

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

**Inspector's Report**

**Bradford West  
Constituency  
Volume**

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

## **Inspector's Report**

### **Bradford West Constituency Volume**

#### **Contents**

<b>Chapter number and title</b>	<b>Page number</b>
4 Urban Renaissance	1
6 Housing	8
7 Centres	39
8 Transport and Movement	43
12 Open Land in Settlements	51
13 Green Belt	53

## Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

### **BW/UR5.3, SOM/BW/H1/265, SOM/BW/H2/265 & SOM/BW/GB1/265: Back Fold, Clayton, Bradford**

#### **Objectors**

119/554                      *Mrs. Gillian E Parr*  
1459/9676 & 10811      *English Heritage*  
3435/8869, 10415 &    *Patchett Homes Ltd*  
10424

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should not be designated as safeguarded land and should be included within the Green Belt.
- Development would have an adverse effect on the conservation area and adjacent listed buildings.
- The site should be allocated for housing under Policy H1 or H2, as the infrastructure constraints can be overcome.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 4.1 I understand that the site has never been designated as Green Belt and is allocated for housing in the adopted UDP. My colleague Inspector addressed this allocation when considering objections to that plan. He concluded that the site was appropriate for housing, that any impact on the conservation area could be dealt with under development control procedures, and that access from Bradford Road, whilst impinging on the Green Belt, would not result in harm to the openness of the area.
- 4.2 PPG2 states that Green Belt boundaries should be changed only in exceptional circumstances. Since the adoption of the current UDP, PPG3 and PPG13 have been revised to give greater emphasis to sustainable development, and RPG12 sets out the basis of a locational strategy for development.
- 4.3 The boundary enclosure on the western side of the site may be considered to be more strongly defined than those on the north and east, and thus provide a more defensible Green Belt boundary. However, this boundary is not robust, and ancillary development has spilled over into the Green Belt. Furthermore, most of the site is not visible from the built-up area of Clayton, Bradford Road or much of the adjacent countryside. The site is located close to the services and facilities in Clayton (which is part of the main urban area) and has built development on two sides.
- 4.4 Accordingly, I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances sufficient to warrant the expansion of the Green Belt to include the objection site.
- 4.5 In relation to the impact on the conservation area and listed buildings, I agree with my colleague Inspector that development of the site could be controlled to ensure that it preserved or enhanced the character or appearance of the area and respected the setting of the listed buildings. However, I consider that this is dependent upon no vehicular access

from Town End Road. I note the suggestion that access could be provided here by the demolition of a barn. In my view this would not be acceptable, as I understand that the barn is a listed building and the resultant access would result in serious harm to the character and appearance of the conservation area. In addition, it is unlikely that the usually acceptable visibility splays could be provided in this location, and the carriageway of Town End Road is of extremely restricted width in part.

- 4.6 I understand that it is for these reasons, coupled with the problems of access from Bradford Road and traffic conditions in Clayton, that the Council has proposed to replace the current housing allocation with that of safeguarded land.
- 4.7 Concerning access from Bradford Road, this would require land outside the objection site and within the Green Belt, probably involving land owned and occupied by third parties. The differences in ground levels between the road and the adjacent land would require fairly extensive groundworks that would have an impact on the openness of the Green Belt. In addition, at the time of my site inspection I observed construction work being undertaken on behalf of Yorkshire Water. The form, location and extent of that work may well inhibit the location, form and nature of any proposed vehicular access from Bradford Road.
- 4.8 Furthermore, substantial housing development has taken place in Clayton in recent years and more is planned. Parts of the local highway network are now at capacity at certain times of the day. Development of the objection site with access from Bradford Road would increase traffic movements in the vicinity of the junction of Bradford Road/Town End Road/The Avenue/Green End where queuing already occurs.
- 4.9 In my view these matters are sufficient to warrant holding back development of the objection site to beyond the plan period.
- 4.10 I accept that the site is in a reasonably sustainable location, being close to a high frequency bus route, schools and the services and facilities in Clayton, and it adjoins the main urban area on two sides. These factors are important in terms of the locational strategy, but the site is greenfield. Taking account of the problems of access, the solution for which has not been forthcoming, I conclude that at this time the site is appropriately allocated as safeguarded land rather than housing under either Policy H1 or H2.

## **Recommendation**

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

**BW/UR5.4 (formerly BW/H2.1 & BW/H2.2), SOM/BW/OS1/161, SOM/BW/OS1/162, SOM/BW/GB1/161, SOM/BW/GB1/162 & SOM/BW/GB1/345: Ferndale, Brook Lane and Baldwin Lane, Clayton, Bradford**

## **Objectors**

*There were no objections to BW/UR5.4 but objections to the former H2 allocations are listed in the appendix to this report.*

## Summary of Objections

- Brownfield sites should be developed before greenfield.
- Loss of green fields and wildlife. The land should be Green Belt or an urban greenspace.
- Insufficient shops, schools and other facilities.
- Access roads too narrow and already busy.
- The site, enlarged to include access from Baldwin Lane, should be transferred from phase 2 to phase 1.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.12 There have been no objections to the UR5 designation but the original objections to the H2 allocations have not been withdrawn, and similar considerations apply to the designation as safeguarded land.
- 4.13 This area of land is on the western edge of the village of Clayton, which is part of the main urban area. There are bus services a short walk from the site, and local facilities in Clayton, but these are about a kilometre away, with the nearest primary school some two kilometres away. Therefore, this is not a particularly good location for housing in terms of sustainability. Also, the existing roads are unsuited to serving further development, and access could only be achieved by constructing a new road from Baldwin Lane, on land at present within the Green Belt.
- 4.14 However, whilst I agree that the site is unsuitable for development within the plan period, it is land that could be considered for development in the future once more sustainable sites have been developed. Therefore, I consider that it is appropriate that it remains as safeguarded land, although the Council may wish to reassess this allocation as part of a full-scale review of the Green Belt, which I am recommending in the Policy Framework volume of this report.
- 4.15 In relation to the strip of land adjoining the site, which would be likely to be required for access, I consider that it would be appropriate for this to be deleted from the Green Belt if development were to take place. However, in the absence of any detailed proposals, I am not satisfied that exceptional circumstances exist to warrant changing the Green Belt boundary at the present time.

## Recommendation

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

### **BW/UR7.1: Cannon Mills, Great Horton, Bradford**

#### **Objector**

4148/12587

*Raven Retail Ltd (Ex Carter Commercial)*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The plan should not support out-of-centre retail development, contrary to the sequential approach, just because there is an extant planning permission. The additional text should be deleted.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 4.17 This site includes two groups of mill buildings, some housing, and extensive open land. A number of the buildings are listed, and in varying states of repair. There is a history of retailing on the site, with a number of the former mill buildings now being in retail use, and the open areas have been used for Sunday markets. Planning permission was granted in 2000 for a mixed-use development comprising retail, leisure, housing and workspace. The floorspace limits included in the RDDP reflect this permission, and are similar to the amount of retail floorspace currently on the site.
- 4.18 This is not an area where large-scale retail development would generally be acceptable. However, I consider that the existing use of the site, the need to find alternative uses for the listed buildings to ensure their preservation, and the regeneration of the area, justify a departure from the retail strategy of the RDDP. In addition, this site is only a short distance from Great Horton district centre, and is close to high-density residential areas. There is, therefore, the possibility of linked trips with the district centre, and a significant number of people who would be able to reach the retail and leisure facilities on foot.

### **Recommendation**

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

### **BW/UR7.2: Greenside Mills, Thornton Road, Bradford**

#### **Objector**

2676/6941 *Hartley Property Trust Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- There is no demand for conversion for employment or residential use, or for new units for employment use, and retention of part of the site for open space is unrealistic. The whole site should be allocated for housing.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 4.20 The area currently contains a mix of residential, employment and open space, with the predominant use historically being employment, although many of the buildings have now been demolished. The RDDP suggests that the future ratio of development should be 60% residential, 20% employment and 20% open space. This represents a considerable shift of emphasis, whilst maintaining some employment for local residents. There are some remaining industrial buildings on the site that could be suitable for small workspace units or residential. The allocation as a mixed-use area would allow flexibility to enable the best use to be made of these structures, and help to create a sustainable community. Furthermore, there is large scale modern industry to the east. New residential development could perhaps be shielded from this by some employment development on the eastern part of the mixed use area.
- 4.21 In relation to the open space use, this is a densely developed part of the city, and the playing field is an existing open space, for which demand is likely to increase with

additional housing in the area. There is also potential to create an attractive linear open space along Bradford Beck.

- 4.22 In my view this is a suitable location for mixed-use development, and I consider that the proportion of residential to employment and open space is realistic. For the purpose of calculating housing supply, the housing development could take place in phase 1 and could produce about 400 dwellings.

### **Recommendation**

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

### **BW/UR7.6: Thornton Road, Bradford**

#### **Objector**

2676/220 *Hartley Property Trust Ltd*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The policy should allow for retail use without restricting it to local needs only.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 4.24 This is an extensive area, comprising mainly employment buildings but with some groups of houses. Part of the area is a conservation area, and there are a number of listed buildings. The RDDP envisages a wide range of uses, including employment, residential, hotels and institutions, with small-scale retail, food and drink and leisure facilities ancillary to these uses. This would provide for the conversion of those buildings of architectural quality, together with some new development.
- 4.25 A small part of the mixed-use area is within the city centre boundary, and there is a local centre on its northern boundary, but the majority of the defined area is not within a centre. The retail strategy of the plan is to sustain and enhance the role of centres, in line with Government advice in PPG6. Unrestricted retail use in this area would be in conflict with this strategy, and I consider that the range of uses specified is sufficient to provide for the regeneration of the area.

### **Recommendation**

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

### **BW/UR7.7: Legrams Lane, Bradford**

#### **Objector**

954/12297 *Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The plan should be more specific about the scale of A1 development likely to be acceptable.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.27 The Council accepts that A1 retail uses should be limited to those on a scale appropriate to supporting the needs of the local community, and suggests additional wording, similar to that applied to other mixed-use allocations. The objector has indicated that this would overcome the objection.

### **Recommendation**

4.28 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified as follows:**

**BW/UR7.7 – add the following sentence**

**A1 uses (Retail) may only be considered acceptable if they are on a scale appropriate to supporting the needs of the local community and in accordance with other relevant policies of the plan.**

### **BW/UR9.1: Park Lane/Marshfields (Trident - New Deal for Communities), Bradford**

#### **Objector**

954/12867

*Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber*

#### **Summary of Objection**

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

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

4.29 Policy UR9 has been deleted from the RDDP, and replaced by lower case text. The Council's proposed changes of January 2003 amend this text, and repeat it in this section of the Bradford West constituency volume. I am recommending further modifications to paragraphs 4.45 and 4.45a of the Policy Framework volume to remove references to the Proposals Map and to replace "should accord" with "should have regard to".

4.30 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**

4.31 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP, except as set out in the Policy Framework volume of my report in relation to RDDP paragraphs 4.45 and 4.45a.**



## **BW/UR11.1: Bradford City Centre (Broadway) Action Area**

### **Objectors**

2480/6946	<i>London &amp; Assoc Properties plc &amp; Bisichi Mining</i>
4296/6802	<i>Consignia Plc</i>
954/12866	<i>Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- The policy and its designation on the Proposals Map should be deleted.
- The plan should acknowledge the presence of the Mail Centre to ensure that there is no future conflict.
- Where land use proposals are put forward in a Proposals Report, there should be a policy to cover the proposals, and the areas should be identified on the Proposals Map.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 4.32 Policy UR11 has been deleted from the RDDP, and the explanatory text expanded to incorporate most of the wording of the policy. However, I have recommended that the policy be re-instated but amended to refer to the detailed proposals in the relevant constituency volumes of the plan, and the need to have regard to the detailed planning guidance. This would appear to satisfy the objection by GOYH, and I see no need to modify this section of the report.
- 4.33 The objection requesting deletion of the policy contends that there is no need for a comprehensive redevelopment of the city centre, and that refurbishment and conversion of existing buildings, and incremental redevelopment, for a variety of uses would be more appropriate.
- 4.34 The proposals for this area are now well advanced, with Public Inquiries having been held into the compulsory purchase of land and the stopping up of highways. The First Secretary of State accepted that Bradford city centre is in decline, that there is a compelling need for the development proposed, and that the development will not detract from the vitality and viability of other retail facilities in the city centre. At this stage in the process it would be unrealistic for the RDDP to suggest an alternative approach.
- 4.35 The proposed redevelopment does not directly affect the Mail Centre, although the Mail Centre immediately adjoins the action area, and the associated highway proposals would alter patterns of movement in the area. It will clearly be important that access to the Mail Centre is maintained during construction works, but this is a matter of detail to be taken into account in the implementation of the scheme. Consignia also express concern that there may be conflict between its 24-hour operation and residential development. Whilst there may be parts of the site that are inappropriate for residential use because of this, or other neighbouring uses, this would not preclude residential use in principle, and will be a consideration at the detailed planning stage.

### **Recommendation**

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

## Chapter 6 Housing

### PARAGRAPH 6.0

#### Objector

954/12859 *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 West constituency volume, as to whether the site is a greenfield site or previously-developed land.**

**BW/H1.4, SOM/BW/OS1/336, SOM/BW/OS3/336 & SOM/BW/OS4/336: Clayton Lane/The Avenue, Clayton, Bradford**

#### Objectors

119/552	<i>Mrs Gillian E Parr</i>
2585/6960	<i>Mr G Crossley</i>
2587/6958	<i>Mrs D C Crossley</i>
2589/266	<i>Mrs Vivien Walker</i>
2843/3074	<i>Ms Janet Firth</i>
2953/9603 & 10412	<i>Mr and Mrs J R Finder</i>
4015/6841	<i>Cllr Malcolm Sykes</i>
4016/6838	<i>Cllr Elaine Byrom</i>
4409/10450/1, 10453 & 10751	<i>Ms A Flint</i>
4580/10461 & 10466	<i>Mr Richard Stables</i>

#### Summary of Objections

- The housing allocation should be deleted and the site retained in open space use.
- Development would result in increased traffic congestion and harm to highway safety.
- Local services, facilities and infrastructure are incapable of providing for further housing.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.3 The site is located between older and more recent housing development and comprises a continuation of open space formed by playing fields, although the site is not public open space nor does it have any public rights of way over it. It is vacant and unkempt, but shows little sign of trespass or informal recreational use and stands generally above the level of the adjacent roads.
- 6.4 I consider that the site has limited visual impact as an open area, due to its setting, condition and the different ground levels. It does not appear to function as an informal recreation area or link between the different parts of the settlement. Conversely, it represents a sustainable location immediately adjacent to a bus terminus and close to a fairly wide range of local shops, services and facilities. Whilst not previously-developed land I consider that it scores highly against the other criteria indicated in PPG3.
- 6.5 The nature and form of the junction of The Avenue and Clayton Lane, together with the positioning of the bus terminus, is not ideal. However, the number of dwellings capable of being accommodated on the site is not likely to give rise to any significant increase in traffic congestion or harm to the safety of highway users. Indeed, the proximity of the bus terminus would encourage the use of public transport rather than private vehicles.
- 6.6 In my view a scheme could be sensitively designed to enhance the character and appearance of the area. I note the concerns relating to local infrastructure, services and facilities, but I have no compelling evidence that the scale of development achievable on this site would have a significant detrimental impact. Rather, it would provide some level of support to local shops.
- 6.7 I conclude, therefore, that allocation of this site for housing complies with national, regional and local policies and advice and is acceptable.

### **Recommendation**

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

### **BW/H1.13: Thornton Road, Thornton, Bradford**

#### **Objector**

4170/6800

*McLean Homes Ridings Ltd.*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The stated requirements for development, particularly relating to the provision of open space and contribution towards affordable housing and education provision, are too onerous and do not apply to other sites in the area.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.9 The objection implies that these matters are required by planning obligations that are unreasonable, unjustified and contrary to advice in Circulars 1/97 and 6/98. Accordingly, the text relating to BW/H1.13 should be amended to delete these requirements.

- 6.10 In response, the Council maintains that the text merely provides advice to potential developers, and the items specified are not intended to be planning obligations. Furthermore, similar statements are made in relation to other sites in the RDDP.
- 6.11 I consider that the matters referred to in the text relating to BW/H1.13 are existing features of the site or matters covered by policies in the RDDP. Accordingly, they provide site-specific and policy advice relevant to development proposals for the land. The nature and form by which such advice would be translated into development proposals would be the subject of discussion on any applications for planning permission. Thus I do not consider that the text imposes any planning obligations or is unreasonable.
- 6.12 The Council maintains that the text relates to issues to ensure that the site is developed sympathetically, sustainably and in line with PPG3. Although the site is close to employment facilities and bus routes I consider that it fails to satisfy many of the sustainability criteria set out in PPG3. In particular, it is divorced from most of the local services and facilities in Thornton and forms further consolidation of development that is essentially detached from the main part of the settlement. Nor is Thornton an urban area. Hence, in my view, the site should be allocated for development in phase 2 of the plan period rather than phase 1.

### **Recommendation**

- 6.13 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by allocating the site under Policy H2 rather than H1.**

### **BW/H1.17: Westbourne Road, Manningham, Bradford**

#### **Objector**

1740/9674

*John H Raby & Son Chartered Surveyors*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The housing allocation should not permit the site to be used for hospital buildings.
- If such use is permitted the site should be allocated as recreational open space for the adjoining school.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.14 The land was previously occupied by housing that has been demolished and the site is now grassed pending redevelopment. Outline planning permission was granted in November 2002 for a community hospital and medical centre, including the re-location of adjacent open space provision to that part of the site alongside the adjoining school.
- 6.15 Such development is included within Policy CF3 of the RDDP, for which sites are not specifically allocated on the Proposals Map. The policy allows such development on sites allocated for other uses where there is a demonstrated local need and subject to a sequential approach looking first at existing buildings and then unallocated sites.
- 6.16 In these circumstances an allocation for housing (or indeed other uses) does not prevent the land being developed for a facility included within Policy CF3. I accept that such

community uses are often difficult to plan for and thus may occupy sites initially allocated for other forms of development. However, such uses are important in serving the residential population and need to be in accessible locations. Furthermore, the approved proposal seeks to provide recreational open space in close proximity to the school, as desired by the objector.

- 6.17 Nevertheless, whilst outline planning permission has been granted this does not guarantee that the proposed development will come to fruition. Taking all these matters into account I consider that the housing allocation should be retained whilst accepting that development under Policy CF3 may occur.

### **Recommendation**

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

### **BW/H1.18: Dirkhill Road, Dirkhill, Bradford**

#### **Objector**

3873/12502                      *Ms Jean Hunter*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The land should be allocated as urban greenspace rather than housing.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.19 The loss from the site of its potential ecological value is regrettable, but the clearance of the site has effectively removed such value and it is unlikely that it will return. The land to the west of the site is allocated in the RDDP as recreational open space and is laid out as informal parkland with a children's play area. Land beyond Great Horton Road is also allocated as recreational open space, and to the south-west of the site is Horton Park, allocated in the RDDP as recreational open space and playing fields, and subject to Policy BH16, Historic Parks and Gardens. At the time of my site visit there was no evidence that the objection site was available as an area of open space.
- 6.20 The site is in a sustainable location for housing in terms of PPG3. It is close to a wide range of local services and facilities, including public transport, and near to the city centre where extensive employment opportunities are located. It is within the urban area and appears to be previously-developed land. It therefore ranks first in the locational strategy and sequence of development sites in terms of RPG12 and the RDDP. It is also available for development.
- 6.21 Accordingly, I conclude that the site is appropriate for housing under Policy H1 and that its development would not result in a shortage of open space in the area.

### **Recommendation**

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

## **SOM/BW/H1/148: Upper Syke, Clayton Lane, Bradford**

### **Objector**

2843/8447

*Ms Janet Firth*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The site has been unused for some years and should be developed for housing instead of site BW/H1.4.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.23 I have considered site BW/H1.4 above, where I conclude that the housing allocation in the RDDP is appropriate and reasonable. In relation to the Upper Syke land, I note that planning permission for residential use of the existing building has been granted, and at the time of my site inspection there was an application to convert the building to form 2 dwellings. Other than these applications I have no evidence of any desire by the owners to develop the site for housing.

6.24 Furthermore, the site contains many mature trees that make a valuable contribution to the character and appearance of the area, and the existing building is listed as of architectural or historic interest. These factors significantly inhibit the potential of the site for further development.

6.25 The land is currently unallocated in the RDDP and thus subject to Policy UR4, which does not preclude appropriate development. In my view, and in the light of the above considerations, this is the appropriate policy basis for the site.

### **Recommendation**

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

## **SOM/BW/H1/154 & SOM/BW/GB1/154: Land at Lynfield Drive, Heaton, Bradford**

### **Objector**

1753/8421 & 7811

*Daisy Hill Cricket Club*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The Green Belt designation and playing fields allocation should be withdrawn and the land allocated for housing under Policy H1 of the RDDP.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.27 The land is owned and occupied by the Daisy Hill Cricket Club and is subject to trespass and vandalism. Because of this the Club wishes to move to a more secure site. It is argued that the land is in a sustainable location and is not fundamental to the functions and purposes of the Green Belt. Accordingly, development for housing would help to meet the needs of the district by providing a housing site attached to the main urban area,

close to local services and facilities, including high quality bus services along Lynfield Drive that connect to the city centre and other parts of the city.

- 6.28 I have considered below the objection relating to the adjacent site to the west (SOM/BW/H2/344) where I conclude that the land should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated for housing. The acceptance of that recommendation would mean that this site would be essentially bounded on three sides by housing in the main urban area. Furthermore, the track that runs along the southern boundary is a continuation of that which is recommended as a distinct and defensible Green Belt boundary to SOM/BW/H2/344.
- 6.29 The eastern section of the objection site is overgrown and vacant. The western section, however, is occupied by the cricket pitch and is well-maintained, although with some evidence of the problems of trespass and vandalism referred to. PPG17 advises that playing fields should be retained rather than lost to built development. There are public playing fields and open space in the general locality, and I have no evidence of any shortfall in recreational open space or playing field provision in the area. Nevertheless, the loss of playing fields should be resisted, and the cricket pitch provides a valuable local recreational resource and an important visual open space.
- 6.30 The land is in a sustainable location and forms a small extension to the main urban area. The RDDP is intended to be a replacement plan responding to my colleague Inspector's recommendation that a review of the Green Belt should be undertaken. PPG3 emphasises that vacant and unused land, especially in the urban areas, should be used for housing. RPG12 advises that land in sustainable locations in or close to the urban areas should be developed for housing in order to limit the encroachment of development into the open countryside. Hence, there are strong reasons that can amount to the exceptional circumstances required to alter the extent of the Green Belt.
- 6.31 In the light of all of these considerations it is my view that the eastern section of the site could be beneficially developed for housing whilst the cricket pitch itself should retain the playing field allocation. The whole site should be removed from the Green Belt. In this way a defensible Green Belt boundary can be maintained, housing provided in a sustainable location and the club can use the financial resources generated to improve its facilities and the security of the site.
- 6.32 However, in view of the greenfield nature of the site, its location on the edge of the urban area and the need to resolve issues of access and the improvement of the cricket club facilities, I consider that development should be under Policy H2 rather than H1.

## **Recommendation**

- 6.33 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the Green Belt designation from the site, with the eastern section allocated for housing under Policy H2 and the western section retaining its playing fields allocation.**

## **SOM/BW/H1/155, SOM/BW/H2/155 & SOM/BW/GB1/155: Land at Westminster Drive, Clayton, Bradford**

### **Objector**

*1735/8412/3 & 7813 Mr. R Hannon*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The Green Belt designation should be deleted and the site allocated for housing, or as safeguarded land.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.34 I note that the site was allocated as protected open land in the draft version of the now adopted UDP, but was returned to the Green Belt on the recommendation of the then Inspector, pending a review of the Green Belt. The RDDP is intended to include such a review.
- 6.35 The site lies on the edge of the built-up area of Clayton and forms a small part of the open countryside separating Clayton from Thornton. It therefore fulfils Green Belt functions, but it is not essential to the Green Belt in this locality, and it is on the edge of the main urban area where land should be sought to make up the deficiencies in housing and safeguarded land. It is within reasonable distance of a frequent bus service and of services in Clayton.
- 6.36 Clayton is located on a plateau which falls away north of the objection site. Development on the site would extend the settlement northwards by only one field's width, and would take the developed area of Clayton up to a natural limit set by landform. I agree with the Inspector who considered objections to the approved UDP in that development here would not be prominent, despite the height of the land. Views of the objection site from the valley between Clayton and Thornton are not significant, because of the lie of the land. Views from Thornton of development on the site would not be significant because the development would be seen against the background of the existing buildings of Clayton. In my opinion development would not harm the landscape or damage the core functions of the Green Belt in this area. There are exceptional circumstances justifying the release from the Green Belt of the land.
- 6.37 However, I do consider that, on the available evidence, the site should not be allocated for development during the plan period. This is because of the infrastructure problems identified by the Council and not denied by the objector. Consequently, the notation for the site should be that of safeguarded land.

### **Recommendation**

- 6.38 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the Green Belt notation from the land at Westminster Drive, Clayton, and by the site's allocation as safeguarded land.**

## **SOM/BW/H1/156 & SOM/BW/GB1/156: Land at Thornton Hall Farm, Thornton Road, Bradford**

---



## **Objector**

1733/7816 & 8416     *Transatlantic Property Co Ltd.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated for housing as it is in a sustainable location.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.39 The site forms part of an important area of open land that fronts onto Thornton Road, providing a break in the essentially linear form of development to the south of the road. The Council has indicated that the site is not an integral part of the wider Green Belt, other than helping to ensure priority is given to the development of sites within the urban area. However, loss of this site to development would inevitably increase pressure on the remaining frontage land, with a consequent impact in terms of urban sprawl and encroachment into the open countryside.

6.40 The site, together with the adjacent mainly open land to the west, provides expansive views across the open countryside. These views counter-balance the sprawl of built development along Thornton Road. In my opinion the site meets the purposes and functions of the Green Belt and should be retained. Furthermore, Thornton Road provides a clear and defensible boundary to the Green Belt in this location.

6.41 I accept that the site is on a good quality bus route and reasonably close to the local services and facilities in the centre of Thornton (though too far, in my view, for the suggested use for accommodation for older persons). Nevertheless, Thornton is not an urban area, and the site is thus low down in the sequential order for development sites.

6.42 Accordingly, I conclude that the site is important to the Green Belt in this location, and the exceptional circumstances required to warrant removal from the Green Belt have not been demonstrated.

### **Recommendation**

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

## **SOM/BW/H1/157 & SOM/BW/GB1/157: Land at Chellow Lane, Daisy Hill, Bradford**

### **Objector**

1732/8426 & 10796     *Mr. D Ward*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated for housing, or shown as unallocated land.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

---

- 6.44 The site forms the greater part of a small field lying mainly between existing housing and a golf course. I consider that the contribution of the site to the functions and purposes of the Green Belt are not significant, and the proposed boundaries are clearly defined by the adjoining uses. In the context of a replacement plan and my recommendation that there should be a full scale review of the Green Belt, in addition to the more recent advice in PPG3, there are special circumstances sufficient to warrant removal from the Green Belt. The site is located adjoining the urban area but is not previously-developed land.
- 6.45 Accordingly, I consider that the site should be allocated for housing. I note the comments of my colleague Inspector in relation to his consideration of the site during the Inquiry into the now adopted UDP. However, for the reasons given above I consider that the circumstances have changed materially, and thus warrant a different conclusion.
- 6.46 However, as the site is greenfield, on the edge of the urban area and somewhat restricted in size and shape, I consider that it would be more appropriate for it to be developed under Policy H2 rather than H1.

### **Recommendation**

- 6.47 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the land from the Green Belt and its allocation for housing under Policy H2.**

### **SOM/BW/H1/158, BW/H1.12 & SOM/BW/GB1/158: Land at Prospect Mills, Thornton Road, Bradford**

#### **Objector**

890/549, 7954 & *Ghyll Royd (Holdings) Ltd.*  
8428

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The Green Belt boundary is ill-defined, contrary to PPG2, and should be revised in association with site BW/H1.12.
- The site should be allocated for housing in order to enable conversion and retention of the listed buildings of Prospect Mill.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.48 I note that the Green Belt boundary in this location was the subject of comment by my colleague Inspector in his report on objections to the now adopted UDP. The current southern boundaries of both the objection site and the adjoining BW/H1.12 follow no readily discernible features on the ground, contrary to the advice in PPG2 that Green Belt boundaries should be clearly defined using readily recognisable features. The Council's Green Belt Review survey sheets indicate that the southern boundary of the site is not robust, and whilst the contrary is stated in relation to the southern boundary of BW/H1.12 the survey was carried out some 5 years ago. In the intervening period the area has become more overgrown and the boundary enclosure dilapidated so that it is no longer readily apparent.

- 6.49 The Council has stated that a new boundary can be identified through suitable boundary treatment. As a general rule I consider that such a view can lead to undesirable results - for example, new boundaries could be created simply as a means of reducing the extent of the Green Belt and opening the way for development that would otherwise have been unacceptable. However, where there are no distinctive physical features, but it is important to define a limit to acceptable development, there are occasions where new boundary features will need to be created. In those circumstances it is necessary to give careful consideration to the character of the adjacent uses and the needs of necessary and acceptable development proposals.
- 6.50 The objection site contains the buildings of the former Prospect Mill, which are listed as being of architectural or historic interest and located within a designated conservation area. The buildings mainly comprise four linked blocks. That fronting onto Thornton Road is largely occupied by a number of employment uses, and the block behind also has some such uses, but much appears to be vacant. The remaining two blocks are essentially vacant and unused. All the buildings are in need of repair, and the vacant ones are deteriorating.
- 6.51 The objection proposes the conversion of the buildings to residential use, in association with the development of the adjoining allocated housing site (BW/H1.12). It is argued that such use is necessary in order to make restoration of the buildings commercially viable, and that additional land is required to the south, outside the Green Belt, in order to provide the necessary curtilage for access, vehicle manoeuvring and parking space.
- 6.52 I consider that it is unlikely that the whole of the mill buildings will be occupied by employment uses. Furthermore, employment rental levels in this location would be insufficient to make the restoration and conversion of the buildings viable. Therefore, an element of conversion to housing is necessary in order to restore the listed buildings. Similarly, I consider that it is necessary to provide additional land to the south of the mill buildings to allow for proper access, which may need to come from the adjoining allocated housing site.
- 6.53 I note the comments of the previous Inspector to the effect that such facilities could be acceptable in the Green Belt. However, I consider that the provision of an access road and associated hard surfaces here would have an undesirable impact on the Green Belt, and would also create a somewhat anomalous situation. Such development elsewhere in the Green Belt could warrant a refusal of planning permission, and claims of inconsistency of application of Green Belt policy. As a new boundary would have to be created in any event, in order to provide a clear boundary to the Green Belt, it would be preferable for all construction works to be outside the Green Belt.
- 6.54 Hence, in my view the current ill-defined southern boundaries of the objection site and BW/H1.12 need to be revised. In defining the line of the new boundary it is important to relate it to some existing physical features in order to provide clear guidance. The most appropriate feature in the immediate vicinity is the wall marking the southern boundary of the curtilage of Ashfield House. I consider that extending the line of this wall westward across the objection site and BW/H1.12 would provide a reasonable and sensible delimitation of the developable area and the Green Belt.
- 6.55 Turning to the question of the use of the objection site, I consider that it is important to retain employment uses in the area to provide local job opportunities and assist in achieving sustainable development objectives. Nevertheless, I accept that some

residential conversion of the former mill buildings is commercially necessary and reasonable in terms of land use. The site is in a sustainable location, alongside a high frequency bus route, very close to health and community facilities and near to the services and facilities provided in the local shopping centre. Thus it is suited to both employment (B1 and B2) and residential use, and in my view can accommodate both. Therefore, I consider that it would be appropriate for the site to be allocated for mixed-use under Policy UR7.

6.56 In view of the need to prepare a comprehensive scheme of development in association with H1.12, access and the conversion of the listed buildings, I consider that development of SOM/BW/H1/158 is more appropriate in phase 2 of the plan period.

### **Recommendation**

6.57 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified as follows:**

- [a] The Green Belt boundary be revised to run as a continuation of the line of the southern wall of the curtilage of Ashfield House westwards across the objection site and BW/H1.12;**
- [b] The site should be allocated for mixed-use under Policy UR7, including B1, B2 and C3 uses, and the supporting text be amended accordingly;**
- [c] The housing element on the Prospect Mills site be developed in phase 2 of the plan period.**

**SOM/BW/H1/279, SOM/BW/UR5/279, SOM/BW/H2/279 & SOM/BW/GB1/279: Mount Pleasant Farm, Sandy Lane, Bradford**

### **Objector**

*3435/8969, 10420, Patchett Homes Ltd.  
10422 & 10423*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The Green Belt designation should be deleted and the land allocated for housing under Policies H1 or H2, or as safeguarded land.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.58 The primary basis of the objection is that additional land is needed in order to satisfy the housing requirement of the area during the plan period and that of RPG12. The question of housing need is dealt with in the Policy Framework volume of my report. My consideration of this site, therefore, is on the basis that, as more land is required for housing, is it appropriate for the objection site to help satisfy such need?

6.59 The objection site forms part of the open land immediately to the north-west of the built-up area of the small settlement of Sandy Lane - the original objection referred to a larger area but was subsequently reduced. The land sits on a fairly prominent plateau and is used as pasture, with a gated entrance from the adjoining housing area.

- 6.60 I accept that the site adjoins the existing built-up area, and Sandy Lane is within the main urban area. The site is fairly close to some local services and facilities, including schools, but these are limited and the existing bus services are not high frequency. Thus Sandy Lane is not as well located and equipped as much of the main urban area. The site is also greenfield and, therefore, does not rank in the highest category of the locational strategy, nor satisfy many of the criteria set out in PPG3.
- 6.61 In terms of the Green Belt, in my view the land forms an important part of the open area that separates Sandy Lane from Cottingley and Wilsden, and development here would constitute urban sprawl encroaching into the open countryside. In this I do not accept the view of the Council that the site feels enclosed and is not part of the surrounding open countryside. The site is fairly prominent and development would be clearly seen as a significant encroachment of built development into open land. In addition, early development of this greenfield site would detract from the efforts to direct development towards derelict and vacant land and the objectives of urban regeneration. Furthermore, the proposed Green Belt boundary is not robust or as well defined as that which currently exists.
- 6.62 I note the comments of the previous Inspector in relation to this land, but I consider that circumstances have changed significantly since he considered this matter, including the revisions to PPG3 and PPG13 and the emphasis on sustainable development.
- 6.63 Accordingly, I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to warrant deleting this site from the Green Belt. In addition, the land does not rank sufficiently highly in terms of sustainable development criteria and the locational strategy to justify allocation for housing or as safeguarded land.

### **Recommendation**

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

### **SOM/BW/H1/283.01 & SOM/BW/GB1/283: Land at Long Lane, Heaton, Bradford**

#### **Objector**

4590/8893 & 10468 *Mr. M J Procter*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be deleted from the Green Belt and the north-western section allocated for housing under Policy H1 of the RDDP.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.65 The total site area forms a broad swathe of land in primarily open uses, including a golf course and driving range, agriculture and playing fields together with the steep, wooded valley of Red Beck. The area proposed for housing comprises the north-western section, occupied by the golf course and driving range plus a small group of dwellings together with an office and plant storage yard of a building company.

- 6.66 Notwithstanding the existence of the open land to the north, the objection site forms a clear limit to the built area of Heaton. Whilst there is some built development on the west side of Bingley Road (the Hallmark Cards premises) much of the frontage is occupied by open uses, including school playing fields. Not until reaching Ryelands Grove does built development begin to become characteristic of the area, and even here this is restricted to the western side of the road. Conversely, the eastern side of the road (the objection site) is characterised by open uses that are visually closely linked to the open area to the north, which together form the distinctive break between Shipley and Heaton.
- 6.67 In my view, the objection site forms an integral and essential part of the Green Belt in this location. It is not previously-developed land nor is it an urban extension. The proposed development area is largely divorced from the built area of Heaton and would appear as an isolated development in the generally open countryside. In addition, it is not close to a comprehensive range of local services and facilities, and would not be served effectively by the bus routes along Bingley Road. It would conflict with national policy advice in PPG3 and with regional guidance in RPG12.
- 6.68 Hence, the proposed development would represent the extension of urban sprawl, would threaten the separation of Heaton and Shipley, result in significant encroachment into the open countryside and hinder urban regeneration - all functions of the Green Belt. It would also seriously detract from the openness of the Green Belt - its primary feature.

### **Recommendation**

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

### **SOM/BW/H1/284.01 & SOM/BW/GB1/284: Land at Chellow Dean, Bradford**

#### **Objector**

4589/8892 & 10467 *Hallbaron Ltd., M J Procter & I M Procter (Settlement)*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site does not fulfil any of the purposes or functions of the Green Belt and should be allocated for housing to help satisfy the need for additional housing in the area.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.70 The site forms the easternmost extent of a tongue of open land that stretches from the open countryside in the west into the urban area. This area of land includes a golf course, reservoirs and major water treatment plant and provides a significant wedge of open space between the suburbs of Daisy Hill and Allerton.
- 6.71 The principal Green Belt function of this land is the prevention of the coalescence of these major housing areas. In addition, development here would represent encroachment into an important lung of open countryside extending into the urban area. It has been argued that development of the site would provide a more defensible boundary to the Green Belt than that existing, which is formed by the rear garden boundary enclosures of dwellings to the south. This boundary runs straight and clear for a considerable distance.

In my view the southern boundary is distinct and, having stood the test of time over a number of years, constitutes a logical and defensible boundary in this location.

- 6.72 It is incorrect to state that the Green Belt in this area is temporary. Whilst my colleague Inspector, when considering the objections to the currently adopted UDP, recommended that the boundaries should be subject to early review, this did not imply that the Green Belt as then proposed should be regarded as interim pending such review. The Green Belt has been formally adopted and carries the full weight of the development plan and national policy guidance. Any change to the boundary must be supported by demonstrable exceptional circumstances that justify the change proposed.
- 6.73 I accept that the site adjoins the main urban area and could come within the definition of an extension to such area. I also accept that there are no major physical constraints to its development, and it is located close to existing local services and facilities, including public transport routes. It thus constitutes a sustainable location. The size of the site could offer opportunities for a mixed-use development, including public open space. I recognise that the land suffers from some of the characteristic problems of the urban fringe, making agricultural use somewhat difficult, although I note that nearby land has been retained in agricultural use, including the keeping of livestock.
- 6.74 I am recommending, in response to other objections to the RDDP, that the Council carry out a further review of the Green Belt. This partly reflects the need for housing and safeguarded land. As part of that review, the Council will no doubt examine the objection site alongside other similar areas. However, in the context of the evidence before me, I am satisfied that the need for housing land does not override the harm which would arise from the development of this Green Belt site. Built development would be contrary to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, and there are not exceptional circumstances sufficient to warrant the alteration of the boundary in this location.

## **Recommendation**

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

## **SOM/BW/H1/288 & SOM/BW/GB1/288: Ashwell Farm, Heaton, Bradford**

### **Objector**

1778/8971 & 10403 *Mr. M A Choudhury*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land does not satisfy the functions of the Green Belt and should be allocated for housing.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.76 The site adjoins the main urban area with a school to the south, housing to the east and allotments to the west. Thus it is surrounded on three sides by urban (although partly open) uses. Immediately to the north the land falls away steeply into the area of the Red Beck valley, which is generally devoted to open space uses and, together with other land

to the north, provides an important separation between the built development of Bradford and Shipley.

- 6.77 An intensive pig-rearing unit formerly occupied part of the land, and some structures remain. As this was an agricultural use it does not satisfy the PPG3 definition of previously-developed land, but it does represent a vacant site within the urban area. It is within easy walking distance of a fairly wide range of local services and facilities, including shops, schools, health and community premises and public transport. I consider that it is a sustainable location and satisfies the RDDP definition of an urban extension. Accordingly, it ranks highly in terms of national, regional and local priorities for the location of development sites.
- 6.78 The current Green Belt boundary around the site is generally poorly defined - marked mainly by post and rail fencing. Conversely, the northern boundary of the site is very close to a marked change in ground levels that forms a very strong physical feature and would provide a clear and defensible limit to built development.
- 6.79 Taken with the facts that a review of the Green Belt was to be undertaken, the RDDP is intended to be a replacement plan, and the publication of the revised PPG3, I consider that there are exceptional circumstances to warrant the deletion of the land from the Green Belt.
- 6.80 Accordingly, I conclude that it would be appropriate to allocate the site for housing. However, in view of the greenfield status of the land, its location on the edge of the urban area and the need to determine vehicular access, I consider that development would be more appropriate under Policy H2 rather than H1.

## **Recommendation**

- 6.81 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the Green Belt designation from the site and its allocation for housing under Policy H2.**

## **SOM/BW/H1/291: Haworth Road, Heaton, Bradford**

### **Objector**

2507/8896 *Parkers Trustees*

### **Summary of Objection**

- The site should be allocated for housing under Policy H1.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.82 The site comprises an overgrown stone quarry and yard, now vacant and generally unused, together with a petrol filling station and small builder's yard, and is unallocated in the RDDP. I understand that permission exists for mineral extraction and landfill on the site. The Council takes the view that this permission should be implemented prior to any plans for built development and, furthermore, that the site cannot be regarded as previously-developed land, in accordance with the advice in PPG3. However, a letter dated 8 January 2003 from the Council to the objector's agent states that if the site



"becomes available during the first Phase of the Plan ... a planning application will be assessed as a brownfield windfall site in the context of the Plan and PPG3".

- 6.83 As unallocated land the site is subject to Policy UR4 of the RDDP. Definition of the site as previously-developed land would enable development with a preference for housing. However, PPG3 makes it clear that minerals and waste sites covered by permissions with restoration conditions are considered to be greenfield. The Council argues that the current permission for mineral extractions and landfill comes within this category. Accordingly, the site, currently unused and with clear evidence of its former use, does not comply with the PPG3 definition of previously-developed land. Hence, development under Policy UR4 would only be permitted if there were an overriding reason for it in that particular location.
- 6.84 The site is situated adjacent to residential and related uses to the west, north and east, with a golf course to the south. In the immediate vicinity there are two small groups of shops, including a post office and pharmacy, in addition to the petrol filling station which includes a convenience shop. The land has frontages to Haworth Road and Chellow Grange Road, both of which carry high-frequency bus routes. There are further local services and facilities in the neighbourhood, including schools, health and community facilities. I conclude, therefore, that this is a sustainable location for housing.
- 6.85 I understand that the current owner is unlikely to continue the quarrying operations. The location of the site next to residential properties makes quarrying operations by any new owner problematic and could give rise to complaints from nearby residents - as could the landfill operations, especially if occurring over a long period of time. There is no open space use of the site nor do I have any evidence of nature conservation interest. I agree with the Council that the landfill operations should be completed prior to redevelopment of the site, but development for housing would require this in any event as the current landforms would pose significant difficulties for housing development.
- 6.86 The landfill operations have been postponed twice already, with the consent of the Council. It seems that the restoration of the site without any indication of financially beneficial after-use is unlikely to occur in the near future. Meanwhile, a potential housing site within the urban area and in a sustainable location is unable to make a contribution towards satisfying the housing needs of the area.
- 6.87 In these circumstances I consider that allocation of the land for housing is sensible and reasonable, whether the site is classified as previously-developed land or not.
- 6.88 I note the comments of the Health and Safety Executive (HSE) in relation to the proximity of the Yorkshire Water Chellow Heights Treatment Works, and the statement that it would advise against a development of 30 or more houses on the site. This would reduce the contribution that the site could make to meeting housing needs, although the HSE comment is advisory only. The agent's response that larger houses could be built to cater for identified needs fails to have regard to the fact that the number of people at risk is material, and that the number of houses is merely a proxy measure based upon average occupancy levels.

## **Recommendation**

- 6.89 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the allocation of the objection site for housing under Policy H1.**

## **SOM/BW/H1/334 & BW/OS3.3: Land off Parkside Drive, Manningham**

### **Objector**

891/10400 & 10776 *Scotchman Road Limited Liability Partnership*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The northern fringe of the sports field should be allocated for housing. Development would not affect the sports use of the rest of the site, and would be sustainable.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.90 The Council agrees that housing development would be sustainable in terms of access to services, employment and facilities. This open, largely grassed area of land is basically a greenfield site in the urban area of Bradford, and would be a second choice for allocation in accordance with Policy H2 of RPG12. However, its actual and potential use in conjunction with the sports field tells against allocation for housing.
- 6.91 The objection land is narrow. The western end is close up to the football field, and the eastern section, up to the point where it falls steeply away, has a similar relationship with the clubhouse and pavilion. The central part of the land consists of the hard-surfaced parking area associated with the sports field. Housing would be too close for comfort, both from the point of view of residents and of the operation of the sports field, and would result in the loss of parking.
- 6.92 The Council's evidence suggests that the objector no longer owns the land, but that ownership is now in the hands of the previous long-term tenants, Manningham Mills Sports Association. The new owners intend to upgrade the facilities and have secured funding. A further consideration against housing allocation is that the objection land could prove to be needed to help upgrade the site as a whole. Additionally, there are deficiencies in playing pitch provision in the district. This site is located close to the Bradford Sport Action Zone, a deprived area that is particularly lacking in playing field provision.
- 6.93 Regional Policy H2 makes the second level of its sequential approach for housing allocation subject to achieving appropriate standards of urban greenspace. In view of the considerations I have set out above, it is my conclusion that housing allocation of the objected land would run counter to this policy.

### **Recommendation**

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

## **SOM/BW/H1/335, SOM/BW/H1/335.01, SOM/BW/H1/343 & BW/OS1.2: Wilmer Road / Park Road / Lister Park, Heaton**

### **Objectors**

4174/10378 & 10437                      *Keyland Developments Ltd.*  
4250/10381, 10440 & 9672              *Manningham HA Ltd.*

## **Summary of Objections**

- Two parts of this urban greenspace should be released for housing to meet requirements in this part of Bradford, and to bring benefits to the locality.
- The sites are previously-developed land. A strip of land along the south-eastern side of the urban greenspace is surplus to the operational requirements of Yorkshire Water.
- Housing development would be highly sustainable.
- The objection area is not of particular value as open land or as part of the Heaton Estates Conservation Area. Development would not cause harm.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.95 There are 3 objection sites at Heaton Reservoir. The Keyland Developments site is a strip of land along the south-eastern edge of the urban greenspace. One of the other sites is part of the Keyland site, and the third site is located at the northern edge of the urban greenspace allocation. I deal first with the Keyland site, and the question of whether it is previously-developed land.
- 6.96 The covered reservoir occupies only the western corner of the whole area of land. The south-eastern part of the area is not operational land, is no longer required by Yorkshire Water, and is separated from the reservoir by open land. The objection site is not used in connection with the reservoir, even though underground Yorkshire Water assets run beneath part of the site. In my opinion the objection sites in the south-eastern part of the urban greenspace are not within the curtilage of the covered reservoir. The site was once part of the open reservoir that used to be here, but that reservoir was replaced by the smaller covered structure in about 1990. The site was landscaped as part of that development but the area forming the planning unit is not necessarily the same as the curtilage. The landscaping has been effective and the site is largely occupied by grass, mature trees, and younger planting.
- 6.97 The site is not previously-developed land either by virtue of falling within the curtilage of the present reservoir or by reason of its previous status as part of the former open reservoir. Any traces of the old reservoir are difficult to detect and the land is open and green. My conclusion in this respect applies also to the smaller objection site contained within the larger Keyland site.
- 6.98 The Heaton Reservoir site as a whole is an attractive open break in the built-up area. The principal function of the reservoir area as open land is as a visual amenity. To develop any of the objection sites would reduce the size of the open area, views across which can be obtained especially from the west. The reduction in size would reduce the openness, which is important to the character of the locality. This would itself cause significant harm, particularly bearing in mind that the open area is within the Heaton Estates Conservation Area. The openness of the site has been a feature of the locality since the original reservoir was built in 1858. Good design would not prevent the encroachment onto open space, nor the provision of a footpath link make up for it. Furthermore, none of the objection sites is defined by a physical boundary against the remainder of the open land. Yorkshire Water's requirements may change in the future, and the same arguments as now could be used to justify a second tranche of development.

- 6.99 On the subject of the status of the northern objection land as previously-developed land, I do not know whether or not this is operational land, but again the open and landscaped nature of this site leads me to conclude that it falls within the terms of the second paragraph of the second footnote to Annex C of PPG 3. Should it fall within the curtilage of the covered reservoir, it should nevertheless not be developed, because of the considerations outlined in the preceding paragraph.
- 6.100 As for wildlife objections to a development allocation, although the reservoir area is a Bradford Wildlife Area, there is no specific evidence of the harm which would be caused to wildlife interests by house building on the objection sites.
- 6.101 The Council admits the sustainability of housing here in terms of accessibility to facilities. However, housing would not be sustainable in terms of reducing the openness of the urban greenspace and spoiling the character of the area. In the context of RPG Policy H2 the site falls in the second preference category, but this category also aims to avoid the loss of urban greenspace which contributes to the character of an area. PPG3 also says that developing more housing within urban areas should not mean building on urban greenspaces. To my mind the sustainability of the sites is outweighed by the need to retain the open and green character of the urban greenspace.
- 6.102 I give full weight to the consideration that the sites could provide types of housing, and employment, particularly needed in the Manningham district. Even so, there are other housing development possibilities in the district, and attention should be concentrated on securing their development. Certainly, the special needs of the local area should not override the value of the sites as parts of the urban greenspace. Otherwise, housing need is considered in the Policy Framework volume of this report, where I conclude against an approach based on subdivisions of the district, such as market areas or constituencies.
- 6.103 I am not aware of the circumstances which led to urban greenspace boundary changes involving Bradford Grammar School, but I do not consider that the objection sites should be removed from the urban greenspace at Heaton Reservoir or allocated for housing.

## **Recommendation**

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

## **BW/H2.1: Ferndale, Clayton, Bradford**

### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The housing allocation should be deleted and the land designated as Green Belt.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.105 This site was deleted as a housing allocation in the RDDP and designated as safeguarded land (BW/UR5.4). The objections are considered in relation to that heading above, to which reference should be made.

## **Recommendation**

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

### **BW/H2.2: Brook Lane, Clayton, Bradford**

#### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The housing allocation should be deleted and the land designated as Green Belt.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.107 This site was deleted as a housing allocation in the RDDP and designated as safeguarded land (BW/UR5.4). The objections are considered in relation to that heading above, to which reference should be made.

## **Recommendation**

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

### **BW/H2.4: Sapgate Lane, Thornton, Bradford**

#### **Objector**

3435/6944 *Patchett Homes Ltd.*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The site should be allocated for housing under Policy H1 rather than H2.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

6.109 It is argued that the site was previously used for spoil tipping and the landforms are not natural. Thus the site should be regarded as previously-developed land. Furthermore, a suitable access can be provided from Sapgate Lane, and this is a sustainable location for housing.

6.110 Whilst there is evidence that the land has been used for spoil tipping this seems to have been many years ago and since then natural regeneration has taken place so that the site is now grassland. Whilst the current landform may be man-made it is not obviously artificial and has blended into the landscape. Steep slopes are by no means uncommon in Bradford as a whole and this area in particular. There is no clear evidence of the former mineral extraction or waste uses. This is sufficient to comply with the PPG3 definition of

greenfield. In addition, the last use of the land was for agriculture and, in planning terms, this remains its established use. Therefore, again the land is greenfield in terms of PPG3.

- 6.111 I note the statement that adjoining land fronting onto Sapgate Lane is in the ownership of the objector and is sufficient to provide a satisfactory access to the site. However, the local road network - especially to the centre of the settlement - is very sub-standard in terms of width, vertical and horizontal alignment. Without improvement to this route the introduction of additional vehicular and pedestrian traffic would result in significant harm to the safety of highway users in the area.
- 6.112 In terms of sustainability, the site is reasonably close to high-frequency bus routes and the local services and facilities in Thornton, but direct access involves steep gradients and numerous steps that are a disincentive, especially for the return, up-hill journey.
- 6.113 Thornton is not part of the main urban area but is a relatively low ranking settlement in terms of regional Policy H2. This factor is not outweighed by the detailed sustainability considerations. Taking all these matters into consideration, I conclude that the site is appropriately allocated under Policy H2 and is unsuited for inclusion under H1.

### **Recommendation**

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

### **BW/H2.6 & SOM/BW/GB1/163: Allerton Lane, School Green, Bradford**

#### **Objector**

261/8459 & 11052 *Mr. David Gordon Brown*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be designated as part of the Green Belt rather than allocated for housing.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.115 The site lies to the north of a small group of generally old properties on the edge of the small settlement of School Green, in an elevated and somewhat visually prominent location above the Pitty Beck valley. Whilst mainly vacant, the land contains a number of stone walls in varying states of repair, is crossed by a low voltage power line from the adjoining electricity sub-station, and has mature trees, particularly near its northern boundary. The Council accepts that housing development is dependent upon improvements to the local highway network, which are in turn dependent on development of site H2.9, which I consider later in my report.
- 6.116 The Council also accepts that the site has some nature conservation interest as part of the Pitty Beck area, and I place little weight on the view that this could be enhanced by the development of domestic gardens. The Council concedes that the listed buildings adjoining the site may require the creation of a landscape buffer and retention of hedgerows that contribute to the setting of the area. Similarly, the contention that development of the site could contribute towards improved open space provision seems little justification for the loss of open countryside. Furthermore, such open space

provision would be of much greater benefit closer to the main residential areas rather than on the edge of a very small settlement. Although the Council says that development would provide new homes for families in the local area, no evidence has been presented to support such a statement.

- 6.117 I note the Council's arguments that the site is allocated for housing in the adopted development plan and was previously unallocated land outside the Green Belt. I also note that the site is described as within a high frequency public transport corridor, being within 300 metres of bus stops. The sustainability appraisal carried out by the Council is considered to justify the retention of the site for housing, and it is stated that there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant changing the Green Belt boundary in this location.
- 6.118 As I have indicated, the site is prominent in views across the Pitty Beck valley, where a new road is planned, and is similar in character and appearance to the neighbouring countryside. The gap between the development at School Green and the housing estates south of Allerton is quite narrow. The proposed road would add to the urban pressures on the area, and make the site more conspicuous.
- 6.119 I consider that the site performs many of the functions and purposes of land in the Green Belt, including preventing urban sprawl and the coalescence of built-up areas. In addition, development would form an incursion into open countryside. The comprehensive review of the Green Belt recommended by my colleague who reported on the currently adopted UDP, together with the increased national and regional policy emphasis on developing in the existing urban areas, are important factors. Furthermore, the boundary enclosures of the existing built development at School Green provide a distinct and clearly defensible boundary. In my view these matters in total constitute exceptional circumstances that warrant including the site within the Green Belt.
- 6.120 In terms of the sustainability appraisal, I accept that the site is close to good public transport routes. However it is greenfield, and on the Council's admission ranks low in the locational sequence of the development strategy. School Green has very limited local services and facilities. The facilities in Thornton are some distance away.
- 6.121 I conclude, therefore, that the housing allocation should be removed and the site included within the Green Belt.

## **Recommendation**

- 6.122 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the housing allocation BW/H2.6 and the inclusion of the site within the Green Belt.**

## **BW/H2.9 & SOM/BW/GB1/340: Cote Lane/Allerton Lane, Allerton, Bradford**

### **Objectors**

1459/9675 & 10401 *English Heritage*  
2707/9657 *Mr. Paul Cooper and Mrs. Edna Abbey*  
3512/11083 *Hallam Land Management Ltd.*  
3887/7021 *Mr. J C Rhodes*  
3889/7019 *Mrs. P M Rhodes*  
3890/6999 *Miss Elizabeth Anne Rhodes*

## Summary of Objections

- The land has important landscape, historic and nature conservation value and development would be detrimental to the area and its residents. The resultant increase in traffic could not be absorbed by the local and wider highway network and, together with the construction of the required off-site highway and drainage infrastructure, would cause further harm to the character and appearance of the area and the amenities of local residents.
- New housing provision should be concentrated within the existing urban area, particularly on previously-developed land, in order to help revitalise the city and protect the countryside from the encroachment of further built development.
- The housing allocation should be deleted and the land designated as Green Belt as it is not required for housing and the site fulfils the functions of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it.
- Development of the site is fundamental to achieving the housing requirements of the district and there is insufficient land allocated under Policy H1 of the RDDP. The off-site highways and drainage works are necessary prior to the occupation of new dwellings on the site and provide for the development of other allocated housing sites in the area. The lead-time for the design, approval and implementation of such works requires that early permission be given for the residential development.
- The site should be allocated for development under Policy H1 of the RDDP, or specific provision should be made for the early granting of planning permission for housing development to enable the off-site works to be completed in the first phase of the plan period. In either case a legal agreement could require that no dwellings be occupied until the completion of the off-site works.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.123 The site comprises a plateau area to the north with a steep slope down towards the Pitty Beck valley, where it forms a more rolling landscape. It is in a very prominent location and clearly visible from extensive parts of the locality and from further afield, including the settlements of Thornton and Queensbury. In terms of character and appearance it forms an integral part of the open countryside beyond the strong boundary of the urban area comprising Cote Lane/Allerton Lane and the housing beyond to the north and east. The Council's Landscape Assessment notes that the landscape is "sensitive to change".
- 6.124 Its historic interest includes three groups of buildings within or adjacent to the site, which include important listed buildings of Grade II and Grade II\* value. The impact of development on these buildings and their setting is the subject of specific objection by English Heritage. I consider that these groups of buildings are important to the local scene and as good examples that help illustrate the varied history of Bradford and its surroundings - examples that are all too few due to urban encroachment and unsympathetic development. The open countryside setting of these buildings is an important component of their visual and historic interest. Whilst the planning brief for the area indicates the retention of areas of open space around the listed buildings, the scale of housing development would have a very significant impact on them and their setting.
- 6.125 The site is also crossed by a number of public rights of way that are stated to have formed part of the historic drove road network. These are important features historically and in providing access from the urban area into the open countryside. I note that the planning



- brief for the site indicates that these rights of way should be retained, but clearly their character and appearance would fundamentally alter.
- 6.126 In addition, the field pattern of the site and surrounding area, and the fact that the steep slope in the central section of the site illustrates the existence of a glacial overflow channel, increase the historic interest of the landscape. Again, whilst the planning brief indicates that the stone walls of the field boundaries should be retained, and the steeper slopes would be used as an open space link through to the countryside, the scale of development would inevitably harm the historic landscape.
- 6.127 It is recognised that the Pitty Beck valley is an important wildlife corridor, and the Council's Nature Conservation Strategy recognises and protects the area as an important habitat. Whilst the development of this site would leave much of it intact, the RDDP also includes proposals for other housing development in the valley, together with the off-site highway and drainage constructions. In total, these developments would have a significant impact on the nature conservation interest of the area, and this housing site, being the major component in the development proposals, would have the greatest single effect. I note that schools use the valley for educational visits and the loss of the landscape and reduction of the nature conservation interest would considerably reduce its value in this respect.
- 6.128 The northern section of the western boundary is well-defined by the wall and roadway leading to the group of buildings at Bailey Fold. However, beyond that point the boundary follows a series of stone walls that are no different from any of the others in this part of the valley. I can see no reason why such a Green Belt boundary should be considered any more defensible than any of the other field boundaries. This raises the possibility that further encroachment into the Green Belt could be made more likely by allowing development of this site, contrary to the advice in PPG2.
- 6.129 I note the Council's view that the planning brief requires a strong landscaped edge to the site, which would provide a more prominent boundary feature. However, such treatment could be applied to any of the other boundary enclosures in the area, or elsewhere. Indeed, it might encourage a landowner and/or potential developer to deliberately create a strong boundary feature in order to argue that Green Belt land enclosed within it could be developed. Therefore, I give little weight to this argument. The advice in PPG2 emphasises the importance of existing well-defined and defensible boundaries.
- 6.130 In addition, the Council accepts that the land satisfies many of the functions of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it. I note that the land has never been part of the Green Belt and is allocated in the adopted UDP for housing, a designation that was accepted by the Inspector who held the Inquiry into objections to the now adopted UDP. The Council argues that there are no exceptional circumstances to warrant changing the extent of the Green Belt, and that case law requires that land can be included in the Green Belt only where some fundamental assumption that caused it to be excluded initially is clearly and permanently falsified by a later event [Copas v The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead. Ref. (2001) JPL 1169].
- 6.131 Nevertheless, the previous Inspector expressed sympathy with the views of the objectors who wanted the site designated as Green Belt. He considered that he was constrained by the existing housing allocation and the then overriding need for housing land in the district. Whilst the housing allocation remains, other fundamental circumstances have changed. The revised PPG3, together with PPG13 and RPG12 and the institution of the

'plan, monitor and manage' process for housing provision have altered the basis for the allocation of housing land. Furthermore, the previous Inspector recommended that a detailed review of the Green Belt should be undertaken, and the RDDP is described by the Council as a replacement plan rather than a review. These matters not only provide a basis for the exceptional circumstances required to alter the extent of the Green Belt, but also amount to the falsification of fundamental assumptions upon which the current Green Belt designation in this locality was made.

- 6.132 The question of the need for land for housing was covered in the various Round Table Sessions and is commented on in the Policy Framework volume of my report. The advice in PPG3, PPG13 and RPG12 makes it clear that a sequential approach to the allocation of land is required, with priority given to development within the existing urban area and the re-use of previously-developed land. The objection site lies on the edge of the urban area, does not come within the PPG3 definition of previously-developed land and is largely agricultural in use. Whilst the site is an extension to the main urban area, it is large, highly visible and prominent in the landscape and lies beyond a well-defined urban edge.
- 6.133 The Council concludes that the site is "relatively sustainable". Emphasis is placed upon the existence of public transport routes, shops, services and facilities in the locality. However, the main locations of such services and facilities are some distance from the site - such as the public transport routes along Thornton Road and the Allerton shopping centre. Yet the development of the site also requires significant works in terms of off-site highways and drainage construction, the destruction of a prominent landscape that is sensitive to change and impingement on a recognised important wildlife habitat.
- 6.134 Therefore, I conclude that, in terms of the sequential approach of national and regional policy guidance and the RDDP strategy itself, the development of this site for housing should be included under Policy H2 rather than H1, if required and appropriate for housing at all.
- 6.135 In relation to the argument that commitment to the planning, design and implementation of the required off-site highway and drainage works requires the certainty of planning permission on the objection site, this can be achieved without allocating the site under Policy H1. The argument for change would therefore seem to stem from a desire to develop at least part of the site in the earlier part of the plan period for reasons of an earlier return on the investment and cash flow. To some degree this was confirmed at the Inquiry when it was indicated that the objector would wish to construct up to 200 dwellings in the first phase of the plan period, but would accept a legal agreement to the effect that none could be occupied until the off-site works had been completed. The remainder of the site would then be developed in the later phase of the plan period.
- 6.136 I recognise that the allocation of the site under Policy H2 would be likely to delay the construction of the off-site works, as any developer would not wish to commit significant expenditure on such activity far ahead of being able to develop the housing site. I accept that Allerton Lane carries a significant volume of traffic at present and requires improvement, particularly along its southernmost section. However, I have no evidence that the local highway network as a whole cannot cope with existing and future traffic volumes until the allocated housing sites are developed. By implication, therefore, the later the housing development takes place the later the off-site works are required.

- 6.137 I consider that there is sufficient land allocated, and likely to be available, within the early phase of the plan period to cope with meeting the housing need. Therefore, there is no housing need justification for bringing the objection site forward in the plan period.
- 6.138 More importantly, I consider that the objection site performs poorly in relation to overall sustainability criteria and its development would have significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the area, including its landscape, historic and nature conservation value. The site is physically and visually an important part of the open countryside, and development would result in a very obtrusive encroachment beyond the well-defined urban boundary. The site performs many of the functions of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it, and there are sufficient exceptional circumstances to warrant its designation as Green Belt. I give greater weight to these factors than to the need for housing land, and recommend accordingly.

### **Recommendation**

- 6.139 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the housing allocation BW/H2.9 and the land designated as Green Belt.**

**BW/H2.10, BW/TM20.11, SOM/BW/TM20/370, SOM/BW/OS2/268, BW/OS3.2, SOM/BW/OS7/268 & SOM/BW/GB1/286: Ivy Lane, Allerton, Bradford**

### **Objectors**

2021/8872	<i>Mr. G Maren</i>
2195/11046	<i>Mrs. Beverley Porter</i>
3839/9611	<i>Bryant Homes Northern Ltd.</i>
3887/8888	<i>Mr. J C Rhodes</i>
3889/8886	<i>Mrs. P M Rhodes</i>
3890/8884	<i>Miss Elizabeth Anne Rhodes</i>
4017/8875 & 10432	<i>Cllr Valerie Binney</i>
4130/11047	<i>G M Johnson Deceased, P R Johnson &amp; A Johnson</i>
4207/9606	<i>Bairstow, Jowett &amp; Johnson</i>
2169/10427, 10523 & 10750	<i>Ms D M Davey</i>
3904/10429 & 10771	<i>Mrs Ann Ozolins</i>

### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be retained in open use, as village greenspace and/or allocated as Green Belt in view of its landscape, ecological and recreational open space value.
- The site should be allocated for development under Policy H1 of the Plan rather than H2 as it is previously-developed land and an extension to the urban area, a planning brief for the development has been prepared and planning permission has been granted for the road access at Ivy Lane.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.140 The site comprises a number of fields bounded by stone walls, and some former quarried and filled areas. A number of public rights of way cross the land linking the adjoining residential areas and Chellow Dean. Whilst clearly some parts are used by local residents, the only authorised access relates to the public rights of way across the site. A

number of the fields are used for grazing, and these and others have been cut for silage at various times. Where there is informal recreational use, this is of low intensity, and there is ample alternative opportunity nearby for similar use.

- 6.141 The site forms a continuation of the open land to the east and is divided into a number of fields, at least some of which are in active agricultural use. Whilst in conjunction with adjoining open land it forms part of a wildlife corridor, I have no evidence that it is of any significant ecological value. To the north of the site is the wooded Chellow Dean.
- 6.142 Land to the north and east is currently allocated as Green Belt, forming a lung of open countryside extending well into the urban area. The majority of the perimeter of the objection site abuts existing residential development, and the site itself is visually and physically closely related to these. The boundaries to the north and north-east are clearly demarcated by the steep sides of the wooded Chellow Dean and the former quarry face. The site is allocated in the adopted UDP for housing and I consider that the current Green Belt boundary is clearly defensible. No site-specific exceptional circumstances have been advanced to justify changing this boundary.
- 6.143 It has been argued that the greater part of the site (some 70%) is previously-developed land. Combined with it meeting the plan definition of an urban extension and being located close to a wide range of local services and facilities, including public transport services, it is stated that this justifies development within the early part of the plan period.
- 6.144 Whilst there is evidence to show that much of the site has previously been quarried and parts filled, I consider that the stage of vegetative regeneration over the great majority of the site is such as to make it essentially appear as part of the natural landscape. Whilst the expert eye may discern landforms that are man-made, I do not consider that these are sufficient to create an artificial landscape or justify categorisation as previously-developed land.
- 6.145 In addition, significant parts of the site are in active agricultural use for stock grazing and silage cutting. Other parts were in use at the time of my site inspections for grazing by horses. Whilst this activity is not in itself classified as agriculture, it does indicate that stock grazing on these other areas, albeit not necessarily high quality grassland, is possible.
- 6.146 I accept that the main former quarry area that occupies the north-eastern section of the site is previously-developed land, but the great majority of the site does not meet the definition given in PPG3.
- 6.147 I agree that Allerton contains a variety of local services and facilities, including frequent bus services, and that these are within a reasonable walking distance of at least part of the site. Accordingly, the site meets some of the essential criteria relating to sustainable development. I also accept that the site complies with the plan definition of an urban extension but this does not satisfy the criteria for inclusion within the first phase of the plan period. First phase needs can be met on more sustainable sites.
- 6.148 I note that the preparation of a planning brief for the site and the granting of planning permission for access from Ivy Lane and associated highway works to Allerton Road indicate that early development was previously intended. However, more recent national and regional policy guidance, particularly PPG3, PPG13 and RPG12, have required re-assessment of allocated housing land and the phasing of its development. Such recent

policy guidance also, in my view, requires re-assessment of the planning brief, particularly in relation to housing density and provision for private motor vehicles.

- 6.149 Concern has been expressed that traffic generated by development of the site, during site preparation, construction and subsequent occupation of the houses, would result in problems for the safety of highway users and the free-flow of traffic on Allerton Road and the surrounding network.
- 6.150 I note the evidence presented to the Inquiry, but am concerned that the provision of a single access to the site, together with its location on Allerton Road so close to the junctions with Cote Lane and Prune Park Lane would lead to problems. In my view detailed consideration should be given to accessing the site from additional points, so that development could be divided into smaller sections and traffic dispersed over a broader area, with alternative routes on the wider road network.
- 6.151 Objections also relate to the effect of the use of Ivy Lane on the adjoining recreational and playing field, which is regarded as an important local resource and of historic interest. The proposed reconstruction and widening of Ivy Lane would impinge on the eastern boundary of the open space and affect the line of mature trees. I consider that the impact on the playing field itself would not be material to its continued use for organised sport and recreational purposes. The loss of the mature trees could be mitigated in the longer term by appropriate landscaping and re-planting in association with the highway works.
- 6.152 Concern was expressed that the proposed highway works to Allerton Lane and Prune Park Lane would similarly affect the southern and western boundaries. In my view the impact would be minimal. Thus whilst suffering some loss I consider that the essential value and functions of the open space recreation area would be retained (see also BW/TM6.1).
- 6.153 In conclusion, therefore, I consider that the site is correctly allocated for housing under Policy H2 and that retention as open land, and/or allocation as Green Belt, is not justified. The recreational value of the land, and other considerations, are outweighed by the need for housing land and the relative sustainability of the site. However, further detailed consideration should be given to the planning brief for the development of the site and the access to it.

### **Recommendation**

- 6.154 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP, but that further detailed consideration be given to the planning brief for the development of the site, particularly in relation to layout, housing density, provision for private motor vehicles and additional accesses from the surrounding highway network.**

### **SOM/BW/H2/337, SOM/BW/UR5/337 & SOM/BW/GB1/337: East of Ivy Lane, Allerton**

#### **Objector**

4169/10380,                      *Mr. Edward Bairstow*  
10435/36

## Summary of Objections

- The site should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated for housing under Policy H2, or as safeguarded land.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.155 The site lies immediately to the east of the land allocated as BW/H2.10 in the RDDP. It is divided physically by a small valley running east to west. The southern section forms a continuation of land in the southern part of BW/H2.10, whilst the northern section stands above the former quarry face of the land in BW/H2.10. Although there is a crest in the ground levels through the site the more prominent physical features in the area are the significant depression to the east of the site and the steep, wooded valley of Chellow Dean to the north.
- 6.156 The boundary between the Green Belt and BW/H2.10 is marked in part by a stone wall (little different to others in the area) and the top of the old quarry face, but between these there is no distinctive boundary feature. I do not consider that this existing boundary, other than the old quarry face, represents a clearly defensible boundary for the Green Belt, nor is it apparent why this line was chosen as the limit to the housing allocation.
- 6.157 As with BW/H2.10 the site is close to local services and facilities in Allerton, and adjoins an extensive existing residential area. I consider that these factors, together with those relating to the need to review the extent of the Green Belt, the production of a replacement UDP and the revision of PPG3, provide the exceptional circumstances needed to warrant alteration to the extent of the Green Belt.
- 6.158 My concern in relation to housing development is in regard to access. In my conclusion on BW/H2.10 I have indicated the desirability of examining additional vehicular access routes and thus splitting the development area into sections. Adding further development land accessed only via Ivy Lane will require detailed investigation, and emphasises the need for additional access points. In the longer term it may be that this objection site could provide opportunities to achieve additional accesses through the existing housing area.
- 6.159 Accordingly, I consider that this objection site should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated as safeguarded land.

## Recommendation

- 6.160 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the site's Green Belt designation and its allocation as safeguarded land.**

## SOM/BW/H2/344 & SOM/BW/GB1/344: Galsworthy Avenue, Daisy Hill

### Objector

4174/10379 & 10439 *Keyland Developments Ltd*

## Summary of Objections

---

- The site should be deleted from the Green Belt and allocated for housing under Policy H2.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 6.161 The objection site comprises a piece of land between existing housing on 2 sides and a golf course and playing fields. Road access is available from 2 points. The land is unused and subject to fly-tipping. In the draft of the adopted UDP it was allocated as a school site, but late in the development plan preparation process the school proposal was abandoned and the site placed within the Green Belt.
- 6.162 The Green Belt Review appraisal of the site prepared by the Council concludes that the removal from this designation would not harm any of the purposes of including land within the Green Belt, although the individual text states that, "The boundary separates the suburbs of Allerton and Heaton". It states that the character and appearance of the land is more related to the urban area and adjoining residential development than to the open land beyond the southern boundary of the site. It is also accepted that development of the site would assist urban regeneration in directing development into the urban area. The suggested new boundary is stated to provide a physical separation of the site from the adjoining open land.
- 6.163 The Council's evidence to the Inquiry, however, argues that the land is part of the swathe of land that separates suburbs of the city and that, as a greenfield site, its inclusion in the Green Belt assists regeneration of previously-developed land within the urban area.
- 6.164 I consider that the suburbs of Allerton and Heaton are physically separated by the golf course that is not only allocated as Green Belt in the adopted UDP but also as a Special Landscape Area. Whilst the RDDP omits this latter designation, the golf course, with its Green Belt notation, provides an effective separation between the residential areas.
- 6.165 I agree with the Green Belt Review appraisal that the site relates primarily to the residential area rather than the open land to the south and east. The suggested southern boundary is marked by a well-used public right of way and the strong physical boundary enclosure of the golf course. I consider that this represents a very significantly more defensible Green Belt boundary than that which currently exists, which includes 2 road accesses into the land. Being open land with other open land on 2 sides, development would represent a minor extension to the main urban area here.
- 6.166 In terms of sustainable development I note that the Council has not undertaken a full sustainability appraisal of the site. In relation to the criteria set out in PPG3 paragraph 31, whilst the site is not previously developed it is unused and unkempt and suitable for housing. It is accessible to schools, shops, local services and facilities, including a high quality public transport corridor giving access to a wider range of services and facilities including jobs. The existing physical and social infrastructure appears capable of absorbing the development of the site without additional cost, and it would become part of the existing community, supporting existing local services and facilities.
- 6.167 It is argued that the fact that the land was previously proposed as a school site demonstrates that it was not considered that Green Belt designation was appropriate or necessary. Furthermore, no objection to such designation was raised at that time because the change was brought about late in the plan preparation process. Hence this site was not considered or referred to by the Inspector who reported on the objections to the

current adopted UDP. I note these points, but they are not fundamental to my conclusions. The objection also contends that development here would be more sustainable than on some of the sites allocated for development in the RDDP - particularly site BW/H2.9. That is a matter that I consider elsewhere in my report.

- 6.168 The extent of the Green Belt should be altered only in exceptional circumstances. One of the primary reasons for the preparation of the replacement UDP was the recommendation of the previous Inspector that a full-scale review of the Green Belt should be undertaken in order to establish long-lasting boundaries. I consider that the existing boundary of the Green Belt in relation to the objection site is unlikely to be long-lasting and that the land fails to satisfy any of the purposes of the Green Belt. The Council's own appraisal of the site comes to the same conclusion. Furthermore, the land is in a sustainable location and its development would help to retain land in the open countryside that would otherwise be taken for development. Allocation for housing would comply with the advice in PPG3, PPG13 and RPG12.
- 6.169 In the light of all of the foregoing, I consider that there are exceptional circumstances that warrant the release of the objection site from the Green Belt. In terms of its use for housing, the objector proposes allocation under Policy H2. I agree, as the site is an urban extension site.

### **Recommendation**

- 6.170 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the site from the Green Belt and its allocation as housing land under Policy H2.**



## Chapter 7: Centres

### BW/CT1.1: Broadway/Petergate, Bradford (1.1)

#### Objector

2480/7112                      *London & Assoc. Properties Plc & Bisichi Mining Plc*

#### Summary of Objection

- The site should be deleted from the list of sites covered by Policy CT1. There is no need for comprehensive redevelopment, and the provision of increased parking is in conflict with the Government's sustainability objectives, and the restrictive approach to the provision of car parking within the plan.

#### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.1 The reference to this site is largely an acknowledgement of proposals which are now at an advanced stage, with outline planning permission having been granted, and an Inquiry held into compulsory purchase of land and the stopping up of highways. The objection related to the FDDP, and the text has been amended in the RDDP. It no longer relates specifically to the proposal for which planning permission has been granted, and it indicates that parking provision must accord with the maximum standards set out in the plan. Whilst there is still a reference to increased parking provision, the requirement for compliance with maximum standards should ensure that the level of parking is not such as to encourage excessive journeys by private car.

#### Recommendation

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

### BW/CT1.18: Hammstrasse, Canal Road and Valley Road, Bradford (6.2)

#### Objectors

2014/7113                      *Bradford Retail Action Group*  
2276/7117                      *Bradford District Chamber of Trade*  
4135/6148 & 10434           *Dixon Motors Plc.*  
4138/5805                      *Wm. Morrison Supermarkets Plc*  
4165/5806 & 12378           *Miller Developments Northern Ltd and Magellan*

#### Summary of Objections

- The area should be designated for office development to support the city centre retail and leisure trade and create employment.
- The area should be extended to include land owned by Dixon Motors.
- The site should be for non-food retailing only.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 7.3 This site is on the opposite side of Valley Road from Forster Square Retail Park, and thus well located for Forster Square railway station and within walking distance of the city centre, albeit beyond the 200-300 metres referred to in PPG6 as an easy walking distance. It already has some retail uses but there is potential for additional large-scale uses. The Expansion Areas are intended to be developed only if the uses proposed cannot be accommodated within the Central Shopping Area of the city centre, and I consider that provision should be made to enable the city centre to expand if there is a demand for additional floorspace. Whilst this site is identified as being suitable for large format food and non-food shops, the plan indicates that other town centre uses could be acceptable, subject to similar considerations.
- 7.4 The main foodstore within the city centre at present is a Morrison's store, which adjoins the markets area, and there are also food halls at Sunwin House and Marks and Spencer. These are well located to serve people working and living in or near the city centre, but none provide a full convenience offer, and Morrison's appeared to be very busy at the time of my site visit.
- 7.5 The Colliers Erdman Lewis (CEL) Study indicated that there was no scope for additional convenience retail floorspace in the city centre, but the Council advises that the amount of floorspace has reduced considerably since 1988. This does not appear to be supported by the Retail Floorspace Capacity Updates, but I understand that these include figures for development outside the city centre, as defined in the RDDP. Thus it would appear that, whilst there is probably no quantitative need for additional convenience retail floorspace within the wider area, there is a shortfall within the defined city centre. This is certainly supported by my observation of the amount of existing floorspace, and the level of trading.
- 7.6 The strategy of the plan is to support both comparison and convenience retail development in the city centre, and I consider that there is scope to improve the convenience goods offer in a way that would complement the city centre. A food store on the Expansion Area would no doubt draw some trade from existing city centre food retailers. However, I consider that it would also attract customers who currently shop at out-of-centre stores, some of whom would combine their food-shopping trip with a visit to the city centre or Forster Square Retail Park. A large food store in this location would also draw trade from similar large stores in district centres within Bradford, but I think it unlikely that it would have a significant impact on any single store as most people would continue to shop at the store closest to where they live. I therefore consider that the policy should allow for both food and non-food shops.
- 7.7 The area referred to in the objection by Dixon Motors is to the north-east of the proposed Expansion Area, and hence further away from the city centre and the station. The Expansion Area already covers an extensive area, and I think it most unlikely that additional land will be required for city centre uses within the plan period. In these circumstances, I see no need to include this additional land.

## **Recommendation**

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

## **BW/CT1.20: Nelson Street Area, Bradford (6.4)**

### **Objectors**

2156/7116                      *Mr. Jeff Frankel*  
4138/5807                      *Wm. Morrison Supermarkets Plc*

### **Summary of Objections**

- The site should be allocated for office development to support the city centre and create employment.
- The site should be for non-food retailing only.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 7.9 This Expansion Area is located to the south of the city centre, on the opposite side of a major road from the Transport Interchange. It is, however, some distance from the Central Shopping Area, and the route is not particularly attractive. In my view a food store in this location would be unlikely to generate a significant number of linked trips with the city centre by car-borne customers. The site is reasonably well located for residential areas on the outskirts of the city centre, and for people using the Transport Interchange, but much of this is likely to be walk-in or top-up trade, for which the existing city centre food outlets are probably adequate.
- 7.10 I accept the Council's view that there is a need to improve the convenience food offer within or adjoining the city centre, and appreciate the wish to provide an alternative if the Valley Road Expansion Area does not come forward. However, I consider that the provision of a food superstore in this location would encourage additional car-borne trips to the area, without any appreciable benefit to the city centre in terms of increased trade.
- 7.11 Office use is clearly an appropriate use for a site with high accessibility by public transport but, as a former employment site, such development would be acceptable without the need for a site-specific policy, and I therefore consider that the proposed Expansion Area should be deleted.

### **Recommendation**

- 7.12 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the Expansion Area (6.4) Nelson Street, Bradford.**

## **SOM/BW/CT1/366: Leisure Exchange, Bridge Street, Bradford**

### **Objector**

3809/10570                      *J J Gallagher Ltd.*

### **Summary of Objection**

- There should be an additional paragraph "4.4 Leisure Exchange" to recognise the scope for a broader mix of uses including retail, offices and other commercial uses consistent with the location of the site within the city centre.

## **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

7.13 The Leisure Exchange has recently been developed for uses including a cinema, bowling alley, hotel and bars/restaurants, and is not, therefore, an area where change is anticipated during the plan period. It is on the edge of the city centre, remote from the Central Shopping Area, and I do not consider that it is a suitable location for retail uses generally, although planning permission has been granted for a change of use of one unit for non-food retail. There may be other city centre uses that would be appropriate, should units become vacant in future, but any specific proposals could be considered in the context of the district-wide policies relating to centres. In these circumstances, I consider that it would be inappropriate to include the addition requested by the objector.

## **Recommendation**

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

## Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

### BW/TM5.1: Former Keighley - Denholme - Bradford Line

#### Objector

2804/10409                      *Bradford Urban Wildlife Group*

#### Summary of Objection

- The cycleway should not be tarmac or developed into a modern footpath.
- The section north of Thornton Road should not be included as it leads to a tunnel and is a good wildlife area.

#### Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.1 It is proposed that this former rail line be developed as a traffic-free walking, cycling and horse riding route. Policy TM5 safeguards the line from development in order that it can be used for this type of sustainable use. The question of materials for the surfacing of any improved route is a matter of detail and is not an issue that needs to be addressed within a policy that simply seeks to protect the route for these purposes.
- 8.2 Core Document 205, 'The Great Northern Railway Trail', details the type of operations that would be necessary to develop the route. From this it is clear that the cycle route would be intended to pass through the Well Heads Tunnel. No details have been provided of what wildlife interest there may be along the section of line leading into the tunnel or how this might be affected by public access. This likewise applies in the section of line crossing Denholme Beck, but which lies within the Shipley constituency.
- 8.3 As stated above, the policy is merely a safeguarding one and the design of any route would be for later detailed consideration. Therefore, in response to the specific objection on this front, I do not consider changes are necessary to the RDDP.
- 8.4 On another matter, I see from CD205 that the route of the cycleway improvement, which follows the railway line and is considered under Policy BW/TM20.15, does not terminate at Clayton Tunnel. Instead it is intended to take a line from the tunnel mouth up the hillside to Brow Lane. For the sake of clarity, I suggest that the Council considers extending the TM20 notation on the Proposals Map to reflect this.

#### Recommendation

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

### SOM/BW/TM5/365: City Centre Rail Link

#### Objectors

2546/10567                      *Pedestrians Association*  
4694/10572                      *Transport 2000*

## Summary of Objections

- A link connecting the stations at Forster Square and Bradford Interchange should be included.
- There should be a heavy rail link between the 2 stations capable of carrying both local commuter and inter-city services. Just because the alignments planned for such a link over the past 110-plus years have been built over does not mean that the project could not be taken forward.

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

8.6 I have considered the matter of a cross-city centre link in connection with Policy TM5 to which reference should be made. Specifically in relation to a heavy rail link between the 2 existing stations, I consider it likely that the differences in levels between them and intervening city centre development would make tunnelled, bridged or at-grade options impractical. A major Council objective is the bolstering of city centre retailing, which such a rail link would be likely to prejudice by reason of its presence through the heart of the centre if this were to be at-grade or on a bridge.

8.7 Neither Metro, the body responsible for the operation of local public transport, nor the Strategic Rail Authority has raised the possibility of such a link with the Council. Nor have they objected to its omission within the UDP. No suggested alignment for a link has been put forward. In the light of this I do not consider that any possible benefits that could result from through rail linkage warrant reference within the RDDP.

## Recommendation

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

## BW/TM6.1: Cottingley - Thornton Bus Link

### Objectors

2019/7	<i>Mr. Paul Barker</i>
2021/8874	<i>Mr. G Maren</i>
2169/10524	<i>Ms D M Davey</i>
2341/210	<i>Mr. and Mrs. Ghweil</i>
2362/11	<i>Mrs. Dorothy M Booth</i>
4387/10448	<i>Mr. George Rhodes</i>
4655/10474	<i>Mrs. Heather Waite</i>

## Summary of Objections

- The proposed bus link is unnecessary and unfeasible and would require further encroachment on the Allerton Recreation Field (Prune Park).

## Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

8.9 The proposed route from Cottingley to Thornton does not appear to satisfy any significant movement between these two locations, and is essentially along the edge of the urban area rather than through it. It may ultimately provide a link from proposed new

housing areas to main routes along Thornton Road, Haworth Road and Bingley Road, leading to important destinations in Bradford, Shipley, Bingley and Keighley. However, the Council's evidence described the proposal as "an aspirational long term addition to the Quality Bus Network to facilitate public transport access to planned developments". In view of this and my recommendations in relation to some of those planned developments, I am not satisfied that the proposal is of sufficient certainty to be included within the RDDP, in accordance with the advice given in PPG12.

- 8.10 I note that the existing highway will require improvements in various locations in order to accommodate the route and some of these are included in the RDDP. Again some of my recommendations may affect these proposals, and additional traffic management measures will probably be required in some locations, such as Prune Park Road, in order to ensure the free flow of traffic at peak periods.
- 8.11 In relation to the specific concerns about further encroachment onto the Allerton Recreation Field, I note the evidence of the Council that no separate bus lane is proposed. Accordingly, I am satisfied that a revised Allerton Road/Prune Park Lane junction need not encroach upon the Recreation Field. In addition, the Council's witness at the Inquiry agreed that the necessary improvement to the Allerton Road/Cote Lane junction could be accommodated on the open land to the south of Allerton Road and thus again not encroach on the Recreation Field.
- 8.12 Nevertheless, in view of the uncertain and long-term nature of the proposed bus link I consider that it should be deleted from the RDDP.

### **Recommendation**

- 8.13 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the Cottingley - Thornton Bus Link.**

### **BW/TM20.9: Allerton Lane, Pitty Beck, Allerton, Bradford**

#### **Objectors**

261/553	<i>Mr. David Gordon Brown</i>
1169/547	<i>Mr. Eric Kellett</i>
1200/6856	<i>Mr. Paul Eric Wagstaff</i>
1201/546	<i>Mr. David A Jowett</i>
1702/3052	<i>Miss Frances O'Connell</i>
4017/6829	<i>Cllr Valerie Binney</i>
261/12065	<i>Mr. David Gordon Brown</i>
1200/12068	<i>Mr. Paul Eric Wagstaff</i>

#### **Summary of Objections**

- Objection to the removal of proposed better and safer improvements to Allerton Lane in favour of this new road proposal.
- The road would be an incursion into the Green Belt.
- The land that would be enclosed by the road, Allerton Lane and Old Road would become vulnerable to housing development.

- There would be a loss of much new tree planting and a valuable amenity in the Pitty Beck valley.
- The road has no merit on highway management or road safety grounds.
- Severe congestion would result at the School Green junction on Thornton Road and at the junction of Old Road and Thornton Road.
- The delay in building the road would leave Allerton Lane dangerous and unimproved.
- Additional carbon dioxide emissions will arise by creating a detour to return to Allerton Lane.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 8.14 The proposed road improvement scheme, which is carried forward from the adopted UDP, would involve the provision of a new stretch of road running from the north of Pitty Beck on Allerton Lane to join Old Road, or Thornton Road to the east of School Green. The Council considers this to be necessary to cater for additional traffic generated from proposed housing developments within Allerton close to Allerton Lane. Contributions would be expected from the developers of these sites towards its construction. It would also enable buses to use it as part of a High Frequency Bus Corridor between Cottingley and Thornton. The road would effectively replace the stretch of Allerton Lane from School Green to Pitty Beck.
- 8.15 I concur with the view that this existing road is poor in terms of horizontal and vertical alignment, width, lack of adequate footpaths, and poor visibility at its junction with Old Road. In its present state I do not consider it would be capable of catering safely for additional traffic likely to be generated by proposed housing within Allerton. Although improvements to the existing Allerton Lane were the subject of a proposal within the FDDP, this has been deleted from the RDDP. This follows the Council's assessment that even with improvements the road would remain poor in terms of geometry and safety, would not allow the passage of buses, and would result in additional traffic passing through School Green with the environmental consequences this would have.
- 8.16 I do not doubt that a new stretch of road could be designed that would represent a substantial improvement in terms of safety and capacity compared with the existing southern portion of Allerton Lane. It would rise up the north-facing valley slope towards Thornton Road crossing open fields and relatively recent tree-planted areas within the Green Belt between Thornton and Allerton. Inevitably there would be some adverse visual impact on the Green Belt, although the detailed design of the road and the opportunity for landscaping could serve to minimise this and the loss of any recent tree planting. The ability to provide a bus route as part of the proposed High Frequency Bus Corridor would also weigh in favour of the proposal although I am recommending above that BW/TM6.1, the Cottingley – Thornton bus link, be deleted from the plan.
- 8.17 If there were to be the provision of a bus link this may reduce some car travel and therefore offset any slight additional CO<sup>2</sup> emissions that could arise as a result of increased journey length by reason of the new route. Formation of a junction with either Old Road or Thornton Road would be a matter for the detailed design stage, as would the consideration of any traffic management measures that might be required to prevent unnecessary access and 'rat-running' through School Green. I do not consider that objectors need fear that if the road were to be built this would result in the release of land for housing between it and School Green. Much of the land is designated as Green Belt and, if my recommendation is accepted, site BW/H2.6 will also be so designated. The



strong presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt would apply to this area.

- 8.18 A significant justification of the road link is to cater for additional traffic that would arise from the development of allocations of housing, the largest of which (BW/H2.9) would be a phase 2 development, and from which contributions would be sought for the road building. However, I have recommended above that this BW/H2.9 allocation be deleted and the site designated as Green Belt.
- 8.19 Given the quantum of housing that the site could have provided close to Allerton Lane, the development of this site might have been expected to make a substantial contribution to the cost of road building. If the Council accepts my recommendation on that site then this might cause the road improvement scheme to be re-evaluated in terms of feasibility and timing. This may be even more likely if the Cottingley-Thornton bus link is deleted, as recommended above. Should these recommendations be accepted then the justification for the link road is largely removed and the realisation of the scheme within the plan period far less likely. In these circumstances I consider the proposal should be deleted.
- 8.20 If the scheme were not to come forward in the near future it would leave the existing very poor section of Allerton Lane in use. Therefore, I consider that it would be prudent for the Council to give further consideration to reinstating the southern portion of Allerton Lane as a road improvement scheme within the RDDP.

### **Recommendation**

- 8.21 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of proposal BW/TM20.9 and the re-instatement of BW/TM20.10 to bring forward improvements to the existing Allerton Lane prior to, or in the absence of, the provision of an alternative route.**

### **BW/TM20.10: Allerton Lane/Old Road, Thornton, Bradford**

#### **Objectors**

5/9645	<i>Mr. David Newton</i>
261/12066	<i>Mr. David Gordon Brown</i>
1200/12067	<i>Mr. Paul Eric Wagstaff</i>

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The proposed new road could not be built until 2009 and in the meantime Allerton Lane will remain unimproved and dangerous. Improvements to the existing road would be a better and safer solution.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

- 8.22 This road improvement featured in the FDDP but was deleted from the RDDP in favour of BW/TM/20.9. I have considered these matters in relation to BW/TM20.9 above, to which reference should be made.

## **Recommendation**

8.23 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by reinstating BW/TM20.10, in accordance with my recommendation relating to BW/TM20.9.**

### **BW/TM20.11: Ivy Lane, Allerton, Bradford**

#### **Objectors**

*These are listed in the appendix to this report.*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The loss of open space would significantly harm the amenity, recreational and historic importance of the area.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

8.24 I have considered these matters in relation to BW/H2.10 above, to which reference should be made.

## **Recommendation**

8.25 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP other than as set out in relation to BW/H2.10 above.**

### **SOM/BW/TM20/144: Manningham Lane, Bradford**

#### **Objector**

180/7984                      *Mr. Koyas Ali*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- Manningham Lane should be classed as an improvement scheme.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

8.26 The objector's concern is that this is a highly used main road leading from the city centre to the north-west and should be improved to promote greater traffic safety. The Council indicates that it has tried to downgrade the status of this road, which between Queens Road and Drewton Road is seen as a district centre, and attract traffic onto other routes more suited as radial routes from the city centre. As such, Canal Road, which runs roughly parallel to Manningham Lane, is identified as a Transport Corridor under Policy D10.

8.27 Manningham Lane has been designated as part of the Bus Priority Network. I accept that improvements that might be made under this could result in wider-ranging safety benefits and could also encourage motorists to use more appropriate alternative routes. Furthermore, the RDDP contains proposals for highway improvements along

Manningham Lane at its Queens Road and Oak Lane/Heaton Road junctions. Given this background, I do not consider it to be necessary for Manningham Lane as a whole to be designated as a highway improvement scheme.

### **Recommendation**

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

**SOM/BW/TM20/370: Ivy Lane, Allerton (BW/H2.10)**

### **Objector**

2169/10566 *Ms D M Davey*

### **Summary of Objection**

- An alternative to Ivy Lane should be sought to provide access to the proposed housing area.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

8.29 I have considered this matter in relation to BW/H2.10 above, to which reference should be made.

### **Recommendation**

8.30 **I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP but that detailed study be given to, amongst other things, the provision of additional vehicular accesses to BW/H2.10 from the surrounding road network.**

**POL/BW/TM24: Helicopter Landing Site, Bingley Road, Heaton**

### **Objector**

4186/12391 *Hallmark Cards (Holdings) Ltd.*

### **Summary of Objection**

- Further clarity/detail is required on proposals for the safeguarding of the site as a helicopter-landing site.

### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

8.31 A helicopter-landing site was identified on playing fields to the west side of Bingley Road within the adopted UDP. The Council indicates that this was omitted in error from the FDDP but is now shown within the RDDP, albeit on a portion of playing field further to the east of that shown in the adopted UDP. The site is identified as an emergency set-down for helicopters bringing cases to the nearby Bradford Royal Infirmary.

8.32 Neither the landowner nor the tenant has raised objections to the allocation. The Council indicates there have been no changes in circumstances since the original allocation to suggest that it is either no longer required or that this is an inappropriate location. The objector, Hallmark Cards, whose business occupies a site to the immediate north, has not detailed any specific objection to the allocation. I have seen no evidence to suggest that the location of the site or its likely amount of use would result in any specific detriment to the objector's operations. No modification to the RDDP is therefore necessary.

### **Recommendation**

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

## **Chapter 12 Open Land in Settlements**

### **SOM/BW/OS1/161 & SOM/BW/OS1/162 (BW/UR5.4): Brook Lane & Ferndale, Clayton, Bradford**

#### **Objector**

*4409/10752 & 10753 Ms A Flint*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- The land should be protected as urban greenspace.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.1 I have considered these matters in relation to BW/UR5.4 above, to which reference should be made.

#### **Recommendation**

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

### **SOM/BW/OS2/369: Open Space Bradford City Centre**

#### **Objector**

*2804/10569 Bradford Urban Wildlife Group*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- There are not enough open spaces and recreation areas in the centre of Bradford.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

12.3 This is a general objection expressing the view that there is an insufficiency of open space, particularly that incorporating soft landscaping such as 'pocket parks'. More trees, shrubs, grass and water features are requested and it is the objector's view that there is too much hard landscape of paving. Regret is also expressed that Exchange Square was not made into a garden. It is Policy OS2 that is cited as being the subject of the objection. However, this is a protective policy preventing the loss of existing open space to development. This policy would be applicable to future development proposals within the city centre.

12.4 Other RDDP policies, such as D1 and D5, are more positive. They require development to make a contribution to the environment, through high quality design, layout and landscaping, and by being designed so that important existing and new landscape features are incorporated as integral parts of a proposal. Additionally, Policy CT1 requires land and buildings within the city centre and defined Expansion Areas to be developed in accordance with the area policy statements. I consider that these provide scope for the incorporation of additional soft landscaping and general greening of the city centre. In particular, the statement relating to the civic core indicates that there may be an

opportunity to create improvements to the setting of buildings around the 2 public open spaces there.

- 12.5 Against this existing policy background, and in the absence of any indication of site-specific improvements the objector wishes to see, it is my view that the application of the plan's existing policies should be sufficient to ensure that proper consideration is paid to future landscaping in the city centre. Therefore, I do not consider any modification to the RDDP to be necessary.

### **Recommendation**

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

## Chapter 13 Green Belt

### **BW/GB1.3: House and Garden at Wilmer Drive, Heaton**

#### **Objectors**

2132/6858                      *The Heaton Woods Trust*  
2828/5785                      *Heaton Township Association*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- This site should be retained within the Green Belt.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.1 This area of land has been developed with a dwelling and garden, and now appears as part of the urban area, rather than the countryside. In my view these are exceptional circumstances which justify removal of the land from the Green Belt.

#### **Recommendation**

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

### **BW/GB1.4: Garden area at Park Drive, Heaton**

#### **Objectors**

2132/1231                      *The Heaton Woods Trust*  
2828/5786                      *Heaton Township Association*

#### **Summary of Objections**

- This site should be retained within the Green Belt.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.3 This is an elongated triangle of land between the rear gardens of residential properties and a footpath alongside Heaton Woods. The land is open, although in part the residential curtilages appear to have been extended into it. However, I do not consider that this is an exceptional circumstance that justifies removing the land from the Green Belt. Also, if it is taken out of the Green Belt, it could become more urbanised, detracting from the pleasant rural character of the footpath.

#### **Recommendation**

13.4 **I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of proposal GB1.4 and that the land at Park Drive, Heaton be retained within the Green Belt.**

**SOM/BW/GB1/161 & SOM/BW/GB1/162: Brook Lane & Ferndale, Clayton, Bradford (BW/UR5.4)**

**Objectors**

57/8456	<i>Mr. F A Twineham</i>
58/7981	<i>Mrs. J M Twineham</i>
4409/10454	<i>Ms A Flint</i>
4482/10458	<i>Mr. Victor Carson</i>
4580/10465	<i>Mr. Richard Stables</i>

**Summary of Objections**

- The land should be included in the Green Belt.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.5 I have considered this matter in relation to BW/UR5.4 above, to which reference should be made.

**Recommendation**

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

**SOM/BW/GB1/289: Wilmer Drive, Heaton, Bradford**

**Objector**

2339/10406	<i>Mrs. Sally Wigglesworth</i>
------------	--------------------------------

**Summary of Objection**

- The land should be removed from the Green Belt to enable the construction of a dwelling.

**Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.7 The objection site is a small field on the edge of the built up area. It is open, and clearly part of the countryside. I note that development has taken place on adjoining land but the Council advise that this was not in the Green Belt. The objection site is currently part of the approved Green Belt, and boundaries should not be changed unless exceptional circumstances make it necessary. In my view there are no exceptional site-specific circumstances for removing the land from the Green Belt.

**Recommendation**

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



### **SOM/BW/GB1/345: Baldwin Lane, Clayton (BW/H2.2 now BW/UR5.4)**

#### **Objector**

3435/10416                      *Patchett Homes Ltd.*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- The area of BW/H2.2 (now BW/UR5.4) should be extended to include land required for access from Baldwin Lane, and such area deleted from the Green Belt.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.9 I have considered this matter in relation to BW/UR5.4 above, to which reference should be made.

#### **Recommendation**

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

### **SOM/BW/GB3/192: Back Heights, Thornton**

#### **Objector**

1738/11128                      *Mr. Alan Hobbs*

#### **Summary of Objection**

- Infilling should be allowed in this area under Policy GB3.

#### **Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions**

13.11 Policy GB3 allows for infill development within the defined boundaries of settlements washed over by the Green Belt, in line with advice in PPG2. The area to which this objection relates is not a settlement but scattered development in the countryside, with large gaps between the individual clusters of dwellings. It would not, therefore, be appropriate to apply this policy to it, and the advice in PPG2 is that infill development should only take place within settlements.

#### **Recommendation**

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