

FAO Chris Pritchard
Development Plans Division
The Planning Inspectorate
Room 406
Temple Quay House
2 The Square
Temple Quay
Bristol
BS1 6PN

Department of Transportation, Design and Planning

Plans and Performance

8th Floor
Jacobs Well
Manchester Rd
Bradford
BD1 5RW

Tel: (01274) 434050
Fax: (01274) 433767
Minicom: (01274) 392613
E-Mail: andy.haigh@bradford.gov.uk
My Ref: TDP/P&P/DP&P
Your Ref: W4705/539

6th August 2004

Dear Mr Pritchard

Schedule of Errors and points requiring Clarification

Having now had time to go through the 700 plus pages of the Inspectors report we have a number of points where there are errors in need of resolution or matters requiring clarification so as to help the Council in considering modifications to the Plan arising from the Inspectors recommendations.

I have set these points out below following the same structure as the report i.e. commencing with policy issues and then proposals in constituency order.

Policy Framework

Chapter 5 Economy, Employment and Tourism

Page 36 of the Inspector's Report

The Inspector's Report refers to objections by the Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber to paragraphs 5.11, 5.13, 5.16 and 5.17. There is no record on the database to any objection to paragraph 5.17. Is the inclusion of this paragraph just a typing error?

Chapter 6 Housing

Pages 64 and 65 of the Inspector's report

In Table 2 the Inspector documents the components of his Phase 2 Housing Supply. He calculates the total supply to be 8137 units.

Is this total correct? The Council's calculation of the sum of all the components is 8117.

Annex: Matrix 1

BN/H1.36 Norbury Road, Ravenscliffe, Bradford, is an un-objected site that lies outside centres/corridors, that has not been included in column 3 of matrix 1.

Is this an omission, or has the yield from this site been accounted for in some other way?

If this is an omission, the column total and Table 1, in paragraph 6.42 on page 63 will require consequent amendment.

Centres Chapter

Page 90 Inspectors report Policy CT3 pages 87 and 88 of the Policy Framework

The Inspector has not reported on an objection by BT (objection reference number 6193). BT objected to the wording of the policy. A revision was incorporated to the policy and supporting text in the second deposit to meet their objection. Despite repeated attempts to explain that this revised wording now constituted the Plan the agents would only conditionally withdraw the objection. A proof was therefore prepared and submitted to the programme officer, but there is no reference to this matter in the report.

Pages 95 and 96 of the Inspector's report Paragraph 7.57 of the Policy Framework

The Inspector has not made a specific recommendation to modify the plan despite agreeing with the objector. At paragraph 7.23 of his report the Inspector deals with an objection by William Morrison's that the boundaries to district centres on the Proposals Maps should be amended to include areas of car parking which serve a district centre. The Inspector concludes that where a car park is an integral part of the centre and required for the efficient operation of the centre, it should be included in the boundary. However in the list of recommendations in para 7.26, no specific recommendation regarding this objection is made.

Bradford North

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

Clarification sought on exactly where the Inspector intends the new Green Belt boundary to be..

SOM/BN/H1/5.02, SOM/BN/GB1/5, SOM/BN/GB1/5.02 Land at Carr Bottom Road Greengates

Clarification required regarding the boundary between the safeguarded land recommended by the inspector and the green belt. In this case the objector revised his position in evidence to the Inquiry and it is not clear whether the inspector is recommending on the basis of the revised position or the objectors original position in his representation

Bradford South

SOM/BS/H1/149 (SITE/BS/E1.9) Land at Black Dyke Mills, Queensbury.

The objection land relates to the western end of the employment site not the whole of the site. The Inspector recommends that site E1.9 be deleted and that the land be reallocated as a phase 1 housing site. Clarification is sought from the Inspector to determine whether the intention of the recommendation is to:

1. delete site E1.9 and allocate it all for housing
2. delete the E1.9 and allocate only the objection site for housing
3. delete the objection site from E1.9 and allocate this part for housing leaving the remainder allocated for employment.

The 3rd scenario appears to best fit the reasoning in the report where the Inspector suggests in paragraph 6.46, that 1.80 hectares would remain available for employment development. However this does not accord with the recommendation.

SOM/BS/GB1/262;SOM/BS/OS1/262 & SOM/BS/H1/262.01 Shibden Valley, Queensbury

The Inspector recommends that the objection site be deleted from the green belt and left unallocated. It was agreed at the Inquiry, that the southern boundary of the objection site as indicated by the objector could no longer be identified on the ground and this is reinforced in the Councils evidence. The report does not address the matter of the boundary of the green belt. Has this part of the report been omitted inadvertently or is there some other reason for not addressing the boundary?

Bradford West

SOM/BW/GB1/158 SOM/BW/H1/158 & BW/H1.12

The Council feel the intent of the recommendation is unclear. What is unclear is the Inspectors recommendation that, Prospect Mills should be allocated for Mixed Use with any housing in phase 2. when the adjacent and related housing site (BW/H1.12) is a phase 1 site. The Council feels this sends out a conflicting message to potential developers and deferring the housing element to phase 2 does not help in addressing the deterioration of the Listed Buildings. Clarification is sought on the intent of this recommendation.

Keighley

SITE/K/E1.9; SOM/K/UR7/18,SOM/OS1/18,SOM/K/GB1/18 – Sykes Lane

There is a conflict between the contents of paragraphs 5.38 and 5.39 in the Keighley Report. In paragraph 5.38 it states that some greenfield land might need to be utilised to make the best use of the previously developed land allocated for a Phase 1 housing site. Having regard to the areas of PDL, and the adjacent greenfield land, this could result in the allocation of a 2-3 ha housing site. However, in paragraph 5.39, it states that for the sake of estimating global housing figures, 1 ha of land would be allocated as a Phase 1 housing site. This figure is less than the two areas of PDL put together, without including any greenfield land as suggested in paragraph 5.38. Clarification is sought on what scale of allocation as a phase 1 site is proposed.

Shipley

SITE/S/E1.1; SOM/S/OS2/183 – Otley Road.

The Inspector has not reported on the objection made to this site (Mrs Annie Butler – 4295). The case was originally scheduled as a hearing but reverted to a Written Representation.

SITE/S/E1.12, S/E1.13, SOM/S/NE9/177 & 178 – Land Adjacent to Manywell Quarry/Industrial Estate.

Although the Inspector has rightly referred to SITE/S/E1.12 in reference to the deletion of the designated Bradford Wildlife Area from the employment allocation, he then wrongly refers to SITE/S/E1.13 in his recommendation in paragraph 5.62. Are you able to issue a correction on this recommendation?

S/H1.13, S/H2.12, SOM/S/OS1/124 & SOM/S/GB1/124 Pendle Road, Gilstead, Bingley

This site was allocated as a Phase 1 Housing Site in the Council's Pre Inquiry Changes Report of January 2003. However, the Inspector's Report paragraph 6.25 and 6.28 wrongly refers to this change being made in the RDDP. The last sentence of paragraph 6.25 and the first sentence of paragraph 6.28 should therefore be changed accordingly. In addition the recommendation refers to the revised deposit plan when it should refer to the pre inquiry changes.

SOM/S/CF3/182 Former Ferniehurst 1st School, Valley View, Baildon (S/H1.8)

The Inspector's recommendation in paragraph 11.4 indicates that no modification is to be made to the RDDP. However, this recommendation should acknowledge that the phasing of the housing site is to change to a Phase 1 Housing Site in line with the recommendation in paragraph 6.13.

SOM/S/CF3/202 Ferniehurst Farm, Baildon Wood Court, Baildon (S/H1.6)

The Inspector's recommendation in paragraph 11.6 indicates that no modification is to be made to the RDDP. However, this recommendation should acknowledge that the phasing of the housing site is to change to a Phase 1 Housing Site in line with the recommendation in paragraph 6.13.

SOM/S/CF3/408 St Michael's Church, Littlelands, Cottingley

Delete words "hospital land" from the site's sub heading, as this is incorrect

I look forward to receiving clarification on these points in due course

Yours sincerely

A L Haigh

Andy Haigh
Group Planning Manager
Development Plan & Policy