limiting the exposure to electromagnetic fields. Clear exclusion zones should be in place around all base station antennas to prevent the public from exposure to radio frequency radiation above ICNIRP guidelines. (These exclusion zones relate to an area directly in front of and at the height of the antenna). All applicants should include with their applications, a statement to certify that the apparatus complies with the ICNIRP guidelines, and should also indicate for each site its location, height of the antenna, the frequency and modulation characteristics, and details of power output.

Reason

Correct a drafting at revised deposit and provide clarification as to the application of the policy with regards to mast sharing.

Chapter 10 Built Heritage and the Historic Environment

Text Amendment 10.3 Introduction

10.3.1 The areas designated vary from Victorian suburbs such as Little Horton Lane representing the c19th growth of Bradford, to the historic linear upland villages such as Stanbury. The periodic re assessment of boundaries and consideration of additional areas ensures the relevance of the designations remain valid.

- **12 [Delete: 10]** Historic Parks and Gardens identified on the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England designated by English Heritage

Reason

Additions to register since revised deposit

Text Amendment 10.21 Alteration, Extension or Substantial demolition of Listed Buildings

10.21 The Local Planning Authority has the responsibility for determining the majority **of** development control proposals relating to buildings listed by the Secretary of State as being of Special Architectural or Historic Interest. The character of listed buildings is easily damaged if inappropriate building work is carried out which pays no regard to the buildings heritage value, detailing and materials. In particular the appearance of historic buildings has in the past been adversely affected by unsympathetic replacement of doors, windows, inappropriate use of materials and poor workmanship.

Reason

Correct grammatical error

Text Amendment 10.48 Space About Buildings

10.48 To retain the character of the Conservation Areas development which takes place within or adjacent to the boundaries should carefully follow the form and scale of the existing urban form. In previous years this has not always been possible as highway standards, sight lines and facing distances have required greater and greater amounts of land is left between buildings. By carefully **y** adjusting standard road and building types and carefully planning layouts leaving boundary walls in situ, **and** positioning entrances to minimize the need for visibility splays, new development in or adjacent to Conservation Areas can be closed right down to replicate the local character of different settlements and thereby be more easily integrated into Conservation Area settings.

Reason

Correct grammatical error

Text Amendment 10.62 Historic Parks and Gardens

10.62 The following sites are included in the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England.

Heathcote	Ilkley	GD 2226	Grade ii
Lister Park	Bradford	GD 2229	Grade ii
Roberts Park	Saltaire	GD 2233	Grade ii
Undercliffe Cemetery	Bradford	GD 2820	Grade ii
Peel Park	Bradford	GD 3330	Grade ii
Bowling Park	Bradford	GD 3332	Grade ii
Horton Park	Bradford	GD 3331	Grade ii
Lund Park	Keighley	GD 3327	Grade ii
Prince of Wales Park	Bingley	GD 3346	Grade ii
Scholemoor Cemetery	Bradford	GD 3414	Grade ii
Whinburn	Keighley	GD 3519	Grade ii
Central Park	Haworth	GD 3386	Grade ii

Reason

Update the schedule to include listings since revised deposit

Policy Amendment BH17 Local Historic Parks and Gardens

Policy BH17

DEVELOPMENT LIKELY TO HAVE AN ADVERSE AFFECT ON THE FOLLOWING LOCAL INTEREST PARKS, GARDENS, AND OPEN AREAS WILL NOT BE PERMITTED UNLESS IT CAN BE CLEARLY DEMONSTRATED THAT THERE ARE REASONS FOR THE PROPOSAL WHICH OUTWEIGH THE NEED TO SAFEGUARD THE SITE.

[Delete: WHINBURN KEIGHLEY]

HEBER'S GHYLL ILKLEY (*Map ref: 409447*)

MILNER FIELD GILSTEAD (*Map ref: 412439*)

CLIFFE CASTLE AND DEVONSHIRE PARK KEIGHLEY (*Map ref: 405441*)

BIERLEY HALL WOOD BRADFORD (*Map ref: 417429*)

Reason

Consequential change at Whinburn and insertion of grid references to enable the sites to be located on the Proposals Map

Text amendment 10.70 Archaeological Areas Class 1

- 10.70 Class I areas are sites and landscapes of national importance which are protected as Scheduled Ancient Monuments under the terms of the Ancient Monuments and Archaeological Areas Act 1979

Policy BH18

DEVELOPMENT WHICH ADVERSELY AFFECTS CLASS 1
ARCHAEOLOGICAL AREAS OR OTHER NATIONALLY - IMPORTANT
REMAINS AND THEIR SETTING WILL NOT BE PERMITTED

Reason

Consequential to changes made to paragraph 10.71 to improve clarity of the Plan (note this is a layout change there are no changes to the text)

Text Amendment 10.71 Archaeological Areas Class 11 and 111

- 10.71 Class 11 areas are sites and landscapes which are regionally important **[Delete: or of national importance]** but unscheduled, and which merit preservation in-situ. ***Class 111 areas are sites registered in the County Sites and Monuments Record as containing or likely to contain remains of archaeological importance.*** Where a Class 11 or 111 archaeological site is adversely affected by a development proposal, it is important that an archaeological evaluation is undertaken to assist in determining the importance of the archaeological remains and the appropriate course of action. Therefore

Reason

Clarify the degree of protection to be given to different classes of ancient monument

Chapter 12 Open Land in Settlements

Text Amendment 12.2 Introduction

“12.2 These greenspaces often come under pressure for development, particularly for housing and employment developments. The Government in **[Delete: its] revised** Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 **[delete: on Sport and Recreation] ‘Planning for Open space, Sport and Recreation’ (July 2002)** attaches great importance to the protection of **[Delete: such] all** greenspaces, recognising that once built on they are likely to be lost to the community forever. The Council wishes to retain and wherever possible enhance a network of both large and small urban greenspaces for the benefit of the community.”

Reason

Revisions to take account of new PPG17.

Text Amendments 12.14 & 12.15 Recreation open space

12.14 The Government, in Revised PPG17, does not prescribe national standards for recreational provision and says it is for local authorities to **undertake robust assessments to identify future needs of local communities for sport and recreation. [Delete: identify deficiencies in public open space and recreation provision and to justify the amount and location of new provision against other competing pressures for the use of land]. The assessments should be used to derive local standards for the provision of open space, sports and recreation provision.** Although the Council has not developed its own minimum standards for recreation open space, recent studies in the urban areas of Bradford, Shipley and Keighley have shown that overall provision falls below ‘The Six Acre Standard’ set by the National Playing Fields Association (NPFA). The NPFA’s ‘Outdoor Playing Space’ category is broadly the same as the Council’s ‘Recreation Open Space’ as defined in Policies OS2 to OS4. **[delete: In the absence of locally derived minimum standards, the Government, in PPG17, recognise and endorse the NPFA standards as a useful guide to the minimum provision of recreation open space.]**

- 12.15 As the District has a growing population with increasing numbers of children, particularly in the urban areas, the Council believes the standards set by the NPFA are an appropriate level of provision to work **towards in the absence of a locally derived standard based upon an up to date and robust assessment**. Therefore, a main objective for the policies on recreation open space is to seek to achieve, as a minimum, the following provision, based upon 'The Six Acre Standard', for open space in the District:

0.8 ha of recreation open space, including children's play space and informal space, per 1000 population.

1.6 ha of playing fields per 1000 population.

Reason

Clarify the Council's approach to meeting the requirements of revised PPG17

Text Amendment 12.15a Recreation Open Space

- 12.15a Work has recently begun to develop a detailed strategy for playing pitch provision within Bradford as part of a West Yorkshire initiative supported by Sport England. The outcomes will include a comparative profile of outdoor playing pitch sport in the region and an analysis of cross boundary issues, and an individual strategy for Bradford. This work will be based upon the methodology developed by Sport England which provides a more detailed assessment than that provide by the NPFA Standard. When complete this will inform future provision of new outdoor playing pitches and the improvement and protection of existing facilities. **The assessment will inform an early review of the Plan to bring it into line with revised PPG17 and set appropriate local standards.**

Reason

Clarify the Council's approach to meeting the requirements of revised PPG17.

Policy amendment OS2 Protection of Recreation Open Space

Policy OS2

DEVELOPMENT WILL NOT BE PERMITTED ON LAND SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAPS AS RECREATION OPEN SPACE OR SITES **[DELETE: UNDER 0.4 HECTARES] OTHERWISE USED AS RECREATION OPEN SPACE UNLESS:**

- (1) THE LOSS OF RECREATION OPEN SPACE DOES NOT LEAD TO LOCAL DEFICIENCY IN THE AVAILABILITY OF OPEN SPACE: OR
- (2) THE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL PROVIDES FOR EQUIVALENT ALTERNATIVE PROVISION IN TERMS OF SIZE AND QUALITY WHICH IS CLOSE TO EXISTING USERS;

- (3) AND IN EITHER CASE IT DOES NOT RESULT IN A SIGNIFICANT LOSS OF AMENITY.
- (4) THE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL IS ANCILLARY TO AND SUPPORTS THE RECREATIONAL USE, AND WOULD NOT SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECT
- THE QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF OPEN SPACE
 - ITS RECREATIONAL FUNCTION
 - THE CHARACTER AND APPEARANCE OF THE RECREATION OPEN SPACE.

12.18 This policy will **[Delete: also]** apply to *all land used as* recreation open space **[delete: s] including those** created during the lifetime of the Plan and existing recreation open spaces, which are too small to show on the Proposals Maps (i.e. under 0.4 hectares).”

Reason

Clarify intent of the policy and conform with revised PPG17

Text Amendment 12.22 Protection Of Playing Fields

12.22 **Revised** Planning Policy Guidance Note 17 **[delete: on Sport and Recreation]** encourages Local Planning Authorities to protect both public and private playing fields to meet the local communities needs. **[delete: Subsequent]** Recent Ministerial statements and directions **as well as revised PPG17**, have sought to strengthen **the [Delete: this approach] protection of playing fields** . In 1996 Sport England was made a statutory consultee, on planning applications for development affecting existing playing fields, land which has been used as a playing field in the previous 5 years or allocated for use as a playing field in a development plan. The Town and Country Planning (Playing Fields) (England) Direction 1998 relates specifically to playing fields owned by a local authority or used by an educational establishment. It requires that, where a local planning authority proposes to grant planning permission involving the loss of a playing field despite an objection from Sport England, the authority must notify the Secretary of State, who will determine whether the application should be called in for decision. **Revised PPG 17 advises that existing playing fields should not be built upon unless an assessment has been undertaken which clearly shows that the open space is surplus to requirements. In the absence of an up to date robust assessment Local Planning authorities are advised to give very careful consideration to any planning application involving development on playing fields. Revised PPG17 sets out several key tests, which should be met before development on playing fields would be allowed. These are reflected in the criteria under policy OS3.”**

Reason

Clarify the Council’s approach to meeting the requirements of revised PPG17.

Policy Amendment OS3 Protection of Playing Fields

Policy OS3

DEVELOPMENT WILL NOT BE PERMITTED ON LAND SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAPS AS PLAYING FIELDS OR OTHERWISE USED AS PLAYING FIELDS, UNLESS:

- (1) THERE IS A DEMONSTRABLE EXCESS OF PLAYING FIELD PROVISION IN THE AREA; OR
- (2) THE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL PROVIDES FOR ALTERNATIVE PROVISION IN THE FORM OF EQUIVALENT OR BETTER QUALITY AND OF EQUIVALENT OR GREATER QUANTITY OF PLAYING FIELD PROVISION IN A SUITABLE LOCATION, OR IF SUITABLE REPLACEMENT LAND DOES NOT EXIST, THE PLAYING FIELDS CAN BE SATISFACTORILY RE-LOCATED ELSEWHERE WITHIN THE SAME NEIGHBOURHOOD, **OR**
- (3) ***THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ONLY AFFECTS LAND WHICH IS INCAPABLE OF FORMING A PLAYING PITCH (OR PART OF ONE), OR***
- (4) ***THE PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT IS FOR AN OUTDOOR OR INDOOR SPORTS FACILITY OF SUFFICIENT BENEFIT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF SPORT TO OUTWEIGH THE LOSS OF THE PLAYING FIELD, OR***

[DELETE : (3) THE PLAYING FIELD IS NOT IMPORTANT TO THE CHARACTER OF THE SURROUNDING AREA OR TO LOCAL AMENITY.]

[DELETE:(4)]

- (5) THE DEVELOPMENT IS ANCILLIARY TO THE PRINCIPAL USE OF THE SITE AS A PLAYING FIELD OR PLAYING FIELDS AND DOES NOT AFFECT THE QUANTITY AND QUALITY OF PITCHES OR ADVERSLY AFFECT THEIR USE, **AND**
- (6) ***THE PLAYING FIELD IS NOT IMPORTANT TO THE CHARACTER OF THE SURROUNDING AREA OR TO LOCAL AMENITY***

Reason

Clarify intent of the policy and conform with revised PPG17.

Text amendment New paragraph 12.43a Village Greenspace

12.43a *In some of the listed settlements work has been undertaken to identify these small areas of locally important open space through the preparation of Village Design Statements. Where such local guidance has been produced which identify areas, which meet the criteria of the policy OS8, these will be given commensurate weight according to their status and level of public consultation.*

Reason

To recognise the role of VDS, which identify areas of village green space under 0.4 ha.

Chapter 13 Green Belt

Policy Amendment GB1 and New paragraph 13.4a Development in Green Belt

Policy GB1

EXCEPT IN VERY SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES, PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GIVEN WITHIN THE GREEN BELT AS DEFINED ON THE PROPOSALS MAPS FOR **DEVELOPMENT** ~~[DELETE:THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW BUILDINGS]~~ FOR PURPOSES OTHER THAN:

- (1) AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY, ESSENTIAL FACILITIES FOR OUTDOOR SPORT AND OUTDOOR RECREATION, CEMETERIES; OR
- (2) FOR OTHER USES OF LAND WHICH PRESERVE THE OPENNESS OF THE GREEN BELT AND WHICH DO NOT CONFLICT WITH THE PURPOSES OF INCLUDING LAND IN IT.

13.4a *The definition of development includes the construction of new buildings, engineering and other operations as well as the making of any material change in the use of land.*

Reason

To accord with guidance in PPG2 (paragraphs 3.1-3.3 & 3.12) which refers to 'development' and not just new buildings, and improve the reading of the policy

Text Amendments 13.27b to d and policy amendment GB6A Major Developed Sites In the Green Belt

13.27b The Council has carried out an assessment of potential sites, which could be identified as major developed sites within the district. A total of three sites have been identified. ***The Council identified the major developed sites on the basis of several criteria.*** The ***first*** test ***related to size and looked at*** ~~[delete: of]~~ whether a site was considered major ~~[Delete: is]~~ based upon a guideline of ~~[Delete: a minimum of]~~ 5ha existing developed area (includes buildings, structures, hard standing and circulation space between buildings). ***The Council also looked at the planning unit and their capacity to accommodate infill development without compromising the purposes of the Green belt or its openness.*** The extent of the existing developed portion of each site is shown on the proposal map. The identification of these sites offers a greater degree of flexibility within the Green belt for limited infilling ~~[delete: or redevelopment]~~ which meet the criteria, provided the proposals are for the preferred use specified in the policy. All of the sites are in current use as water treatment or waste water treatment works. All of the identified sites are expected to continued in their existing use within the plan period and have been identified in order to facilitate this continuing use.

Policy GB6A

THE FOLLOWING MAJOR DEVELOPED SITES HAVE BEEN IDENTIFIED WITHIN THE GREEN BELT AND ARE SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP:

Site Preferred Use:

Chellow Heights Water treatment operations
Esholt Waste water treatment operations
Marley Waste water treatment operations

ON THESE SITES LIMITED INFILLING FOR THE PREFERRED USE WITHIN THE PRESENT EXTENT OF DEVELOPMENT WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDING:

- (1) IT HAS NO GREATER IMPACT ON THE PURPOSES OF INCLUDING LAND IN THE GREEN BELT THAN THE EXISTING DEVELOPMENT;
- (2) IT DOES NOT EXCEED THE HEIGHT OF THE EXISTING BUILDINGS;

AND

- (3) IT DOES NOT LEAD TO A MAJOR INCREASE IN THE DEVELOPED PORTION OF THE SITE.

REDEVELOPMENT OF THE SITES (OR PART OF THE SITES) **[DELETE: FOR THE PREFERRED USE]** WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDING:

- (4) IT HAS NO GREATER IMPACT THAN THE EXISTING DEVELOPMENT ON THE OPENNESS OF THE GREEN BELT AND THE PURPOSES OF INCLUDING LAND IN IT, AND WHERE POSSIBLE HAVE LESS;
- (5) IT CONTRIBUTES TO THE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE OBJECTIVES FOR THE USE OF LAND IN GREEN BELTS;
- (6) IT DOES NOT EXCEED THE HEIGHT OF THE EXISTING BUILDINGS;
AND
- (7) THE REDEVELOPMENT WOULD NOT OCCUPY A LARGER AREA OF THE SITE THAN THE EXISTING BUILDINGS, UNLESS THIS WOULD ACHIEVE A REDUCTION IN HEIGHT WHICH WOULD PROVIDE A NET BENEFIT TO VISUAL AMENITY.

- 13.27c Infilling under this policy means the filling of small gaps between built development.
- 13.27d The relevant area for the purposes of **[delete: D] (7)** is the aggregate ground floor area of the existing buildings (the footprint), excluding temporary buildings, open spaces with direct external access between wings of a building, and areas of hard standing. The character and dispersal of proposed redevelopment will need to be considered as well as its footprint. Additionally, the site should be considered as a whole, whether or not all the buildings are to be redeveloped.

Reason

To comply with guidance in PPG2 and to clarify how the major developed sites were identified.

Chapter 14 Natural Environment and the Countryside

Text amendment 14.21b Countryside Recreation

14.21b Water bodies are a major resource that could be better developed for public use and enjoyment. However, these can also be of considerable ecological value and there is a need to balance recreational and ecological needs. The Council generally supports the recreational use of the District's rivers, canals, lakes, reservoirs and other water courses, where the water quality permits and where such uses will not be detrimental to **water quality or the ecological value of the area. *Development proposals which impact upon watercourses or water bodies will also be assessed against policy NR17A.***

Reason

Cross reference to other relevant policy and add consideration of water quality.

Policy amendment NE 4 Trees and Woodlands

THE COUNCIL WILL SEEK TO PRESERVE AND ENHANCE THE CONTRIBUTION THAT TREES AND AREAS OF WOODLAND COVER MAKE TO THE LANDSCAPE CHARACTER OF THE DISTRICT, (INCLUDING THE AMENITY VALUE OF TREES IN BUILT UP AREAS). IN PARTICULAR THE COUNCIL WILL:

- (1) REFUSE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS WHICH WOULD RESULT IN THE LOSS OF TREES OR AREAS OF WOODLAND COVER WHICH CONTRIBUTE TO:
 - (a) THE CHARACTER OF THE LANDSCAPE;
 - (b) THE CHARACTER OF A SETTLEMENT OR ITS SETTING;
 - (c) THE AMENITY OF THE BUILT UP AREA,
 - (d) VALUABLE WILDLIFE HABITATS OR
 - (e) THE **[Delete: SEMI-NATURAL]** ANCIENT WOODLANDS OF THE DISTRICT.

THE COUNCIL WILL CONTINUE TO MAKE TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS WHERE NECESSARY, ESPECIALLY WITHIN AND ADJACENT TO DEVELOPMENT, IN ORDER TO PROTECT TREES AND WOODLAND AREAS WHICH CONTRIBUTE TO LOCAL AMENITY OR LOCAL LANDSCAPE CHARACTER. THE COUNCIL WILL RIGOROUSLY ENFORCE SUCH ORDERS.

Reason:

To address clarify the intention of the policy as it relates to ancient woodlands

Text amendment 14.42a trees/areas of Woodland cover

14.42a Ancient **[Delete: (semi-natural)]** woodlands are those woodlands which have had a continuous woodland cover since at least 1600AD and are valuable for their extensive flora and fauna and historic interest which has developed, through lack of cultivation, clearance or other disturbance,. The Ancient Woodland Inventory for West Yorkshire was revised in 1994 and this information is held by English Nature.

Reason

To reflect the change to policy NE4

Policy and policy title amendment NE7

Sites of International Importance [Delete: European Sites] - Special Protection Areas/Special Areas of Conservation (SPA/SAC)

DEVELOPMENT WHICH MAY AFFECT **[Delete: A EUROPEAN SITE OR A PROPOSED EUROPEAN SITE] A SITE OF INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE OR PROPOSED SITE OF INTERNATIONAL IMPORTANCE** WILL BE SUBJECT TO THE MOST RIGOROUS EXAMINATION. DEVELOPMENT THAT IS NOT DIRECTLY CONNECTED WITH OR NECESSARY **[Delete: FOR] TO** THE MANAGEMENT OF THE SITE FOR NATURE CONSERVATION AND WHICH IS LIKELY TO HAVE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS ON THE SITE (EITHER INDIVIDUALLY OR IN COMBINATION WITH OTHER PLANS OR PROJECTS) AND WHERE IT CANNOT BE ASCERTAINED THAT THE PROPOSAL WOULD NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE SITE WILL NOT BE PERMITTED UNLESS :

- THERE IS NO ALTERNATIVE SOLUTION; AND
- THERE ARE IMPERATIVE REASONS OF OVER-RIDING PUBLIC INTEREST WHICH JUSTIFY THE GRANT OF PLANNING PERMISSION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT.

WHERE THE SITE CONCERNED HOSTS A PRIORITY NATURAL HABITAT TYPE AND/OR PRIORITY SPECIES, DEVELOPMENT WILL NOT BE PERMITTED UNLESS THE COUNCIL IS SATISFIED THAT IT IS NECESSARY FOR REASONS OF HEALTH OR PUBLIC SAFETY OR FOR BENEFICIAL CONSEQUENCES OF PRIMARY IMPORTANCE FOR NATURE CONSERVATION.

Reason:

For consistency with terminology used in PPG9 and wording used in Conservation (Natural habitats & c.) Regulations 1994

Text amendment 14.52 designated sites

14.52 English Nature will be consulted on all applications affecting **[Delete: a European Site] a Site of International Importance** and will advise on the likely significant effects of the proposed developments, in accordance with the Conservation (Natural Habitats & c.) Regulations 1994 (or any amended regulations in force from time to time). Where a development is likely to have a significant effect on the site, an appropriate assessment will be

required to show the impact of the development. English Nature will advise on the scope and content of assessment. Following this assessment, if it is found that the proposal will adversely affect the integrity of the site, a series of further stages, as set out in Annex C of PPG 9, must be systematically worked through. If no alternative solutions or locations can be found and the site does not host a priority natural habitat type or species defined in the Habitats Directive (European Directive 92/43/EEC) planning permission will only be granted if the development has to be carried out for imperative reasons of overriding public interest. If the site hosts a priority habitat or species, and there is no alternative solution, the only considerations which can justify the grant of planning permission are those which relate to human health or public safety. PPG 9 also states that “if planning permission is granted for a development which would adversely affect the integrity of an SPA or SAC, regulation 53 requires the Secretary of State to secure that any necessary compensatory measures are taken to ensure that the overall coherence of the Community-wide network of SPA’s and SAC’s, known as Natura 2000, is protected.”

Reason:

For consistency with terminology used in PPG9 and wording used in Conservation (Natural habitats & c.) Regulations 1994 (English Nature objection)

Text amendment 14.53 Designated Sites

- 14.53 In relation to permitted development rights, developers should also note that Regulations 60-63 of the Habitats Directive ensure that any permission granted under the GDPO is not in breach of the Habitats Directive and prevent any development which is likely to significantly affect a **[Delete: SPA or SAC] Site of International Importance**. Developers should therefore seek to opinion of English Nature before proceeding with any development within a **[Delete: SPA or SAC] Site of International Importance**.

Reason:

For consistency with terminology used in PPG9 and wording used in Conservation (Natural habitats & c.) Regulations 1994

Policy title amendment Policy NE 8

Sites of National Importance – Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI)

Reason:

Consequential amendment to heading to ensure consistent with approach to amendments to title of Policy NE 7 (see above)

Policy amendment NE 10 Protection of Features and Species

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS SHOULD ENSURE THAT IMPORTANT :-

- LANDSCAPE
- ECOLOGICAL
- GEOLOGICAL FEATURES
- WILDLIFE HABITATS [~~Delete: AFFECTING~~] **ACCOMMODATING** PROTECTED SPECIES.

ARE PROTECTED.

THE COUNCIL WILL ENSURE THAT THE REQUIREMENTS OF THIS POLICY ARE SATISFIED THROUGH THE USE OF CONDITIONS AND/OR PLANNING OBLIGATIONS.

PLANNING PERMISSION WILL NOT BE GRANTED FOR DEVELOPMENT WHICH WOULD HAVE AN ADVERSE IMPACT ON BADGERS OR SPECIES PROTECTED BY SCHEDULES 1, 5 OR 8 OF THE WILDLIFE AND COUNTRYSIDE ACT 1981, AS AMENDED

Reason:

To clarify intent of policy

Text amendment 14.59a Biodiversity

14.59a Regulation 37 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats & c.) Regulations 1994 states that plans shall include policies encouraging the management of features of the landscape which are of importance for wild flora and fauna. Such features include:-

Linear tree belts/shelter belts	Semi-natural grasslands	River corridors
Plantations	Moorlands	Canals
Small woodlands	Peatlands	Lakes
[Delete: Semi-natural]	Heathlands	Reservoirs
Ancient woodlands	Green Lanes/Drove	Ponds
Parkland trees	roads	
	Stone Walls	
	Hedgerows	

Reason:

Response to an objection to the omission and to correct drafting error

Text amendment 14.60 Biodiversity

14.60 The presence of a protected species is a material consideration determining an application for planning permission. In such cases, where proposed development may have an impact on a protected species English Nature will be consulted **and the developer will normally be required to submit an appropriate ecological survey, undertaken by a qualified and licensed ecologist, to assess the potential impact of the proposed development prior to the consideration of granting planning permission.** Where permission is granted, the Council will impose conditions and/or enter into planning obligations to minimise adverse effects on protected species and will draw the applicant's attention to the need to obtain any necessary licence to disturb protected species. Potential harm can often be overcome by modifications to the proposals (such as restricting works to specific seasons to protect nesting birds, breeding badgers or bat roosts). Species protected by British or European law relevant to the Bradford District are:-

- Badgers (Protection of Badgers Act 1992)
- All wild birds with particular reference to Schedule 1 of Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981
- Wild animals listed in Schedule 5 (W&C Act 1981), especially bats, water voles & otters
- Wild plants listed in Schedule 8 (W&C Act 1981)
- Species listed in Annex 1 of the Birds Directive 79/409/EEC
- Species listed in Annex IV of the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC

Reason:

Clarify when an ecological survey is to be undertaken.

Text amendment 14.63 Biodiversity

14.63 Plus other considerations, where development would have an adverse impact upon:-

- **A Biodiversity Audit of Yorkshire and the Humber**
- Bradford Local Biodiversity Action Plan species and habitats
- Aquatic habitats – including ponds and mill ponds, in particular, for their heritage as well as their ecological value; watercourses and other wetlands such as reservoirs.

Reason:

To rectify factual omission to take account of RPG 12.

Text amendment 14.66 Ecological appraisal

- 14.66 The developer will be required to demonstrate due consideration of the environmental impact of the proposed development, by way of an ecological appraisal, where development is likely to have an adverse effect on the biodiversity of the Bradford District. The Developer **will** ~~**may**~~ be expected to carry out regular review and monitoring programmes of post-development impacts where appropriate, and implement measures to mitigate any subsequent adverse effects **of** ~~**on**~~ the development. The Council will need to be satisfied that the level and detail of information contained within the ecological appraisal is appropriate for the particular nature conservation value of the site. Environmental Impact Assessments ~~**will**~~ **may** be required in accordance with the Environmental Assessment Regulations.

Reason:

Response to objections and to correct drafting errors.

Chapter 15 Natural Resources

Text amendment 15.22 Aggregates Areas of Search

- 15.22 MPG 6 "Guidelines for Aggregate Provision in England" [~~delete: 1996~~]
[insert: 1994].

Reason

To correct a factual error

Policy amendment NR11B Coal Extraction

WHEN CONSIDERING WHETHER A PROPOSAL IS ENVIRONMENTALLY ACCEPTABLE OR CAPABLE OF BEING MADE SO UNDER A) ABOVE THE FOLLOWING WILL BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT, WHERE RELEVANT:

- (1) THE EFFECTS ON LOCAL AMENITY; LANDSCAPE; FEATURES OF ARCHAEOLOGICAL, ARCHITECTURAL, HISTORIC OR [~~DELETE: NATURAL INTEREST~~] **ECOLOGICAL OR NATURE CONSERVATION INTEREST**
- (2) THE EFFECT ON HYDROLOGY OR HYDROGEOLOGY;
- (3) THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS OF TRANSPORTATION OF MINERALS AND WASTE;
- (4) THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE PROPOSAL WOULD ADVERSELY AFFECT EFFORTS TO ATTRACT OR RETAIN INVESTMENT IN AN AREA;
- (5) THE NEED TO ENSURE THAT WHERE THE PROPOSAL LIES WITH THE GREEN BELT, IT CAN BE DEVELOPED, OPERATED AND RESTORED TO THE HIGHEST STANDARDS

WHEN CONSIDERING WHETHER THE ADVERSE IMPACTS OF A PROPOSAL IS OUTWEIGHED BY THE BENEFITS THAT THE DEVELOPMENT WOULD PROVIDE, IMPORTANCE WILL BE GIVEN TO THOSE BENEFITS THAT WOULD BE UNLIKELY TO BE ACHIEVED BY ANY OTHER MEANS. IN PARTICULAR, THE FOLLOWING WILL BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT, WHERE RELEVANT, EITHER SEPARATELY OR CUMULATIVELY:

- 1) THE CONTRIBUTION OF THE PROPOSAL TOWARDS THE COMPREHENSIVE RECLAMATION OF AREAS OF DERELICT OR CONTAMINATED LAND;
- 2) THE AVOIDANCE OF STERILISATION OF MINERAL RESOURCES IN ADVANCE OF DEVELOPMENT THAT IS SUBJECT TO A PLANNING PERMISSION;
- 3) E CONTRIBUTION (OR OTHERWISE) TO THE MAINTENANCE OF HIGH AND STABLE LEVELS OF ECONOMIC GROWTH AND EMPLOYMENT;

Reason

To clarify to implementation of the policy

Text amendment 15.55 Flood Risk

“15.55 Two main rivers, the Aire and the Wharfe, as well as many other smaller watercourses fall within the Bradford District. Current uncertainties over possible climate change make the need to safeguard floodplain areas particularly important. The Government’s policy, as set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 25 ‘**[Delete: Planning] Development** and flood risk’ is to reduce as far as practicable, the risk to people and the developed and natural environment from flooding. Planning has a positive role to play in achieving these aims, by ensuring that flood risk is properly taken into account in the planning of developments and that measures are taken to reduce the risk of flooding.”

Reason

Correct a factual error.

Text amendment 15.56c Washland

“15.56c These areas are shown on the proposals map. These are *principally* areas of functional floodplain which provide essential storage for floodwater and are the flood risk areas requiring the highest level of protection. In accordance with PPG25, built development in the washlands where excess water flows or is stored in times of flood, should be wholly exceptional and limited to essential infrastructure that has to be there. **Functional floodplain may not necessarily be shown as washland on the proposals map.**

Reason

Clarification as to the definition of washlands.

Policy amendment NR17A Water bodies

“POLICY NR17A
DEVELOPMENT ADJOINING OR NEAR TO **[delete: SIGNIFICANT]**
WATERCOURSES AND BODIES WILL NOT BE PERMITTED IF IT
WOULD HAVE AN ADVERSE EFFECT ON NATURE CONSERVATION,
WATER QUALITY, FISHERIES, LANDSCAPE, PUBLIC ACCESS, OR
WATER BASED OR WATER SIDE RECREATION.

Reason

Clarify the intention of the policy and broaden its considerations to include impact on water quality.

Chapter 16 Pollution Hazards and Waste

Policy amendment P4 Contaminated Land

Policy P4

PLANNING PERMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT ON LAND KNOWN OR SUSPECTED BY THE COUNCIL TO BE CONTAMINATED WILL **ONLY** BE GRANTED, **IF THE FOLLOWING PROVISIONS ARE MADE**

- (1) AN APPROPRIATE SITE INVESTIGATION AND RISK ASSESSMENT HAS BEEN CARRIED OUT BY THE DEVELOPER TO DETERMINE WHETHER CONTAMINANTS ARE PRESENT OR NOT, AND
- (2) IF ANY CONTAMINANTS ARE FOUND THE DEVELOPER SHALL CARRY OUT APPROPRIATE MEASURES AGREED WITH THE COUNCIL TO ADEQUATELY OVERCOME THE PROBLEM ON THE COMMENCEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT.

Reason

Address an objection and clarify the intent of the policy

Policy amendment P6 Unstable Land

Policy P6

PLANNING PERMISSION FOR DEVELOPMENT ON LAND KNOWN OR SUSPECTED BY THE COUNCIL TO BE UNSTABLE WILL **ONLY** BE GRANTED, **IF THE FOLLOWING PROVISIONS ARE MADE**

- (1) A FULL SITE INVESTIGATION HAS BEEN CARRIED OUT BY THE DEVELOPER TO DETERMINE WHETHER INSTABILITY MAY OCCUR OR NOT, AND
- (2) IF ANY INSTABILITY IS FOUND, THE DEVELOPER **[Delete: CARRIES] SHALL CARRY** OUT ANY MEASURES REQUIRED TO ADEQUATELY OVERCOME THE PROBLEM, ON THE COMMENCEMENT OF DEVELOPMENT.

Reason

Address an objection and clarify the intent of the policy

Text amendments appendix c: parking standards

1. Introduction

The maximum car parking standards set out below are based on standards in PPG13 as issued in March 2001 and the Regional Planning Guidance (RPG12) issued in October 2001. The maximum levels form the top end of a range down to no spaces on site. Wherever appropriate, the Council will minimise the number of spaces provided on site with new development and changes of use within this range, particularly in locations such as Bradford City Centre and other towns and district centres, which are highly accessible by public transport, cycling and walking.

All major development proposals above the size thresholds, set out below, will be considered in the context of a **detailed** transport assessment. **For smaller schemes the transport assessment should simply set out the transport implications of the development.** All local authorities are currently awaiting national guidance on transport assessments and more details will be provided once this is available, but the assessment is likely to examine:

- a) the location of the proposal
- b) the likely modal split of journeys to and from the site
- c) measures to be undertaken to improve access to the site by public transport, walking and cycling
- d) measures to be undertaken to reduce the number and impact of private car journeys associated with the proposal

2. Maximum Car Parking Standards for Single Use **[Delete: Major]** Developments

[Delete: The parking standards set out below are for major developments above the size thresholds specified.]

Use	Maximum Car Parking Standard <i>at and above threshold</i> [Delete: 1 space per square metre of gross floor space unless otherwise stated]	Threshold [Delete: from above which standard applies] (gross floorspace)	<i>Maximum Car Parking Standard below threshold</i>
Food Retail	1 space per 14sqm	1000sqm	<i>1 space per 20sqm</i>
Non Food Retail	1 space per 25sqm	1000sqm	<i>1 space per 25sqm</i>
A2 Offices	1 space per 35sqm	2500sqm	<i>1 space per 30sqm</i>
B1 Business	1 space per 30sqm	2500sqm	<i>1 space per 30sqm</i>
B2 Industry	1 space per 50sqm	2500sqm	<i>1 space per 50sqm</i>
C2 Hospitals	1 space per 4 staff + 1 space per 4 daily visitors	2500sqm	<i>To be assessed on individual basis</i>
D1 Higher and further education	1 space per 2 staff + 1 space per 15 students	2500sqm	<i>To be assessed on individual basis</i>
D2 Assembly and Leisure	1 space per 22sqm	1000sqm	<i>To be assessed on individual basis</i>
Cinemas and conference facilities	1 space per 5 seats	1000sqm	<i>To be assessed on individual basis</i>
Stadia	1 space per 15 seats	1500 seats	<i>To be assessed on individual basis</i>

3. Maximum Parking Standards for **Other** Single Use Developments **[Delete: below Thresholds]**

A3 Food & Drink: 1 space per 5sqm

B8 Storage & Distribution: 1 space per 250sqm

C1 Hotels & Guest Houses: 1 space per bedroom

C2 Nursing homes: 1 space per 5 residents
+ 1 space per 2 staff

C3 Dwellings:

Average of 1.5 spaces per unit over whole development.

In the City and town centres, the average per development should not exceed 1 space per unit.

The Council will pursue more restrictive maximum levels of parking in the case of conversion of properties for multi-occupancy residential use except where this is likely to result in or add to significant road safety or on-street parking problems.

D1 Non Residential:

Health centres/surgeries	3 spaces per consulting room
Day nurseries/creches	3 spaces per 4 staff
Places of Worship	1 space per 25 sqm

D2 Leisure:

Sports and leisure activities	1 space per 2 players/staff
Swimming pools	1 space per 5 fixed seats 1 space per 10 sqm pool area
Tennis/Squash/Bowling	4 spaces per court or lane

Miscellaneous:

Auction Rooms	1 space per 2 sqm of standing area
Car Sales & Garage	
Forecourts:	

Workshops - staff	1 space per 2 staff
Workshops - customers	3 spaces per service bay
Car Sales - staff	1 space per full time staff
Car Sales - customers	1 space per 15 cars on display

Private Hire/Hackney Carriage Office	Minimum of 5 spaces or 1 space for every 4 cars operating from centre, whichever is greater
---	---

4. Cycle Parking Standards

Use	Minimum Cycle Standard	
	Long stay	Short stay
A1 Retail Food / Non Food	Greater of 1 space per 10 employees or 1 stand per 300 sqm	1 stand per 200 sqm
A2 Financial & Professional services		
A3 Food & drink		
B1 Business	1 stand per 150 sq.m.	1 stand per 500 sq.m.
B2 General Industry	350 sq.m.	500 sq.m.
B8 Storage & distribution	500 sq.m.	1000 sq.m.
C1 Hotels, boarding and guesthouses	1 space per 10 employees	1 stand per 10 beds
C2 Hospital / Nursing homes	1 space per 6 staff	1 loop/hoop per 2 beds
C3 Dwellings	1 secure space per unit	1 loop/hoop per unit
D1 Health centres/surgeries	1 space per 2 consulting rooms	1 stand per consulting room
Day nurseries/creches	1 space per 6 staff	2 stands per establishment
Higher and further education	1 space per 5 students + 1 space per 10 staff	
Schools	To be determined through school Travel Plan	
D2 Cinemas and Conference Facilities, Stadia, Sports and leisure activities	1 space per 6 staff or 1 space per 40 sqm	1 stand per 20 sqm
Tennis/Squash/Bowling	1 space per 5 pitches or lanes	
Miscellaneous: Car Sales & Garage Forecourts	1 space per 8 staff or 1 space per 250 sqm	1 stand per 500 sqm

5. Parking facilities for Disabled People

For car parks associated with employment premises, spaces for parking by disabled people should be provided at the following rates:

- up to 200 spaces, 5% of capacity subject to a minimum of 2 spaces to be reserved
- over 200 spaces, 2% of capacity plus 6 spaces

For car parks associated with public, shopping or leisure facilities:

- up to 200 spaces, 6% of capacity, minimum of 3 spaces
- over 200 spaces, 4% of capacity plus 4 spaces

Further advice is available in 'Reducing Mobility Handicaps – Towards a Barrier Free Environment' (the Institution of Highways and Transportation). It is understood that a steering group led by the government is currently revising these guidelines. Any changes to the disabled parking rates arising from this will be adopted when available.

Parking for disabled people is additional to the maximum parking standards. Where a reduced number of car parking spaces below the maximum levels is provided with new development or change of use, the level of parking provision for disabled people should be maintained in the same proportion as if the overall number of spaces was up to the maximum level. This condition will not apply where it is not possible to provide any car parking on site.

Reason

To clarify the implementation of car parking standards on smaller developments

Proposals Reports

Bradford North Proposals Report

Text amendment BN/UR7.1 Cutler Heights Mixed Use Area

The range of uses appropriate for the area include:

- B1 Business
- B2 General Industry
- C3 Dwellings

Small scale A1 and A3 uses where it can be demonstrated to support local needs ***and in accordance with the relevant policies elsewhere in the Plan.***

Reason

To clarify the scale of retail development

Text amendment BN/UR7.3 Dudley Hill

- B1 Business
- B2 General Industry
- C3 Dwelling Houses

A1 uses (retail), A3 uses (food and drink) and D2 uses (leisure and recreation) may be acceptable if they are of a scale appropriate to supporting the needs of the local community ***and in accordance with the relevant policies elsewhere in the Plan.***

Reason

To clarify the scale of retail development

Text amendment Area Based Regeneration Strategies

Within the SRB areas, Estate Action Areas and the New Deal (Trident) area defined on the proposals maps and where adopted village design statements exist which have been prepared in the proper manner and are consistent with the Plan, proposals for new development should accord with these approved planning frameworks.

Area strategies are underway at:-

Reason

To clarify the role of supplementary planning guidance following deletion of policies at revised deposit

Bradford South Proposals ReportPolicy BS/UR11.1, Proposal and Text Change Odsal Action Area**[Delete: Odsal Stadium Action Area**

Historically, Odsal stadium and the Richard Dunn complex has been the centre of activity for live sporting events for the people of Bradford. In particular, Odsal stadium has a great tradition associated with rugby league. It has always been a stadium of regional significance and brings economic benefits to the local economy. With its good highway network it is highly accessible both locally and regionally. The introduction of the new quality bus initiative along the Manchester Road corridor further improves the locational advantage.

The sports facilities are now very much outdated. The new regulations which govern the operation of stadia means that Odsal is now substandard. The Council is therefore determined to secure the redevelopment and upgrading of this facility but the high costs involved demand an element of high value uses incorporated within the scheme as enabling development. Under these particular circumstances, the Council has provided for development which would not otherwise be in accordance with the plan, where high value uses such as out of centre large scale retail or leisure uses would be allowed. However, it must be demonstrated that the exceptional uses and their scale are solely required to assist in cross subsidising the construction of the stadium. Development over and above this criteria will not be allowed, other than in accordance with normal planning policy.

As an established location for sport and recreation, the Council recognises the wider potential of the area and seeks to improve the choice of activities available. Based on the premise of developing a new regional stadium together with the expansion of leisure uses, the Council sees a regeneration opportunity which will provide an enviable gateway to Bradford, attracting inward investment, jobs and the benefit of economic multipliers. This will enhance the employment prospects for many of the disadvantaged community in the neighbouring areas which are suffering social deprivation. It will secure the redevelopment of brownfield land and provide a focus for a range of integrated activity.

Because of the particular circumstances of the Odsal Stadium proposals a policy to guide development is required therefore:

IN THE INTERESTS OF ENSURING THE PROVISION OF A NEW SPORTS STADIUM WITHIN THE AREA SHOWN ON THE PROPOSALS MAP DEVELOPMENT WHICH ASSISTS IN ENABLING THIS PROVISION WILL BE PERMITTED.

IN ADDITION TO THE PROVISION OF A NEW SPORTS STADIUM, THE DEVELOPMENT WHICH WILL BE PERMITTED IS

- **A1 FOOD AND NON FOOD RETAILING**
- **A3 FOOD AND DRINK**
- **C1 HOTEL**
- **D2 LEISURE**

PROVIDED THE DEVELOPMENT IS NECESSARY TO ENSURE THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE STADIUM. ADDITIONAL ANCILLARY FACILITIES WILL BE PERMITTED, SUBJECT TO OTHER RELEVANT POLICIES ELSEWHERE IN THE PLAN.

SUCH DEVELOPMENT MUST ACCOMMODATE THE COUNCIL'S TRANSPORT POLICIES FOR THE AREA.

THE PROPOSALS WILL BE GUIDED BY A DEVELOPMENT BRIEF AND WILL BE DELIVERED THROUGH A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH THE COUNCIL AS LANDOWNER]

Consequential amendments to proposals

Proposed Housing Site

BS/H1.41 Northern View Hospital

Brownfield housing site brought forward from the adopted Plan

Playing Field

BS/OS3 Richard Dunn Sports Centre include existing playing field on the proposals map.

Reason

Deletion of the odsal stadium action area arises from the abandonment of the comprehensive redevelopment of the stadium. The new proposals made reflect the position in the current adopted plan

Map amendment BS/GB1.32 Green Belt Addition

Delete the proposal.

Reason

The site has planning permission for a use incompatible with green belt status

Text amendment

BS/OS4.3 BRAFFERTON ARBOR, BUTTERSHAW

Land identified by Royds as open space, to be laid out for children's play. **[Delete
See also site BS/H1.5]**

Reason

The housing site was deleted at revised deposit

Bradford West Proposals Report

Text amendment UR7.5 Thorn Lane

- B1 Offices and light industry
- B2 General Industry
- B8 Warehousing and distribution
- C1 Hotel
- C2 Residential institutions
- C3 Residential
- D1 Non residential institutions

Small scale A1 (retail) will be considered where it can be demonstrated as appropriate to support local needs **and is in accordance relevant policies elsewhere in the Plan**. Consideration will be given to Listed Building Consent for refurbishment of the main building.

Reason

To clarify the implementation of the Plan

Text amendment Area Based Regeneration Strategies

Within the SRB areas, Estate, Action Areas and the New Deal (Trident) area defined on the proposals maps and where adopted village design statements exist which have been prepared in the proper manner and are consistent with the Plan, proposals for new development should accord with these approved planning frameworks.

Area strategies are underway at:-

Reason

To clarify text following deletion of policies at revised deposit

Keighley Proposals Report

Text amendment K/UR7.1 Worth Valley

- B1 Business
- B2 General Industry
- C3 Dwelling Houses

Uses A1 (retail), A3 (food and drink) and D2 uses (leisure and recreation) may be acceptable if they are of a scale appropriate to supporting the needs of the local community **and are in accordance with the relevant policies elsewhere in the Plan.**

Reason

To clarify the implementation of the Plan

Text Amendment to Safeguarded Land Site

~~K~~**[Delete:H]**UR5.26 NORTH DENE AVENUE, GUARD HOUSE,
KEIGHLEY

Reason

To correct a typographical error.

Text amendment to Employment Site

K/E1.5 BELTON ROAD, SILSDEN 4.99

Site carried forward from adopted UDP. A greenfield site within the settlement. Retention of mature trees is essential, as is the provision of a buffer zone to the residential properties to the north of the site. The site may be contaminated. The site is in an Employment Zone and the Airedale Corridor, a prime location for B1 and B8 employment provision as specified in the Hainsworth Road Development Brief (adopted in 1989) and in support of the 2020 Vision. **[Delete: A comprehensive development scheme for the whole of the site is sought in accordance with Policy E2.]** Planning permission for a building society headquarters has been granted on part of the site since April 2000.

Reason

To reflect recent approvals that almost complete to site's potential.

Text amendment to lists of historic parks and gardens

Policy BH16 Parks and Gardens designated by English Heritage as of national value

K/BH16.1 Heathcote, Ilkley GD 2226 grade II

K/BH16.2 Lund Park, Keighley GD 3327 grade II

Policy BH17 Parks and Gardens recognised by the Council as of local value

K/BH17.1 Whinburn, Keighley

K/BH17.2 Heber's Ghyll, Ilkley

K/BH17.3 Cliffe Castle and Devonshire Park,
Keighley

K/BH17.4 Central Park, Haworth

Reason

To correspond with English Heritage's "Register of Parks and Gardens of Specific Historic Interest in England".

ShipleY Proposals Report

Text amendment S/UR7.1 ShipleY/Saltaire Corridor

The use classes acceptable in the area are:

B1 Business

B2 General Industry

C3 Residential

A1 uses (retail), A3 uses (food and drink) and D2 uses (leisure and recreation) may be acceptable if they are of a scale appropriate to supporting the needs of the local community ***and are in accordance with the relevant policies elsewhere in the Plan.***

Reason

To clarify the implementation of the Plan

Text and Map amendments

[Delete:

S/H2.12

PENDLE ROAD, GILSTEAD

0.67

Housing site carried forward from the adopted UDP. Greenfield site located in the urban area. Located on an exposed skyline any development should be set back and incorporate a landscape buffer to minimise impact. There have been past problems of fly nuisance from the adjacent water treatment works, but these now appear to be under control. Access via Pendle Road. Informal footpath links to be retained within site.]

S/H1.13

PENDLE ROAD, GILSTEAD

0.67

Housing site carried forward from the adopted UDP. This greenfield site is located in the urban area and has planning permission for residential development that was granted and commenced (footings established) in 1976. Any further planning applications to develop the site will need to take account of the following; the site is located on an exposed skyline development should therefore be set back and incorporate a landscape buffer to minimise impact. There have been past problems of fly nuisance from the adjacent water treatment works, but these now appear to be under control. A Waste Management Licence was issued in 1985 for the deposit of dried material, demolition and excavation waste. No waste has been deposited on site for several years, although elevated levels of methane have been detected that will need to be monitored. Access via Pendle Road. Informal footpath links to be retained within site.

Reason

Submissions have been made to the Council which demonstrate that the site has a planning permission which was implemented in part in 1976 rendering the phase 2 proposal invalid.

Map amendment Only

S/OS7.3 Ellar Gardens, Menston

Retain the existing village green space notation and in addition show the site as recreation open space.

Reason

The site is maintained as a recreation open space

Text amendment

S/OS7.7 CLEASBY ROAD, MENSTON

New site. ***That maintains an open aspect and is*** centrally located in the village **[delete: and overlooked by residential properties.]** This area is characterised by an open field that has been gifted to the residents of Menston ***and is to be maintained as an open field*** in perpetuity. **[Delete: for their enjoyment.]**

Reason

Clarify the description and role of the site