

**Replacement
Unitary Development Plan
for the
Bradford District**

Inspector's Report

**Bradford North
Constituency
Volume**

Replacement Unitary Development Plan for the Bradford District

Inspector's Report

Bradford North Constituency Volume

Contents

Chapter number and title	Page number
4 Urban Renaissance	1
5 Economy and Employment	12
6 Housing	21
7 Town Centres, Retail and Leisure Development	38
8 Transport and Movement	41
12 Open Land in Settlements	47
13 Green Belt	53
15 Natural Resources	56
16 Pollution, Hazards and Waste	61

Chapter 4: Urban Renaissance

SOM/BN/UR4/62.02: Site A, Land to South of Greengates Local Centre

Objector

2209/8492 *Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd*

Summary of Objection

- The land should be included within the defined Greengates Centre.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.1 I have considered this objection in relation to SOM/BN/CR3/62 below, to which reference should be made.

Recommendation

4.2 See recommendation on SOM/BN/CR/3/62.

BN/UR5.1, SOM/BN/OS2/13 & SOM/BN/OS4/13: Bradford Moor

Objectors

20/1442	<i>Alan E Jagger</i>
31/1424	<i>Miss Gillian Clements</i>
38/1426	<i>Miss Joan Youngs</i>
39/1444	<i>Dr Keith Manchester</i>
43/1407	<i>Mrs A M Wilkinson</i>
237/1496	<i>Mr D R Blackwell</i>
532/1499	<i>Mr Walter Metcalfe</i>
709/1914 & 2173	<i>Mrs B E Taylor</i>
859/1912	<i>Mr S Pearson</i>
1034/890	<i>Mr Eddie Hawkins</i>
1257/887	<i>Mr C Ireland</i>
1264/1911 & 2175	<i>Mrs M Ireland</i>
1997/1910 & 2178	<i>Mr Harry North</i>
2068/1913	<i>Mrs K Lee</i>
2925/1927	<i>Mr Eric Dalby</i>
3068/1787 & 5764	<i>Mrs Joan Dalby</i>
3206/11156	<i>Mrs Patricia Suddards</i>
3883/5457	<i>Bradford Moor Golf Club</i>
4018/8538	<i>Brian Moore</i>

Summary of Objections

- The land should remain as a golf course, and be designated as urban greenspace.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.3 This site is within the Bradford urban area, some 2 kilometres from the city centre. It was designated as safeguarded land and urban greenspace in the FDDP but the latter designation was deleted in the RDDP. Since the land is within the urban area, it is not appropriate to refer to it as safeguarded land: this term should only be used for land between the urban area and the Green Belt.
- 4.4 PPG17 advises that existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land should not be built on unless an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space or the buildings and land to be surplus to requirements. I note the Council's view that the land may be suitable for development in the future, with a new golf course located on the northern edge of the city. However, at present this is an important open space in a densely developed part of the city, and should be protected unless satisfactory alternative provision is made. This should not only provide for the members of the golf club, but should also redress the deficiency in open space available to the local population. In my view this can best be achieved by designating the land as urban greenspace.

Recommendation

- 4.5 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by deletion of the safeguarded land designation BN/UR5.1 from Bradford Moor and the land be designated as urban greenspace under the terms of Policy OS1.**

BN/UR5.2 (formerly BN/H2.2), SOM/BN/H1/14 & SOM/BN/OS1/14: Westfield Lane, Idle

Objectors

2207/12351/52 *Elders and Trustees Upper Chapel URC*

The objectors to the allocation as a phase 2 housing site are listed in the appendix to this report.

Summary of Objections

- The site should be allocated for phase 1 housing.
- There should be no further housing in Idle without additional school and highways provision.
- The land should be retained as a greenspace.
- Westfield Lane cannot take any more traffic.
- Highway improvements will spoil the look of the conservation area.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.6 This site was shown as a phase 2 housing allocation in the FDDP, but changed to safeguarded land in the RDDP. Those objectors opposed to the housing allocation have not made specific representations in respect of the designation as safeguarded land but the points made are largely applicable to the current proposal.
- 4.7 I have considered the principle of safeguarded land in the Policy Framework volume (Urban Renaissance Chapter) of the report, and conclude that it is inappropriate to refer

to land within the urban area as safeguarded land. Therefore, if this land is not required or appropriate for housing within the plan period, it would remain unallocated and could come forward for development under the provisions of Policy UR4. However, there is a need for additional land for housing within the plan period, and I am therefore considering whether the original housing allocation should be re-instated.

- 4.8 This is a greenfield site within the main urban area, close to local facilities and bus services, and hence is a sustainable location for new housing. Whilst I can appreciate that local residents would like to see the land remain open, there is an extensive area of urban greenspace on the opposite side of Westfield Lane, and there does not appear to be a shortage of open space in the area generally. I do not therefore consider that there is any justification to retain this land permanently as open space. I also consider that the provision of school places, and design issues relating to the adjoining conservation area, could be resolved. A satisfactory access could be provided to the site. Although the capacity of the highway network in the vicinity of the site is a constraint on large-scale development, this site is unlikely to accommodate more than 50 dwellings. I do not consider that the additional traffic generated would have a significant impact on the existing problems. Also, much of the present congestion is caused by parked cars, and restrictions could be introduced to remedy this situation prior to the site being developed, if it were thought necessary.
- 4.9 In these circumstances, I see no reason why the site should not be allocated as a housing site to come forward in the latter part of the plan period. However, I do not consider that it should be allocated for development within phase 1 as there are highway constraints at present, and postponing development to the latter part of the plan period will allow time to consider measures to remedy the existing congestion problems.

Recommendation

- 4.10 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation BN/UR5.2 from land at Westfield Lane, Idle and that the land be allocated for housing under the terms of Policy H2.**

BN/UR5.3 (formerly BN/H2.1): Westfield Lane/All Alone Road, Idle, Bradford

Objectors

2584/1800	<i>Mr & Mrs Ray & Georgina Bell</i>
2635/8016	<i>Miss S F A Walker</i>
2867/1978	<i>Mr Dennis Wood</i>
2962/5504	<i>Mr & Mrs Brian & Jennifer Mortimer</i>
3366/5474	<i>Mrs Donna Spencer</i>
3368/5477	<i>Mr Wayne Spencer</i>

Summary of Objections

- The allocation should be deleted and the site left open.
- There should be no further housing in Idle without additional school and highways provision.
- There is too much traffic and housing already.
- Rural character would be lost.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.11 This site was allocated for phase 2 housing in the FDDP, and the objections relate to this, and not the current designation as safeguarded land. However, the objections have not been withdrawn, and similar considerations apply whether the site is proposed for development within the plan period or safeguarded for needs beyond the plan period.
- 4.12 I have considered the principle of safeguarded land in the Policy Framework volume (Urban Renaissance Chapter) of the report, and conclude that it is inappropriate to refer to land within the urban area as safeguarded land. Therefore, if this land is not required or appropriate for housing within the plan period, it would remain unallocated and could come forward for development under the provisions of Policy UR4. However, there is a need for additional land for housing within the plan period, and I am therefore considering whether the original housing allocation should be re-instated.
- 4.13 The site is in two parts, separated by All Alone Lane, which is an unmade road. To the east of the lane are a large former employment building, a further building still in employment use, and a small paddock. On the other side of the lane are two residential properties, an open storage area, and rough grassland. Much of the site is therefore previously-developed land and, being within the main urban area, it is the first location for housing provision in the sequence set out in the location strategy of the plan. However, it is not particularly well located in relation to local facilities, or good public transport routes, and the access is poor at present.
- 4.14 The Council has not addressed the point about school provision, since the site is not currently allocated for housing. In relation to other sites in the Idle area, it has confirmed that there is capacity at some schools, and I do not consider that this is likely to be a constraint. In relation to access, the Council indicates that third party land would be required to provide a safe access, but that the highway network would be capable of accommodating the additional traffic. Whilst the open parts of the site are no doubt appreciated by local residents, there is no public access to this land, and there is a sports ground to the south, and an extensive area of urban greenspace to the north.
- 4.15 I consider that this site should be allocated for housing but, because of the need to achieve an improved access, this should come forward in the latter part of the plan period.

Recommendation

- 4.16 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the safeguarded land designation BN/UR5.3 from land at Westfield Lane/All Alone Lane, Idle and that the land be allocated for housing under the terms of Policy H2.**

SOM/BN/UR5/60: Land to the South of Bradford Moor Golf Club

Objector

3206/8528

Mrs Patricia Suddards

Summary of Objection

- Land adjoining the golf course could be used for the same purpose.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.17 This land is designated as urban greenspace and recreation open space. I am unclear whether the objector wishes this land to remain open, as well as the golf course, or to be designated as safeguarded land instead of the golf course. However, as indicated above, I consider it inappropriate to refer to land within the urban area as safeguarded land, and the designations currently applied to this land reflect its existing use. This would not necessarily preclude development if alternative open space provision was made.

Recommendation

4.18 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/UR7.2 AND SOM/BN/OS4/278: Fagley

Objectors

2939/10713	<i>Brenda Howorth</i>
4122/8546	<i>Brighthouse Estates Ltd</i>
4645/10312	<i>FLAG</i>

Summary of Objections

- This area is already in mixed uses which are beneficial to the community, but which could be lost under the terms of the RDDP proposals.
- Development would fill in an urban greenspace of recreational and psychological value.
- Mixed use area designation is not necessary to accommodate the expansion of the Bradford Industrial Museum.
- The policy and supporting text should be broadened to allow flexibility for a wider range of uses, and to clarify the reference to the Fagley regeneration area.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

4.19 The eastern part of this land consists of grassed fields but, to my mind, the site as a whole is located within the urban area. There are extensive housing estates on all sides, with only a relatively narrow connection to the Green Belt to the south-east. There is a good deal of developed and previously-developed land within the site too. I set out my views on meeting the housing requirement elsewhere, in the Policy Framework volume of this report. There is a need for urban greenfield land to be allocated to meet the requirement, and the sustainability of the Fagley mixed use area is illustrated by the availability of bus services, including a 10-minute frequency service along Harrogate Road. There is also a need to increase the amount of employment in Bradford. The Council's policies for recreation and open space, and the benefits of keeping the existing uses undisturbed, must be balanced against development needs.

4.20 The fields and overgrown parts of the area are not in my view particularly attractive, and there is no expert evidence that they are of special wildlife value. The species assemblage

mentioned by FLAG is not such as to justify keeping the land permanently open, although parts of the area could be retained in open uses. I do not see that the wildlife in those areas would be significantly harmed by building on other sections of the area. A degree of separation of different communities within this part of the city would continue to be achieved by the allocation as urban greenspace of the valley in the southern part of the area, and by the continued activities of Fagley quarry. The Local Education Authority has not expressed a requirement for land near St. Luke's School. The management of the soccer pitch in the south-eastern corner of the site is a matter for the owner.

- 4.21 It is national policy to concentrate development in urban areas, and previously-developed land will play its part in meeting needs in Bradford District. The value to local people of the open land at Fagley is considerable, but in order to avoid a shortfall in housing, in particular, or the excessive spread of development into the countryside, the allocation for development of the majority of this land is necessary. Town cramming need not result, if layout and design are carefully handled. I also acknowledge the success of the riding school, and its varied contribution to the community, but again this, with the other matters raised by objectors, does not outweigh the need for development and the suitability of this site. Loss of jobs at the riding school would be more than made up for, in terms of numbers, by the expansion of the employment area at the northern end of the site.
- 4.22 It is true to say that the area is in mixed use now, but more intensive use would benefit the district as a whole. The potential uses are as mentioned in the RDDP, namely housing, employment and recreation. Housing could be protected from the effects of quarrying by means such as the provision of landscaped buffers. In the south-western section of the land there are opportunities for the expansion of Bradford Industrial Museum or other uses in association with the museum. Although FLAG criticises the Council for selling off museum facilities, its representations also appear to support museum use of some of the adjacent land.
- 4.23 With the variety of uses on the land at present, and the potential for developing these uses further, a mixed use allocation is appropriate. A further argument in favour of a mixed use area designation is the need to plan and negotiate in order to secure future comprehensive development. An improved access is necessary, and the RDDP proposes one off Harrogate Road (see BN/TM/20.6 below). The Council hopes, by negotiation, to retain the riding school. A large area of the site west of Fagley Lane comprises the active Fagley quarry, with Radfield quarry, where extraction has ceased, to the north. It may be that quarrying will continue for the permitted period until 2042, and I recommend elsewhere that all active quarries be shown on the Proposals Map, but the mixed use area notation gives the opportunity for the owners and the Council to discuss other possibilities for land owned by Brighouse Estates Ltd. Overall, the complexities of the site also tell against specific allocations for particular land uses at this stage.
- 4.24 The detailed objection of Brighouse Estates Ltd does not itself specify what other uses might be suitable. I recommend below against the objection requesting a landfill allocation. However this objector has noticed an error in the supporting text of the RDDP, and the Council suggests a correction, which I support.
- 4.25 Purely for the purposes of assessing housing land availability I make an assumption concerning the areas which might be developed for housing during the plan period. The assumption is based on the housing locations suggested in the supporting text, namely east of Fagley Lane in 2 parts separated by the open valley I have already referred to,

and, in the area west of Fagley Lane, at Haigh Fold. This might give about 8 hectares of land. I assume, again purely for the purposes of land availability calculations, that development would be at the lower figure used by the Council in their calculations. This figure averages 34 dwellings per hectare. Applying the density to the possible housing area results in an assumed dwelling total of about 270. These count towards the phase 2 requirement, given the urban greenfield status of the land, and the need for access provision. I note that the comprehensive development of the area has been a proposal of the Council for many years, but an assumption of housing development in phase 2 gives time for obstacles to development to be overcome by determined efforts on the part of the Council.

Recommendation

- 4.26 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by replacing the phrase “Fagley Regeneration Area”, in line one of the text concerning this objection area, by the phrase “Fagley mixed use area”.**

BN/UR7.4: Little Germany, Cathedral Quarter, Barkerend, Canal Road/Valley Road

Objector

3809/12685 *J J Gallagher Ltd*

Summary of Objection

- It is inappropriate to single out the Shipley Paints site for specific guidance in relation to uses.
- Object to the reference to the supplementary planning guidance (SPG) for Little Germany.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.27 The Shipley Paints, or Millennium Gate, site is located at the junction of Leeds Road and the Airedale Ring Road, on the edge of Little Germany remote from the city centre, but in a very prominent location from the major road network. The buildings on the site at present are small in scale and in a dilapidated condition, and appear incongruous in the context of the general character of the Little Germany area. Both the objector and the Council wish to see the early redevelopment of the site. The objector is concerned that the wording proposed in the RDDP could preclude schemes coming forward if they did not include “commercial and small-scale leisure activities, attracting evening patronage”. The objector doubts the viability of such uses.
- 4.28 Discussions have taken place in an attempt to find a wording acceptable to both parties, and the Council suggested an alternative wording which would provide for prestige residential, office or hotel development. It then added that developers should give consideration to use of the ground floor frontage for a mix of leisure and commercial activities which would help enhance the vitality of the Little Germany area. The objector is not satisfied that its concerns have been fully addressed, although it welcomes the acknowledgement that the site is suitable for a range of uses.

- 4.29 This is clearly a visually important site, and its early development with a suitably designed building would significantly enhance the area. I therefore consider that the Council’s alternative wording in referring to a “prestige” development for residential, office or hotel is an improvement. However, being remote from the city centre and adjoining the main roads, I consider that this is probably the part of the Little Germany area least suited to the type of small scale retail and leisure uses envisaged by the Council. The text of the RDDP already refers to the range of uses that would be acceptable in the area as a whole, mentioning those areas where dead ground floor frontages should be avoided. The objection site is not one of those areas but the Council indicated that it would wish all developments throughout Little Germany to consider the introduction of such uses on the ground floor. In this context, I see no need for a specific reference in relation to this site, and I appreciate the objector’s concern that this wording could give rise to objections to redevelopment proposals that did not include retail or leisure activities on the ground floor.
- 4.30 In relation to the SPG, the objector’s concern is that the Council did not take account of their representations, and the guidance in relation to this site does not reflect the realistic development potential of the site. Whilst I appreciate that the SPG does not accord with the objector’s views on the future of the objection site, this was subject to public consultation and has been adopted as Council policy. I therefore consider that it should be referred to, but clearly where there is a difference between the SPG and the RDDP the latter would carry greater weight, and the Council will no doubt review the SPG once the Replacement UDP has been adopted in order to ensure consistency.

Recommendation

- 4.31 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the sentence “As such, the site could accommodate a range of commercial and small scale leisure activities, attracting evening patronage.”, and its replacement by “As such, the site could accommodate a prestige residential, office or hotel development.”, but that no modification be made in respect of the reference to SPG.**

SOM/BN/UR7/143, SOM/BN/UR9/143, SOM/BN/E6/143 & SOM/BN/CF6/143: Land at Sticker Lane, Laisterdyke, Bradford (BN/E6.1 part)

Objector

2676/8526, 8530 *Hartley Property Trust Ltd*
10820 & 10821

Summary of Objections

- The site should be allocated as a mixed use area to include residential, retail and leisure uses.
- The site should not be subject to Policy UR9.
- The site should not be subject to Policy CF6.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.32 This site contains a number of employment buildings, some of which are vacant. It was included in an Employment Zone (Policy E6) in the FDDP, but the designation has now

been removed from this site, together with land to the south of the railway, which has been included in the Cutler Heights mixed use area. To the north and east of the site are residential properties, and there are employment uses on the opposite side of the main road.

- 4.33 The mixed use area to the south is extensive, with a number of different uses, and requires a comprehensive planning framework to resolve the land use issues and other concerns. The objection site is different in character, being almost entirely in employment use, and physically separated from the mixed use area by the railway. I see no basis for including this land within the Cutler Heights mixed use area and, in isolation, it is not of sufficient size to require specific policy guidance.
- 4.34 Since the site is no longer included in an Employment Zone, development for other uses would be permitted if the buildings became functionally redundant for employment use, subject to compliance with other policies of the RDDP. Retail or leisure uses, other than those to meet local needs, would be unlikely to be acceptable but residential development would appear to be an appropriate alternative use for the site.
- 4.35 The site is within the Regen 2000 SRB area, which is a scheme administered by Yorkshire Forward, and the extent of the SRB area cannot be altered through the RDDP. However, Policy UR9 has now been deleted from the RDDP, and replaced by lower case text, and I have recommended that the SRB areas be removed from the Proposals Map.
- 4.36 In relation to Policy CF6, the Council points out that the Community Priority Areas have been widely drawn, and there are sites within them, such as this, that are unsuitable for community use. In addition, I have recommended that Policy CF6 be modified to relate only to open space or other land in community use, and hence it would not apply to the objection site. However, I do not consider that the boundaries of the Community Priority Area should be changed.

Recommendation

- 4.37 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/UR9.1 & BN/UR9.2: Newlands SRB3 & Bradford Moor - Regen 2000

Objector

954/12864, 12865 & 13028 *Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber*

Summary of Objections

- Where there are no land use proposals, the areas on the Proposals Map need to be referenced to the Policy Framework and Proposals Report.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.38 Policy UR9 has been deleted from the RDDP, and replaced by lower case text. The Council's proposed changes of January 2003 would amend this text, and repeat it in this section of the Bradford North Constituency Report. I am recommending further

modifications to paragraphs 4.45 and 4.45a to remove references to the Proposals Map and to replace “should accord” with “should have regard to”.

- 4.39 The removal of these areas from the Proposals Map would appear to meet this objection, and I see no need to modify this section of the report. Neither do I consider it necessary to repeat the text of paragraph 4.45a but, if this is to be included, it should be modified as I recommend elsewhere.

Recommendation

- 4.40 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

POLICY OMISSION BN/UR/28: Leeds/Bradford Strategic Regeneration Corridor

Objector

4197/5947 *Consortium of Developers*

Summary of Objection

- The plan should include a policy that identifies the Leeds - Bradford corridor as a regeneration priority in line with the strategy set out in RPG12 and the 2020 Vision document.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.41 Both RPG12 and the 2020 Vision refer to the importance of the Leeds - Bradford axis in terms of economic regeneration. The RDDP makes brief reference this to in Chapter 4 of the Policy Framework. The area contains a number of general and site-specific policies and allocations, including an SRB area, employment zone, mixed use area, and sites for housing, employment and recreational uses. Leeds Road is defined as a gateway route and part of the bus priority network.
- 4.42 However, the objection points out that there is no overall strategic statement for the area that would bring greater emphasis and attention to the needs and opportunities that exist in the part of the plan area that provides the closest physical links between Bradford and Leeds.
- 4.43 In view of the importance given to the Leeds - Bradford axis in RPG12 and the 2020 Vision I would have expected the RDDP to have given greater emphasis to it. I accept that there are various land use allocations and policy areas indicated within this corridor in the RDDP, and there are few opportunities for major site developments in such a densely developed area. Yet the urban areas of Leeds and Bradford almost coalesce in this location, and this proximity could be an important feature in drawing commercial investment towards the Bradford centre.
- 4.44 Policy S2 of RPG12 provides for the identification of local regeneration areas in development plans in order to focus investment on areas of greatest need. Policy S3 emphasises that local authorities and other local and regional agencies should work together to foster renaissance of existing settlements. The RDDP identifies a variety of regeneration areas and initiatives but these are not given policy status, as they do not

comply with the advice in PPG12. Similarly, the type of policy originally suggested in the objection lacks specificity, due in part to the fact that the area identified as the corridor is large and very varied in its activities, needs, problems and opportunities. Such a policy does not sit happily with advice in PPG12 and the Good Practice Guide.

- 4.45 Conversely, the amended policy suggested by the objector seeks to commit the Council to actions that have not been considered by it. In my view it would be more appropriate, and advantageous, to expand the supporting text of the RDDP to indicate that the corridor is of potential significance in strengthening and exploiting the commercial investment links between Leeds and Bradford. A statement that recognises the importance of these physical and economic linkages, and sets out an overview of the relevant land use and transport policies and allocations of the RDDP in this area, would be helpful. Whilst the current development plan process is perhaps not the appropriate vehicle for the inclusion of the regeneration strategy proposed by the objection, it may well be that forthcoming changes in the process may provide for the preparation of such a local area-based strategy.
- 4.46 It would be appropriate to include a statement at the beginning of the supporting text on Area Based Regeneration Strategies, and I suggest wording in my recommendation.

Recommendation

- 4.47 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the inclusion of additional supporting text as follows:**

After the heading "Area Based Regeneration Strategies" insert -

The Council recognises the importance of developing economic linkages with Leeds as part of the strategy of economic regeneration. The area astride Leeds Road provides the closest physical link between the main urban areas of Bradford and Leeds and includes important public transport routes. Proposals in the Plan include the enhancement of these routes together with policies and allocations relating to the Single Regeneration Budget, employment zone, mixed use area, district centre, housing and recreation. Together with the 2020 Vision, the Council's Economic Strategy and the Transport Plan, these will form the basis of an Area Based Regeneration Strategy to be produced at an early stage.

Chapter 5: Economy and Employment

BN/E1.3: Birch Lane, Bowling, Bradford

Objector

4164/10284 & 10805 Mr E Sharp/Jespro Limited

Summary of Objections

- The site should not be restricted to employment use and other uses, including non-food retail, leisure and showroom development, should be permitted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.1 The site is adjacent to the Eurocam Technology Park and is now linked to it by a new access road. It is located at the end of the M606, which connects directly to the M62. It is also very close to a major junction with main roads linking to all parts of the city and surrounding area. This is a greenfield site within the strategic development corridor, and I am not aware of any physical constraints to development. Adjacent sites have been or are being developed with employment units, and there is a large hotel close by. The site is close to major residential areas with easy access for potential employees.
- 5.2 I consider that this is a prime site in a strategic location and it is correctly allocated for employment purposes. As clarified at the Inquiry, Policy E1 does not restrict development to B1, B2 and B8 uses, and the RDDP does not specify the site as being restricted to core employment only. Accordingly, uses other than core employment activities are not unacceptable in this location. Whilst these would not include non-food retailing, other uses, including car sales, vehicle repair and maintenance, health care facilities and tourism related developments, are not ruled out. I consider that this provides a generous degree of flexibility for the development of the land.

Recommendation

- 5.3 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/E1.14, SOM/BN/OS4/16, SOM/BN/OS7/16 & SOM/BN/GB1/16: Harrogate Road, Greengates, Bradford SOM/BN/E1/5.01 & SOM/BN/GB1/5.01: Land at Carr Bottom Road, Greengates, Bradford (Site A)

Objectors

<i>165/1453</i>	<i>Mr & Mrs Tom & Eva Booth</i>
<i>315/1419</i>	<i>Ms Joanne Cutter</i>
<i>348/1813 & 3603</i>	<i>Mrs Ann Lesley El'Abdli</i>
<i>601/1805 & 4079</i>	<i>V & J Fraser</i>
<i>685/1501</i>	<i>Miss Sarah Spencer</i>
<i>1111/1779</i>	<i>Mrs Louise McDonagh</i>
<i>1223/1814 & 3601</i>	<i>John & Pauline Corbin</i>
<i>1293/1817 & 3591</i>	<i>Mrs J Crellin</i>
<i>1298/1821</i>	<i>Mr Donald Stansby</i>

1335/1809 & 4075	<i>Mrs E Wade</i>
1570/1824 & 3588	<i>Mrs Janet Lawreniuk</i>
1663/1788	<i>Mr W M German</i>
1664/1823 & 3589	<i>Greengates & District Community Council</i>
1716/1812 & 3606	<i>J Topham</i>
1937/1818 & 3590	<i>Mr & Mrs James & Janet Lambert</i>
3085/8385 & 11155	<i>Apperley Bridge Development Residents Association</i>
3904/6613/14	<i>Mrs Ann Ozolins</i>
4217/8522 & 8518/19	<i>Mr K Norris</i>
4240/9887	<i>Mr Anthony Stockdale</i>
4281/8136/7	<i>Lily Wong & Harvey Jones</i>
4286/8140 & 8156	<i>Mr Tim Lester</i>
4440/10287 & 10294/5	<i>Miss Anne Wallace</i>

Summary of Objections

- There is no need for employment land in this locality and the site should be designated as Green Belt, recreational open space or village greenspace.
- Development for employment purposes will create unacceptable traffic congestion and harm to the safety of pedestrians, including schoolchildren.
- Additional land to the south-east should be included in the employment allocation.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.4 The site fronts onto Harrogate Road but at a higher ground level with a retaining wall varying from some 1.5 to about 3.0 metres in height. The land is currently used for grazing, as is that to the south-east. Apart from this and the Stylo Barratt premises to the north the remainder of the surrounding area is primarily residential in character, together with shops and other local services and facilities.
- 5.5 The land is allocated for employment use in the adopted UDP (having previously been within the Green Belt) on the basis of the need for accessible employment sites and the lack of harm to the purposes of the Green Belt. I consider that there remains a need for strategically located land for employment that cannot be provided by many of the previously-developed sites within the inner urban areas. The site adjoins the main A658 Harrogate Road, is close to the junction with the A657 road to Shipley and Leeds, and is only some 5 kilometres from the Leeds-Bradford International Airport. It adjoins employment uses to the north and is close to large residential areas where there are said to be high levels of unemployment.
- 5.6 I note that the Council no longer considers the site to be a prime location for employment due to physical constraints, including the difference in ground levels. However, the acceptance of a wider range of employment uses, including tourism, leisure and health care activities, should stimulate development interest and provide important employment opportunities in this area.
- 5.7 I accept that the former employment site on the other side of Harrogate Road is now being developed for housing due, at least in part, to the difficulty of securing commercially viable employment redevelopment. However, that site was previously occupied by old, out-dated buildings associated with a former mill that generally proved unsuited to modern employment uses. The objection site is not subject to such

limitations and restrictions and, as I have indicated, a wider range of employment uses is acceptable.

- 5.8 The difference in ground level and the height of the retaining wall also dictate that the open nature of the site has limited visual impact from Harrogate Road. Although the land is clearly used by local residents for informal recreational purposes there is no authorised public access to or public rights of way over the land. No open space or recreational designation is justified. I also consider that the land is not significant to the functions of the Green Belt or the purposes of including land within it.
- 5.9 I note that Harrogate Road and the junction with the A657 suffer from significant traffic congestion. However, a lights-controlled junction for the access to the residential area on the opposite side of Harrogate Road adjoins the site, and there are proposals for the improvement of the A657 junction, including the installation of pedestrian crossing facilities. The specialist traffic and highways evidence has considered a variety of employment uses for the site and concludes, subject to the proposed junction improvements, that there are no transport related reasons why the site should not be allocated for employment. This evidence has not been challenged.
- 5.10 Turning to the objection proposing that the employment allocation should be extended onto land to the south-east, this land, like the allocated site, is contained by rising ground to the south and east. It differs little from the allocated site, except that at its southern end it would project further into the open land to the east. This would make it more noticeable from houses on Carr Bottom Road. In my view this problem could be solved by landscaping and by drawing back the south-eastern corner of the development itself. Within the context of a general need to review the Green Belt in the District, and bearing in mind the need to provide employment land, I consider that there are exceptional circumstances to release the extension land from the Green Belt. I also draw attention to my recommendation below to delete from the Green Belt the area to the east. Extension of the allocation would render access to the whole site more viable, although I doubt that it would be unviable without the extension.
- 5.11 Taking all these matters into account, I consider that site E1.14 is correctly allocated for employment use, and its development would not result in harm to the remainder of the Green Belt or the character and appearance of the surrounding area. Furthermore, I am satisfied that vehicular access can be provided without resulting in harm to the free flow of traffic on Harrogate Road or the safety of highway users, including pedestrians. The extension of the employment allocation on to land to the south-east is warranted.

Recommendation

- 5.12 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion from the Green Belt of the extension land south-east of site BN/E1.14, and by the addition of this extension land to the employment allocation, but that no further modification be made.**

SOM/BN/E1/199.02, BN/E1.12 & SOM/BN/GB1/199: Site B, Land adjacent to Gain Lane Employment Site (BN/E1.12)

Objector

4172/8474 & 8479 *Trustees of A Vint*

Summary of Objections

- The land designated as Green Belt should be re-allocated as an extension to the adjoining employment site (BN/E1.12).

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.13 I accept that site E1.12 and the objection land have many common characteristics. Whilst the objection site is at a slightly higher level than BN/E1.12, development on this land need not be unduly prominent or intrusive, or result in material harm to the openness of the Green Belt beyond Woodhall Road.
- 5.14 In terms of the functions and purposes of the Green Belt, the land would be surrounded on three sides by urban development, and the area beyond Woodhall Road is different in character, use and function. I do not consider that the site serves to prevent the sprawl of urban development between Bradford and Leeds, or the coalescence of these areas. It is not in productive agricultural use and, particularly with the allocation of BN/E1.12 for employment use, does not form an important lung of open countryside into the built-up area. Hence it fails to satisfy essential functions of, and purposes for including land within, the Green Belt.
- 5.15 The RDDP boundary line of the Green Belt is marked by a fragmented line of fence, wall and hedge and does not satisfy the criteria set out in PPG2. Woodhall Road, although an unmade country lane in this location, forms a more acceptable, distinctive, robust and defensible boundary.
- 5.16 I am aware exceptional circumstances are required to delete land from the Green Belt. The RDDP has been stated by the Council to be a replacement plan, rather than a review. Hence the opportunity should be taken to consider allocations afresh rather than be unduly constrained by the current adopted UDP. The Inspector who conducted the Inquiry into the adopted UDP recommended that a review of the Green Belt should be undertaken. Changes in national and regional policy guidance place increased emphasis on locating new development in sustainable locations within existing urban areas, and the objection site adjoins the main urban area close to local services and facilities and areas of high unemployment. In addition, my deliberations reported elsewhere have led me to recommend the deletion and/or re-allocation of proposed employment sites which would result in the reduction of the amount of land available for employment use. The objection site is in a strategic and accessible location to provide an important replacement for some of these losses. Hence, I consider that sufficient exceptional circumstances exist to warrant the deletion of the Green Belt designation.
- 5.17 The land suffers from many of the problems of the urban fringe location. I note that the Council is currently involved, with neighbouring authorities and local community organisations, in establishing a programme for the active management of such areas. However, I have no evidence that this will lead to early action to combat the problems being experienced in this location.
- 5.18 It is well-documented that the topography of Bradford limits the availability of good quality, extensive, strategically located sites for employment. As I have already noted, the area adjacent to the objection site suffers from social deprivation and high unemployment and the site itself is in a strategic and accessible location.

5.19 At the Inquiry it was agreed that I should also consider the allocation of the land as safeguarded land, as a fall-back position if appropriate. That matter is not appropriate unless the Council do not accept my recommendation. In those circumstances I consider that the site should be designated as safeguarded land to provide for the longer-term employment needs of the area.

Recommendation

5.20 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the Green Belt designation and the allocation of the objection site for employment use under Policy E1. If the Council does not accept this I consider that the land should be designated as safeguarded land.**

SOM/BN/E3/57: Stylo House, Apperley Bridge, Bradford

Objector

4132/8550 *Stylo Barratt Properties Ltd*

Summary of Objection

- The site is no longer suited to modern employment uses and should not be considered to be an existing employment site under Policy E3. The site should be redeveloped for housing or a mixed use of housing and offices.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.21 I have given detailed consideration to this site in relation to reference SOM/BN/H1/57 below. Policy E3 permits redevelopment for uses other than employment if the buildings have become functionally redundant. As my consideration in relation to the above reference makes clear, I conclude that the great majority of the buildings are capable of alternative employment use. Therefore they are not functionally redundant and allocation for housing or a mixed use of housing and offices is not appropriate.

Recommendation

5.22 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

SOM/BN/E6/136: Land at Queens Road, Bradford (BN/E6.2 part)

Objector

4135/8540 *Dixon Motors Plc*

Summary of Objection

- The land should be excluded from the employment zone in order to afford more flexibility of use.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.23 The question of flexibility of use within employment zones was discussed at the Inquiry, and this matter is considered in the Policy Framework volume of my report, under Policy E6. As clarified at the Inquiry, acceptable uses within employment zones are not restricted to B1, B2 and B8, except on sites that are specifically stated to be for core employment uses only. Other than on those specific sites, uses that generate employment and support the business and industrial activities in the area are acceptable.
- 5.24 The Council has agreed that car sales and repairs provide employment opportunities and are acceptable in employment zones. I consider that this particular location is an important part of the Canal Road Employment Zone and such allocation is a necessary and reasonable part of the strategy for the provision and retention of employment land.

Recommendation

- 5.25 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

SOM/BN/E6/137: Land at Kings Road, Bradford (BN/E6.2 part)

Objector

4135/10822 *Dixon Motors Plc*

Summary of Objection

- The land should be excluded from the employment zone in order to afford more flexibility of use.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.26 Again, the question of flexibility of use within employment zones was discussed at the Inquiry, and this matter is considered in the Policy Framework volume of my report, under Policy E6. As clarified at the Inquiry, acceptable uses within employment zones are not restricted to B1, B2 and B8, except on sites that are specifically stated to be for core employment uses only. Other than on those specific sites, uses that generate employment and support the business and industrial activities in the area are acceptable.
- 5.27 The Council has agreed that car sales and repairs provide employment opportunities and are acceptable in employment zones. I consider that this particular location is an important part of the Canal Road Employment Zone and such allocation is a necessary and reasonable part of the strategy for the provision and retention of employment land.

Recommendation

- 5.28 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

SOM/BN/E6/139: Arnold Lavers, Canal Road, Bradford (BN/E6.2 part)

Objector

4126/10038 *Arnold Laver & Co Ltd*

Summary of Objection

- The land should be allocated for housing.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.29 I accept that there may be a need for the restructuring of the operations of the current employment user in order to adapt to changing market circumstances, and that this could result in the concentration of activities on other land from which the company operates. I also note that the south-eastern part of the site adjoins existing housing which, together with its narrowness, could restrict employment activities. However, such land appears to be used at present for car parking and open storage - uses that are not unique to the current occupier - and redevelopment for housing of this section alone would be difficult.

5.30 However, employment land in strategic, accessible locations is limited, and proximity to local services and facilities, including public transport and the city centre, is important for employment as well as housing uses. Whilst the site may be generally somewhat long and narrow it is clearly capable of accommodating fairly large buildings together with reasonable circulation space, and has the benefit of a good access onto a major road. Therefore, I consider that the site is important to the provision of employment land within the district and that its designation within an employment zone is appropriate.

Recommendation

5.31 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

SOM/BN/E6/142 & SOM/BN/UR7/142: Whitehead's, New Lane, Bradford (BN/E6.1 part)

Objector

2787/8532 & 8534 *W & J Whitehead (Laisterdyke) Ltd*

Summary of Objections

- The land should be withdrawn from the employment zone and designated as a mixed use area.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.32 The area contains a variety of uses, including employment, housing and some open space/vacant land. Much of the employment space was occupied by Whiteheads, which has now ceased to operate and the former mill buildings appear to be largely vacant and unused. Some adjacent newer buildings, together with the area to the north of the former mill, continue in employment use.

- 5.33 In the RDDP the allocated employment sites were deleted and the area added to the Cutler Heights mixed use area, but the objections have not been withdrawn.
- 5.34 Whilst the loss of strategically located land allocated for employment use should not be lightly agreed to, I agree with the objector and the Council that it is unlikely that the former mill buildings can be brought back into employment use. The land is adjacent to the Cutler Heights mixed use area, and parts of it are appropriate for housing development to assist in meeting the needs of the district and making use of previously-developed land.
- 5.35 In these circumstances I agree that the land would be appropriately designated as a mixed use area under Policy UR7. It has been suggested that, in addition to housing, the mixed use area should include retail and leisure uses. In my view the land would be suitable for B1, B2 and B8 uses, together with non-core employment activities and housing, subject to compliance with the other policies of the RDDP. I note that it is the Council's intention to produce supplementary planning guidance for this area.

Recommendation

- 5.36 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

SOM/BN/E6/142.01 & SOM/BN/UR7/142.01: Whitehead's, New Lane, Bradford (BN/E6.1 part)

Objector

4531/10049/50 *P Dunn & S R Thomas receivers W & J Whitehead Ltd*

Summary of Objections

- The land should be designated as a mixed use area instead of an employment zone.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.37 This matter refers to an area included within that considered in relation to SOM/BN/E6/142 above. It contains the buildings previously occupied by Whiteheads - both the former mill buildings (now generally vacant and unused) and some newer buildings still in and/or capable of employment use.
- 5.38 As I have already indicated, the RDDP has included the site within the Cutler Heights Mixed use Area. I consider that such designation is appropriate and reasonable.

Recommendation

- 5.39 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

POLICY OMISSION BN/E/54/1: Local Policy for Birch La. Bradford North

Objector

4164/10805

Mr E Sharp/Jespro Limited

Summary of Objection

- The site should not be restricted to employment use and other uses, including non-food retail, leisure and showroom development, should also be permitted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.40 This matter is considered in relation to reference BN/E1.3 above, where I conclude that the site is appropriately allocated under Policy E1 of the RDDP. The site is not restricted to core employment uses and, therefore, whilst non-food retail is not acceptable, other uses that generate employment and support the industrial and business activities of the area are permissible. Therefore, a specific local policy for this site is not necessary or reasonable.

Recommendation

5.41 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

Chapter 6: Housing

PARAGRAPH 6.0

Objector

954/12857

Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber

Summary of Objection

- It is difficult to understand how much greenfield land is being allocated because the constituency volumes do not contain this information for each site.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.1 In view of the importance of this information the site specific data in the constituency volumes should state whether each housing site is greenfield land or previously-developed land.

Recommendation

- 6.2 **I recommend the modification of the RDDP by the inclusion of information, for each housing site listed in the Bradford North constituency volume, as to whether the site is a greenfield site or previously-developed land.**

BN/H1.1: Plumpton Mead, Idle, Bradford

Objector

2635/8012

Miss S F A Walker

Summary of Objection

- There should be no further housing in Idle without additional school and highways provision.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.3 This site has now been developed, mainly with two-bedroomed bungalows, and it would therefore be inappropriate to delete the allocation. The Council accept that the nearest primary school is at capacity, and others are some distance away. However, the form of development provided is unlikely to create significant demand for school places. The Council do not comment on the highways provision, but the capacity of the highway network would have been taken into account when planning permission was granted.

Recommendation

- 6.4 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/H1.2: Wrose Road/Kings Drive, Bolton, Bradford

Objectors

These are listed in the appendix to this report.

Summary of Objections

- This is a valuable and much needed open space.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.5 The housing allocation is deleted in the RDDP and replaced by an open space allocation. I support this as the site is part of a maintained, used and needed recreation area.

Recommendation

6.6 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/H1.3: Javelin Close/Northedge Meadows, Idle, Bradford

Objector

2635/8019 *Miss S F A Walker*

Summary of Objection

- There should be no further housing in Idle without additional school and highways provision.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.7 This is a former quarry and landfill site within the main urban area, well located for local facilities, including schools, and public transport. Planning permission has been granted for residential development and construction has started. It would therefore be inappropriate to delete the allocation.

Recommendation

6.8 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/H1.4: Leeds Road, Eccleshill, Bradford

Objector

570/1500 *Mr N W Harris*

Summary of Objection

- The site should remain undeveloped, so children have somewhere to play.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.9 This is a previously-developed site within the main urban area of Bradford, and hence the first choice in the location strategy for housing set out in the RDDP. It is well located for schools, local facilities and public transport. Although the closest schools are currently at full capacity, there are other schools with places available and the Council is satisfied that there are unlikely to be problems with school places. I therefore consider that it is an appropriate site for housing.
- 6.10 The school playing fields are not included in the development site and, although part of the allocated site was previously open, I accept the Council's view that, since this was within the curtilage of the school building, it is part of the previously-developed site.

Recommendation

- 6.11 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/H1.21: Overland Crescent/Apperley Road, Greengates, Bradford

Objectors

1423/1764 *Mr and Mrs Ball*

Summary of Objection

- The site should be deleted because of lack of highway capacity, and used for community facilities.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.12 Planning permission has been granted for the erection of 18 dwellings on this site, and construction has started. It would therefore be inappropriate to delete the allocation. Whilst the objectors acknowledge the fact that development is taking place, they have maintained their objection as they are still concerned about the impact on the local roads. This is part of a larger development and an additional 18 dwellings is unlikely to have a significant effect on traffic volumes in the area.

Recommendation

- 6.13 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/H1.22: Springfield Works, Bradford Road, Idle, Bradford

Objector

2635/8023 *Miss S F A Walker*

Summary of Objection

- There should be no further housing in Idle without additional school and highways provision.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.14 This is a previously-developed site within the main urban area, planning permission has been granted for 55 dwellings, and construction has started. It would therefore be inappropriate to delete the allocation. The Council advises that there are two primary schools within walking distance of the site, one of which has adequate capacity to serve the site. The Council does not comment on highway provision, but this will have been taken into account when the planning application was considered, and I see no reason to doubt that the highway network can accommodate the traffic generated by this site.

Recommendation

6.15 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/H1.24: Highfield Avenue, Idle, Bradford

Objectors

2486/5470 *Mr David Farrar*
2635/1956 & 8018 *Miss S F A Walker*
4046/8184 *Mr Paul Holmes*

Summary of Objections

- There should be no development on the Santa Monica side of this site because of landslip danger, loss of privacy and wildlife value.
- There should be no further housing in Idle without additional school and highways provision.
- There should be no access to Ashton Walk, All Alone Road, Kenstone Crescent or Sandhill Fold.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.16 This site has housing on three sides, although there is an area of unallocated land between the site and the new housing to the north. The Council refers to a number of planning permissions for individual dwellings but only one is within the allocated site. The site is generally at a higher level than the adjoining development, and the Council described it as "brownfield land". However, it has substantial tree and shrub cover and is no doubt of some value for wildlife.
- 6.17 Since this is a site within the main urban area, it is a sustainable location for new housing, in accordance with the strategy of the RDDP and the advice in RPG12 and PPG3.
- 6.18 The Council has not commented on the detailed points made by objectors on the basis that planning permission has been granted. However, it would appear that the site could

accommodate more than the single house for which planning permission has been granted, and I therefore consider that the issues raised should be addressed. The Council has indicated in relation to other housing allocations in Idle that there is sufficient school capacity, and the traffic from a small site such as this would be unlikely to have any significant effect on the highway network. I can appreciate that surrounding residents would wish to see the land remain undeveloped, but I do not consider that the wildlife interest is such as to preclude development, and there is a very substantial area of open land to the west, which is designated as urban greenspace. Issues of privacy and site stability would have to be addressed in the context of a specific proposal.

Recommendation

6.19 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/H1.25, BN/H1.26 & BN/H1.27: Cote Farm (South, West & East), Thackley, Bradford

Objector

2110/1793, 1795 & 1797 *M W H Reynolds*

Summary of Objections

- There should be no additional housing in the area because of increased traffic, lack of community and infrastructure facilities, and need for green areas.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.20 All three of these sites now appear to be fully developed, and hence it would be inappropriate to delete them from the Plan.

Recommendation

6.21 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/H1.28: Park Road, Thackley, Bradford

Objector

4650/9872 *Ms Margaret Robson*

Summary of Objection

- The housing allocation should be deleted.
- Access would cause traffic congestion.
- The trees must remain.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.22 This site is part of the grounds of Park Lodge, and has a number of trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order. It is an attractive green space, although largely screened from

public view by a hedge and wall. However, it is within the urban area of Bradford, well located for public transport and local facilities, and hence a sustainable location for development. Whilst the preserved trees will need to be taken into account in any proposals for the site, I do not consider that these would preclude development.

6.23 I note that Park Road provides access to a school but accept the Council's view that a safe access can be provided. The volume of traffic from the site, and the adjoining site H1.29, is unlikely to have any significant effect on traffic conditions in the wider area.

Recommendation

6.24 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/H1.29: Park Avenue, Thackley, Bradford

Objector

4650/9871 *Ms Margaret Robson*

Summary of Objection

- The housing allocation should be deleted.
- Access would cause traffic congestion.
- The protected trees need to be preserved.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.25 This site is part of the grounds of Park Lodge, and has a number of trees protected by a Tree Preservation Order. It is an attractive green space, but it is within the urban area of Bradford, well located for public transport and local facilities, and hence a sustainable location for development. Whilst the preserved trees will need to be taken into account in any proposals for the site, I do not consider that the value of the site as open space, or the need to retain the preserved trees, justify keeping it open.

6.26 I note that Park Road provides access to a school but accept the Council's view that a safe access can be provided. The volume of traffic from the site, and the adjoining site H1.28, is unlikely to have any significant effect on traffic conditions in the wider area.

Recommendation

6.27 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/H1.30: Hinchcliffe Street, Barkerend, Bradford

Objector

1257/888 *Mr C Ireland*

Summary of Objection

- The housing allocation should be deleted and the site remain as a play area.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.28 This was a housing allocation in the FDDP, but was deleted in the RDDP and the site allocated as an existing recreation area. The FDDP proposals have no formal status and, as the policy has been omitted from the RDDP, I do not conclude upon it.

Recommendation

6.29 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/H1.34: Keighley Road, Manningham, Bradford

Objector

180/1423 *Mr Koyas Ali*

Summary of Objection

- The allocation should be deleted as the area is already densely populated by housing sites.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.30 This is a small area of open land within the urban area. It is part of the curtilage of Bradford Grammar School and, as such, would come within the definition of previously-developed land, although PPG3 makes it clear that not all land within the curtilage of large buildings should normally be developed. However, this site is well located for local services and public transport, and a modest development need not have an adverse effect on the trees which adjoin the site, or on the associated wildlife. The Council acknowledges that vehicle access could be problematic but, provided this can be achieved, I see no reason why this development should not proceed.

Recommendation

6.31 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/H1.35 & SOM/BN/OS4/133: Beech Grove, Undercliffe

Objectors

4924/12415 *Cllrs R Sowman and E McNally*
4018/8536 *Brian Moore*

Summary of Objections

- The land should be safeguarded as part of UR5.1.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.32 This site comprises former tennis courts and allotments. It is allocated as a housing site in the adopted UDP but was shown as safeguarded land in the FDDP. It adjoins Bradford Moor Golf Course which I consider earlier in this report.
- 6.33 This is a site within the main urban area, near the centre of Bradford and close to frequent bus routes. Off-site highway works would be required at the junction with Pollard Lane but the Council is satisfied that this could be achieved to enable the site to come forward as a phase 1 allocation. The site is being promoted by REGEN 2000, possibly for large family housing for sale and for rent, although doubts were expressed at the Inquiry that this would come to fruition within 5 years. However, there is a need for housing sites in sustainable locations, and it would be inappropriate to delay or delete the allocation because development may not come forward as currently envisaged.
- 6.34 The objectors suggest that there is a lack of recreational and community resources in the area. From the Council's evidence, I am satisfied that this particular area is well provided with recreational open space and playing fields. The Council points out that, if there is community support for allotments, alternative provision should be made. I understand that there is a general need for additional community facilities but, in the absence of any specific proposal, I consider that it would be inappropriate to prevent development coming forward.

Recommendation

- 6.35 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/H1.37, BN/H1.38, SOM/BN/OS4/417 & BN/H1.39: Idlethorpe Way (North), Idlethorpe Way (South) & Savile Avenue, Thorpe Edge

Objectors

3549/12358, 12359 & 12360	<i>The Environment Agency - Development Planning</i>
4977/12280	<i>Rev Douglas E Legge</i>
5016/12511/12	<i>Mr Brian John Hughes BA</i>

Summary of Objections

- The allocations should be deleted because of flood risk, or a strategic flood risk assessment should be carried out to assess and mitigate the increased run-off.
- The land should be allocated as recreation open space and not lost as a green area.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.36 The objections by the Environment Agency relate to all three sites, whilst those by Rev Legge and Mr Hughes relate to site BN/H1.38 only.
- 6.37 These are all previously-developed sites within the urban area, the blocks of flats which occupied them having been demolished. Surface water would discharge into Haigh Beck, which has a history of flooding. However, the Environment Agency confirms that there

are methods of managing the flood risk, so that the situation following development of the sites would be no worse than, and possibly an improvement on, the current situation.

- 6.38 In the years since the previous development was demolished, site BN/H1.38 has become an attractive green area, with a number of significant trees which are protected by a Tree Preservation Order. I can well understand the objectors' wish to see the land remain in its present state, as an amenity to be enjoyed by residents in the area. However, there is a need for new housing within Bradford district, and both Government advice and the policies of the RDDP require that sites within urban areas are considered in preference to extensions to the urban areas or in other smaller settlements.
- 6.39 There is sufficient land allocated as open space within the area generally to meet the Council's standards and, although I appreciate that this may be of a different nature to the objection site, I do not consider that there is a need for open space sufficient to justify deleting this housing allocation. Neither do I consider that the nature conservation value of the site is such that it should remain open, and the protected trees would have to be retained in any development. The Council advises that the new development on the site should incorporate a play area. It was suggested at the Inquiry that provision could be made for a path along the edge of the site which would afford views over the lower lying development to the north-east to the countryside beyond.

Recommendation

- 6.40 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

SOM/BN/H1/4, SOM/BN/UR5/4 & SOM/BN/GB1/4: Land at Simpsons Green, Apperley Bridge, Bradford

Objector

4177/5495, 5789 & 8556 *Redrow Homes (Yorkshire) Ltd*

Summary of Objections

- The land should be excluded from the Green Belt and allocated for housing or, if not, identified as safeguarded land.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.41 This is a site on the edge of the main urban area, bounded by development on two sides, by the Leeds-Liverpool Canal and by an unmade track known as Mitchell Lane. It is attractive undulating pastureland, and can be viewed from the road frontage on Apperley Road, from the canal towpath, and from a number of more distant locations. Views from Mitchell Lane, which is a public footpath, are limited by a high wall, although buildings would be visible. In my opinion the most important views are from the canal and the road frontage, as any development would be seen as an extension to the existing built form from more distant viewpoints. Clearly development would change the character of this section of Apperley Road from rural to urban, but there is already development along the whole of the south side of the road, west of the canal bridge, and along much of the north side. I do not consider that the change in character would be unacceptable. The view from the canal is more sensitive since this is a conservation area. The Conservation Area

Statement refers to a number of listed buildings within the conservation area, and also to trees within the objection site, which are described as forming an important feature within the open landscape. The illustrative masterplan for the site showed an area of informal open space alongside the canal, together with structure planting to screen the proposed housing. This would reduce the impact of any development on the conservation area to a level that I consider would be acceptable.

- 6.42 The site is reasonably well located in relation to local services and public transport. Greengates Centre and Idle village centre are within 1200 metres, and there are a number of schools and other community facilities within a similar distance. Whilst many of these are beyond easy walking distance, they could be easily reached by bicycle, and there are regular bus services along Leeds Road. The site is also well located for access to the new railway station proposed at Apperley Bridge. Vehicle access to the site would be gained from Apperley Road and, although concerns were expressed about the effect of additional traffic on the highway network, it does not appear that these are so significant as to prevent development.
- 6.43 I therefore consider that this is land that could be considered for development at some time, but there are a number of disadvantages to this site. It is a greenfield site, which is prominent from a number of viewpoints, and is less sustainable than most sites within the urban area. There are also some concerns about the effect of a significant amount of extra traffic on the already congested highway network in this area. I do not therefore consider that the site should be allocated for development during the plan period.
- 6.44 However, in considering the general extent of the Green Belt earlier in the report, I have concluded that there is a need to remove a significant amount of land from the Green Belt, and to safeguard it to accommodate development needs beyond the plan period, up to 2026. In my view this site would be suitable for development in the longer term, and the need to provide safeguarded land is an exceptional circumstance, which justifies removing the land from the Green Belt.

Recommendation

- 6.45 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by designation of land at Simpsons Green, Apperley Bridge as safeguarded land under the terms of Policy UR5, and the deletion of the land from the Green Belt.**

SOM/BN/H1/5.02, SOM/BN/GB1/5 & SOM/BN/GB1/5.02: Land at Carr Bottom Road, Greengates, Bradford (Site B)

Objector

1129/8465

Mr P B Holmes

Summary of Objection

- The land should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

- 6.46 This site is an indentation on the edge of the main urban area. There is existing housing to the south, and an employment use to the north, whilst to the west is employment allocation BN/E1.14. There is an objection requesting an extension of this allocation onto part of the objection site. The eastern boundary of the site is not clearly defined but roughly follows the top of the partly wooded slope down to Carr Beck, and there is a related objection requesting the allocation of this land as open space. The housing objection site is grassland and, whilst there are no public footpaths across this area, it is clearly well used by local residents who no doubt appreciate the extensive views from this elevated land.
- 6.47 The site is well located in relation to local services, with Greengates centre being within walking distance, as well as schools and other community facilities. However, the only vehicular access to the land is from Carr Bottom Road which is very narrow at each end, and the alternative of access along Elder Street and Ash Grove is far from ideal.
- 6.48 Although this is an attractive area of land, this has to be balanced against its sustainability as a development site. In my view it could be considered for housing in the future if a satisfactory access could be provided, but it would be inappropriate to allocate it for housing at the present time because of the access constraint, its visual prominence, and the informal recreational use.
- 6.49 However, in considering the general extent of the Green Belt earlier in the report, I have concluded that there is a need to remove a significant amount of land from the Green Belt, and to safeguard it to accommodate development needs beyond the plan period, up to 2026. In my view this site would be suitable for development in the longer term, and the need to provide safeguarded land is an exceptional circumstance, which justifies removing the land from the Green Belt. The valley of the Carr Beck would fulfill the important roles of containing sprawl and separating the built up areas of Bradford and Leeds.

Recommendation

- 6.50 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by designation of land at Carr Bottom Road, Greengates as safeguarded land under the terms of Policy UR5 and the deletion of the land from the Green Belt.**

SOM/BN/H1/54, SOM/BN/UR5/54 & SOM/BN/GB1/54: Land at Lower Fagley, Bradford

Objectors

2563/8306 & 8308 *Focusmaster Ltd*
4122/8298, 8302 & *Brighouse Estates Ltd*
8304

Summary of Objections

- The land should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing or included as safeguarded land.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.51 This is a roughly triangular area of Green Belt land, bounded to the north by existing development, to the east by Fagley Brook, and open countryside beyond, and to the west by a dismantled railway line, separating the land from the Fagley mixed use area and an existing residential area.
- 6.52 Access to the land is along Fagley Road, which is of good width up to a short distance from the railway track, and there is a regular bus service with a turning facility here. I see no reason why the road could not be widened to provide improved access into the objection land. However, the land appears to be poorly related to local facilities with little in the way of shops, schools or employment within walking distance. In these circumstances, I consider that it would be inappropriate to allocate the land for housing at the present time. Similar considerations apply to the designation as safeguarded land, and I do not consider that it should be designated as such as long as more sustainable development opportunities remain.
- 6.53 Whilst there is some development on the land, it is mainly open, and serves a number of the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. In my view there are no exceptional circumstances to justify an alteration to the Green Belt boundary to exclude the objection site.

Recommendation

- 6.54 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

SOM/BN/H1/55.02-05: Land at Idle Moor (Sites B-E) (BN/OS1.2)

Objectors

4192/8339	<i>Mr P G Cookson</i>
4194/8349	<i>Mr M Slinger</i>
4195/8332	<i>Mr J Wood</i>
4190/8345	<i>Mr A Warren</i>

Summary of Objections

- The urban greenspace notation should be deleted. The sites are suitable for housing development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.55 I have considered this site in relation to BN/OS1.2 below, where I conclude that the urban greenspace designation is appropriate and that no housing allocation should be made.

Recommendation

- 6.56 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

SOM/BN/H1/57 & SOM/BN/E3/57: Stylo House, Apperley Bridge, Bradford

Objector

4132/8550 & 8552 *Stylo Barratt Properties Ltd*

Summary of Objections

- The site and buildings are no longer suited to the needs of the current occupier and do not lend themselves to the requirements of modern employment activities. There is an over-supply of such employment sites and a corresponding under-supply of housing land. Accordingly, the site should be allocated for housing, or mixed use with the frontage offices remaining in employment use and the remainder of the site redeveloped for housing.
- As previously-developed land within the main urban area, close to local services and facilities, including public transport, the housing should be allocated under Policy H1 for development in the early phase of the plan period.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.57 The site comprises a number of buildings of varying ages and forms that cover a high proportion of the land area. Vehicular circulation space is restricted, especially for large commercial vehicles, and a booking-in system is used in order to control movements of deliveries whilst out-going movements are generally completed prior to 0700. Only two of the buildings appear to have been purpose-built for their current functions - the frontage office block and a new storage/distribution building at the rear of the site. The other buildings have been adapted by the present occupier, including some conversions to offices.
- 6.58 To the north of the site is the Leeds-Liverpool Canal, beyond which is a sports ground and a small group of residential properties, with more playing fields beyond. To the east is open countryside forming part of the Green Belt between Bradford and Leeds - the boundary between the two Council areas runs through the objection site. To the south is a small wooded area and open land - part of the latter is allocated in the adopted UDP and the RDDP for employment use (reference BN/E1.14). To the west, across Harrogate Road is the site of the former Hammonds Sauce Works, for which planning permission for redevelopment for residential purposes has been granted, and the land is unallocated in the adopted UDP and RDDP.
- 6.59 It is argued that this latter site is similar to the objection site in that the buildings were unsuited to new employment use, and that marketing of the site for such use proved unsuccessful. As the site has now been cleared I cannot make a direct comparison, although I understand that the buildings on the Hammonds site were of a significantly different form to those on the objection site. In addition, the objection site has not been marketed and although the professional view of agents has been provided I do not consider that this is conclusive. Furthermore, my examination of the buildings satisfies me that they are not incapable of re-use by a future single user, or by a variety of users. Indeed the office conversions that have been undertaken provide evidence of the versatility of at least some of the buildings.
- 6.60 All parties accept that the frontage office building is capable of continued employment use. In fact, its narrow depth may restrict its suitability for conversion to residential

apartments. It was stated that the new building to the rear of the site was designed for the requirements of the current user, and is unsuited to other industrial, distribution or storage activities. Whilst my site inspection could not provide a structural survey of this building, from what I could see I consider that the building is capable of accommodating a variety of other employment uses, including activities within Classes B1, B2 and B8. Similarly, whilst not providing high quality accommodation I consider that most of the older buildings are capable of accommodating a variety of employment activities either as a whole or by sub-division into individual units.

- 6.61 I accept that vehicular circulation within the site poses problems and that these could be exacerbated if there were a number of separate occupiers. However, selective demolition of some of the buildings would enable the creation of improved circulation whilst maintaining a reasonable amount of accommodation for occupation. Multi-occupation of the site would require the provision of separate power, heating and lighting supplies, and additional external entrances. However, such problems have not proved insurmountable in other locations.
- 6.62 The site is within the urban area and in a reasonably sustainable location for housing. However, such location is equally desirable for employment uses, and the site is adjacent to land allocated for new employment. Whilst this latter site has remained undeveloped for some time, I consider that the current restriction to core employment uses, coupled with the different ground levels that affect access from Harrogate Road, have been significant in this regard. The RDDP proposes that the restriction to core employment should be removed. In my view this is sensible and I consider that development prospects for the site will be significantly improved. Both sites are also close to the Leeds - Bradford International Airport, with direct main road access to it. In addition, the reduction of allocated employment sites that I have recommended elsewhere in the district increases the importance of other employment sites in good strategic locations.
- 6.63 Developing the site for housing, and at the same time removing an important employment location, would result in increased need for travel to work throughout the area. Whilst the availability of public transport routes along Harrogate Road, and the Park and Ride facilities to be created at the proposed railway station at Apperley Bridge, would provide alternatives to the use of the private car, additional journeys would still be created.
- 6.64 As an unallocated site in current employment use the land would be subject to Policy E3 of the RDDP. This seeks to retain existing employment land and buildings, subject to a number of exceptions, including where the buildings have become functionally redundant. I conclude, therefore, that the site should remain subject to this policy and that, at this time, the buildings are not functionally redundant.

Recommendation

- 6.65 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

SOM/BN/H1/139: Arnold Lavers, Canal Road, Bradford (BN/E6.2 part)

Objector

4126/8537

Arnold Laver & Co Ltd

Summary of Objection

- The land should be excluded from the employment zone and allocated for housing under Policy H1.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.66 I have considered this matter in relation to BN/E6.2 above, where I conclude that the site is appropriately include within an employment zone.

Recommendation

6.67 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/H2.3: Doctor Hill, Idle, Bradford (formerly BN/H1.23)

Objector

2635/8021 *Miss S F A Walker*

Summary of Objection

- There should be no further housing in Idle without additional school and highways provision.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.68 This site is within the main urban area, and is well located for schools, local shops and services, and public transport. Although the land is open, it is within the curtilage of a residential property and thus falls within the description of previously-developed land in PPG3. The allocation of the site for housing would therefore accord with the Council's development strategy.

6.69 The Council advises that there are no problems with capacity in primary schools in this area. It is also satisfied that, although Five Lane Ends is a busy roundabout, the small number of houses likely to be accommodated on this site would not exacerbate the situation. There is, however, a potential problem with drainage of the site, and for this reason the Council changed this from a phase 1 allocation to phase 2. Whilst this may affect the viability of development, there would appear to be a good possibility that the problems could be overcome in order for the site to come forward in phase 2.

Recommendation

6.70 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/H2.4 & SOM/BN/OS3/415: Oxford Road, Undercliffe, Bradford

Objectors

2432/12069/70 *Mr Howard Middleton*
4924/12414 & 12416 *Cllrs R Sowman and E McNally*

4974/12275/6	<i>Cllr Colleen Middleton</i>
4999/12469/70	<i>Mrs Naylor</i>
5000/12471/2	<i>Mrs Rawson</i>
5001/12473/4	<i>Oxford Road Residents Association</i>
5002/12475/6	<i>C Sanderson</i>
5003/12477/8	<i>Miss Melanie Armitage</i>
5004/1247980	<i>Ms Marlene Wilkinson</i>
5005/12481/2	<i>Mr Malcolm Davis</i>
5006/12483/4	<i>R Shergill</i>
5007/12485/6	<i>Mrs Kathleen Hainsworth</i>
5008/12487/8	<i>Mr N Mycio</i>
5009/12489/90	<i>Mr & Mrs T Flood</i>
5010/12491/2	<i>Mr John Robinson</i>
5011/12493/4	<i>Mrs Anne-Marie Johnson</i>
5012/12495/6	<i>Mr Paul Carr</i>

Summary of Objections

- All/part of the site should be retained as playing field/recreation space/Green Belt.
- The traffic would be horrendous with more houses.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.71 In the FDDP this land was allocated as part of a school site. The Undercliffe Primary School has now been built, and this land has been declared surplus to educational requirements.
- 6.72 This site is within the main urban area, and is well located for schools, local services and public transport. Whilst a satisfactory access can be achieved from the site to Oxford Road, parts of the wider road network do not meet current highway standards, and concerns were expressed in relation to the effect on the highway system when the whole of the school site was considered for residential development. However, the Council is satisfied that the amount of traffic generated by this small part of the site could be accommodated. There is a high pressure gas main crossing the site, and there could be some difficulties with drainage. However, I see no reason to doubt that these can be overcome to allow this to come forward as a phase 2 housing site.
- 6.73 In relation to the need for open space, I am satisfied that this area is well provided with both formal and informal recreation facilities. I understand that these are under pressure at times because of a shortage of facilities elsewhere in the city. However, the retention of this area of land as open space would do little to address the needs arising in other areas.
- 6.74 It was also suggested at the Inquiry that there was a need for community facilities, and the Council acknowledged that such a need existed. However, in the absence of any specific proposal, I consider that it would be inappropriate to prevent development coming forward. It was also suggested that there was potential for community use of the new school, thus making good use of an existing facility.

Recommendation

- 6.75 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

SOM/BN/H2/55.01: Land at Idle Moor (Site A) (BN/OS1.2)

Objector

4124/8356

Grimston Leisure and Investment Ltd

Summary of Objection

- Housing allocation is appropriate

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.76 I have considered this objection under BN/OS1.2 below, and recommend against housing allocation.

Recommendation

6.77 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

Chapter 7: Town Centres, Retail and Leisure Development

SOM/BN/CR3/62, BN/CR4.4, SOM/BN/CL1/62, SOM/BN/CR4/62.01 & SOM/BN/UR4/62.02: Greengates Local Centre and Land to South of Greengates Local Centre

Objectors

2209/6635, 6638 & *Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd*
8490 & 8492
4200/6636/7 & 6639 *British Land*

Summary of Objections

- Greengates should be designated as a district centre.
- The site boundary should include the full extent of the centre, including the Holybrook Mills site, which has planning permission for retail.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.1 The RDDP designates 6 district centres and 41 local centres throughout the district. All of the district centres are within the main urban area of Bradford, and are roughly equidistant from each other and from the city centre. They vary considerably in size and character, from a single large convenience store, or a row of small shops, to centres comprising extensive convenience and comparison shopping in large units, together with a range of smaller shops.
- 7.2 Greengates currently comprises a Sainsbury's superstore and a Homebase store in a single building, together with further convenience and comparison outlets, both in modern large units and traditional shops. A further development is taking place for comparison goods with site clearance works well advanced at the time of my site visit. With this new development, the total retail floorspace would be slightly less than that at the Five Lane Ends or Thornbury District Centres, and the number of units would be between that of these other two centres. In my view, Greengates functions as a district centre, serving the needs of a wide geographical section of Bradford for both day-to-day convenience goods and for more specialist shopping. This role will be enhanced with the additional retail floorspace to be provided. In this respect I see little difference between Greengates and the two designated district centres in North Bradford.
- 7.3 However, although evidence given at the Inquiry compared the size of these centres, the Council confirmed that the main criteria for designating centres as district centres, rather than local centres, were based more on location than size and function. This is referred to in paragraph 7.55 of the plan, which explains that district centres are close to substantial catchment populations, are located at strategic points on the transport network, and are well located to serve the residents of separate and distinct parts of Bradford's urban area. The Council was satisfied that Greengates could be reached by bus or car, and that it is close to a substantial population although, being towards the edge of the urban area, this is less than at Five Lane Ends. The main concern of the Council was that it does not serve a separate part of the urban area, but largely the same area as Five Lane Ends. I have no doubt that the catchment areas for these two centres overlap with each other, as well as with those for the City Centre and Shipley town centre. If a new centre were being proposed, it may be preferable to seek a greater geographical separation. However,

Greengates and Five Lane Ends have co-existed for some years now, and there is no evidence that either has suffered from the proximity of the other. Although there are a number of vacancies within the Enterprise 5 shopping mall at Five Lane Ends, both centres appear to be generally healthy.

- 7.4 With regard to the retail performance of the City Centre, I note that this has remained static whilst other large centres have increased their trade. However, I see nothing to link this with the performance of other centres within Bradford, and think it far more likely that it is a result of other cities in the region increasing their attractiveness for shoppers. I consider the answer lies in redressing this by improving the offer within the City Centre. Shipley town centre is more likely to be affected by the district centres as, although it has significantly more units, it does not appear to offer a much greater range of goods and services. Evidence given by the Council suggested that there had been a fall in the amount of retail floorspace in Shipley between 1988 and 1997, but there are no obvious signs of this apart from a greater number of vacant properties, which account for only a small proportion of the reduction. It is possible that some trade has been diverted from Shipley to the more modern and easily accessible stores at Five Lane Ends and Greengates. However, the policies of the plan will ensure that retail development more appropriate to a town centre is directed to the appropriate town centre, and that district centres complement the role of the city and town centres. In these circumstances, I consider that it makes no significant difference whether there are one or two district centres drawing on the same catchment area as Shipley town centre.
- 7.5 I therefore see little point in not recognising the current role and function of Greengates, and consider that there would be no harm to the objectives of the retail hierarchy if it were designated as a district centre. The Council suggested that this could have implications for other local centres, but I am not considering any objections in respect of these, and it appeared from the evidence presented at the Inquiry that there are no directly comparable centres. However, the Council may wish to re-assess whether other local centres are functioning as district centres when considering modifications to the plan.
- 7.6 In relation to the boundary of the centre, the Council acknowledged that, if the additional retail development at Greengates had been completed, consideration would be given to including this within the centre, with the exception of the service yard and car park. Whilst only demolition works had taken place at the time of the Inquiry, I was satisfied that the development would proceed in accordance with the planning permission, with the exception of the garden centre, and that the named occupier was committed to a pre-Christmas opening. In these circumstances, I see no reason to exclude this from the centre boundary. In relation to the inclusion of the service area and car park, I have considered a number of objections relating to this issue, and consider that where these are required for the efficient functioning of the centre, they should be included within the boundary. In my view neither the service area nor car park are over-large for the development, and without them the retail use could not operate effectively. I therefore consider that they should be included within the centre boundary. I accept that this could provide some flexibility should redevelopment occur in the future, but not sufficient to allow for any significant expansion of the centre. The scale of new development would be subject to the terms of the retail policies of the plan, which require that development should be appropriate in scale to the role of the centre and the community it serves.

Recommendation

- 7.7 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the designation of Greengates Local Centre as a District Centre, and that the boundary be extended to include the whole of the site for which planning permission for retail development has been granted, including the car park and service yard.**

Chapter 8: Transport and Movement

BN/TM4.2: Apperley Bridge

Objectors

1314/1786 *Mr & Mrs D Wagstaff*

Summary of Objection

- A new station would draw additional traffic onto Apperley Lane, bringing a deterioration in the environment.
- Something should be done to alleviate traffic problems in the area in conjunction with the station development.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

8.1 I have considered this objection in relation to BN/TM 7.1 below, to which reference should be made.

Recommendation

8.2 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/TM5.1 & SOM/BN/TM20/58: Parts of the Former Shipley to Laisterdyke Line - Thackley to Idle to Fagley

Objector

778/8515 & 11799 *Mr A L Winder*

Summary of Objection

- Light railway should be considered on the former track from Shipley to the Thackley old station site in an effort to remove traffic from the roads.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

8.3 The Shipley - Thackley - Idle former railway line is shown within the RDDP as being protected under Policy TM5. It is also allocated as a cycleway improvement under Policy TM20. As the line passes through both the Bradford North and Shipley constituency areas the objection relates to both areas and has also been considered under S/TM5.2.

8.4 Policy TM5 safeguards disused railway lines from development to allow their use for sustainable transport purposes. Such purposes may include rail schemes, cycle routes, pedestrian paths and bridleways. Although the Council has not indicated that the possibility of light rail is being actively considered the proposed designations would not rule this out in the future. This in itself need not be incompatible with possible cycleway development.

Recommendation

8.5 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.

BN/TM7.1, BN/TM4.2 & SOM/BN/TM7/9: Apperley Bridge Park and Ride

Objectors

1912/8374, 8499 & 9879
1910/8501

Mr R Margerison
Mrs Jean Margerison

Summary of Objections

- Whereas the plan for a station is supported it is not necessary to have a Park and Ride scheme nearby as it would intrude into the Green Belt and would be a noise and pollution hazard for residents.
- Little Park is a residential cul de sac and shouldn't have to support an entrance to a Park and Ride facility that would be detrimental to residents.
- The junction with Apperley Lane is dangerous.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.6 RPG12 indicates that improved rail services have an important contribution to make to increasing travel choice, reducing dependency on the car, and tackling problems of congestion. A key element in encouraging more sustainable travel is the improvement of integrated modes of transport. Accordingly, both a new station and associated Park and Ride facility are proposed at Apperley Bridge. These are carried forward from the adopted UDP.
- 8.7 An indicative Park and Ride facility is shown on the Proposals Map to the west of the residential cul de sac of Little Park, lying within the Green Belt. PPG13 states that schemes may be permissible in the Green Belt where assessment shows such locations to be the most sustainable of the available options, taking account of all relevant factors. A further requirement is that the scheme should be contained within a Local Transport Plan. The scheme is not specifically mentioned within the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan or shown on the "Significant Investment Proposals" plan within it. I find this somewhat strange in that a Park and Ride scheme for Apperley Bridge was also a specified policy of the existing UDP. Nevertheless, the Local Transport Plan does indicate that money is designated for Park and Ride schemes within the Aire valley.
- 8.8 Other options have been studied as part of the Leeds Rail Park and Ride Feasibility Study in 1999 including, according to the Council, ones not within the Green Belt. No other sites have proved feasible, including the area of land to the west of The Avenue close to the Apperley Viaduct, which would be more remote from the proposed station. A further suggestion for a site to the east of Apperley Junction, where the Wharfedale and Airedale lines converge, would be outside Bradford district and would be likely to be constrained by lack of access and its relationship with the river and Leeds-Liverpool Canal. In my view, provided a scheme within the general location as envisaged on the Proposals Map was to be sensitively designed and landscaped it need not have a detrimental effect on the overall openness or amenity of the Green Belt.

- 8.9 Fears have been expressed that access to a Park and Ride facility might be taken off Little Park. The Council indicates that this would not be the case, any access to a new station and associated Park and Ride facility being taken from The Avenue to the north, which provides access to Esholt sewage works. I agree with objectors that the access from Little Park onto Apperley Lane, part of the A658 Bradford to Harrogate road, is not ideal because of road alignments. It would not be suitable for accommodating increased volumes of traffic that would be associated with a station/Park and Ride facility.
- 8.10 The provision of a Park and Ride scheme and station would be likely to create more traffic on Apperley Lane. However, this has to be considered within the wider context that such a facility is likely to contribute to overall greater sustainability; the transfer of passengers to rail should reduce the number and length of journeys that would otherwise be made by car. Matters of the speed of traffic, design of the junction of The Avenue and Apperley Lane, and traffic management generally are ones that would need to be addressed under Highway Orders and at the detailed design stage.
- 8.11 The general indicative siting for the scheme has not changed from the adopted UDP. Overall, I have seen no compelling reasons within the duly made objections as to why this proposal should be deleted or moved.

Recommendation

- 8.12 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/TM20.6: Fagley Lane Access Road and Associated Junction with Harrogate Road

Objector

4645/10314 *FLAG*

Summary of Objection

- The road development should be cancelled entirely and the whole of the larger UR7 area re-designated as ‘protected urban greenspace’.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.13 Policy TM20.6 proposes an improved access from Harrogate Road into an area of over 30 hectares which is designated as the Fagley mixed use area under Policy BN/UR7.2. The designation of this wider area and the proposed access improvement are carried forward from the adopted UDP. The objection from FLAG to improved access appears to spring from opposition to the concept of the mixed use area itself, and the desire to see it protected for recreational and amenity use. I have considered this wider-ranging objection in relation to BN/UR7.2 above.
- 8.14 The mixed use area is seen as being suitable for new employment, residential and recreational uses, together with the provision of additional visitor facilities required by the Bradford Industrial Museum on Moorside Road. Poor highway access is considered one of the constraints to the comprehensive redevelopment of the area. It is indicated that the principal means of access should be from Harrogate Road to accommodate mainly residential development and to rationalise the facilities for St Luke’s School. The

proposal envisaged would result in the closing of Fagley Lane and the formation of a new signalled road junction with Harrogate Road further to the east. At present the area is served by Fagley Lane which runs roughly north-south through the centre of the proposed mixed use area. This is closed to through traffic by bollards at its southern end preventing access to and from the residential area beyond. I consider that neither its present junction with Harrogate Road, close to but separate from the Pullan Avenue roundabout, nor its width, alignment and lack of footpaths make Fagley Lane suitable for serving additional development within the area.

- 8.15 The mixed use area site also has a narrow frontage to Moorside Road to its western side adjacent to the Industrial Museum. The Council states that vehicular movements from this road onto Harrogate Road are already problematic at peak times, despite the relatively light traffic flows along Moorside Road. The spare capacity for adding traffic to this road from the mixed use area without junction improvements and possible road widening is limited. Without large-scale improvements to the road and its junction with Harrogate Road it could only serve a limited part of the overall site.
- 8.16 I therefore accept that the present road network imposes constraints on the comprehensive redevelopment of the area and that highway improvements in the manner proposed would be an integral part of the promotion of a co-ordinated and sustainable strategy. In my view no cogent reasons have been provided as to why, in themselves, the proposals under Policy TM20.6 are unacceptable in principle.

Recommendation

- 8.17 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/TM20.7: Harrogate Road/New Line, Greengates, Bradford

Objectors

1293/1777 *Mrs J Crellin*
4433/9877 *Dr Alice Gavin*

Summary of Objections

- The proposals will not affect the underlying traffic problem as the approach roads will still carry the same volume. The changes will attract more traffic, increase noise levels and compromise safety.
- There is insufficient room for major changes.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.18 The proposal relates to the upgrading of the crossroads junction at Harrogate Road and New Line, Greengates, and has been carried forward from the adopted UDP. Policy TM20 safeguards land required for transport and highway improvement schemes. The junction is also affected by Policy TM6, which seeks to improve the bus priority network. Harrogate Road is a main route into the area from the Leeds/Bradford airport. Improvements are seen as necessary to assist public transport services and provide better pedestrian facilities. I also consider them to be important in connection with the proposed Park and Ride facility linked with a new station at Apperley Bridge.

- 8.19 I am not convinced that any junction improvements would in themselves attract more traffic into the immediate area, particularly as they would be undertaken in conjunction with measures under TM6 to improve bus priority measures, a factor which could help reduce traffic volumes. The Park and Ride scheme, about 1km to the north, may attract more traffic into the area to use this facility. However, the impact of such a scheme is likely to reduce the length of journeys that might otherwise have been taken by car and so make an overall contribution towards achieving greater sustainability.
- 8.20 The design of any improvements would be a matter for detailed consideration and it is inappropriate for the UDP, which is a land use plan, to include such detail.

Recommendation

- 8.21 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/TM20.14: Gain Lane Cycle Route, Bradford

Objector

4172/8476 *Trustees of A Vint*

Summary of Objection

- Unless the adjoining land is allocated for employment use, the cycle route should be deleted.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.22 This allocation of the adjoining land is considered in relation to SOM/BN/E1/199.02 above. I conclude there that allocation for employment purposes is acceptable and the land should be deleted from the Green Belt.
- 8.23 In relation to the cycle route, I accept that the encouragement of modes of transport other than the private motor vehicle is an important aspect of national policy, and the provision of cycle routes is a significant element in the implementation of that policy. I note that the proposed route is intended to link the urban area with routes in the open countryside around Bradford and Leeds, and with the emerging national network of cycle routes (although the latter appears to be subject to a somewhat prolonged timescale in this particular area). Accordingly, the provision of a cycle route in this location is in line with national policy and should be encouraged.
- 8.24 I understand that the line on the Proposals Map is intended to be diagrammatic. Notwithstanding the scale of the map I consider that greater precision could and should be given to the identification of the route. From my site inspection I can see no physical problem with locating the route to the northern side of Fagley Beck, on land allocated for recreational open space and, I understand, in the ownership of the Council. At the Inquiry the Council's witness accepted this view.
- 8.25 The objector has also proposed (see SOM/BN/OS4/199.01 below) that the land including the indicated cycle route be allocated as a linear park, again subject to the allocation of adjoining land for employment purposes. As discussed below in relation to that

objection, I can see merit in such an open space proposal and this could include the cycle way.

Recommendation

- 8.26 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the relocation of the cycle route, as shown on the Proposals Map, to the north of Fagley Beck, within the land allocated for recreational open space, unless land on the southern side of Fagley Beck is allocated for recreational open space as set out in my recommendation in relation to SOM/BN/OS4/199.01.**

Chapter 12: Open Land in Settlements

BN/OS1.2, SOM/BN/H1/55.02-05, SOM/BN/H2/55.01: Idle Moor, Idle, Bradford

Objectors

4124/8353	<i>Grimston Leisure and Investment Ltd</i>
4190/8342	<i>Mr A Warren</i>
4192/8335	<i>Mr P G Cookson</i>
4194/8346	<i>Mr M Slinger</i>
4195/8330	<i>Mr J Wood</i>

Summary of Objections

- These sites do not meet the objectives of urban greenspace, and are privately owned. There is no active recreational use.
- Idle Moor is not a moor but a flat featureless area of poor grassland, having no landscape qualities. Urban fringe problems are rife. Enhancement and planting are unlikely to happen.
- The moor is well related to the urban area, with housing on 3 sides and services within reach.
- Much needed housing development would lead to access and other improvements, which could be negotiated with the Council.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 12.1 Although the objections have been classified by the Council as relating to several distinct areas of land, most of the objectors seek a housing allocation for the whole moor, with substantial open areas being retained as part of a negotiated package. Accordingly, I deal with all of the Idle Moor objections together.
- 12.2 Housing need is dealt with in the Policy Framework volume of this report.
- 12.3 Idle Moor is a large open area. There are housing estates to the south and east, with a line of houses between the moor and other open land to the north. Nevertheless, the open land of the moor continues that of Idle Hill to the west. The moor is one of a number of substantial undeveloped areas which form a band of open land separating adjacent parts of the built-up areas of Shipley and Bradford. The size of Idle Moor and Idle Hill, together with the extensive views obtainable over, and from, the moor, give an atmosphere of tranquillity. The land may not be a moor in terms of ecology, but the rough nature of the ground and the peaceful quality which characterises the area are important in bringing relief from the urban area. The contrast between the untended objection land and the more regimented built-up area is part of this relief.
- 12.4 Some of the fields within the individual objection sites are not open to public access, but substantial sections of the moor are crossed by public rights of way or informal paths. The area is well used for informal recreation. Many fields on the moor are effectively open to public access.
- 12.5 I conclude that the moor fulfils the objectives of urban greenspace, which the RDDP seeks to achieve, and of open space, given in PPG17. It is not necessary for the landscape to be of a high quality for an area to be suitable as urban greenspace.

- 12.6 Regional guidance Policy H2 does envisage the allocation of infill land in urban areas, but allocation is subject to achieving appropriate standards of urban greenspace and conserving the character of the area. Development on Idle Moor would spoil its character and would take away an area of urban greenspace. Partial development, for example of the northern or southern objection sites, would reduce the separating and open break functions of the moor. The allocation of urban fringe land for housing, because of dumping and other problems, would be at the expense of the positive aspects of such land. These aspects characterise the objection land regardless of whether it is improved. The objectors refer to the Warren Lane allocation to exemplify their approach, but this large allocation on greenfield land is an unfortunate example to choose.
- 12.7 Idle Moor is within the main urban area but any sustainability advantages over other sites which it might possess are not weighty, based on the Council's unchallenged evidence. For example, the local bus services do not approach nearer to the sites than 400 metres, and there is no evidence that the housing proposed by objectors would improve services. My view is that the arguments in favour of housing allocation are outweighed by the value of the land as urban greenspace, and the harm to urban greenspace which would follow from allocation for housing development.
- 12.8 It is possible that satisfactory access could be provided to the southern objection sites on the moor, as part of an overall housing allocation, and the northern objection site has a long road frontage. The Council does not raise the more general traffic points it raised during the preparation of the adopted UDP. Nevertheless, for the reasons given above, I consider that the urban greenspace designation should remain.

Recommendation

- 12.9 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/OS1.8: Poplars Farm, Bolton, Bradford

Objector

4122/5492

Brighthouse Estates Ltd

Summary of Objection

- The Bolton Woods quarry buffer zone does not function as urban greenspace, and its identification as urban greenspace in the RDDP is too restrictive.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 12.10 In fact the objection as summarised in the objector's final written representation is much narrower than the duly made objection, being concerned only with the risk of locating an urban greenspace near an active quarry face. Nevertheless, as the objection as originally set out has not been withdrawn, I deal with all the arguments originally advanced.
- 12.11 Both the buffer zone and the urban greenspace are partly in Shipley constituency and partly in Bradford North.

12.12 The urban greenspace is widest at its south-western end, where it is also steep and prominent in views from other parts of Bradford. This part of the allocation plays an important part in the wider urban scene. Behind this west facing slope the higher part of the open space narrows between housing on one side and the quarry face of Bolton Woods quarry on the other. In my opinion this eastern end of the urban greenspace has a more local function. The north-eastern end of the urban greenspace is particularly narrow. The principal function is as a buffer between the housing and the present and future working areas of the quarry. The main separation between different sections of the urban area is achieved by the quarry itself. The eastern end of the allocated urban greenspace is not, in the words of paragraph 12.5 of the RDDP Policy Framework, one of the most significant greenspaces in terms of size or prominence within the urban area. It does not bring the character of the countryside into the town, and it can be distinguished from the remainder of the area in terms of its function.

12.13 I understand that some at least of the land is owned by the Council, and, on the basis of the representations and my own observations, that it is used for informal recreation. I do not have sufficient information to allow me to conclude whether the eastern area should be allocated under another open space policy, but the urban greenspace allocation is not in my view appropriate for the eastern end of the area. Again I do not have the evidence to enable me to advise the Council where the eastern boundary of the urban greenspace should be drawn (i.e. exactly which part of the land is not prominent in views), and so my recommendation is couched in general terms. However, the Council will be able to assess exactly which parts of the land function as urban greenspace and which have a lesser and/or different function.

12.14 The safety of users of the land is, as far as I am aware, primarily a matter for the owners of the land and the users themselves. Insofar as it is a town planning matter, I consider that both it, and the restrictions it may impose on the operation of the quarry, are outweighed by the significance as open space of the western part of the urban greenspace.

Recommendation

12.15 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the eastern end of the Poplars Farm area from the urban greenspace.

SOM/BN/OS1/14: Westfield Lane, Idle, Bradford (BN/UR5.2)

Objectors

These are listed in the appendix to this report.

Summary of Objections

- The land should be retained as greenspace.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.16 I have considered this objection in relation to BN/UR5.2 above, to which reference should be made.

Recommendation

12.17 See my recommendation on BN/UR5.2.

SOM/BN/OS2/15: Wrose Road, Kings Drive, Bradford (BN/H1.2)

Objectors

615/3232	<i>Mrs Christine Roberson</i>
2621/2192	<i>Mr & Mrs Michael & Victoria Carroll</i>
2663/2184	<i>Mr Richard Reese</i>
3461/6618	<i>Mr and Mrs Delaney</i>

Summary of Objections

- This is a valuable and much needed open space.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.18 The RDDP correctly recognises the open space value of the site by deleting the housing allocation and replacing it with the allocation requested by objectors.

Recommendation

12.19 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.

SOM/BN/OS3/15: Wrose Road, Kings Drive, Bradford (BN/H1.2)

Objector

2432/6640	<i>Mr Howard Middleton</i>
-----------	----------------------------

Summary of Objection

- This is a valuable and much needed open space.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.20 The housing allocation is deleted in the RDDP as stated immediately above. The correct allocation is under Policy OS2, because the plot of land in question is used for informal recreation. The detailed facilities to be provided are matters for the Council, not for me.

Recommendation

12.21 I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.

SOM/BN/OS4/5.02: Land at Carr Bottom Road, Greengates, Bradford (Site B)

Objector

1129/8469

Mr P B Holmes

Summary of Objection

- The steep wooded hill should be allocated as parkland or recreational land.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.22 This objection is related to an objection to the housing provisions of the plan, which I have considered earlier in this report. I conclude that this adjoining land should not be allocated for housing at the present time, but should be safeguarded for possible development beyond the current plan period. In these circumstances, I see no merit in allocating this land as open space at the present time but agree that this area of land should not be built on and, if the adjoining land is allocated for housing at some future date, it would be appropriate to consider an open space designation for this land.

Recommendation

12.23 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

SOM/BN/OS4/199.01: Site A, Land adjacent to Gain Lane Employment Site (BN/E1.12), Bradford

Objector

4172/8477

Trustees of A Vint

Summary of Objection

- Subject to the adjoining land being allocated for employment purposes, the site should be allocated as a linear park.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.24 Consideration of the allocation of the adjoining land is given in relation to SOM/BN/E1/199.02 above, where I conclude that the land should be allocated for employment and deleted from the Green Belt.

12.25 The site lies immediately on the southern side of Fagley Beck, and land to the northern side of the beck is allocated for recreational open space. The site is subject to the common urban fringe problems of trespass, vandalism, tipping, etc. and is no longer in productive agricultural use. Allocation of land on the southern side of the beck as recreational open space would seem to be logical and sensible, particularly if positive management and the erection of suitable boundary enclosures were undertaken.

12.26 I understand that land for public open space purposes is only shown on the Proposals Map when it is already in public ownership. Land use planning should not be

unnecessarily constrained by issues of land ownership. However, I can understand that the Council will not wish to appear to commit itself to land acquisitions that it may not be able to finance (although the inclusion of a cycle route through this site may imply such a commitment - see BN/TM20.14 above). Nevertheless, I consider that it would be helpful and appropriate to allocate land on the southern side of Fagley Beck as recreational open space, similar to the allocation on the northern side. As indicated in relation to BN/TM 20.14 above, the proposed cycle route could then stay as already shown on the Proposals Map.

Recommendation

12.27 I recommend that the RDDP be amended by the inclusion of the objection site as recreational open space on the Proposals Map.

SOM/BN/OS4/278: Land at Fagley Lane, Fagley, Bradford (BN/UR7.2 part)

Objectors

2939/10714 *Brenda Howorth*
4645/10316 *FLAG*

Summary of Objections

- This land is of value for amenity and recreational reasons.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.28 I have considered this site in relation to reference BN/UR7.2 above, where I conclude that the RDDP designation of mixed use area for the majority of the site is appropriate.

Recommendation

12.29 My recommendation is given under reference BN/UR7.2 above.

Chapter 13: Green Belt

BN/GB1.3: Apperley Lane, Little London, Rawdon

Objectors

1625/1784 *Mr and Mrs D Wagstaff*
1940/8166 *Mrs P A Midgley*
2603/5468 *Dr Kingsley Reid*
3846/5458 *Mr J Fell*

Summary of Objections

- The Green Belt line should be restored to the original.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

13.1 This area has been enclosed with a fence, and there is evidence of former buildings, which I understand were hen houses, on the site. However, it remains generally open and the fact that it has a fence around it is not an exceptional circumstance to justify removing the land from the Green Belt.

13.2 I accept that the existing Green Belt boundary is ill-defined, both on the ground and in relation to other more permanent features. I consider that the rear garden line of the adjoining properties should be continued up to the track, in order to provide an easily identifiable boundary.

Recommendation

13.3 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by inclusion in the Green Belt of the parcel of land defined by the track and a continuation of the rear garden boundary of the adjoining properties.**

SOM/BN/GB1/5 & SOM/BN/GB1/5.02: Land at Carr Bottom Road, Greengates, Bradford

Objectors

1129/11152 & 8466 *Mr P B Holmes*
4217/8516 *Mr K Norris*

Summary of Objections

- The land should be removed from the Green Belt and allocated for housing.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

13.4 I have considered these objections in relation to SOM/BN/H1/5.02 above, to which reference should be made.

Recommendation

13.5 See recommendation on SOM/BN/H1.5.02.

SOM/BN/GB1/199: Land adjacent to Gain Lane Employment Site (BN/E1.12), Bradford

Objector

4172/8473 *Trustees of A Vint*

Summary of Objection

- The land should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated for employment use under Policy E1.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

13.6 This matter is considered in relation to references SOM/BN/E1/199.02 and SOM/BN/OS4/199.01 above, where I conclude that the Green Belt designation should be deleted.

Recommendation

13.7 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the Green Belt designation and the allocation of the site for employment use, subject to my recommendation in relation to SOM/BN/OS4/199.01.**

SOM/BN/GB1/405, BN/GB6A.1, BN/GB6A.2, BN/GB6A.3 & SOM/BN/GB7/405: Esholt Sewage Treatment Works

Objectors

4174/11229 & 11123 *Keyland Developments Ltd*
4365/12827, 12828 & 12829 *Yorkshire Water Services Ltd*

Summary of Objections

- There should be a new policy to cover infilling and redevelopment at major developed sites (MDS) in the Green Belt, and this site should be identified.
- The boundary should encompass the whole of the operational site.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

13.8 In response to an objection by Keyland Developments Ltd, Policy GB6A relating to MDS in the Green Belt was included in the RDDP. This lists a number of water or sewage treatment works, including Esholt, and the Proposals Map shows three separate areas allocated as MDS. The objections by Keyland Developments Ltd have therefore been met, and the only outstanding matter is the area that should be covered by the designation.

13.9 The Council proposes three separate MDSs, covering the buildings and other structures directly associated with the waste water treatment works. The objector suggests a boundary that would include Esholt Hall and Home Farm, together with slurry lagoons and undeveloped land required for future operational development, consistent with the Operational Area as defined for the purposes of Part 16 of the General (Permitted Development) Order 1995. Esholt Hall is a substantial listed building, used as a training centre and meeting venue by Yorkshire Water Services. Home Farm is partly vacant, having been damaged by fire. Whilst the operations carried out by Yorkshire Water Services cover parts of their site ownership not identified by the Council, much of the remainder of the site is undeveloped countryside, and Esholt Hall and Home Farm are distinct and physically separate from the waste water treatment operations. These would not individually be considered as MDSs, and I do not consider that their relationship with the main use of the site is sufficiently close to justify their inclusion within an extended site area. I therefore conclude that it would be inappropriate to include the whole of the operational site with the MDS.

Recommendation

13.10 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

Chapter 15 Natural Resources

SOM/BN/NR3/56: Land at Fagley Quarry, Bradford (BN/UR7.2)

Objector

4122/8544 *Brighouse Estates Ltd*

Summary of Objection

- Fagley Quarry should be shown on the Proposals Map, in order to comply with national policy and the advice of the previous UDP Inspector.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

15.1 I recommend in paragraph 15.12 of the Policy Framework volume of this report that existing quarries should be shown on the Proposals Map. This would give greater certainty to users of the UDP. The Council says that, at Fagley, the southern part of the objection site, Fagley Quarry itself, is an active quarry, whereas the northern part, Radfield Quarry, is no longer used for mineral extraction. This corresponds with what I saw on my site visit, and has not been disputed by the objector. Consequently I consider that only that part of the objection site south of the east-west footpath, Fagley Quarry, should be shown on the Proposals Map. Finally, as I note in the Policy Framework volume of the report, the relevant policy for safeguarding quarries is NR1.

Recommendation

15.2 I recommend that the RDDP be modified by showing Fagley Quarry, south of the east-west footpath separating Fagley Quarry from Radfield Quarry, as an existing mineral extraction site, on the Proposals Map, with a reference to Policy NR1 in the Legend to the map.

POLICY BN/NR4/1: Bolton Woods Quarry Buffer Zone

Objector

4122/10791 *Brighouse Estates Ltd*

Summary of Objection

- Objection is made to the reference to the site's inclusion in the Poplars Farm urban greenspace.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

15.3 I conclude above (see under Policy OS1) that the eastern end of the Poplars Farm urban greenspace should be deleted from the urban greenspace. This would leave part of the buffer zone in the urban greenspace and part outside it. The reference to the urban greenspace under Policy NR4 should be amended accordingly.

Recommendation

- 15.4 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the replacement, in the final sentence of the reasoned justification to Policy NR4, of “All of the zone” by “Part of the zone”.**

BN/NR5.1: Little London, Rawdon

Objectors

425/5808	<i>Mrs J C Hutchinson</i>
730/5770	<i>Mr & Mrs Andrew & Susan Anne Turner</i>
1314/5769	<i>Mr & Mrs D Wagstaff</i>
1912/10028	<i>Mr Roy Margerison</i>
2603/5467	<i>Dr Kingsley Reid</i>

Summary of Objections

- This area is located within the Green Belt.
- Mineral extraction could harm the environment and the amenities of residents.

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

15.5 National policy is that Councils should help to ensure an adequate supply of minerals to meet needs, and should indicate areas for possible future working of minerals. One tool for doing this is by identifying areas of search. The area of search notation at Little London reflects the likely presence of workable minerals.

15.6 The inclusion of land in an area of search is not the equivalent of a grant of planning permission for mineral extraction. Any application for planning permission would be considered against the relevant policies of the UDP, taking account of the merits of the particular proposal. Thus the matters referred to by objectors, such as amenity, access, traffic, landscape and other effects, would be assessed as part of this exercise. I note, however, that the land is not part of a special landscape. The RDDP does not designate such areas.

15.7 National policy says that the extraction of minerals is a temporary activity. Such extraction need not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt: it need not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belts, provided that high environmental standards are maintained and that the site is well restored. It follows that there is no reason in principle why an area of search for minerals should not include Green Belt land. Compliance of individual proposals with Green Belt policy would be investigated in the context of the circumstances and characteristics of those proposals themselves.

15.8 Overall I conclude that this area of search notation should remain.

Recommendation

- 15.9 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/NR5.2: Apperley Bridge, Bradford

Objectors

74/5768	<i>Mr & Mrs John & Judith Bolland</i>
315/5809	<i>Ms Joanne Cutter</i>
1293/5767	<i>Mrs J Crellin</i>
1423/5285	<i>Mr and Mrs Ball</i>
1910/5765	<i>Mrs Jean Margerison</i>
1912/10029	<i>Mr Roy Margerison</i>
1912/5766	<i>Mr Roy Margerison</i>
4286/11794	<i>Mr Tim Lester</i>

Summary of Objections

- A quarry here would intrude into the landscape of the Green Belt, and cause disturbance, pollution, and traffic problems.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

15.10 National policy is that Councils should help to ensure an adequate supply of minerals to meet needs, and should indicate areas for possible future working of minerals. One tool for doing this is by identifying areas of search. The area of search notation at Apperley Bridge reflects the likely presence of workable minerals.

15.11 The inclusion of land in an area of search is not the equivalent of a grant of planning permission for mineral extraction. Any application for planning permission would be considered against the relevant policies of the UDP, taking account of the merits of the particular proposal. Thus the matters referred to by objectors, such as noise, disturbance, pollution, traffic, landscape and other effects, would be assessed as part of this exercise. The visual impact of any proposal would also fall to be considered as part of a planning application.

15.12 National policy says that the extraction of minerals is a temporary activity. Such extraction need not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt: it need not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belts, provided that high environmental standards are maintained and that the site is well restored. It follows that there is no reason in principle why an area of search for minerals should not include Green Belt land. Compliance of individual proposals with Green Belt policy would be investigated in the context of the circumstances and characteristics of those proposals themselves.

15.13 Overall I conclude that this area of search notation should remain.

Recommendation

15.14 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/NR5.3: Esholt

Objectors

1912/10030	<i>Mr Roy Margerison</i>
------------	--------------------------

2354/6633	<i>Mr & Mrs J S Lloyd</i>
3111/5757	<i>Mr E Barker</i>
3144/5756	<i>Mr & Mrs S Thrippleton</i>
3201/5754	<i>Mr J R Shepherd</i>
3525/6641	<i>Mr & Mrs Bryan & Anne Harrison</i>
3547/8031	<i>Doreen Caton</i>
4455/10016	<i>A H Irving</i>
4475/10025	<i>Mr & Mrs P Cook</i>
4476/10008	<i>Esholt War Memorial Institute</i>
4483/10010	<i>Ms Theresa Oworm</i>
4484/10011	<i>S Whitham</i>
4485/10012	<i>Jean & Philip Owens</i>
4486/10013	<i>Ms Judy Teroy</i>
4487/10014	<i>A Sallabank</i>
4488/10015	<i>F Hillier</i>
4492/10009	<i>D Elliott</i>
4507/10003	<i>Ms Joan Ives</i>
4573/10006	<i>Ms Helen Bates</i>
4579/10004	<i>Mr J Tasker</i>
4612/10007	<i>Ms Caryn Riley</i>
4634/10001	<i>R Bentley</i>

Summary of Objections

- Minerals development would destroy the Green Belt, and the setting of this conservation area village and its listed buildings.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

15.15 These objections are to the FDDP. The minerals area of search at Esholt has been deleted from the RDDP, but the objections have not been withdrawn. It is the RDDP proposals which are before me, not the proposals of the FDDP. Hence, as the objected proposal is not part of the RDDP, I make no further comment.

Recommendation

15.16 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

BN/NR5.4: Hollins Hill, Guiseley

Objectors

1912/10026	<i>Mr Roy Margerison</i>
2354/6634	<i>Mr & Mrs J S Lloyd</i>
3111/5753	<i>Mr E Barker</i>
3144/2211	<i>Mr & Mrs S Thrippleton</i>
3201/5755	<i>Mr J R Shepherd</i>
3547/8029	<i>Doreen Caton</i>
4455/10037	<i>A H Irving</i>
4475/10024	<i>Mr & Mrs P Cook</i>
4476/10022	<i>Esholt War Memorial Institute</i>
4483/10031	<i>Ms Theresa Oworm</i>
4484/10032	<i>S Whitham</i>
4485/10033	<i>Jean & Philip Owens</i>

4486/10034	<i>Ms Judy Teroy</i>
4487/10035	<i>A Sallabank</i>
4488/10036	<i>F Hillier</i>
4492/10023	<i>D Elliott</i>
4507/10018	<i>Ms Joan Ives</i>
4573/10020	<i>Ms Helen Bates</i>
4579/10019	<i>Mr J Tasker</i>
4612/10021	<i>Ms Caryn Riley</i>
4634/10017	<i>R Bentley</i>

Summary of Objections

- This area is located within the Green Belt and the allocation might encourage more mineral extraction.
- Mineral investigation and extraction would destroy the setting of Esholt village and its listed buildings.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

15.17 National policy is that Councils should help to ensure an adequate supply of minerals to meet needs, and should indicate areas for possible future working of minerals. One way of doing this is by identifying areas of search. The area of search notation at Hollins Hill reflects the likely presence of workable minerals.

15.18 The inclusion of land in an area of search is not the equivalent of a grant of planning permission for mineral extraction. Any application for planning permission would be considered against the relevant policies of the UDP, taking account of the merits of the particular proposal. Thus the matters referred to by objectors would be assessed as part of this exercise. However, as national policy says, the extraction of minerals is a temporary activity. Such extraction need not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt: it need not conflict with the purposes of including land in Green Belts, provided that high environmental standards are maintained and that the site is well restored. It follows that there is no reason in principle why an area of search for minerals should not include Green Belt land. Compliance of individual proposals with Green Belt policy would be investigated in the context of the circumstances and characteristics of those proposals themselves.

15.19 Esholt is a conservation area, and the effects of any minerals development upon its setting would fall to be assessed in the context of the specific proposal. Nevertheless, it seems to me that the separation between the village and the area of search is such that the presence of the conservation area and of listed buildings should not prevent the identification of the Hollins Hill area as an area of search.

15.20 Overall I conclude that this area of search notation should remain.

Recommendation

15.21 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

Chapter 16 Pollution, Hazards and Waste

SOM/BN/P15/56: Land at Fagley Quarry, Bradford (BN/UR7.2)

Objector

4122/8548

Brighthouse Estates Ltd

Summary of Objection

- The after-use of the quarry should be identified as waste disposal.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 16.1 The extraction of minerals is permitted at the quarry until 2042. It would be premature to identify the site for waste tipping in view of the potentially lengthy life remaining to the quarry, and the need to avoid sterilising mineral resources.
- 16.2 I have dealt in Chapter 16 of the Policy Framework volume of this report with the question of need for further landfill sites. There I conclude that there is not the evidence to allow for a decision either way, pending the completion of the relevant waste strategies. In these circumstances I support the use of a criteria-based policy for the determination of planning applications. It is not known whether the objection site would meet the criteria of the relevant RDDP policies. In particular, it is not clear what the Best Practicable Environmental Option for the particular waste stream would be. As landfilling is the lowest level in the hierarchy of methods of waste treatment, this is another reason why I consider that the objection site should not be allocated as a landfill site.

Recommendation

- 16.3 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**

SOM/BN/P15/271: Manor Farm, Old Hollins Hill, Guiseley

Objector

4597/10051

Mr R Drake

Summary of Objection

- The site is available and suitable to meet the need for more inert landfill capacity, and could not be improved for agriculture by any other means.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 16.4 I have dealt in Chapter 16 of the Policy Framework volume of this report with the question of need for further landfill sites. There I conclude that there is not the evidence to allow for a decision either way, pending the completion of the relevant waste strategies. In these circumstances I support the use of a criteria-based policy for the determination of planning applications. It is not known whether the objection site would

meet the criteria of the relevant RDDP policies. The site is well screened from all, or nearly all, public viewpoints, but it is not clear what the Best Practicable Environmental Option for the particular waste stream would be. However, landfilling is the lowest level in the hierarchy of methods of waste treatment. It is possible, therefore, that the capacity of existing permitted landfill sites, together with higher-level methods of waste treatment, would render landfilling at Manor Farm unnecessary.

16.5 In all the circumstances I consider that the objection site should not be allocated as a landfill site.

Recommendation

16.6 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.**