

Local Development Framework for Bradford

Core Strategy

Further Issues and Options

Consultation Event Log

Temple Row Centre, Keighley
(19th March 2008)

June 2008



CONTENTS	PAGE
1.0 EVENT OVERVIEW	1
2.0 LIST OF ORGANISATIONS AND GROUPS INVITED	4
3.0 LETTER OF INVITE	6
4.0 BOOKING FORM	8
5.0 DELEGATE LIST	10
6.0 EVENT PROGRAMME	12
7.0 PROMPT SHEETS FOR OFFICERS	13
8.0 FACILITATOR NOTES	29
9.0 OPTIONS FORM	36
10.0 OPTIONS FORM FEEDBACK	37
11.0 OPTION FORM ANALYSIS	40
12.0 EVALUATION FORM	42
13.0 EVALUATION FORM FEEDBACK	44

1.0 EVENT OVERVIEW

BACKGROUND

- 1.1 The Core Strategy is the document that will show broad areas for growth and restraint, and will set out the role that different areas of the District will have in 2026. There are three stages in the production of the Core Strategy, the first being the pre-production stage that is termed 'issues and options' stage; the next is the preferred option stage and lastly examination stage prior to adoption of the document.
- 1.2 In line with the requirements of the new Planning system, Bradford Council conducted a public consultation on the issues and options for the Bradford district in January 2007. Following the publication of revised housing figures in the Regional Spatial Strategy (the regional development plan published by the Yorkshire and Humber Assembly) in October 2007, the Council sought to provide further consultation on the issues and options for the broad locations of new housing development – this is named Further Issues and Options consultation stage.

FURTHER ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION

- 1.3 The Further Issues and Options consultation process, which ran from February 2008 to May 2008 included different methods of public consultation and aimed to reach the different groups within the community, with help from Planning Aid (Yorkshire Branch).
- 1.4 The purpose of the Further Issues and Options Consultation was to respond to the increase in the housing requirements and to seek the issues and possible options to accommodate the increase in housing. The revised housing figures for Bradford meant that the Council is required to supply enough land for 50,000 homes, an annual rate of 2700, an increase of 1140 houses per year.
- 1.5 The Council put forward four options for the location of development, with each option seeing different areas of the District with different a proportion of the 50,000 houses.
- 1.6 The consultation sought views from the public, landowners, community groups, infrastructure providers and other interested parties, and to identify which option was viewed more favourably, or whether there was a fifth option that emerged from comments received.
- 1.7 A total of 191 people attended the public consultation events and we received 313 written comments, plus 107 Option comment forms which were handed out during the five

consultation events as detailed below. This has been an increase of over 600% of submitted representations since the first round of Issue and Options consultation in 2007.

OBJECTIVES

- 1.8 The events had two broad objectives:
- Raise awareness of the Core Strategy Further Issues and Options for Bradford.
 - Engage with key stakeholders in exploring the four spatial options for the location of housing and employment development within the District.

The events focus on the Further Issues and Options Documents, in particular the Spatial Vision and Strategy.

PARTICIPANTS

- 1.9 The Council targeted invites to local bodies, organisations and groups with an interest in the area. Section 2.0 sets out those who were invited to the events and a sample invite letter. Participants were sent out copies of the relevant documents
- 1.10 A total of 34 people attended the Keighley public consultation event.

PROGRAMME

- 1.11 The event took the form of a 3-hour session with two workshops, which started with a general introduction and scene setting presentation followed by a five-minute DVD that outlined the 4 spatial options for development. The attendees were then divided into break out groups, the first workshop session focused on Options 1 and 2, and the second workshop session focused on Options 3 and 4.

DOCUMENTATION

- 1.12 Copies of the Further Issues and Options Reports were available on registration, these were:
1. Spatial Vision and Strategy
 2. Initial Sustainability Appraisal
 3. Draft Settlement Study

In addition, LDF information leaflets (No.1 on The New Development Plan System and No.2 on the Core Strategy) were made available for the public. A delegate pack was provided which contained:

- Programme
- Delegate list
- Summary leaflet - Your District in 2026

- Spatial Options Comparison Table

BREAK OUT GROUPS

- 1.13 The break out groups were designed to allow people to express their opinions on the four Spatial Options for housing and employment development within the District until 2026. The first half of the session focused on Options 1 and 2 with the second session focusing on Options 3 and 4.
- 1.14 There were two break out groups for each session. Each had a dedicated facilitator who also acted as a scribe to record the discussions, and a planning officer was available within both groups to explain each option in detail.

EVENT EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK

- 1.15 Each delegate pack included an event evaluation form. A total of 13 delegates completed a form. These have been analysed and used to inform later events.

2.0 LIST OF ORGANISATIONS AND GROUPS INVITED

This event was jointly organised with Keighley Area Co-ordinators office. In addition to the invite list below, 18 district councillors were also invited.

Able All	Contact Point Oakworth
Addingham Civic Society	CPRE Bradford District
Aire and Calder Rivers Group	DDA Task Team
Aire Valley Conservation Society	Dial Bradford
Airedale Enterprise Services	Drovers Way Residents Group
Airedale Partnership	Drug and alcohol agency
Airedale Shopping Centre	Extended Schools Co-ordinator
Baildon & District Residents Association	Fell Lane - Community Group
Baildon Civic Society	Friends of Ilkley Moor
Baildon Community Link	Goitside Regeneration Partnership
Bangladeshi Community Association	Greenhill Action Group
Beechcliffe Face Community group	Greenway Amenity Group
Ben Rhydding Action Group/Save Us Pub	Haworth & Oxenhope District
Bingley Civic Trust	Haworth, Stanbuty & Lees Parish Council
Bingley CVS	Heaton Woods Trust
Bingley Environmental Transport Association	Highfield Community Centre
Bizzfizz Business Forum (Airedale)	Holy Family School
Black Mountain Millennium Green/Brunel Community Association	Ilkley Civic Society
BMDC Rural Services Team	Ilkley CVS
Bracken Bank Community Centre	Ilkley Design Statement
Bradford & District Coalition of Disabled People	Ilkley Parish Council
Bradford Access Action	KADAL
Bradford Association of Visually Impaired People & Centre for Deaf People	Keighley Asian Sport Association
Bradford Botany Group	Keighley Asian Women and Children's Centre
Bradford Civic Society	Keighley Disabled People's Centre
Bradford Community Environment Project	Keighley Furniture Project
Bradford CVS	Keighley Healthy Living Network
Bradford District Senior Power	Keighley News
Bradford Environmental Action Trust	Keighley Regen
Bradford NHS	Keighley Town Centre Association
Bradford Night Stop	Keighley Town Council
Bradford Older People's Alliance	Keighley Voluntary Services
Bradford Ornithological Group	Keighley Volunteer Centre
Bradford Ramblers Association Group	Keighley VS
Bradford Urban Wildlife Group	Key House - Keighley
Bradford Vision	Let Wyke Breathe
Braithwaite & Guardhouse Community Centre	Making Space
Buildings Consultation Group	Mobility Planning Group
Cathedral Centre Project	Mr G E Tattersall
CNet – Community Empowerment Network	Mr Kurt Kunz
Contact Point Haworth	Mr Martin Spiers
	Mr T Bendrien

Mr Tom Jones
Mrs B Smith
Older People's Focus Group
Oxenhope Parish Council
Penny Trepka
Ramblers Association
Roshni Ghar
Royds Community Association
Sangat Centre Keighley
Shared Churches
Silsden Parish Council
Sport Keighley

St Aidan's Presbytery
Steeton & Eastburn Parish Council
The City Centre Project
The Moravian Manse, Baildon
The Vicarage, Baildon
Touchstone Project
Transport 2000
Visual Disability Services
Worth Valley Young Farmers
Yorkshire Rural Community Council
Youth Services

3.0 LETTER OF INVITE

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

www.bradford.gov.uk

Department of Environment and Neighbourhoods

Neighbourhood Support Service
1st Floor, Jacobs Well
BRADFORD
West Yorkshire BD1 5RW

Tel: (01274) 431447
Fax: (01274) 437656
E-mail: steve.hartley@bradford.gov.uk
Website: www.bradford.gov.uk

Date: 25/03/2008

Dear Sir or Madam,

Your District in 2026

Bradford Council is currently consulting on how best to provide land to meet the future housing and development needs of the District. The broad location of land for housing and other development will be set out in a new document called the "Core Strategy" that will form part of the "Local Development Framework".

Some of you may already have attended events earlier last year as part of the early stages of consultation. Since these events, the Council has received new guidance from the government increasing the number of new homes to be provided to at least 50,000 in order to meet the needs of our growing population over the next 15-20 years. The five Area Coordinators' Offices are working with the Council's Planning Officers to involve residents and community groups in further consultation. The consultation will be based on the 'Core Strategy Further Issues and Options – Spatial Vision and Strategy' report published in January and supporting documents.

As part of the consultation the Council is holding a number of half-day events to discuss with local groups and other interested parties, in more detail, issues relating to their area. You or your organisation has been invited to attend one of the events as detailed on the enclosed Booking Form.

If you wish to attend one of these events please fill in and return the enclosed booking form by 27 February 2008.

Further information on the Local Development Framework is available on the Council's website at www.bradford.gov.uk/ldf. Copies of the three consultation documents are available online and reference copies can be found in the Council's Planning Offices at Bradford, Ilkley, Keighley and Shipley, and the libraries in Shipley, Bingley, Keighley and Ilkley, and Bradford Central Library. Hard copies will also be made available on request by contacting the LDF Group.

Even if you cannot attend an event please feel free to send us your comments. The Council welcomes your views and will take these into account when developing the Preferred Options for the Core Strategy. Comments should be made in writing and sent to the following FREEPOST address:

Bradford Local Development Framework
FREEPOST NEA 11445
PO Box 1068
BRADFORD
BD1 1BR

Alternatively, comments can be marked 'Core Strategy Further Issues and Options Consultation' and emailed to ldf.consultation@bradford.gov.uk. Comments should be received at the very latest by 20 March 2008.

Please note that representations cannot be treated as confidential and a schedule of all representations received will be published.

If you would like further information about the events, or would like to know more about the LDF please contact Helen Breen on 01274 432456 (or helen.breen@bradford.gov.uk), or Edward Broadhead on 01274 432499 (or edward.broadhead@bradford.gov.uk).

Yours sincerely

Steve Hartley
Assistant Director Neighbourhood Services

4.0 BOOKING FORM

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

www.bradford.gov.uk

Your District in 2026

Bradford Local Development Framework Core Strategy Issues & Options Further Consultation

Bradford District has a growing population; this is anticipated to grow by 109,700 to 594,300 by 2029. The Council and its partners need to plan for this growth in terms of providing homes, jobs, healthcare, education, shops and open spaces to cater for the needs of this growing population.

Bradford Council is currently producing a new strategic planning document, called a **Core Strategy** that will form part of its Local Development Framework. This crucial document will influence the scale and location of development to be provided for housing, employment, leisure and retail across the district for the next 10 – 20 years.

If you have an interest in shaping the future planning of the district, you are invited to attend one of the following events to discuss the issues and give us your views:

Wednesday 5 March 2008
Thornton Primary School, Thornton
Road, Thornton
6.30pm – 9pm

Saturday 8 March 2008
Victoria Hall, Victoria Road, Saltaire
10am – 1pm

Wednesday 12 March 2008
Thornbury Centre, Leeds Old Road,
Bradford
1pm – 4pm

Saturday 15 March 2008
Riddings Hall, Ilkley
10am – 1pm

Wednesday 19 March 2008
Temple Row Centre
Temple Row, Keighley
6.00pm – 9.00pm

To book a place on one of these sessions, please complete the form overleaf.

Alternatively, please email ldf.consultation@bradford.gov.uk and give your name, an organisation you may be representing, a contact telephone number and any special requirements you may have (including dietary); and remember to state which event you would like to attend.

You can also call the LDF Group on 01274 432499.

Core Strategy Further Issues and

Please return this form by 27 February 2008.

Name:	
Address:	
Organisation:	
Telephone:	
Email:	

Options Consultation – Booking Form

I will be attending the event at Thornton Primary School, Thornton on **5 March 2008**

I will be attending the event at Victoria Hall, Saltaire on **8 March 2008**

I will be attending the event at the Thornbury Centre, Bradford on **12 March 2008**

I will be attending the event at Riddings Hall, Ilkley on **15 March 2008**

I will be attending the event at Temple Row Centre, Keighley on **19 March 2008**

Dietary Needs (Please tell us if you have any special dietary needs)

Any special requirements Please list below anything else you may need. We will try our best to meet your needs so that you can fully participate on the day.

Please return this form to
Helen Breen
LDF Group
8th Floor Jacobs Well
BRADFORD
BD1 5RW

Or email to
ldf.consultation@bradford.gov.uk

Or fax to
01274 433767

Or telephone
01274 432499

Further details of the conference and a map will be sent to you with your booking confirmation.

If you would like to view the Core Strategy documents – the Spatial Vision and Strategy, the Initial Sustainability Appraisal, and the Settlement Study; please visit www.bradford.gov.uk/ldf and click the link for the Core Strategy.

Hard copies can be requested by telephoning 01274 432499.

5.0 DELEGATE LISTS

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

www.bradford.gov.uk

SPECIAL NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

CORE STRATEGY CONSULTATION

TEMPLE ROW CENTRE, KEIGHLEY – 19 MARCH 2008 6 – 9 pm

DELEGATE LIST

Name	Organisation
Andrew Marshall	Local Development Framework Group (CBMDC)
Isha Ahmed	Local Development Framework Group (CBMDC)
Helen Longfield	Local Development Framework Group (CBMDC)
Michelle Greenwood	Local Development Framework Group (CBMDC)
Jeff Bennett	Keighley Area Coordinator's Office (CBMDC)
Noreen Aktar	Keighley Area Coordinator's Office (CBMDC)
Susan Gledhill	Keighley Area Coordinator's Office (CBMDC)

Name	Organisation
Liz Balding	Cullingworth Parish Council
Anthony Barnett	Robinsons Architects
Abina Dorgan-Smith	Bradford Youth Worker
Alice Green	Resident
Mr Green	Resident
Mrs Green	Resident
Jacqui Guy	Cullingworth Parish Council
Mary Fraser Hay	CPRE
David Henson	Resident
Valerie Henson	Resident
Peter Hill	Haworth, Crossroads & Stanbury Parish Council
Angela Homes	Cullingworth Parish Council

Cllr Khadim Hussain	Ward Councillor – Keighley Central
John Huxley	Haworth, Crossroads & Stanbury Parish Council
Mark Jackson	Resident
Molly Kenyon	Saltaire Village Society
Anne Knott	Haworth, Crossroads & Stanbury Parish Council
William Lakin	Resident
Iain Mann	Resident
Joyce Newton	Keighley Town Council
Rob Martin	Saltaire Village Society
Cllr Steve Pullen	Ward Councillor – Keighley East
Chris Rollings	Early Years & Childcare Service (Bradford Council)
Cllr Angela Sinfield	Ward Councillor – Keighley West
Joy Smith	Resident
Carole Smithies	Resident
M Uppet	CNET
Joe Varga	Resident
Brian White	Prospect Neighbourhood Watch

Additional list of delegates that signed in on the day:

Name	Organisation
L. Head	Resident
P. Flenager	Resident
J. Mawson	Resident
K. Malik	Resident
B. Coffey	L.O.W.G.A.T.A.
B. Coffey	L.O.W.G.A.T.A.
J. Emmett	Resident
Sue Skinner	Resident
Paul Skinner	Resident
M. Ward	Keighley Town Council
Val Goater	Resident
Tony Paget	Resident
M. Fraserhay	CPRE
A. P. Naylor	BMDC

6.0 EVENT PROGRAMME

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

www.bradford.gov.uk

SPECIAL NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK CORE STRATEGY FURTHER ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION

TEMPLE ROW CENTRE, KEIGHLEY, 19TH MARCH 2008, 6 – 9pm

PROGRAMME

6.00pm	Registration, Food and Refreshments.
6.30pm	Welcome and Introduction: By the Neighbourhood Forum Area Co-ordinator setting out the aims of the event and proceedings
6.35pm	Purpose of the Consultation: Andrew Marshall (Group Planning Manager) Short presentation introducing the Local Development Framework and Core Strategy, the purpose of the consultation and how we have got to where we are now. Includes a short DVD presentation
6.50pm	Questions and Introduction to Workshops
7.00pm	Workshop Session 1: Discussion focused on Options 1 & 2 (as detailed in the Core Strategy Summary Leaflet) for the location of development
7.45pm	Refreshments break.
8.00pm	Workshop Session 2: Discussion focused on Options 3 & 4 (as detailed in the Core Strategy Summary Leaflet) for the location of development
8.45pm	Summary and where next: Andrew Marshall will summarise key issues raised on the day and set out the next steps in developing the LDF Core Strategy.
9.00pm	Close

7.0 PROMPT SHEETS FOR OFFICERS

PURPOSE AND AIMS OF WORKSHOP SESSIONS

The purpose of the workshops is to discuss the 4 spatial options identified in the Further Issues and Options Consultation document (and summary leaflet) for the location of development.

The overall aim of each workshop is to get delegates to think about the strengths and weaknesses of each option, what are their fears and concerns, as well as any other considerations that the Council should take into account in moving towards the next stage in the process, Preferred Option(s)

There are 5 foam boards for each workshop – 1 for each of the 4 options, 1x environmental considerations

The 1st workshop session will discuss Options 1 & 2, there will then be a break and the 2nd workshop session will discuss Options 3 & 4

Reference should be made to the environmental considerations board as a means to prompt discussion on other issues that should be considered in locating development.

It is also important to stress to participants that the Core Strategy is still at an early stage of development.

EXAMPLES OF QUESTIONS

Under each option there should hopefully be a natural discussion focused around the following issues:

Transport - infrastructure, capacity, access to public transport

Green Belt – loss of, and importance of in particular locations

Open Space – value of, amenity, implications of losing open space

Infrastructure/Utilities – e.g, school capacity, sewerage capacity etc

Environment – wildlife, flood risk, conservation etc

Housing Needs – affordability, lifetime homes

Jobs – providing land for the range of employment needs

Sustainability

Climate Change

Planners should get people to think about the role of places and how they should evolve/develop in accommodating growth.

The following are suggested questions that planner's should use as prompts/bear in mind in any discussions when exploring the strengths and weaknesses, and peoples fears and concerns of each option.

Where can we accommodate 50k homes and economic growth? Is there an alternative option?

What are the environmental considerations that may constrain growth e.g flood risk, wildlife areas etc.

What role does the District's various settlements play in accommodating growth?

How adequate is infrastructure (including future programmed infrastructure) provision to accommodate growth?

What is the best option for achieving sustainable growth?

ROLE OF PLANNERS/AREA CO-ORDINATORS AT EACH WORKSHOP

The Area Co-ordinators are to act as facilitators and will take a note of the meeting. They will use flip charts to note the **strengths** and **weaknesses, fears and concerns**, and any **other considerations** that should be taken into account for each option.

The facilitator should inform the workshop group that a note will be taken of the workshop - but that this will be a general note and not attributable to individuals.

The planners' role is to act as planning experts. Planners will need to know and explain each of the options and refer to any other background information that helps with the discussions.

Delegates have been (will be) sent a copy of the summary leaflet showing the 4 options and a copy of the table on page 37 of the Further Issues and Options Consultation document with their booking confirmation.

BACKGROUND

Why we are consulting now with Further Issues and Options – What has changed since the last consultation?

Housing

- When we consulted the public last year the Council had a housing requirement of approx. **31,000¹** dwellings to provide in the years 2004 - 2021. This was the figure in the draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)

¹ This is the figure outlined in the draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) – The regional development plan Core Strategy Further Issues & Options Consultation – Keighley (19th March 2008)

- Since then the Secretary of State has modified the (RSS), and a new housing requirement has been set. This is now **54,840²** dwellings to be provided between 2004 – 2026. – A significant increase of more than 23,000 homes despite the longer timeline of 2026.

Table 1: Comparison of net housing requirement for Bradford District

Draft RSS	Proposed Changes
2004 – 11 = 7 yrs x 1560 dwellings = 10,920 2011 – 16 = 5 yrs x 1920 dwellings = 9,600 2016 – 21 = 5 yrs x 2180 dwellings = 10,900 <u>Total 2004 – 21 = 31,420</u>	2004 – 08 = 4 yrs x 1560 dwellings = 6,240 2008 – 21 = 13 yrs x 2700 dwellings = 35,100 <u>Total 2004 – 21 = 41,340</u> (9,920 more a 32% increase than draft RSS) 2021 – 26 = 5yrs x 2700 dwellings = 13,500 Total housing requirement from 2004 – 26 is 54,840 dwellings.

We will not need to go into the details of the above table - although it is useful to have at the workshops

The rise in the housing requirement is significantly above what the market is currently providing for. For example the build rate for 2006 – 07 is 1578 dwellings (just meeting the 1560 set by the region). This year the housing requirement is for 2700 homes per annum!

So far 4,000 dwellings have been built between 2004 – 07 therefore:

Table 2:

Total housing requirement from 2004 – 26	54,840
Minus homes already built 2004 – 07	- 4,000
Total	50,840

We need to find land for approx. 50,000 homes by 2026. The above figs in table 2 should be mentioned in the workshops.

Other potential sources of housing supply include:

- Land with planning permissions for housing - approx 9,900 potential homes at October 2007
- Remaining Replacement UDP Phase 1 Housing sites

² This figure is based on more recent population projections

- Replacement UDP Phase 2 Housing sites³
- Replacement UDP Safeguarded Land Sites⁴
- Urban Capacity Study Sites*

* The Urban Capacity Study is being undertaken to look at the capacity of the existing urban area to accommodate growth. Outcomes from this work will depend on a) the densities used on any sites found, and b) the level of discounting i.e sites that cannot be developed due to constraints etc.

Work on the Urban Capacity Study will be used to inform the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA). Council's are now required by the Govt to undertake a SHLAA – this study is more onerous as we no longer just identify potential development sites, we also have to assess whether they are available for development and deliverable as part of the housing land supply.

Employment

The Regional Spatial Strategy as modified does not allocate an employment land requirement as it does for housing. However, it projects that Bradford Council will need to accommodate an annual jobs growth rate of **4,720** (this figure refers to jobs growth in traditional employment sectors, office, as well as retail and leisure)

Arups Consultants were commissioned last year to undertake an employment land review. The Council received their report in December, but this is not yet in the public domain. We can, however, refer to some of the Report's findings.

- There is approx.**160 hectares** of employment land – this includes RUDP allocations and regeneration proposals
- However, some of this supply is skewed towards small sites, and sites which have constraints such as access and contamination.
- The location of some of the employment land does not always marry with where the strongest demand for land is.

In terms of land required to meet employment growth forecasts it is projected that we need **214 hectares** (this is comprised of 40 ha office, 100ha manufacturing and industry, 74 ha storage and distribution)

In conclusion we need to find approx **50 hectares** of new, not yet identified employment land to meet projected jobs growth. Much of this will be for manufacturing and industry and will be located within the Bradford Urban Area.

³ Sites identified in the RUDP to come forward for development once 90% of phase 1 sites has commenced/completed

⁴ Sites identified in the RUDP as potential areas of search for future development

In all probability the Council will need to release land from the Green Belt in order to accommodate the level of growth for jobs and homes envisaged.

THE 4 SPATIAL OPTIONS

Have been put forward, based in varying degrees, on:

- Previous consultations (Feb – July 2007)
- Modified RSS (Sept 2007)
- Replacement UDP
- Emerging settlement study
- Masterplan proposals for various parts of the district e.g Airedale, City Centre
- Other strategies

The 4 options are still in the early stages of development and this consultation will provide a basis for more discussion that will lead to the next stage, Preferred Option(s)

Aim of the workshop is for people to think about the strengths and weaknesses, fears and concerns, and other consideration that should be taken into account for each option. And if possible for people to put forward the option that they think is best - this may be a hybrid of the options illustrated.

Towards the end of the workshops participants will be given a slip of paper and asked to fill in which option they think is the most suitable. These will be collected at the end of the event.

Planners will need to explain each option – so they need to digest the following (copied from Further Issues and Options Consultation document):

SPATIAL OPTION 1: RSS SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY OPTION

This option relates directly to the settlement hierarchy as set out in the modified RSS.

In the RSS, Bradford district forms part of the Leeds City Region. - The following settlement hierarchy is proposed:

Sub Regional City – Bradford/Shipley/Baildon south of Otley Road

Principal Towns – Ilkley, Keighley

Local Service Centres – Addingham, Baildon, Bingley, Burley in Wharfedale, Cottingley, Cullingworth, Denholme, East Morton, Harden, Haworth, Menston, Oakworth, Oxenhope, Queensbury, Steeton with Eastburn, Silsden, Thornton, Wilsden.

The Housing Requirement (approx 50,000 between 2008 - 2026) would be split as follows:

- 65% (32,500) in the Sub Regional City
- 30% (15,000) in Principal Centres
- 5% (2500) in Local Centres

In Bradford/Shipley/Lower Baildon (Sub Regional City) housing development would be concentrated in:

- Bradford City Centre
- Shipley and the Canal Road Corridor
- East Bradford
- Existing Mixed Use Areas

Due to the scale of development required around the Bradford Urban Area, Safeguarded Land as identified in the RUDP, and Green Belt releases around the whole of Bradford/Shipley area will also be necessary.

In Keighley and Ilkley (Principal Towns) housing development would be provided through

- Phase 2 housing sites and safeguarded land as identified in the RUDP
- Intensification (especially Ilkley)
- Major Green Belt releases

In Local Service Centres the extent of housing development in individual settlements will be dependent on the role of the settlement in the hierarchy. (Local service Centres are not identified in modified RSS.) Development will be brought forward on brownfield sites and Phase 2 Housing sites as identified in the RUDP, and relate to local housing need in the settlement.

Employment development with this option would be concentrated in:

- Existing employment zones, as identified in the RUDP,
- South and East Bradford (possible Green Belt releases)
- Keighley.
- Local Service Centres would only provide enough employment development to cater for local needs and to promote sustainability.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Option 1

These are the strengths and weaknesses listed in the consultation document. Participants will raise others – but these can be used to help the debate

Strengths:

- Conforms with RSS
- Majority of development will take place within or in close proximity to the existing built up area, with little expansion of free standing settlements within the Green Belt, therefore development will be close to existing public transport and infrastructure
- More effective use of vacant and underused land and buildings in the urban area

Weaknesses:

- Extensive Green Belt releases around Bradford,/Shipley/Lower Baildon, Ilkley and Keighley will be required to meet the housing requirements
- It is questionable whether there is sufficient Green Belt land available around Ilkley and Keighley to provide the housing quota for these areas, bearing in mind the environmental constraints e.g. flood risk areas, topography, South Pennines Special Protection Areas, in and around these settlements
- Only 5% of the total housing requirement would be allocated to local service centres, and this could lead to the decline of some settlements, and consequently, local housing need would not be realised in these settlements.
- Phase 2 housing sites (55 ha) in local centres such as Bingley (Sty Lane), Menston, Denholme, Silsden, Steeton, Queensbury and Haworth would still be required, but it would not necessarily provide the most appropriate or sustainable location for housing development in Local Service Centres
- There would be a mismatch between the focus for development (i.e. Bradford/Shipley/Lower Baildon, Ilkley, Keighley) and the location of safeguarded land (as this tends to be spread across the district).
- Employment opportunities in the Keighley area are severely constrained by flood risk issues and the housing requirement, therefore in reality not much land is available
- Employment opportunities in the east and south of Bradford will be competing with housing development for the same limited land resource.
- Development will not necessarily be in the most sustainable locations as all available land around Bradford/Shipley/Lower Baildon will be required for development to meet the housing target.

SPATIAL OPTION 2: CONTINUATION OF THE RUDP STRATEGY

This option is based on the existing RUDP, but with modifications based on:

- Masterplan proposals
- Community consultation (May/June Workshops)
- Emerging Settlement hierarchy
- Modified RSS
- Existing transport infrastructure

From these the following settlement hierarchy is proposed:

Sub Regional City – Bradford/Shipley/Baildon south of Otley Road

Principal Towns – Ilkley, Keighley, Bingley

Local Service Centres – Addingham, Baildon, Burley in Wharfedale, Cottingley, Cullingworth, Denholme, East Morton, Harden, Haworth, Menston, Oakworth, Oxenhope, Queensbury, Steeton with Eastburn, Silsden, Thornton, Wilsden.

The housing requirement (approx 50,000 between 2008 - 2026) would be split as follows:

- 50% (25,000) in the Sub Regional City
- 30% (15,000) in Principal Towns
- 20% (10,000) in Local Service Centres

This will result in a more dispersed form of development than that being put forward in option 1

In Bradford/Shipley/Lower Baildon housing development would be concentrated in:

- Bradford City Centre
- Shipley and Canal Road Corridor
- East Bradford
- Mixed Use Areas

However, both Safeguarded Land as identified in the RUDP, and Green Belt releases to the north, east and south of the Bradford/Shipley area will also be necessary.

In Keighley, Ilkley and Bingley housing development would be brought forward through:

- Phase 2 housing sites and safeguarded land as identified in the RUDP
- Intensification (especially Ilkley)
- Green Belt releases

In Local Service Centres development would be concentrated in the settlements of:

- Queensbury
- Menston
- Steeton
- Thornton
- Silsden
- Denholme
- Burley
- Baildon

These settlements have been identified, as early analysis shows that these settlements have most potential for development through existing Phase 2 housing allocations and safeguarded land, as identified in the RUDP; and many are in well-connected transport corridors. In these settlements development would be allocated on:

- Brownfield sites (mainly former employment sites)
- Phase 2 Housing sites
- Safeguarded Land
- Green Belt releases

In other local centres development would be based on local need, and would be minor in scale.

Employment development would be concentrated in

- Existing employment zones, as identified in the RUDP,
- South and East Bradford (possible Green Belt releases)
- The Airedale Corridor.
- Local Service Centres would only provide enough employment development to cater for local needs and to promote sustainability.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Option 2

These are the strengths and weaknesses listed in the consultation document. Participants will raise others – but these can be used to help the debate

Strengths:

- Growth will be targeted in areas which are currently capable of taking more development, therefore there will be less need for extensive Green Belt releases around the Bradford Sub Regional City
- Development will support Masterplan proposals, which have already been given some planning status by the Council
- Development will be based on existing transport infrastructure

- Development will be based on feedback from previous consultations
- Development will support the existing RUDP settlement hierarchy

Weaknesses:

- It is questionable whether there is sufficient Green Belt land available around Ilkley and Keighley to provide the housing quota for these areas, bearing in mind the environmental constraints e.g. flood risk areas, topography, South Pennines Special Protection Areas, in and around these settlements
- Employment opportunities in the Keighley area are severely constrained by flood risk issues and the housing requirement, therefore in reality not much land is available
- Employment opportunities in the east and south of Bradford will be competing with housing development for the same limited land resource.
- This option will not be in general conformity with RSS, as some Local Service Centres would provide large areas of housing and employment development, which would be more than that required for local needs.
- Development will be spread across the district so that new infrastructure requirements will also need to be spread more thinly across the district.
- Areas of Green Belt land around Bradford/Shipley/Baildon and Keighley and Ilkley would still be required to fulfil the housing requirement.

SPATIAL OPTION 3: FOCUSED GROWTH POINTS AROUND THE BRADFORD SUB REGIONAL CITY

This option is based on the RSS hierarchy, with development focused on growth points in and surrounding the north and east of Bradford/Shipley/Lower Baildon, in line with the growth point initiative being promoted by the Leeds City Region.

The RSS settlement hierarchy would be used as follows:

Sub Regional City – Bradford/Shipley/Baildon south of Otley Road

Principal Towns – Ilkley, Keighley

Local Service Centres – Addingham, Baildon, Bingley, Burley in Wharfedale, Cottingley, Cullingworth, Denholme, East Morton, Harden, Haworth, Menston, Oakworth, Oxenhope, Queensbury, Steeton with Eastburn, Silsden, Thornton, Wilsden.

It is proposed that the housing requirement (approx 50,000 between 2008 -2026) would be split as follows:

- 70% (35,000) in and surrounding the Sub Regional City
- 20% (10,000) in Principal Towns
- 10% (5,000) in Local Service Centres

In and surrounding Bradford/Shipley/Lower Baildon (sub regional city) housing development would be concentrated in the following growth points:

- Shipley and the Canal Road Corridor
- A new settlement at Esholt
- An extensive Green Belt release to the east of Bradford at Holmewood
- Bradford City Centre

With further development and or restructuring in:

- East Bradford
- Mixed Use Areas
- Safeguarded Land as identified in the RUDP

In Keighley and Ilkley (principal towns) housing development would be provided through:

- Phase 2 housing sites and safeguarded land as identified in the RUDP

- Intensification (especially Ilkley)
- Green Belt releases

In Local Service Centres the extent of housing development in individual settlements will be dependent on the role of the settlement in the hierarchy. Development will be brought forward on brownfield sites and Phase 2 Housing sites as identified in the RUDP and relate to local housing need in the settlement.

Employment development would be concentrated in

- Existing employment zones, as identified in the RUDP,
- South Bradford and the growth areas around Bradford/Shiopley/Lower Baildon and Keighley.
- Local Service Centres would only provide enough employment development to cater for local needs and to promote sustainability.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Option

These are the strengths and weaknesses listed in the consultation document. Participants will raise others – but these can be used to help the debate

Strengths:

- General conformity with the RSS
- This option attempts to link the RSS Core Approach with the emerging Leeds City Region Growth Point initiative.
- Development will be concentrated in a few areas, therefore infrastructure investment will be able to be targeted.
- Green Belt releases will be targeted to specific areas to the north and east of Bradford/Shiopley/Lower Baildon, rather than a number of smaller releases across the whole of the district

Weaknesses:

- It is questionable whether there is sufficient Green Belt land available around Ilkley and Keighley to provide the housing quota for these areas, bearing in mind the environmental constraints e.g. flood risk areas, topography, South Pennines Special Protection Areas, in and around these settlements
- Employment opportunities in the Keighley area are severely constrained by flood risk issues and the housing requirement, therefore in reality not much land is available

- Employment opportunities in the east and south of Bradford will be competing with housing development for the same limited land resource.
- Extensive Green Belt releases will be associated with the growth points at Esholt and Holmewood
- Existing large Phase 2 housing sites and some safeguarded land in local centres would still be required, and this development would not be in accordance with RSS strategy as these settlements should only provide for local need

SPATIAL OPTION 4: DISPERSED GROWTH POINTS

This option is based on the concept of sustainable dispersed growth points linked to:

- RSS growth point initiative
- Masterplans
- Existing transport corridors

This approach introduces a new tier in the settlement hierarchy, which would promote local growth centres based on well located settlements in the key transport corridors as follows:

Sub Regional City – Bradford/Shiopley/Baildon south of Otley Road

Principal Towns – Ilkley, Keighley

Local Growth Centres – Bingley, Burley in Wharfedale, Menston, Steeton with Eastburn, Silsden, Queensbury, Thornton

Local Service Centres – Addingham, Baildon, Cottingley, Cullingworth, Denholme, East Morton, Harden, Haworth, Oakworth, Oxenhope, Wilsden.

Housing Requirement (approx 50,000 between 2008 - 2026) would be split as follows:

- 65% (32,500) in and surrounding the Sub Regional City
- 10% (5,000) in Principal Towns
- 20% (10,000) in Local Growth Centres
- 5% (2500) in Local Service Centres

In and surrounding Bradford/Shiopley/Lower Baildon (sub regional city) housing development would be concentrated in the following growth points:

- Shiopley and the Canal Road Corridor
- A new settlement at Esholt
- An extensive Green Belt releases to the east of Bradford e.g. Holmewood
- Bradford City Centre

With further development and or restructuring in:

- East Bradford

- Mixed Use Areas
- Safeguarded Land as identified in the RUDP

In Keighley and Ilkley (principal towns) housing development would be brought forward through:

- Phase 2 housing sites and safeguarded land as identified in the RUDP
- Intensification (especially Ilkley)
- Green Belt releases

In Local Growth Centres housing development would be brought forward through:

- Phase 2 housing sites and safeguarded land as identified in the RUDP
- Green Belt releases

In Local Service Centres the extent of housing development in individual settlements will be dependent on the role of the settlement in the settlement hierarchy. Development will be brought forward on brownfield sites and Phase 2 Housing sites, as identified in the RUDP, and relate to local housing need in the settlement.

Employment development would be concentrated in

- Existing employment zones,
- South Bradford and the growth areas around the sub regional city,
- The Airedale Corridor.
- Local Service Centres would only provide enough employment development to cater for local needs and to promote sustainability.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Option 4

These are the strengths and weaknesses listed in the consultation document. Participants will raise others – but these can be used to help the debate

Strengths:

- Development will support Masterplan proposals, which have already been given some planning status by the Council
- Development will be based on existing transport infrastructure
- Development will be based on feedback from previous consultations
- Green Belt releases will be targeted to specific areas to the north and east of Bradford/Shiopley/Lower Baildon, and in well connected transport corridors, rather than a number of smaller releases across the whole of the district

- Development will relate to other development opportunities outside the district, especially in Craven and Leeds.

Weaknesses:

- It is questionable whether there is sufficient Green Belt land available around Ilkley and Keighley to provide the housing quota for these areas, bearing in mind the environmental constraints e.g. flood risk areas, topography, South Pennines Special Protection Areas, in and around these settlements
- Employment opportunities in the Keighley area are severely constrained by flood risk issues and the housing requirement, therefore in reality not much land is available
- Employment opportunities in the east and south of Bradford will be competing with housing development for the same limited land resource.
- Extensive Green Belt releases will be associated with the growth points at Esholt and Holmewood
- This option will not be in general conformity with RSS, as a new tier of Local Growth Centres will be included in the settlement hierarchy. Some Local Service Centres will be upgraded to Local Growth Centres. These will provide large areas of housing and employment development, and consequently will provide significantly more development than that required for local needs.

8.0 FACILITATOR NOTES

Questions/issues/comments raised from the floor outside of Workshop times.

It was suggested that industrial land was not utilised for development of housing as it could potentially be.

Can the internal infrastructure cope with such an increase in dwellings?

Issues around the level of brown field sites being utilised as opposed to easier to develop Green field sites.

Can the government support developers to look at Brown field developments through incentive programmes?

Unoccupied properties not being targeted and/or redeveloped.

Development should be based around existing locations with good transport links i.e. locations within the train network.

Tackling private/absent landlords to redevelop private derelict properties.

The baseline data coming from the government including future population growth estimates seemed to be over exaggerated and this reflected in the numbers of developments expected to be delivered per year.

No overall holistic plan to incorporate infrastructure and capacity to equal the levels of housing expected.

There was no information on the types of housing and the level of affordability, is this decision based locally or is it a national level.

Does this model fit supply and demand at a current rate of population growth, or at projected rates, can projected rates be trusted.

WORKSHOP SESSION:	4 Spatial Options
TIME:	18.00 to 21.00
GROUP:	A
FACILITATOR:	Andrew Marshall
NOTE TAKER:	Area Coordinator

Introduction

- The members of the group, the facilitator and the scribe introduce themselves

General

- Need to take into account local geographical details, e.g. water courses, archaeology, flood management, ancient woodland and rising water tables, through planning.
- Concerns re saving tourist hotspots – inappropriate development in the Worth Valley – Crossroads, Oxenhope and Stanbury.
- Parish Councils not being listened to re planning applications – need to refer to accurate mapping.
- Build communities not estates.
- Drainage problems are major problems in the Aire Valley.
- Planning not using up to date figures.
- Need for planning committees to be as smart as the planners.
- Public transport to be an integral part of the LDF process to ensure connectivity.
- Need for green separation of communities
- Adequate infrastructure is a prerequisite.

1st Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 1 and 2

- Flooding and more traffic will have a knock on effect for other communities.
- Concerns over the splits between communities.
- No adequate road links.
- Need for a revised metro agreement.

2nd Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 2 and 3

- Economy of scale re infrastructure.
- Create a new town!
- Possibility of people wanting to move out but not able to due to costs.

Option 5

- Need to support small industry in local rural communities.

[Out of time]

WORKSHOP SESSION:	4 Spatial Options
TIME:	18.00 to 21.00
GROUP:	B
FACILITATOR:	Helen Longfield
NOTE TAKER:	Area Coordinator

Introduction

- The members of the group, the facilitator and the scribe introduce themselves

General

- Quality of recreation facilities – swimming pools, allotments
- Countryside is a selling point but development could be detrimental.
- Environment – loss or damage is a concern.
- Importance of open spaces in urban areas.
- Housing – social landlords, potential for this in the future? Shared ownership.

1st Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 1 and 2

Option 1

- Flood plan – risk for employment development.
- Link to Airedale Masterplan
- Transport (all 4 options) – Continental model.
- Industry and housing developed as mixed settlements would reduce infrastructure problems
- Affordable public transport.
- % wise – Bradford is 6 times larger than Keighley – more housing could take place in Bradford.
- Sustainability concern,
- Risk of loss to tourism (Bronte)
- Desirability of new build – improvements to transport/income generation.
- Viability – improve sustainability of services, loss of some if no development.
- What constitutes a household? – Leeds for example – flats, but what about family homes?
- Stagnant housing market – concerns over affordability.
- Conservation areas – adds to problem of affordability.
- Builders – impact on businesses if not able to sell.
- CBMDC – face penalties for none delivery.
- Hospital – only one entrance/exit. Pollution – workers/patient impact.

- Traffic – major impact.
- Schools – new build at Greenhead suggests decrease in numbers but this process suggests an increase.
- Service providers (education etc) are they being forced to look at this projection?

Option 2

- Concern again about affordability of houses in locations detailed.
- Standing room only on trains – issues around the spread of development.
- Loss of character – to feed Leeds' employment demand.
- A number of these areas are already overdeveloped (Local Service Centres)
- Employment – what kind, service industry? Manufacturing declining.

2nd Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 2 and 3

Option 3

- Responds more to relative size of Bradford.
- Better link to employment opportunities..
- Could include Thornton and Queensbury as in Option 4 – for business development – cutting edge industry, relieving pressure on the city centre.
- Driving/transport – pressure on commuting. Need behavioural change.
- Link between the Interchange and Forster Square.
- This might secure green way into city centre through investment – an improved public amenity.
- Family housing and mixed communities – a possibility.
- Can cycle from Keighley to Leeds; more difficult Keighley to Bradford.

Option 4

- Would like to see elevation of development in Bingley.
- Housing growth points favoured.
- Influence over design achievable through density planned growth.

[Out of time]

WORKSHOP SESSION: 4 Spatial Options
TIME: 18.00 to 21.00
GROUP: C
FACILITATOR: Michelle Greenwood
NOTE TAKER: Area Coordinator

Introduction

- The members of the group, the facilitator and the scribe introduce themselves

1st Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 1 and 2

Option 1

- Develop “infill” restrictions/policies
- How will the population growth reflect new job growth in 2026?
- How do people move around the District? Housing on one side of the District and employment on the other.
- Keighley currently – cannot move east-west, north-south. Parking is a big problem.
- Bus times do not coincide with trains.
- What type of housing will it be?
- What is affordable?
- Develop a clear transport corridor from west to east. This is not considered.
- Incomplete infrastructure shifts the problem elsewhere.
- Look at infrastructure before housing.
- Need development appropriate for the elderly, so to free up private housing.

Option 2

- Housing should be developed in harmony with infrastructure and the economy.
- Option 2 is worse than Option 1.
- Option 2 puts more pressure on Keighley and the Aire Valley.
- An end to small communities.
- Impact on sewerage system, already at full capacity.
- Impact on floodplains.
- Impact on insurance.

- New tons would make more sense – a national vision not local.
- Implications on splitting families.

2nd Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 3 and 4

Option 3

- Leeds and Bradford become one.
- Should be looked at in the context of other local authorities.
- Are the figures right?
- Global financial markets are moving downwards – expected migration may not materialise.
- School numbers in certain areas are low.
- Less growth in Keighley.
- Are plans being discussed with North Yorkshire, Harrogate, Calderdale etc?

Option 4

- Transport infrastructure is poor.
- Chicken and egg situation with transport investment.
- Transport links currently full to capacity.
- The infrastructure links are weak.
- Are the predicted population statistics accurate?
- 2026 too long a period to plan for – too many variables.
- Assumption that jobs are going to be there.
- Asked to chose the least worse.
- Infrastructure.

[Out of time]

9.0 OPTIONS FORM

Core Strategy Further Issues and Options

Consultation Workshop

Temple Row Centre - 19th March 2008

Which Spatial Option do you prefer? (Please indicate below)

Option 1 **Option 2** **Option 3** **Option 4**

OR a combination of the Options:

FURTHER COMMENTS:

10.0 OPTION FORM FEEDBACK

10.1 The table below provides a summary of each Option form received at this event.

QUESTION - WHICH SPATIAL OPTION DO YOU PREFER?		
Rep No.	Option 1,2,3,4 or Combination	<u>Comment</u>
TRC 1	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Infrastructure crucial to all
TRC 2	1,2,3,4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Infrastructure – flooding / higher water tables ▪ Employment – protecting green belt, preserving character of communities ▪ Can we be confident the Government's projections are correct? ▪ Sympathetic design
TRC 3		I am sceptical about all your options because they all need more infrastructure (e.g roads) which will threaten the ancient woodlands of Park Wood.
TRC 4	Yes	
TRC 5	Perhaps further development in Bingley which is really, an important town	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Housing mix – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ not single flats for one person households e.g. apartments ○ Social/low cost housing ○ Sheltered accommodation/ housing for elderly ▪ Transport hubs – bus/train/trans(?) junctions / termini on same site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Through routes so journeys not necessarily broken by change of bus at termini to complete in east/west & north/south journey.
TRC 6	3 & 4	Public transport is a key issue – this needs more officer time and resources. A creative, challenging approach is needed to cope with environmental issues (possibly fewer cars by 2014) alongside greater population.
TRC 7	1	The transport network is inadequate to develop the local service areas around Bradford Metropolitan District.
TRC 8	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Option 4 plus increasing status of Bingley. <p>Important considerations for any option:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Transport infrastructure / green routes

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Affordable housing – council housing / association ▪ Houses for the young/families and sheltered housing for the elderly. ▪ Suitable local employment ▪ Preserve greenbelt, environmental and local leisure ▪ Good planning in all aspects of future development
TRC 9	3 (and part 4)	Adding in the development of Thornton & Queensbury
TRC 10	4 with reservations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consider the green issues ▪ The tourism industry could suffer by eroding safer cycle/motorcycle routes ▪ Consider also differing community issues – i.e Asian families tend to have large families in a tight knit area whereas others tend to have smaller families and spread out in a wider area. ▪ With Emmerdale still popular, will expanding Esholt impact on tourism for that area?
TRC 11	1 & 2	More detail on developments
TRC 12	1 & 4	Further details of proposed infrastructure need to be made public and account needs to be taken regarding knock on effects of developments in neighbouring sites.
TRC 13	1,3 and 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sustainability ▪ Infrastructure – flooding ▪ Employment – access to services ▪ Transport ▪ Retain conservation areas ▪ Abandon hard standing ▪ Is this growth realistically pitched?
TRC 14	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I would accept option 4 if and only if by-pass roads for the local growth areas were provided. ▪ The density of present buildings is too dense, more allowance should be made for green spaces. ▪ Developers have too much power to cherry pick site giving high profit but wrecking rural villages and smaller towns ▪ Designs are cheap and repetitive, 3 and 4 storey house inevitable interfere with light and view for existing residents. ▪ The planning process does not take enough regard of

		<p>ordinary residents within the areas affected</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What about sustainable building guide? And eco friendly buildings?
TRC 15	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provided that the eastern by-pass is built and new schools, doctors, dentists (infrastructure) is in place to accommodate new housing estates. ▪ There should be no industrial buildings on the canal bank between Silsden and Kildwick. There is ample industrial land in Silsden without using the canal bank.
TRC 16	4 (1 & 3)	<p>Quite clearly infrastructure is the key issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Roads and railways one essential to development of industry and by default housing ▪ Education, health services and leisure facilities are then equally important.
TRC 17	3	<p>I think we are being asked to chose the 'least risk' of the options, as they all have drawbacks and disadvantages. I consider that the principal that should be given the final discussion should be – housing development should be coordinated geographically with the development of employment – to minimise travel and maximise / optimise infrastructure use.</p>
TRC 18	2	<p>We need a better infrastructure for any of these options to work</p> <p>But we need to do something.</p>

11.0 OPTION FORM ANALYSIS

11.1 The key issues and themes arising from the Options form are set out below:

- Infrastructure crucial to all options
- Flooding
- Employment – suitable local / access to services
- Protect Green Belt
- Preserve character of communities
- Sympathetic design
- Housing mix
- Transport hubs – junctions / termini's on same site
- Public transport is a key issue
- Green routes
- Affordable housing
- Will expanding Esholt have an impact on tourism for that area?
- Retain conservation areas
- Density of present buildings are too dense
- Need more allowance for green spaces within developments
- Developers cherry picking sites
- [Housing] designs cheap and repetitive
- Sustainable building guide?

11.2 The table below provides a summary of the various Options favoured at this event:-

	KEIGHLEY 19 March 08
OPTION 1	2
OPTION 2	1
OPTION 3	1
OPTION 4	4
COMBINATION OF THE OPTIONS	9
NONE OF THE ABOVE	1
NO COMMENT	0
TOTAL	18

12.0 EVALUATION FORM**City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council**

www.bradford.gov.uk

**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – CORE STRATEGY
FURTHER ISSUES & OPTIONS
SPECIAL NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM
Wednesday 19 March 2008 – Temple Row Centre, Keighley**

FEEDBACK FORM

Please spend sometime to fill in the form below. Your feedback will help us to improve future events. Thank you.

A. Presentations/ Speakers

i. Was the level of detail provided appropriate?

1 = not enough detail and 5 = too much detail (please circle)

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

ii. Were the introductory presentations an appropriate length?

1 = too short and 5 = too long (please circle)

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

iii. Please rate the overall quality of the introductory presentations and speakers

1 = poor and 5 = excellent (please circle)

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

iv. Was the content of the DVD appropriate for the event?

1 = not enough detail and 5 = too much detail (please circle)

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

B. Workshop Sessions

i. Were the workshops an appropriate length?

1 = too short and 5 = too long (please circle)

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

ii. Please rate the overall quality of the facilitators

1 = poor and 5 = excellent (please circle)

1	2	3	4	5
---	---	---	---	---

C. Organisation

- i. Please rate the overall organisation and management of the event on the day
1 = poor and 5 = excellent (please circle)
1 2 3 4 5
- ii. Please rate the communication and background material provided leading up to the event
1 = poor and 5 = excellent (please circle)
1 2 3 4 5

D. Venue

- i. Was the venue convenient and easy to get to?
1 = poor and 5 = excellent (please circle)
1 2 3 4 5
- ii. Please rate the overall quality of the venue?
1 = poor and 5 = excellent (please circle)
1 2 3 4 5
- iii. Please rate the quality of the refreshments
1 = poor and 5 = excellent
1 2 3 4 5

E. Please identify the best features of the event

.....

.....

.....

.....

F. Please identify any areas for improvement

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

Thank you once again for your time, please hand this sheet in.

13.0 EVALUATION FORM FEEDBACK

The outputs below indicate the total number of responses for each option.

(1 = not enough detail; 5 = too much detail)

Total number of returned feedback forms = 5

Question	Results				
	1	2	3	4	5
A Presenters / Speakers					
i. Was the level of detail provided appropriate?	0	0	11	0	2
ii. Were the introductory presentations an appropriate length?	0	1	10	1	1
iii. Please rate the overall quality of the introductory presentations and speakers	0	0	4	7	2
iv. Was the content of the DVD appropriate for the event?	0	3	8	0	2
B. Worksoop Sessions					
i. Were the workshops an appropriate length?	0	3	8	0	2
ii. Please rate the overall quality of the facilitators	0	0	3	4	6
C. Organisation					
i. Please rate the overall organisation and management of the event on the day	0	0	3	6	3
ii. Please rate the communication and background material provided leading up to the event	0	1	2	6	3
D. Venue					
i. Was the venue convenient and easy to get to?	0	0	3	5	3
ii. Please rate the overall quality of the venue?	0	0	5	4	3
iii. Please rate the quality of the refreshments	0	0	2	7	2
Totals	0	8	59	40	29

BEST FEATURES OF THE EVENT

Overall, delegates thought that this event was interesting, well structured and the information was imparted in such a helpful and understanding way with key information provided in four formats, verbally, written packs to take away, charts or groups and a DVD. Delegates liked the workshop sessions which provided an overview of future plans and allowed for open discussions and an opportunity to feed in ideas as well as comments. One delegate commented that the two sessions were required to get through all the material and that the facilitators were good.

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

Delegates made the following comments as to how we could improve our events in the future:

- More time for workshops
- Turn the heating down
- Documentation before event would have been useful
- More explanation of the implementation of each option would have been good
- Introductory questions – may have been better at the end since many of these were not really relevant to the LDF.

Produced by the
City of Bradford Metropolitan
District Council

Local Development
Framework Group

June 2008

City of Bradford MDC

www.bradford.gov.uk