

Local Development Framework for Bradford

Core Strategy

Further Issues and Options

Consultation Event Log

Victoria Hall, Saltaire
(8th 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	14
4.0 BOOKING FORM	16
5.0 DELEGATE LIST	18
6.0 EVENT PROGRAMME	22
7.0 PROMPT SHEETS FOR OFFICERS	23
8.0 FACILITATOR NOTES	39
9.0 OPTIONS FORM	54
10.0 OPTIONS FORM FEEDBACK	55
11.0 OPTION FORM ANALYSIS	60
12.0 EVALUATION FORM	62
13.0 EVALUATION FORM FEEDBACK	64

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 50 people attended the Saltaire 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 17 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 Bradford North, Bradford West, Bradford South and Shipley Area co-ordinators offices. In addition to the invite list below, 90 councillors were invited to this event, and Shipley Area Coordinators Office also targeted 790 Shipley Residents, Shipley Ward councillors and a range of voluntary and community groups and key contacts for Shipley. Advertisements were placed on local websites including: BD18, Baildon Village Community Website, Saltaire Village Website as well as CNet Electronic Newsletter and on Shipley Community Radio.

20th Bradford South Scout Group	Asa Briggs Bowling Club
21st Bradford Guides, Brownies, Rangers	Ashbourne Estate Community Association
21st Bradford St Paul's Rainbows	Ashdown Friendship Club
21st Halifax (Queensbury) Boys Brigade	Ashiana Elderly Day Centre
34th Bradford South Scout Group	Asian Games Tournament
36th Bradford South Scout Group	Asian Poetry Recording Group
3rd Queensbury Baptist Guides	Asian Women & Girls Centre
68th Bradford South Scout Group	Asian Women's Support Group
91st Bradford Guides Rainbows and Boys Brigade	Asian Youth and Cultural Organisation
ABDRA	Assisi Centre
Able All	Assisi House Project
ADAAB	Ataxia Self Help Group
Addingham Civic Society	Attock Park Residents Association
Addingham Parish Council	Autistic Spectrum Disorder Team
Advice and Training Centre	Avery Tulip Court Tenants Social Club
African Community Support Project	Award Centre
AFTOC	Azad Cricket Club
Agape	B.P.A.
Age Concern	Baby Sense and Toddler Gym
Ahmadiyya Movement Mosque	Baby Sense and Toddler Gym, Holmewood
Aire and Calder Rivers Group	BAFR
Aire Valley Conservation Society	Baildon & District Residents Association
Al Huda Institute	Baildon Civic Society
Albion Juniors AFC	Baildon Community Council
Aldersgate Methodist Church	Baildon Community Link
Aldersgate Parent & Toddler Group	Baildon in Bloom
All Together	Baildon Parish Council
Ambler Thorn Play Group	Bangladesh Community Association
Anand Milan Centre	Bangladesh Community Cultural Organisation
Anchor Housing	Bangladesh Cultural Association
Anchor Housing Social Club	Bangladesh Youth Organisation
Anchor Trust	Bangladeshi Community Cultural Association
Apna Ghar Community Association	Bangladeshi Youth Club
	Bank Top Harriers ARLFC

Bankfoot Darby and Joan Club	Bradford Bandits BMX Racing Club
Bankfoot Partnership	Bradford Bengali Hindu Cultural Society
Bankfoot Villa Football Club	Bradford Botany Group
Barkerend Children's Centre	Bradford City Disabled Supporters Association
Basement Gym	Bradford City Womens Football Club
BAZM-E-ILM-O-FUN	Bradford Civic Society
Bazm-e-urdu Bradford	Bradford Click-On
BCB Radio	Bradford Community Broadcasting
BCEP	Bradford Community Environment Project
BCW LAP	Bradford Community Housing Trust
BD4Family, Parents & Toddlers	Bradford CVS
BEAP Community Partnership	Bradford Cyrenians
Bedale Community Centre	Bradford District Peace Festival
Bedale 'Darby & Joan' Luncheon Club	Bradford District Senior Power
Beldon Sports FC	Bradford Dudley Hill Under 12's
Ben Rhydding Action Group/Save Us Pub	Bradford Dynamoes
Bereavement Welfare Association	Bradford East District Venture Scout Unit
Bfunded	Bradford Environmental Forum
BIASAN	Bradford FSV
Bierley Social Group Committee	Bradford Gymkhana Cricket Club
Bierley Walkers	Bradford Hate Crime Alliance
Bierley Youth Action Project	Bradford Khalsa Cricket Club
Bingley Civic Society	Bradford Ladies Hockey Club National League
Bingley Civic Trust	Bradford Lions
Bingley CVS	Bradford Local Communities FC
Bingley Environmental Transport Association	Bradford Magistrates Court
BKYP - Bradford & Keighley Youth Parliament	Bradford Moor African Caribbean Young People's Forum
Black Mountain Millennium Green/Brunel Community Association	Bradford Moor Bowling Club
Blenheim Project	Bradford Moor Cricket Club
BMDC - Community Researcher, Policy Unit	Bradford Moor Youth Sports Association
BMEP & JAS	Bradford Moor, Thornbury and Barkerend Neighbourhood Plan
Bolton & Undercliffe Urban Village	Bradford Motor Education Project
Bolton Villas CC	Bradford Nightstop
Bolton Villas Cricket Club	Bradford North Retirement Group
Brackenhill Primary School	Bradford Older Carers' Association (Mencap)
Bradford & Airedale Mental Health Advocacy Group	Bradford Older People's Alliance
Bradford & District Assoc Mental Health	Bradford Ornithological Group
Bradford & District Autistic Support Group	Bradford Park Avenue Junior FC
Bradford & District Coalition of Disabled People	Bradford Park Avenue Junior Football Club
Bradford Access Action	Bradford People First
Bradford Action for Refugees	Bradford Ramblers Association Group
Bradford Aid for Kosova	Bradford Real Nappy Project (BEAT)
Bradford All Stars	Bradford Repetitive Strain Injury Support
Bradford Alliance on Community Care	Bradford Resource Centre
Bradford Association of Visually Impaired People & Centre for Deaf People	Bradford Scout/Guides Water Activities

Bradford Sea Cadets	CHACH Association
Bradford Shalimar Cricket Club	Chairobics Group
Bradford South & West Live at Home Scheme	Charities Information Bureau
Bradford South & West PCT	Chattabox Holiday Club
Bradford Tigers J F C	Checkpoint Women's Group
Bradford Trades Union Council	Christians Against Poverty
Bradford Tradesmen's Homes Residents Committee	Church of the Nazarene
Bradford Urban Wildlife Group	City of Bradford Esprit Diving Club
Bradford Vision	Clayton ARLFC
Bradford Wildcats F C	Clayton Heights Community Group
Bradford Women's Aid	Clayton Heights Methodist Church
Bradford Youth Development Partnership	Clayton Heights Mother & Toddler Group
Bradford Youth F.C.	Clayton Parish Council
Bradford Youth Service	Clayton Urban Village
BRADNET	COM-B Computing Bradford
Braithwaite, Guardhouse & Upper Highfield Action Planning Committee	Community & Environmental Programme Manager
Branshaw & Fell Lane Action Plan	Community Art Room at Community Works
BRAVE Women's Support Group	Community Association of Great Horton
Bretton Court	Community Involvement Worker
British Wheelchair Sport Federation	Community Unity
Broadstone Way	Community Works
Broadstones Resource Centre	Communityworks Community Centre & Children's Centre
BSCP	Cooper Lane Primary School
BT (Bradford) Cricket Club	Cottingley Community Association
Buildings Consultation Group	CPRE Bradford District
Burley-in-Wharfedale Parish Council	Craven United FC
Buttershaw Action Group	Cross Roads Urban Village
Buttershaw Bantams AFC	Crossflatts Village Society
Buttershaw Baptist Church	Cullingworth Parish Council
Buttershaw Celtic FC	Czech Community in Bradford (C.C.B.)
Buttershaw Christian Family Centre	Daisy Hill Action Planning
Buttershaw High Rock Challenge Group	DDA Task Team
Buttershaw High School	Denholme Community Association
Buttershaw Primary School	Denholme Town Council
Buttershaw Youth Centre	Dial Bradford
Buttershaw Youth Football Club	Dockfield Homezone Group
Buy a Child a Smile	Dominica Association of Bradford
BYAP	Dominican Association of Bradford
BYCO	Drovers Way Residents Group
Café Project	Dudley Hill Imps
CALEB	Dudley Hill Rangers FC
Cambing Cricket Club	Dunsford Group for Older People
Caravan Site Bolling	Earlwood Community Group
Carlisle Business Centre	East Bierley Local History Group
Carrwood Primary School	East Bowling Community Link
Cathedral Centre Project	East Bowling Unity Club
Centre for Deaf People	East Bowling Unity Pensioners Club

East Shipley Partnership	Friends of Bowling Park
Eastwood School	Friends of Buck Wood
EBRO	Friends of Harold Park
Eccleshill Community Playgroup	Friends of Hendford Drive
Eccleshill Day Care Centre	Friends of Holybrook
Eccleshill F.C.	Friends of Ilkley Moor
Eccleshill Football Club	Friends of Lister Park (FLIP)
Eccleshill Horticultural Society	Friends of Newhall Park Primary School
Eccleshill Karate Club	Friends of Peel Park
Eccleshill Local History Group	Friends of Swain House
Eccleshill Mechanics Institute	Friends of Undercliffe Cemetery
Eccleshill Mechanics Youth and Comm. Association	Friends of Wibsey Park
Eccleshill Road Runners	Friends of Woodside Primary School
Eccleshill Sports & Social Club	Friends Together
Eccleshill Urban Village Chair	Frontline Initiative
Eccleshill Veterans Association & Bowling Club	Fun Care Out of School Holiday Club
Eccleshill WMC	Future For Women
Eccleshill Utd	Gateway Centre
Edwards Rainbow Centre	Gateway Toddler Group
Eesti Kodu	Gateway Trinity Football Club
Eesti Kodu Estonian Club	Get Up & Go Club
Eldwick Civic Society	Gilstead Village Society
ELIM Church Centre	Gingerbread
Equalities Unit	Gingerbread Housing Project
Esholt Action Planning Group	Gingerkidz
Estonian Club	Girlington Community Centre
Extended Schools Project Manager	Girlington Together
EYCS	Glenroyd Residents Association
Fabric - Forum for the Arts in Bradford	Goitside Regeneration Partnership
Fagley Community Social Club	Good Companions Dancing Club
Fagley Football Club	Grange Girls Project
Fagley Intermediates	Grange Technology College
Fagley Locals In Partnership	Great Horton Action Group
Fagley Over 60's	Great Horton Community Partnership
Fagley Sports and Social Club	Great Horton with Lidget Green Methodist URC
Fagley Youth and Community Centre	Great Horton Youth Club
Fairweather Green Action Group	Greengates & Ravenscliffe Community Forum
Fairweather Green Urban Village	Greengates Albion Football Club
Family Service Unit	Greengates JFC
Faxfleet Residents Association	Greengates Juniors Football Club
Fibromyalgia Support	Greengates Veterans Association
Fitness First	Greengates Veterans Bowls Association
Foxhill Guides	Greenhill Action Group
Foxhill Primary School	Greenhill Friday Club
Francis House Residents Association	Greenway Amenity Group
Freshstart	Greenway Project
Friendly Club Low Moor and Wyke	Greenwoods Community Centre Wood Lane
Friends of Alma Nursery	Grosvenor Association

Guru Gobind Sikh Temple	Idle CC
Guru Nanak Elderly Day Centre	Idle Cricket Club
Gurunanak Sikh Temple	Idle Hands Cross Stitch & Craft Club
Hainsworth Moor Grove	Idle Juniors
Hainworth Community Centre	Idle Juniors F.C.
Hamzah Elderly Community Association	Idle Tenants and Residents Association
Hanfia Mosque	Idle Tide Committee
Happy Little People Parent Toddlers	Idle Urban Village
Harbourne Residential Care Centre	Idle Working Means Club & Institute
Harbourne Residents Group	Idlethorpe Indoor Bowlers Club
Harden Parish Council	Ilkley Civic Society
Harden Village Society	Ilkley CVS
Haworth & Oxenhope District	Ilkley Design Statement
Haworth & Oxenhope District Bridleways Group	Ilkley Parish Council
Haworth Road Playgroup	Indian Workers Association
Haworth, Crossroads & Stanbury Town Council	International Voluntary Service
Haycliffe Special School	Iqra Community Centre
Headway	Islamic Cultural & Educational Assoc
Heaton Park Cricket Club	Islamic Relief Agency
Heaton Woods Trust	Italian Senior Citizens Association
Hepworth and Idle Cricket Club	Its Fun to Dance
High Fearnely Primary School	Jamiyat Tabligh UI-Islam
Hindu Cultural Society	Jer Lane Cricket Club
Hirst Wood Regeneration Group	Jireh House Community Centre
Hollingwood Primary	Joint Activities Service
Holme Christian Care Centre	JW School of Dance
Holme United Reformed Church	KADAL
Holme Wood Community Council	Kala Sangam
Holme Wood Library	Karmand Community Centre
Holme Wood Raiders	Katana Ju Jit Su Club
Holmewood Activity Centre	Keighley Town Council
Holmewood Advice Service	Keighley Voluntary Services
Holmewood Clinic	Kids 2 Gether
Holmewood Elderly Persons Forum	Kidzone Unit Manager
Holmewood Executive	Kings Park Environment Focus Group
Holmewood Health Centre	Laisterdyke Cricket Club
Holmewood Library	Laisterdyke Local History Group
Holmewood Raiders	Laurence House Emi Unit
Holmewood United Football Club	Legrams Lane U5's & Women's Centre
Holy Trinity Church	Let Wyke Breathe
Holybrook Centre	Let Wyke Breathe
Homestart	Liasterdyke Community Centre
Horton Bank Top Playgroup	Lidget Green Community Development Initiative
Horton Grange Regeneration Partnership	Lidget Green Community Partnership
Horton Park Centre	Lidget Green Primary
Humdard	Lilycroft Urban Village
Hungarian Heritage	Link Project
Idle & Thackley Men's Forum	Little Gems Parent and Toddler Group

Little Horton Neighbourhood Action Group	Mr Martin Spiers
Low Moor & Wyke British Legion (Women's Section)	Mr T Bendrien
Low Moor C of E Primary School	Mr T Benrial
Low Moor Local History Group	Mr Tom Jones
Low Moor Paper Crafts	Mrs B Smith
Low Moor Primary School PTFA	Multi Arts International
Low Moor Urban Village	Multiple Sclerosis Friends
Lower Fields Primary School	Mum's and Tots at Suttys
Lowerhouse Close Residents	Munch Bunch Toddlers Group
Making Space	Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator
Manningham & Girdlington Heat Project	Netherlands Avenue School &
Manningham & Girdlington Plus Project	Network East Action Trust
Manningham Brotherhood Cricket Club	New Hey Road Methodist Church
Manningham FC	New Horizons
Manningham Hockey Club	Newhall Park Primary School
Manningham in Bloom	Newlands Community Association Invit. Village Cup
Manningham Mills Cricket Club	Newton Street Day Centre
Manningham Mills Sports Association	North Bierley Pensioners
Manningham Moving Forward	North Bradford Retired Men's Forum
Manningham Project	North Bradford Retired Persons Action Group
Manningham Residents Association	North Wing Community Centre
Manningham Sports Centre	North Wing Mission Community Centre
Manningham Sports Cricket Club	Northern Orchestral Enterprises
Manningham West Bank Football Club	Norwood Green Cricket Club
Manningham Youth Project	Oakenshaw Residents Association
Manorlands Sue Ryder Care	Oakenshaw Veterans Association
Marshfield Neighbourhood Action Group	Oakroyd Hall
Martin Spiers	Oakworth Urban Village
Mauritian Society	Oasis Complementary Therapy
Mayfield and Clayhill Tenants Group	Odsal / Sedbergh Junior Rugby Club
Meadowcroft Care Centre	Odsal Residents Liasion Group
Menston Community Council	Older People's Focus Group
Menston Parish Council	Olive Branch Trust
MHA Bradford South and West Live at Home Scheme	On Track
Micklethwaite Village Society	Ormond House Tenants Association
Midas Touch Asian Musical Group	Otley Road Neighbourhood Action Group
Millan Centre	Otley Road Tenants and Residents Forum
Millennium Volunteers	Oxenhope Parish Council
Minister of Clayton Heights Methodist Church	Pakistani Women's Forum
MISSOL-E-SUSSI	Parents and Toddlers Group, Horton Bank Top
Mobility Planning Group	Park Lane Neighbourhood Action Group
Monday Night Social Group Trust	Parks Amateur Boxing Club
Moorfield Centre	Parkside Community Centre Over 55's
Morningside Safe Environment Committee	Parkside Playgroup
Mother and Toddler Group	Parkside Residents Association
Mr G.E Tattersall	Peel Park Primary School
Mr Kurt Kunz	Penny Trepka

Percussion Drumming Group	Roshni Womens Group
Pithill Centre	Rowan Avenue Neighbourhood Watch
Playcentre	Royds Community Association
Pollard Park Residents Association	Royds Healthy Living Centre
Pondside Neighbours Group	Royds Junior Rugby Club
Presence FM	Royds Rugby Club
Prospect Juniors AFC	Royds Rugby League Club
Punjabi Maehfil	Runnymede Court Social Club
Purlin Project	Russell Hall Primary School
Q2 Regeneration Limited	Ryecroft Community Centre
QED	Ryecroft Primary School
Queens Road B Allotment Association	SABA
Queensbridge United AFC	SABRANG
Queensbury 18th Bradford Scout Group	SAFE Project
Queensbury Bell Ringers	Saltaire and Wycliffe Partnership
Queensbury Bowling Club	Saltaire Village Society
Queensbury Club for the Handicapped	Salvation Army
Queensbury Community Association	Salvation Army Mans Hostel
Queensbury Community Programme	Sandale Walk Community Centre
Queensbury Cricket Club	Sandy Lane Parish Council
Queensbury History Society	Scholemoor
Queensbury Juniors	Scholemoor Beacon
Queensbury Juniors ARLC	Scholemoor Community Centre
Queensbury School	SEAFED
Queensbury Support Centre	Sedbergh Crusaders Juniors AFC
Queensbury Tykes Playgroup	Sedbergh Youth and Community Centre
Queensbury Urban Village	Service Development Manager
Queensbury Youth & Community Centre	Sharing Voices Initiative
RAABTHA	Shibden Head Primary School
Rafike	Shipleigh Churches Together
Ramblers Association	Shirley Manor Primary School
Ravenscliffe Community Development Project	Shirley Manor Tappers
Ravenscliffe & Greengates Community Forum	Shree Krishana Community/Day Centre
Ravenscliffe AFC	Sikh Temple
Ravenscliffe and Greengates Partnership	Silsden Town Council
Ravenscliffe Community Association	Slackside Parent and Toddler Group
Ravenscliffe Enterprise Girls Group	SNAP - Thornton
Ravenscliffe Youth & Community Centre	SNOB
Rawson Square Residents Association	SNOOP (Special Needs Objective Outreach Project)
Red Beck Vale Neighbourhood Watch	South and West Bradford Support Group
Reevy Hill Primary School	South Bradford Ladies Football Club
Relay Recruitment Rovers	Southmere Primary School
Reuben Goldberg Memorial Fund	SPEED Project
Revolution Show Corps	Sporting FC
Riddlesden and Morton Urban Village	Springdale Friendship Group
Ripple	Springfield Bike Project
Ripple Project	Springfield Centre
Rockwell Centre	Springfield Junior Youth Drama Group

Springfield XL Group	Surti Muslim Khalifa Society
St Aidan's Presbytery	Sutton Community Association
St Augustine's Art Project	Sutton Community Centre
St Christopher's Church	Swain Green Partnership
St Clares Community Centre and Church	Sycamore Court Tenants & Residents Association
St Clares Improvement Group	Taleemul-Quran Society
St Columba's Catholic Primary School	Telegraph and Argus
St Columbus RC Primary School	TFD Centre
St Georges Football Club	TFD Football Club
St John The Evangelist Catholic Primary	TFD Youth and Community Centre
St John's C of E Primary School	Thackley Cricket Club
St John's Church	Thackley Football Club
St John's Church Youth Club	Thackley Urban Village
St Johns Day Centre	Thalassaemia & Sicklecell Support Group
St John's Luncheon Club	The Albion Sports Bar
St Mary's Church	The Anchor Project
St Mary's Residents Association	The Bankfoot Partnership
St Matthew's C E Primary School	The Bradford Mentor Group
St Matthew's Church, Bankfoot	The City Centre Project
St Matthew's Under Fives	The Community Centre, Bierley
St Oswald's CE Primary	The Cricketers
St Paul's Church	The Friends of Lowerfields
St Wilfrid's Church	The Frizinghall Partnership
St Winefride's Catholic Primary	The Grange Technology College
St Winefrides Playgroup & Toddlers	The Jigsaw Community Project
St Winifred's Parent & Toddler Group	The Light of the World Community Centre
St Winifrid's Hall Users Group	The Lighthouse Outreach
St. Andrews Bowling Group	The Moravian Manse, Baildon
St. John's Luncheon Club	The Moravian Manse, Browgate
St. John's Under Fives	The Old Bell Chapel
St. Mary's Pre School Group	The Peacemakers
St. Matthews Parents Group	The Priestley Centre for the Arts
Starz Performing Arts Academy	The Residents of Westgate
Steeton with Eastburn Parish Council	The Salvation Army
Step 2 Young People's Health Project	The Salvation Army in Wibsey
Stocks Lane Primary School	The Thackley Indoor Bowling Club
Stocks Lane Rangers Football Club	The Thornbury Centre
Streets Ahead Allerton & Lower Grange	The Thornbury Domestic Violence and Abuse Project
Streets Ahead East Shipley	The Thursday Club
Streets Ahead Holme Wood	The Tickhill Centre
Streets Ahead Little Horton & Canterbury	The United Sikh Association
Streets Ahead South Keighley	The Vicarage
Suffa Tul-Islam Assoc.	The Vicarage, Baildon
Support Team for Deaf Children	The Vicarage, Browgate
Surestart	The Vine
Surestart BHT	The Vine Trust
Surestart Manningham	The Wellesley Knitting Club
SURF	The Yorkshire County Cricket Club

Thornbury Gardens and Allotments Association	Wedgewood School & Community Nursery
Thornbury Youth & Community Association	Wedgewood Special School
Thornbury Youth & Community Centre (TYCC)	Wednesday Club
Thornbury Youth Centre	Wellesley Knitting Club
Thornton Urban Village	Wesleyan Reform Church Luncheon Club
Thorpe Edge Community Project	West Bowling Neighbourhood Action Group
Thorpe Edge Disabled Action Group	West Bowling Youth Centre
Thorpe Edge Jaguars St Hockey Team	West Yorkshire LSC
Thorpe Edge Women's Group	West Yorkshire Police
Thorpe Edge Women's Self Help Group	Westbourne Mothers & Toddlers
Tom Jones	Westwood Park Residents Association
Tong School	Westwood Sports Club
Tong Sports and Social Club	Wibsey ARLFC
Tong Vicarage	Wibsey Jets Football Team
Top Line Cricket Club	Wibsey Local History Group
Tots Unlimited - BD4 Family Centre	Wibsey Primary School
Touchstone Project	Wibsey Rugby Club
Transport 2000	Wibsey Urban Village
Tyersal Action Group	Wibsey WMC AFC
Tyersal FC	Wilsden Parish Council
Tyersal Park Junior Football Club	Women Zone
U 3 A Table Tennis Group	Womenzone Centre
Undercliffe ARLFC	Womenzone Community Centre
Undercliffe Celtic	Won Off Wonders
Undercliffe Celtic Junior Football Club	Woodlands C E Primary School
Undercliffe Cemetery Charity	Woodlands Cricket Club
Undercliffe Cricket Club	Woodleigh Rest Home
United Sikh Association	Woodside Action Group
Unity Cricket Club	Woodside Primary School
Upper Heaton Working Together	Woodside Village Centre
Upper Thorpe Edge Tenants and Residents Association	Wrose Parish Council
Urbandesi	Wycollar Residents Group
Usman Welfare Fund	Wyke Amateur RLC
V I Sahara Group	Wyke ARLFC
Valley Allotment Association	Wyke Bowling Club
Ventnor Youth Academy	Wyke Christian Fellowship
Ventus Sports A.F.C.	Wyke Estates Partnership
Victim Support Bradford District	Wyke Local History Group
Victor Road Youth Club	Wyke Manor and Community College
Victoria Rangers ARLFC	Wyke Manor Community Centre
Vision Junior Football Club	Wyke Manor School
Visual Disability Services	Wyke Urban Village
Visual Disability Services	Wyke Youth Link
Volunteer Reading Help West Yorkshire	Yorkshire County Cricket Club
Wannabe Performing Arts	Yorkshire Cricket Board
Waterton Park Asian Golf Society	Yorkshire Martyr's Catholic School
Wedgewood & Community Nursery	Young Muslim Organisation
	Young Women's Project

Youth Base
Youth Development Project

Youth Service
Youth Zone

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: 11/02/2008

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.

Options Consultation – Booking Form

Name:	
Address:	
Organisation:	
Telephone:	
Email:	

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 LIST**City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council**www.bradford.gov.uk**SPECIAL NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM****CORE STRATEGY CONSULTATION****VICTORIA HALL – 8 MARCH 2008 10am – 1pm****DELEGATE LIST**

NAME	ORGANISATION
Adele Gunn	Resident
Alan Smith	Baildon Parish Cllr for SW ward
Alex Ross	Resident
Andrew Rowley	Friends of High Crag & Poplar Crescent Tenants & Residents Assoc.
Ann Mainman	Hirstwood Regeneration Group
Barbara Judd	Shipley Fairtrade group
Bruce Barnes	Resident
Catherine Warwick	Resident
Cllr Margaret Eaton	Ward Councillor – Bingley Rural
Cllr Sarah Ferriby	Ward Councillor - Wyke
Cllr Simon Cooke	Ward Councillor – Bingley Rural
Cllr Stanley King	Ward Councillor - Heaton
Cllr Val Townend	Ward Councillor - Baildon
David A. Moncaster	Resident

NAME	ORGANISATION
David Mullen	Steeton with Eastburn Parish Council
Elizabeth Deakin	Crossflatts Village Society
Ginny Wilkinson	Resident
Graham May	Future Skills
Helen Kidman	Ilkley Civic Society
Ian Lambert	Resident
Jane Breen	Cullingworth Parish Council
Janet Lawreniuk	Greengates Memories Group
Jeremy Cook	Hirstwood Regeneration
Joan Broderick	Bradford Community Housing Trust
Jean Lorrain-Smith	Resident
Judith Johnson	Resident
Julia Pearson	Resident
Kate Nicholas	Rance Booth & Smith
Kathryn Toldeano	Cullingworth Parish Council
Kay Kirkham	Harden Parish Council
Kirsty Hitchon-Anderson	Resident
Lynn Asquith	Resident
Maria Rosa Grice	Resident
Marian Taylor	Resident
Michael John Wood	Micklethwaite Village Society
Mike Allcock	Resident (Shipley)

NAME	ORGANISATION
Norman Alvin	Resident
Norman Scarth	Anti-Crime Party
Pat Mitten	Resident
Paul Marfell	Baildon Parish Council
Pauline Wood	Micklethwaite Village Society
Peter Hartingdon	Baildon Parish Council
Peter Warwick	Patient Public Involvement Forum for Bradford Teaching Hospitals
Philip Davies MP	MP for Shipley
Quentin Deakin	Crossflatts Village Society
Ray Wilkes	Yorkshire and Humber Transport Roundtable
Rebecca Penman	Resident
Rev Paul J Breeze	Rev Saltaire United Reform church
Roy Lorrain-Smith	Resident
Sarah Henderson	Resident
Sarah Shaw	Resident
Sheila Asgari-Tourzan	ISIS Project
Stephen Darwin	Esholt Committee
Susan Stead	Bradford Urban Wildlife Group
Thomas Gill	Resident
Tony Atack	Hirstwood Regeneration
V Barnes	Resident
Yvonne Smith	Sleningford Area Residents Association

NAME	ORGANISATION
Zoe Harley	Sleningford Area Residents Association

Additional list of delegates that signed in on the day:

NAME	ORGANISATION
Cllr Roger L'Amie	Ward Councillor for Baildon
David Henderson	Resident
J. Stanley	Resident
D. Carwerl	Resident
K. Land	Resident
Phil Thornton	Resident

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

VICTORIA HALL, 8TH MARCH 2008, 10am – 1pm

PROGRAMME

10.00am	Registration and Refreshments.
10.30am	Welcome and Introduction: By the Neighbourhood Forum Area Co-ordinator setting out the aims of the event and proceedings
10.35pm	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
10.50am	Questions and Introduction to Workshops
11.00am	Workshop Session 1: Discussion focused on Options 1 & 2 (as detailed in the Core Strategy Summary Leaflet) for the location of development
11.45am	Refreshments break.
12.00pm	Workshop Session 2: Discussion focused on Options 3 & 4 (as detailed in the Core Strategy Summary Leaflet) for the location of development
12.45pm	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.
1.00pm	Lunch and Refreshments

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)
- 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	2004 – 08 = 4 yrs x 1560 dwellings = 6,240
2011 – 16 = 5 yrs x 1920 dwellings = 9,600	2008 – 21 = 13 yrs x 2700 dwellings = 35,100
2016 – 21 = 5 yrs x 2180 dwellings = 10,900	
Total 2004 – 21 = 31,420	Total 2004 – 21 = 41,340 (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.

¹ This is the figure outlined in the draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) – The regional development plan

² This figure is based on more recent population projections

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
- 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)

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 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.

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/ShIPLEY/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/ShIPLEY/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/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 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/ShIPLEY/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

Present: Andrew Marshall, Isha Ahmed; Edward Broadhead, Simon Latimer, Leah Midley, Bradford Council LDF Team; Cllr Margaret Eaton; Cllr Simon Cooke; Cllr Val Townend; Cllr Roger Roger L'Amie; Cllr Phillip Thornton, Cllr Simon Cooke, Bradford Council; Phillip Davies MP plus residents, including representatives of local community groups. Chris Flecknoe, Neighbourhood Support Service in the Chair.

1. Introductions:

Chris Flecknoe, Neighbourhood Support Service took the Chair and welcomed everyone to the meeting. A brief overview of the purpose of the new Local Development Framework, (LDF) and its links with the Community strategy was provided. This meeting was the second in a series of 5 public consultation meetings gathering resident's views on the allocation of land to future housing and development needs in the district.

2. Background:

Andrew Marshall, Group Planning Manager gave a brief introduction to the new Local development framework. The existing Unitary Development Plan (UDP) allocates land for housing up until 2014. Since the UDP as adopted, the government has provided new guidance requiring Local Authorities to move towards a "local Development framework" replacing the existing Unitary Development Plan. A series of meeting last year provided a starting point for consultation on the LDF, asking residents and other stakeholders to for their views on the "big issues" facing the district. Later in the year, new guidance in the form of the "Regional Spatial strategy, (RSS) was issued by the government requiring Bradford Council to provide land for an additional 2,700 homes each year up to 2028. This figure is based on a projected increase in the population of the district by an additional 110,000 people by 2026.

This consultation will look at the choices open to the Council in terms of providing additional land, and the likely impacts in terms of affordability, infrastructure, environment etc. It will need to consider the general role of places and settlements. Today's meeting will be asking for feedback on 4 possible options, with consideration of any further options that might be identified as a result of discussion.

A DVD setting out the 4 options, and summarising key questions in respect of each option was played. A short 2question and answer session followed in which residents raised the following issues:

Q: Who will these new homes be for, and will they replace existing housing?

A: The need is for additional housing to meet the needs of smaller households, young people, people living longer and the growing economy.

Q: Given increasing energy prices, possible shortages and concerns about the possible impact of climate change, will we ensure all homes are energy efficient?

A; All new homes will need to be built to an energy efficiency standard.

C; Why not “spread out” new development to reduce the need for travel to work etc?

A: Development is being driven by the needs of Leeds City _Region and will be focused on providing easy access to main employment centres, including Leeds, and local employment centre.

Q: How much is the growth in population associated with migration into the area?

A: Office of national statistics, (ONS) projects have identified natural change (people living longer, increasing births, etc), internal and international migration to be the major factors affecting population change. The rate of growth from both natural change and international migration is approximately equal, with a small loss of population projected from internal migration.

Q: Definition of a “home”?

A: This includes all dwellings, from small bed sits / apartments to large detached houses. It does not include residential care or nursing home places.

C: Concern that: “everyone” is ignoring the impact of the harm the current “population explosion” is doing to the planet”.

Q: For the purposes of the figures, if we demolish a dwelling and rebuild a new home in it’s place, does this count as “additional”.

A: No. The requirement is for 2,700 additional homes on top of our existing housing stock.

Q: Concern that the majority of new homes built are unlikely to be affordable for first time buyers. This could result in 50,000 new homes, each with 2 cars, a further 100,000 cars on the road. Transport infrastructure is thus a major concern.

A: The process will look at where growth should be and what infrastructure will then be needed. Dialogue with Metro and other transport providers will follow, with the aim of leading people away from cars to make other transport choices.

C: "Much of the main development (in these options) will be on the north side of the city. It takes on average ¾ hour to get from the north side of the city to the Motorway network. We need to build housing in locations that does not require further major road development".

Q: Can we mix options?

A: Yes

Q: How many houses do we build per year at present?

A: Approx 1,500

Residents then moved into 5 small groups to look at each of the 4 options in detail. Information was provided by representatives of the LDF team, (Bradford Council's Planning Service) with Officers from Neighbourhood Support Services acting as Facilitators.

3. Closing Session:

Chris Flecknoe thanked residents for their input. Andrew Marshall gave information on the next stages of the consultation. A report of the event will be published "on line". Dialogue with infrastructure providers will soon take place, after which a preferred option will be agreed. Residents were invited to make further comments through feedback forms, or via the website.

Meeting closed at 1.05pm.

NOTES OF WORKSHOP SESSION

WORKSHOP SESSION: 4 Spatial Options
TIME: 10.00 to 13.00
GROUP: A
FACILITATOR: Andrew Marshall
NOTE TAKER: Area Coordinator

General Comments

- What is the relationship between where the population is centred now and the proposed development?
- We have built properties which are not beautiful. If we made attractive development, people would be more supportive.
- Traffic issues need tackling from the start.
- Planning should impose quality on developers.
- Schools and health centres would need new facilities.
- Dispersed growth puts pressure on transport and roads.
- Houses should not be built without schools and health centres.
- Crossflatts – commuter flats built for Leeds’ overspill. Are we solving a Leeds problem?
Developers are not responding to local need?
- Insufficient parking at Crossflatts station. Links needed to bus services.
- How do we mix employment with housing to reduce pressure on travel?
- By the end of this planning period, energy process will prevent commuting.
- Transport infrastructure not coping at the moment.
- Find a transport solution first.
- Baildon station and Saltaire station - both a problem for parking.
- How will the costs of meeting the infrastructure demands be met?
- Parking fees at stations would encourage people to walk.
- Small environmental businesses could be sited where people live.
- Trying to put a big city into a small city. Why not make a new town between Leeds and Bradford?
- Throw it back to central Government – give us money for infrastructure before we deliver houses.
- If we are part of the Leeds City Region, would a new town east of Leeds be a solution?
- Affordable housing – key issue.
- Canal development – this will reduce the amount of land available for housing.

- Not convinced of the need for new housing, and the locations of the demand.
- Shipley – where is Shipley's place?
- What proportion of growth would be in Shipley?
- Sewerage is essential infrastructure.
- The aesthetical is crucial.
- Will green areas like Esholt be compromised?
- The Aire Valley is important as a wildlife migration route. This could be compromised if the green corridor is broken up.
- We need green corridors throughout Bradford for wildlife, walking and cycling and to keep green areas with people living in them.
- Hard, soft, community and green infrastructure – the balance is crucial.
- Where is Leeds putting their expansion?
- How will the strategy contribute to the regeneration of big BCHT estates?
- There are new towns around South Yorkshire's mining towns.
- Should areas with tourist potential develop at the same rate as other areas?
- Where is the demand?
- Problem of flooding.
- Make it clear that "Esholt" is not the village, but includes Apperley Bridge and Thorpe Edge.
- Employment growth areas must include housing to go with it.
- What is the current distribution of new housing and planned development for 2008/09?
- Please keep Shipley as a town with its own identity. It is an ancient settlement.
- There should be a higher percentage of new housing in Bradford Centre where demand for larger homes for Asian families is.

[Out of time]

WORKSHOP SESSION: 4 Spatial Options
TIME: 10.00 to 13.00
GROUP: B
FACILITATOR: Isha Ahmed
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:

Strengths:

- Retain village commuters
- Reducing community
- Education in the community

Weaknesses:

- Current road infrastructure not coping now
- Only one major transport route
- Lose open space in urban area
- Business access
- Urban wildlife destroyed

Option 2:

Strengths:

- Less Green Belt released
- More open space in urban area left
- Develop Principal Towns

Weaknesses:

- Current infrastructure, but coping well
- Serious flood risk
- Infrastructure may not be addressed as 'dispersed'
- May not be space available to develop necessary infrastructure
- Developing Principal Town

- Investment in town centres needed
- Changes destroying communities
- No guarantee investment follows housing development
- Destroy wildlife habitats

2nd Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 2 and 3

Option 3:

Strengths:

- Brownfield sites used
- Infrastructure would be developed
- People living in City Centre able to commute to other West Yorkshire employment centres

Weaknesses:

- Space for improving infrastructure (listed bridges etc)
- Open Space
- Current access

Option 4:

Strengths:

- Link to Craven District – plans too
- Focuses on existing areas of development
- Builds on current infrastructure

Weaknesses:

- Railway at capacity now
- Public transport
- Some places currently not accessible
- Needs connection between Keighley and Lancashire (some tying in with Craven district plan)

General

- Airport

[Out of time]

WORKSHOP SESSION: 4 Spatial Options
TIME: 10.00 to 13.00
GROUP: C
FACILITATOR: Simon Latimer
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

- Keighley, Ilkley and Bingley are different sizes
- Demand for social housing, people can't get on the housing ladder.

Option 2

- This would change the nature of Bingley
- Would put infrastructure under more pressure – schools are already under pressure.

2nd Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 3 and 4

Option 3 – strengths

- Could help integrate Esholt

Option 3 – weaknesses

- Flood plains
- Transport
- No growth in villages

Option 4 – strengths

- Takes pressure off Keighley and Ilkley
- Could help integrate Esholt
- Spreads development
- Helps build/sustains settlements

Option 4 – weaknesses

- Transport
- Need to save the Green Belt
- Lack of schools/doctors

General Comments

- Type of housing – what is needed versus developers wants
- Wildlife issues
- Already new flats and apartments which are standing empty.

Preferred Option

- Majority of development in the Sub Regional City (Options 1,3,4)
- Some growth in Local Service Centres (Option 4)

[Out of time]

WORKSHOP SESSION:	4 Spatial Options
TIME:	10.00 to 13.00
GROUP:	D
FACILITATOR:	Edward Broadhead
NOTE TAKER:	Area Coordinator

Option 1:**Strengths:**

- Better matches the employment profile of the district. This could mean less commuting and thus lower environmental impact.
- Uses less greenbelt land.

Weaknesses:

- Lack of facilities in the existing city centre for residential use, (NB: applies to all options to a greater or lesser extent)
- Where is the employment to support a high level of housing in Ilkley? This could create more pressure on roads as people will need to travel to work.

Option 2:**Strengths:**

- Less intense development of the Bradford urban area, (but the impact of all 4 options depends on how it's done)

Weaknesses:

- Limitations of existing transport infrastructure in the Bingley area: topography limits further expansion of the road network, and existing network already congested.
- Are people who can "afford" to live in Airedale likely to find work there, and what will this mean for commuting levels. The Aire Valley train line is already full to capacity during rush hour.

Other Issues:

Is Eldwick considered part of the Bingley "Principal Town" area? Eldwick is already overdeveloped with little by way of additional infrastructure.

Option 3:**Strengths:**

- Holmewood area has good transport links to motorway network.

Weaknesses:

- Level of development likely in the Canal road / Shipley corridor: this is already an area of major deprivation.
- Concern re likely loss of greenspace in Canal Road corridor: these spaces already provide habitats for deer, badger, birds, etc.
- This option makes us even more a “suburb” of Leeds.

Other Issues:

- No employment development in the west of the city – this is an area of high unemployment and multiple deprivation. (Could apply to other options to a lesser degree)
- Will need improve rail / other transport links across the city to link housing and employment sites
- What type of housing is likely for the high growth areas, and will it meet local housing need?

Option 4**Strengths:**

- Thornton and Queensbury as growth centres provides for some development in the west of the city.

Weaknesses

Is employment development in Bingley in a flood risk area?

Wildlife issues in Shipley / canal road Corridor, (see also option 3)

Other Issues:

Traffic issues re increased development in Baildon: Baildon already grid-locked

Further Options to be Considered:

New settlements built sustainably linking housing and employment opportunities.

Issues to be considered for all options:

- Transport across the city: we need a tube train!
- Water, sewage and electricity an issue for all

- Levels of unemployment should determine focus for economic development.
- Where do “Windfall sites” fit in?
- Will residents in areas designated for increased development be compensated if property values decline?
- What expectations does BMDC have of employment change, and how will this affect location of housing and development, (e.g. more home-working)
- “Public transport infrastructure cannot be improved at specific locations – e.g. new stations built etc: this needs 10+ years run in time to build new track, acquire new stock etc”
- “Is it “sustainable” to take land out of the greenbelt regardless of its quality”?
- Has an assessment been carried out of the quality of remaining greenbelt land and is there a hierarchy of quality which would guide prioritising land for housing?”
- Has Bradford (Council) assessed independently its housing needs, and do these concur with the RSS / Central Govt. generated figures?
- Need for collaboration with neighbouring Local Authorities in identifying best options, particularly Leeds
- Special Protection Areas need to be increased as they do not take account of the important LOCAL areas for migrating birds.

WORKSHOP SESSION: 4 Spatial Options
TIME: 10.00 to 13.00
GROUP: E
FACILITATOR: Leah Midley
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 – strengths

- Reduces commuting
- It's more desirable – more practical to implement
- It could work
- It leaves the villages alone, less of an impact. Should not swallow up the Green Belt.
- Acknowledges the need for growth, but is the best plan for smaller places.
- Least worst option.
- Denholme does not have a station, so where is the infrastructure?

Option1 – weaknesses

- In Option 1, need to break down the % of development in Shipley and Lower Baildon.
- Flooding concerns relate to a lot of the Aire Valley.
- Wrong to say villages would not be sustainable with only 5% growth.
- The villages also vary and need to be assessed separately.
- Traffic problems in Baildon.

Option 1 – other issues

- What is Lower Baildon? Need to specify the area.
- A lot of people want to live in villages.
- Need to clarify more clearly what is a Local Service Centre.
- Steeton and Silsden does not have a supermarket but it is listed as having one.
- Many of our villages are sustainable and would be with 5%. Question assumption in Option 1.
- Call Local Service Centre “villages”.

- Some Local Service Centres are becoming dormitories – just commuters.
- Businesses will not be attracted to small Local Service Centres.
- Transport is overstretched.
- If build in villages, infrastructure will have to be developed there.
- Market forces determine employment sites – can't all be planned.
- How many people in Local Service Centres run businesses?
- People want local employment.
- Mixed use development is good.
- What is the start date of the Plan?
- How much of the 50,000 houses is included in the RUDP?
- Are windfalls included in the calculation and how?

Option 2 – strengths

None.

Option 2 – weaknesses

- Worst option.
- Where is the infrastructure in Baildon, Denholme, Menston and Burley?
- Railways packed or inadequate.
- It will cause congestion in Bingley again.
- Traffic will increase in Silsden and Steeton
- Leave Bingley alone.
- Need to be explicit – which areas in Bingley are included?
-

2nd Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 3 and 4

Option 3 – strengths

- Housing concentrate in area.
- Greater clarity over where the housing would go.

Option 3 – weaknesses

- Where will the access be to Esholt?
- Reservations about Esholt.
- Based on assumption people want city living – this may not last.
- Flood issues need to be addressed.
- Access to Apperley Bridge only through the water board.

- Need Shipley East Link Road if Esholt or Canal Road is developed.
- Esholt development could worsen traffic in Baildon and Shipley.
- Cannot envisage all villages as capable of having this level of development.
- Baildon should not be included, nor should Esholt.

Option 4 – strengths

None.

Option 4 – weaknesses

- Transport infrastructure is not there in Menston, Burley. This option is scary.
- Railways, roads not adequate in Steeton and Silsden
- No sustainable transport in Queensbury and Thornton.
- Esholt and Lower Baildon development is questionable.
- Developing new growth areas away from infrastructure.
- No to development in Burley and Menston.

Other Issues

- What % of housing is to be in the Growth Point areas in Option 3?
- Need global fund for traffic provision.
- Importance of Shipley Eastern Link Road.
- This consultation does not really explain what this could mean for each village or area.
- Main issue is how much is in the inner city and how much on the outskirts.
- Worried villages will become one big merging sprawl.
- Need to protect tourist areas, e.g. Ilkley.
- Water supply issues for new housing need addressing.
- All options not adequate.
- Should look first at transport, employment and housing in that order.
- Need large amount of investment in general infrastructure.
- Breakdown in the Sub Regional City – no breakdown for these communities.
- Affordable housing is crucial, and also rented.

Other Options

- A mix of Options 1 and 3.
- Option 1 plus intensive Growth Points as in Option 3.
- But generally there is not enough information to be able to be that specific over the preferred option.

[Out of time]

9.0 OPTIONS FORM

Core Strategy Further Issues and Options

Consultation Workshop

Victoria Hall - 8th 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 Options form received at this event.

QUESTION - WHICH SPATIAL OPTION DO YOU PREFER?		
Rep No.	Option 1,2,3,4 or Combination	<u>Comment</u>
VH 1		<p>Include Canal Road Corridor in Option1 or 2 to mitigate the effects of Green Belt releases, or lack of land in Ilkley and flood plain in Keighley and Bingley.</p> <p>Transport infrastructure is vital – cross-rail link, Apperley Bridge and Low Moor stations. Increased capacity on railway along Aire Valley. Also Manningham station.</p> <p>What about an entirely new settlement?</p>
VH 2	1	<p>Affordable Housing (which should be 3-bed homes with small gardens) should be in Shipley East Ward including replacement.</p> <p>Local Development Framework Settlement Study p37 appears to have no post offices for Shipley and Canal Road Corridor.</p> <p>Secondary Schools?</p>
VH 3	2 and 4	<p>50% Bradford/Shipley/Baildon south of Otley Road</p> <p>30% Keighley and Bingley</p> <p>5% Local Centres</p> <p>10% Local Growth Centres</p> <p>Not for Profit/Low Cost housing in Local Centres and Local Growth Centres</p> <p>Least use of green spaces</p> <p>Maximum use of Brownfield sites</p> <p>Infrastructure to include a free transport system for the Bradford area to encourage reduced car use.</p>
VH 4	4	<p>But the idea of Bingley being upgraded like Keighley in Option 2 is appealing.</p> <p>Transport is the major issue in the immediate future.</p>
VH 5	2 and 4	<p>Transport is a major issue. There is only one major route through the Aire Valley.</p> <p>Bingley is a really important area and now the bypass is in place it needs investment in the town centres and could easily have more housing if the town centre is developed.</p>

		Sustainability is also a major issue – including sustainable communities and sustainable construction.
VH 6	3 and 4	
VH 7	2 and 4	Infrastructure must be in place before or ahead of any development.
VH 8	4	Based on existing transport provision. Links out to Lancashire and the NW Development of Esholt as a significant settlements with links to the Airport.
VH 9		Where will employment come from and in what form? Houses need roads, cycle paths, good local transport, buses, trains etc. Children need play areas, parks, and so do adult. There are many empty offices all over the area and industrial premises. Housing can not be thought of in isolation.
VH 10		I would like to see the Shipley and Canal Road Corridor left alone. Following the building of the canal in Windhill and Bolton Woods we have an already dense area of properties which are on low incomes. When the canal was proposed I felt people in these areas would benefit from employment, not more housing. Children need green land and wildlife.
VH 11		None – it needs a complete rethink
VH 12	1	Strength – uses existing vacant and derelict land.
VH 13	1	All options are just strategies too fulfil Government needs. They do not reflect the real needs of Bradford's residents.
VH 14	3 and 4	Full comments to follow.
VH 15	4	Must be a combination of employment and housing in each development area. Preference given to accessibility to public transport especially train, but requires increased parking at stations near to homes. Permission to build must be tied to required infrastructure changes, therefore the ability to refuse permission if improved rail/road links.
VH 16	Unsure	I think it is essential to decide on where you can put in the correct infrastructure – roads, trains, car parks, new sewers and services, schools, medical etc, before any decision is taken about where to put the housing. I am concerned that you will be “bullied” by builders and their very expensive lawyers into building where profits are best You need to make it a condition of planning that every single property has designated parking for two cars – this should not include the garage. Also car parking for visitors on each development.
VH 17	1 plus move	I think you should develop between Bradford and Leeds possibly turning

	towards Leeds	<p>the two cities into one metropolitan area.</p> <p>I don't think you should build on the flood plain in the Airedale corridor from Keighley to Shipley.</p> <p>Option 1 – too much building on the flood plain</p> <p>Option 2 – still some buildings on the flood plain but move to Leeds good.</p> <p>Option 3 – Better spreading towards Esholt but flood plain in the Airedale corridor should not be built over. Esholt should be considered.</p> <p>Option 4 – Esholt may have to be considered.</p>
VH 18		<p>I use this strategy as an opportunity for regenerating our most deprived areas (Options 3 & 4?), but also make use of potential employment/business development in the east and south of the city with Leeds and motorway connections (Options 1 & 2). Option 4 is ok with Local Growth Centres and spreading the development, but concerned about the capacity of infrastructure and increase of mobility.</p>
VH 19		<p>I support redevelopment of Ravenscliffe, Thorpe Edge and also Holmewood.</p> <p>Please concentrate on quality or design, or build and of life.</p> <p>Too much emphasis on numbers.</p> <p>We don't want strings of apartments along the canal.</p>
VH 20	2, 3 and 4	<p>It is important to safeguard the environmental impact. Green routes should be maintained along the Aire Valley, to</p> <p>a) prevent compartmentalism putting undue stress on wildlife development</p> <p>b) enable space for people to escape overcrowded urban development.</p> <p>It should be made clear that Esholt includes large areas of Bradford – Apperley Bridge, Thackley, and Greengates.</p>
VH 21	1	<p>Imaginative redevelopment of the inner city (such as Salford in Manchester has achieved) is what is required. This options doesn't do enough, but it is the best option of the 4 available – with its 8 employment growth areas. Concentrating employment and housing development in the inner-city best matches the higher unemployment levels and social needs of that area. The only serious problem with Option 1 (and all the Options) is that no employment growth areas are proposed for the west of the city. They should be.</p> <p>This option is also best from an environmental point of view – as people will be travelling less distance to their place of work. A light rail system should be made to facilitate this.</p> <p>Crime is highest in high unemployment areas – another reason to</p>

		<p>concentrate in the inner city.</p> <p>The new housing in the outer suburbs is in reality a dormitory for commuters to Leeds. This is undesirable.</p> <p>The flood plain makes more employment and housing development west of Bingley and south of Keighley undesirable.</p>
VH 22		<p>It seems like it would be better to adopt Option 2/4 ideas of Local Service/Local Growth Centres in the larger towns/villages rather than smaller villages (as long as some growth is allowed).</p> <p>Green corridors need priority in tandem with development. Care given to species of trees/plants not just any green. Native species – look at migration patterns predicted by climate change, i.e. change in butterflies, birds, plants.</p> <p>Development on Canal Road Corridor could offer an opportunity for improved biodiversity/good quality green space. Need to work in conjunction with Bradford Urban Wildlife Group, Forest of Bradford, Bradford Environment Forum. Use Boars Well as an example.</p> <p>The types of dwellings needs careful consideration, e.g. Canal Road could attract a level of apartments that would not necessarily be cohesive with neighbouring communities. Can Planning Authorities dictate that the whole of Canal Road corridor is (mixed) social housing, suitable for families and communities? Not apartments used by people on business a few nights a week?</p> <p>Do we need to challenge our aspiration to live in large spaces? European model of good quality that is for families enclosing safe garden space.</p> <p>Does “sustainable living” include the concept of food growing?</p> <p>Development needs to go hand in hand with protection, improvement and increase of allotments.</p>
VH 23	1	<p>Option 1 is the best on offer <u>but</u> the principal growth area should not include Lower Baildon. Also, that area is not a homogenous whole – these should be a concentration as outlined in Options 3 and 4 (but excluding Esholt), and in south Bradford.</p> <p>Without additional transport infrastructure, <u>no</u> allocation should be given to Baildon.</p>
VH 24	1	<p>Hopefully a variety of houses and units – affordable housing first.</p> <p>Need an improved transport system first – road and rail.</p> <p>Avoid making an urban sprawl – joining villages up.</p> <p>Build more on windfall areas.</p>

VH 25	1	But with employment units included
VH 26	1 and 3	Concentrate on Canal Road Corridor, City Centre and Holmewood. Keep major building to the south of the city. Improve road infrastructure first.
VH 27	1 and 3	Figures are needed for what is already planned. Where is the building going to actually take place? What is affordable housing? Villages need to be separated, i.e. Bingley, Crossflatts, Micklethwaite
VH 28	1 and 2	Option 4 should be a non starter on transport grounds All options are compromised by the lack of substantial investment in transport infrastructure.
VH 29	1 and 3	I think concerns about transport infrastructure informs decision. Please try and preserve the villages. It isn't necessarily NIMBYISM – they just can't support enormous numbers of houses. The services are not there – transport, schools, healthcare. Try and work with the current nature of settlements and not try and change this – improve services.
VH 30	1	Esholt not accessible for Apperley Bridge Lower Baildon mostly already committed. Upper Baildon must <u>not</u> expand further. Traffic implications must be funded – Shipley Eastern Link Road/Hard Ings dualling Is Brownfield reuse subject to sufficient grant aid? Potential employment sites already committed.
VH 31	1 and 3	
VH 32		Global funding of highway infrastructure should be element of any planning approval in the same way that funding for education is identified, separate from Section 278 which is often 'unclaimed'.
VH 33	1 and 4	Vital to retain the nature of the rural villages. This is achieved best in Option 1 and Option 4.
VH 34		None of the options, instead, stop the population explosion.

11.0 OPTION FORM ANALYSIS

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

- Lack of land in Ilkley
- Lack of land in the flood plain in Keighley and Bingley.
- Transport infrastructure is vital.
- Not for profit/low cost housing in Local Service Centres and Local Growth Centres.
- Least use of green space.
- Maximum use of Brownfield land/sites.
- Infrastructure to include a free transport system for Bradford area to reduce car use.
- Bingley should be upgraded like Keighley.
- Transport is a major issue for the future.
- Bingley now needs investment.
- Sustainability – communities and construction.
- Infrastructure should be in place before/ahead of development.
- Development of Esholt is a significant settlement.
- Recreation areas for children are needed.
- Housing cannot be thought of in isolation.
- Shipley and Canal Road Corridor should be left alone.
- Wildlife
- Combination of housing and employment in each development area.
- Accessibility to public transport especially trains.
- Develop between Leeds and Bradford turning two cities into one metropolitan area.
- Do not build on the flood plain.
- Support development of Ravenscliffe, Thorpe Edge and Holmewood.
- Quality of design and build for life.
- Too much emphasis on numbers.
- Safeguard the environment.
- Imaginative redevelopment of the inner city.
- Development of the Canal Road Corridor could offer opportunities to improve biodiversity.
- No allocation to Baildon
- Affordable housing
- Avoid urban sprawl

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

	SALTAIRE 8 March 08
OPTION 1	9
OPTION 2	0
OPTION 3	0
OPTION 4	2
COMBINATION OF THE OPTIONS	14
NONE OF THE ABOVE	3
NO COMMENT	6
TOTAL	34

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
Saturday 8 March 2008 – Victoria Hall, Saltaire**

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 = 17

Question	Results				
	1	2	3	4	5
A Presenters / Speakers					
i. Was the level of detail provided appropriate?	2	1	11	3	0
ii. Were the introductory presentations an appropriate length?	0	1	15	1	0
iii. Please rate the overall quality of the introductory presentations and speakers	0	1	7	7	2
iv. Was the content of the DVD appropriate for the event?	1	3	7	6	0
B. Worksoop Sessions					
i. Were the workshops an appropriate length?	0	0	6	4	6
ii. Please rate the overall quality of the facilitators	0	0	5	6	5
C. Organisation					
i. Please rate the overall organisation and management of the event on the day	0	0	2	5	10
ii. Please rate the communication and background material provided leading up to the event	0	1	3	4	9
D. Venue					
i. Was the venue convenient and easy to get to?	2	1	11	3	0
ii. Please rate the overall quality of the venue?	0	1	15	1	0
iii. Please rate the quality of the refreshments	0	1	7	7	2
TOTALS	5	10	89	47	34

BEST FEATURES OF THE EVENT

The best features of the event were being able to exchange different views, and allowing for communication between Planners and the community to take place. It was an informative event and a good opportunity to ask questions. The complex issues were well presented and discussions well facilitated.

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

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

- Have chairs with lumbar support
- Start on time
- Have more planners available
- Be up front about what cannot be changed
- Have more factual information
- Hard to hear at times in workshop in main hall as there were two groups
- More time for each group to discuss
- Focus of workshop – specific questions addressed first to focus discussion
- Can all of today's notes be sent out to all parish councils?
- Improve the catering arrangements.
- Maybe longer sessions – consultation on the infrastructure plans essential.

Produced by the
City of Bradford Metropolitan
District Council

Local Development
Framework Group

June 2008

City of Bradford MDC

www.bradford.gov.uk