

Local Development Framework for Bradford

Core Strategy

Further Issues and Options

Consultation Event Log

Thornton Primary School, Bradford
(5th 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	13
4.0 BOOKING FORM	15
5.0 DELEGATE LIST	17
6.0 EVENT PROGRAMME	19
7.0 PROMPT SHEETS FOR OFFICERS	20
8.0 FACILITATOR NOTES	36
9.0 OPTIONS FORM	44
10.0 OPTIONS FORM FEEDBACK	44
11.0 OPTION FORM ANALYSIS	48
12.0 EVALUATION FORM	49
12.0 EVALUATION FORM FEEDBACK	51

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 22 people attended the Thornton 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 8 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 also invited to this event.

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

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 Dynamo
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	
Black Mountain Millennium Green/Brunel Community Association	Bradford Moor African Caribbean Young People's Forum
Blenheim Project	Bradford Moor Bowling Club
BMDC - Community Researcher, Policy Unit	Bradford Moor Cricket Club
BMEP & JAS	Bradford Moor Youth Sports Association
Bolton & Undercliffe Urban Village	Bradford Moor, Thornbury and Barkerend Neighbourhood Plan
Bolton Villas CC	Bradford Motor Education Project
Bolton Villas Cricket Club	Bradford Nightstop
Brackenhill Primary School	Bradford North Retirement Group
Bradford & Airedale Mental Health Advocacy Group	Bradford Older Carers' Association (Mencap)
Bradford & District Assoc Mental Health	Bradford Older People's Alliance
Bradford & District Autistic Support Group	Bradford Ornithological Group
Bradford & District Coalition of Disabled People	Bradford Park Avenue Junior FC
Bradford Access Action	Bradford Park Avenue Junior Football Club
Bradford Action for Refugees	Bradford People First
Bradford Aid for Kosova	Bradford Ramblers Association Group
Bradford All Stars	Bradford Real Nappy Project (BEAT)
Bradford Alliance on Community Care	Bradford Repetitive Strain Injury Support
Bradford Association of Visually Impaired People & Centre for Deaf People	Bradford Resource Centre
Bradford Bandits BMX Racing Club	Bradford Scout/Guides Water Activities
Bradford Bengali Hindu Cultural Society	Bradford Sea Cadets
Bradford Botany Group	Bradford Shalimar Cricket Club
Bradford City Disabled Supporters Association	Bradford South & West Live at Home Scheme
Bradford City Women's Football Club	Bradford South & West PCT
Bradford Civic Society	Bradford Tigers J F C
Bradford Click-On	Bradford Trades Union Council
Bradford Community Broadcasting	Bradford Tradesmen's Homes Residents Committee
Bradford Community Environment Project	Bradford Urban Wildlife Group
	Bradford Vision

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	Earlswood 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
CHACH Association	East Shipley Partnership
Chairobics Group	Eastwood School
Charities Information Bureau	EBRO
Chattabox Holiday Club	Eccleshill Community Playgroup
Checkpoint Women's Group	Eccleshill Day Care Centre
Christians Against Poverty	Eccleshill F.C.
Church of the Nazarene	Eccleshill Football Club
City of Bradford Esprit Diving Club	Eccleshill Horticultural Society
Clayton ARLFC	Eccleshill Karate Club

Eccleshill Local History Group	Friends of Swain House
Eccleshill Mechanics Institute	Friends of Undercliffe Cemetary
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
Eccleshills 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
Friends of Bowling Park	Guru Gobind Sikh Temple
Friends of Buck Wood	Guru Nanak Elderly Day Centre
Friends of Harold Park	Gurunanak Sikh Temple
Friends of Hendford Drive	Hainsworth Moor Grove
Friends of Holybrook	Hainworth Community Centre
Friends of Ilkley Moor	Hamzah Elderly Community Association
Friends of Lister Park (FLIP)	Hanfia Mosque
Friends of Newhall Park Primary School	Happy Little People Parent Toddlers
Friends of Peel Park	Harbourne Residential Care Centre

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
Idle CC	Little Horton Neighbourhood Action Group
Idle Cricket Club	Low Moor & Wyke British Legion (Women's Section)
Idle Hands Cross Stitch & Craft Club	Low Moor C of E Primary School
Idle Juniors	Low Moor Local History Group
Idle Juniors F.C.	Low Moor Paper Crafts
Idle Tenants and Residents Association	Low Moor Primary School PTFA
Idle Tide Committee	Low Moor Urban Village
Idle Urban Village	Lower Fields Primary School
Idle Working Men's Club & Institute	Lowerhouse Close Residents

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 Liaison 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
Mr Martin Spiers	Percussion Drumming Group
Mr T Bendrien	Pithill Centre
Mr T Benrial	Playcentre
Mr Tom Jones	Pollard Park Residents Association
Mrs B Smith	Pondside Neighbours Group
Multi Arts International	Presence FM
Multiple Sclerosis Friends	Prospect Juniors AFC
Mums's and Tots at Sully's	Punjabi Maehfil
Munch Bunch Toddlers Group	Purlin Project

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	Shipley 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
Roshni Women's Group	Springfield XL Group
Rowan Avenue Neighbourhood Watch	St Aidan's Presbytery
Royds Community Association	St Augustine's Art Project
Royds Healthy Living Centre	St Christopher's Church
Royds Junior Rugby Club	St Clares Community Centre and Church
Royds Rugby Club	St Clares Improvement Group
Royds Rugby League Club	St Columba's Catholic Primary School
Runnymede Court Social Club	St Columbus RC Primary School
Russell Hall Primary School	St Georges 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
Surti Muslim Khalifa Society	Thornbury Gardens and Allotments Association
Sutton Community Association	Thornbury Youth & Community Association
Sutton Community Centre	Thornbury Youth & Community Centre (TYCC)
Swain Green Partnership	Thornbury Youth Centre
Sycamore Court Tenants & Residents Association	Thornton Urban Village
Taleemul-Quran Society	Thorpe Edge Community Project
Telegraph and Argus	Thorpe Edge Disabled Action Group
TFD Centre	Thorpe Edge Jaguars St Hockey Team
TFD Football Club	Thorpe Edge Womens Group

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	Womenszone Centre
Undercliffe ARLFC	Womenszone 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
Wedgewood School & Community Nursery	Young Womens Project
Wedgewood Special School	Youth Base
Wednesday Club	Youth Development Project
Wellesley Knitting Club	Youth Service
Wesleyan Reform Church Luncheon Club	Youth Zone
West Bowling Neighbourhood Action Group	
West Bowling Youth Centre	
West Yorkshire LSC	
West Yorkshire Police	

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.

Name:	
Address:	
Organisation:	
Telephone:	
Email:	

Options Consultation – Booking Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Or fax to
01274 433767

Or telephone
01274 432499

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

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

Hard copies can be requested by telephoning 01274 432499.

5.0 DELEGATE LISTS**City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council**www.bradford.gov.uk**SPECIAL NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM****CORE STRATEGY CONSULTATION****THORNTON PRIMARY SCHOOL – 5 MARCH 2008 6.30pm – 9pm****DELEGATE LIST**

NAME	ORGANISATION
Hillary Beaumont	Resident
Kathleen Black	Pondside Neighbours Group
Maxine Brotherton	Denholme Town Council
Shirley Bryar	Clayton Forum and Watch
Tony Caunt	Wilsden Parish Council
Judith Drake	Denholme Community Association
Nora Haldenby	Denholme Town Council
Peter Jenkins	Burley Parish Council
Mr Kershaw	Resident
Mr A Khan	Bradford Community Housing Trust
M Khan	Resident
Melanie Milnes	Thornton Community Council
Elaine Murphy	Wyke Christian Fellowship
Nick Murphy	Wyke Christian Fellowship
Maria Perez	Bradford & Airedale Teaching Primary Care Trust
Cllr Clive Richardson	Ward Councillor for Thornton & Allerton
Barbara Smith	Pitty Beck Action Group
Mandy Webb	Bradford Libraries
Gillian Wilson	Pitty Beck Action Group

NAME	ORGANISATION
Andrew Marshall	Local Development Framework Group (CBMDC)
Isha Ahmed	Local Development Framework Group (CBMDC)
Emma Crossland Stephen	Local Development Framework Group (CBMDC)
Louise Williams	Bradford West Area Coordinator (CBMDC)
Chris Slaven	Bradford West Area Coordinator's Office (CBMDC)
Charlotte Bourke	Bradford West Area Coordinator's Office (CBMDC)

Additional list of delegates that signed in on the day:

NAME	ORGANISATION
Robert Krempic	Resident
Louise Beever	Resident
Mr Craven	Resident
Mrs J. Craven	Resident
Mrs. D. Le Clerey	Resident
John Ratick	Resident
Mrs L. Leeming	Clayton Resident
Mr C. Eshimbles	Thornton Resident
Adrian Cogill	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

THORNTON PRIMARY SCHOOL, 5TH MARCH 2008, 6 – 9PM

PROGRAMME

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

7.0 PROMPT SHEETS FOR OFFICERS

PURPOSE AND AIMS OF WORKSHOP SESSIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

EXAMPLES OF QUESTIONS

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

Transport - infrastructure, capacity, access to public transport
 Green Belt – loss of, and importance of in particular locations
 Open Space – value of, amenity, implications of losing open space
 Infrastructure/Utilities – e.g, school capacity, sewerage capacity etc
 Environment – wildlife, flood risk, conservation etc
 Housing Needs – affordability, lifetime homes
 Jobs – providing land for the range of employment needs
 Sustainability
 Climate Change

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

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

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

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

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

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

What is the best option for achieving sustainable growth?

ROLE OF PLANNERS/AREA CO-ORDINATORS AT EACH WORKSHOP

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

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

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

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

BACKGROUND

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

Housing

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

¹ This is the figure outlined in the draft Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) – The regional development plan Core Strategy Further Issues & Options Consultation – Thornton (5th March 2008)

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

Table 1: Comparison of net housing requirement for Bradford District

Draft RSS	Proposed Changes
2004 – 11 = 7 yrs x 1560 dwellings = 10,920 2011 – 16 = 5 yrs x 1920 dwellings = 9,600 2016 – 21 = 5 yrs x 2180 dwellings = 10,900 Total 2004 – 21 = 31,420	2004 – 08 = 4 yrs x 1560 dwellings = 6,240 2008 – 21 = 13 yrs x 2700 dwellings = 35,100 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.

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

² This figure is based on more recent population projections

- Replacement UDP Safeguarded Land Sites⁴
- Urban Capacity Study Sites*

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

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

Employment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE 4 SPATIAL OPTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

SPATIAL OPTION 1: RSS SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY OPTION

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

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

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

Principal Towns – Ilkley, Keighley

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Employment development with this option would be concentrated in:

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

Strengths and Weaknesses of Option 1

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

Strengths:

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

Weaknesses:

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

SPATIAL OPTION 2: CONTINUATION OF THE RUDP STRATEGY

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

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

From these the following settlement hierarchy is proposed:

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

Principal Towns – Ilkley, Keighley, Bingley

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Employment development would be concentrated in

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

Strengths and Weaknesses of Option 2

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

Strengths:

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

Weaknesses:

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

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

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

The RSS settlement hierarchy would be used as follows:

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

Principal Towns – Ilkley, Keighley

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

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

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

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

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

With further development and or restructuring in:

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

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

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

- Intensification (especially Ilkley)
- Green Belt releases

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

Employment development would be concentrated in

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

Strengths and Weaknesses of Option

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

Strengths:

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

Weaknesses:

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

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

SPATIAL OPTION 4: DISPERSED GROWTH POINTS

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

- RSS growth point initiative
- Masterplans
- Existing transport corridors

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

Sub Regional City – Bradford/Shipley/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/Shiopley/Lower Baildon, and in well connected transport corridors, rather than a number of smaller releases across the whole of the district

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

Weaknesses:

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

8.0 FACILITATOR NOTES

Present:

Cllr Clive Richardson, Louise Williams (Bradford West Area Co-ordinator's Office), Andrew Marshall (Senior Planning Officer, LDF Team), Isha Ahmed & Emma Crossland-Stephen (Planning Officer, LDF Team) and 21 members of the public.

Welcome & Introductions:

Louise Williams opened the meeting by introducing herself and Council Officers, welcoming everyone and thanking them for attending. She explained basic housekeeping and gave a brief outline of the meeting, before handing over to Andrew Marshall who provided a more detailed explanation about the purpose and structure of the evening ahead.

Andrew thanked everyone for giving up their time to attend this important event and for showing an interest in helping to decide how best to deliver the plans for the future of the District. He explained that Bradford Council is keen to engage people from all areas of the District and all communities within that, to help to determine where housing should be developed.

Andrew checked that everyone had been given the relevant literature on arrival and said he appreciated that some of it was quite technical, but it was basically about shaping the future of the District. He made reference to the agenda as he talked more about the structure of the evening ahead and provided a brief overview about the need for public consultation in respect of plans to develop 50,000 new homes in the District by 2026.

He showed a DVD which gave more background about the need to provide more housing to accommodate the anticipated growth in the population over the next 20 years. He outlined the 4 current options that would form the basis for discussions in the workshops that would follow.

Key points from the DVD:

- 485,000 people currently live and/or work in the Bradford District
- By 2029, a 25% growth in population is projected, which equates to approximately 10,000 annually
- Initial meetings have taken place across the District to help establish some initial options
- As a result, 4 options are currently under consideration

Andrew summarised the DVD by explaining that as people move through the workshops the Planning Officers will help to clarify each option and will facilitate discussions about the possible strengths and weaknesses of each option. He said it was also important to express and capture fears and concerns about each option. Andrew invited initial questions before asking people to split up into their respective groups.

Open Questions:

Q: Why bother having a consultation at all? The Council don't listen to our views anyway and just go ahead with what they want regardless.

A: It is important to understand that we are trying to take a different approach to this issue. We don't have any preconceived ideas or plans about how the end product will look. This is the very first stage of the process and the 4 options that you are here to consider may not progress to the final stages. The outcome of this process may look very different from the current suggested options and will be based on your input at meetings such as this. There are a number of consultation events taking place and we are trying to look well ahead so that there is time to incorporate all aspects of the plans, for example any improvements required to ensure the infrastructure can adequately support the growth.

Q: Is land already allocated under the UDP for a number of new homes included in the 50,000 homes being discussed here?

A: Yes, if they are not already built but have been allocated they can be counted towards the overall requirement.

Q: In the DVD, it said that option 4 is not possible – if that's the case, why even put it forward as an option?

A: All 4 options are genuine possibilities, but they need to be discussed and debated properly. I apologise if the DVD was misleading in this respect. We will review the wording and amend it accordingly.

C: I would just like to say thank you to the Council for giving us an opportunity to input into the future of the District. Has the impact of these extra homes has been fully considered?

A: The growth mentioned is between now and 2026. If you look at this on an annual basis, it is approximately 2700 new homes each year. This is throughout the District so it is not all being proposed in one place, but we need to look ahead for the next generation who will during this time need a home of their own. We have to find a way to accommodate that with the minimum impact.

Q: What counts as a dwelling?

A: We need to look at the needs of the population and therefore we know that one specific house type will not be suitable for all. We envisage a combination of size and styles will be required and will have to ensure that this is incorporated into the final proposals.

C: It is important that the Council understands the need to improve all the supporting facilities in line with these additional homes. The current facilities such as Medical Centres, Public Transport, Education, Doctors and Dental Surgeries' cannot cope with the demands on them now – never mind with the growth you are talking about.

There were no further questions, so the groups moved into the workshop stage.

Once the workshops were completed, the meeting reconvened and Louise thanked everyone for attending. Andrew also thanked everyone for their contributions, views and suggestions and outlined the next steps. He explained there will be a lot more discussions and a lot of work to help develop a preferred approach over the next year.

Andrew also explained that comments on this issue officially need to be received by 20th March, however they are keen to give everyone the opportunity to be consulted and as a result they would still take into consideration comments received after this date.

The meeting closed at 9:00pm.

VENUE: Thornton Primary School, Thornton
DATE: 5TH March 2008
WORKSHOP SESSION: 4 Spatial Options
TIME: 18.00 to 21.00
GROUP: A
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

- Query over densities for new Plan
 - Already overcrowded in inner city – need to disperse housing more
 - Loss of green corridors/spaces
- People want to live in green open spaces – move to ‘outer’ areas
- Brownfield sites – develop these more
- Should be able to include ‘windfall’ sites
- Problems with employment. Schools, health facilities

FOCUS V DISPERSED DEBATE

- City centre developments – concern re- infrastructure
- Concern re- Clayton being in City Centre Development – wants to retain greenery
- Plans for possible infrastructure should be in place prior to LDF
- Dispersed – problems with trains (8million per year for 20/30 years PFI)
- Thornton Park & Ride
- Small local employment centres – not sustainable
- Consider where there is good infrastructure to build on
- Denholme – trunk road problems
- Higher percentage for villages – difficulties re infrastructure (particularly transport) and if we increase employment this aggravates transport problems
- Affordable housing doesn’t create same transport problems
- Villages grown considerably in recent past.
- Education – Ilkley Grammar School – full, therefore children having to travel.
- Dispersed – more difficulties re infrastructure
- Status of wildlife sites.

2nd Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 2 and 3**OPTION 3**

- Infill not good for wildlife
- Intensification – concerns re – space to enjoy/play
- Protect wildlife
- Live/work units in villages
- Recent increased growth in villages
- Increase in Ilkley – is it achievable?
- Ilkley
 - flood risk
 - environmental considerations
 - lots of constraints
- Who will want to live in inner city without green spaces?
- Is there a market for city centre / inner city living?
- Need good design and facilities
- High rise flats could create problems
- Clarity about which neighbourhoods are included in city centre red circle
- Would rather have some housing in villages than ‘over’ intensification in Bradford ‘red circle’ area everyone needs green spaces.
- Need to improve transport into city centre
- Provide more facilities locally and investment in existing facilities
- Need for social housing
- Legislation re/ work with private landlords

OPTION 4

- Infrastructure at capacity in local Growth Centres
- Concern would join Thornton to Allerton?
- Need to keep settlements separate
- LGC losing employment already
 - Are commuter settlements
- Suspicion re government and regional policy and demand
- Lack of confidence in ability/desire to deliver on infrastructure requirements
- Health impact assessments – current health inequalities.

[Out of time]

VENUE: Thornton Primary School, Thornton
DATE: 5TH March 2008
WORKSHOP SESSION: 4 Spatial Options
TIME: 18.00 to 21.00
GROUP: B
FACILITATOR: Andrew Marshall
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
 - Areas intended have existing services
 - Keeps identity of villages
 - Not straining local service centres
- Weaknesses
 - Type of housing inappropriate
- Fears/Concerns
 - Properties focus to rent (no control)
 - Parking to accommodate growth
 - Plans need to deliver community space – money to fund it.
 - Infrastructure needs to improve – transport, education, health care, jobs, highways, drains and sewers etc.

OPTION 2:

- Strengths
 - Bingley takes its share of development
- Weaknesses
 - Near to flood zones
 - Industrial growth needs to be shared more (small or companies)

- Fears/Concerns
 - Plans must include money for communities and commitment to delivering
 - Don't want Thornton/Allerton merge
 - Current infrastructure cant cope
 - Transport can't cope
 - Worth Valley could be included
 - Parking to accommodate growth

2nd Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 2 and 3

OPTION 3:

- Strengths
 - More equal spread across LSC's
- Weaknesses
 - Jobs could be taken by people coming from Leeds etc
 - Bingley not included as Principal Town
- Fears/Concerns
 - Is this driven by people's needs? Affordability? What? Where?
 - Infrastructure cannot cope now – needs to be incorporated in plans to support growth.

OPTION 4:

- Strengths
 - Some areas are taking better share
- Weaknesses
 - Baildon and East Morton not included
 - Silsden – can't cope with further growth
 - Infrastructure – too spread out to enable impact through areas identified – enough to support growth/development proposed
- Fears/Concerns
 - Employment – not spread out enough
 - Housing mix and costs – may not be affordable or cater for needs of home buyers.

Summary Comments

- Bingley needs to take large share (like in option 2 and 4)
- Like emphasis on Airedale Corridor (option 4)
- East Morton and Baildon need to take more share
- Minimise further development in Thornton (option 1 and 4)
- Retain green space
- Need to retain/preserve existing green spaces and model should be within existing structure (option 1 and 4)
- Option 2 better share, equal across all areas

[Out of time]

9.0 OPTIONS FORM

Core Strategy Further Issues and Options

Consultation Workshop

Thornton Primary School - 5th 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>
TPS 1	Option 5 (Combination?)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bingley as a Principal Town – Option 2. ▪ Option 4 – the best option but Thornton & Queensbury need to be local service centres ▪ All areas need to be looked at individually and local needs taken into consideration.
TPS 2	1 and 2	All options require more spread of employment areas. Oxenhope / Haworth have plenty of space for expansion – the railway could be involved in improving transport.
TPS 3	2 and 3	If more homes are built in Thornton, will the swimming pool be rebuilt? Will there be more doctors and will the BRI cope with more people? Thornton will also need more schools.
TPS 4	3	This option should be discussed more fully before pulling it forward to Government; employment in our area is nil, transport is 1 every hour. The A629 run through the village and needs looking into may be we could have a bypass in the future.
TPS 5	2	Don't kill our commuting village corridor.
TPS 6	1, 2 and 3	Greatest proportion in Bradford – 60-65%; Medium in Keighley, Ilkley and Bingley – 25-30%, and smaller amount in Local Service Centres – 5-10% and all categorised as the same.
TPS 7	1, 3 and 4	Options 1 and 3 retain the current form of Bradford; Or Option 4 with less development in Thornton and Queensbury and more in East Morton and Baildon.
TPS 8	4	Bingley must take its share and be a Principal Town like Ilkley and Keighley. Need good transport and infrastructure.
TPS 9	1 and 4	Bingley needs to be brought in on Option 2 [<i>presumably as a Principal Town</i>]. Options 1 and 4 because of good transport links – rail/road. But worry – will central Bradford development take local services/funds away from rural villages, <u>but</u> suppose can't have it

		both ways. If housing not being built in these areas we shouldn't have extra services.
TPS 10	3 (and possibly part of Option 2)	Advantages of 3 – reduce distances for persons to travel to workplaces. Easy access to Leeds District & motorways without having to build lengthy sections of road (consuming money and land)
TPS 11	A Combination	<p>Heavy development of villages (accepting that all parts have to take their share), creates a real own goal, as their existing services are non-existent or creaking. The cost and disruption to infrastructure will increase exponentially with increase in numbers.</p> <p>As for Wharfedale, all settlements are linked to the common problem – poor infrastructure. Poor bus service, crowded train services at peak time, shortage of rail parking, and one secondary school (Ilkley).</p> <p>I'll put my money on it – we won't get the infrastructure!</p>
TPS 12	3	<p>I am strongly against release of Green Belt. People live in villages because they prefer to have green fields maintained around their village.</p> <p>I think CBMDC should fight against central Government and fight for the people of Bradford.</p> <p>I also think the city should develop better accessibility with direct train services to London and join both stations to facilitate this.</p>
TPS 13	1	
TPS 14	1	<p>Infrastructure, schools etc.</p> <p>Identify and respect communities</p> <p>Build houses for families, not flats.</p>
TPS 15		<p>Which is the least worst?</p> <p>All areas seem to be at capacity for infrastructure and green space provision.</p> <p>Perhaps we should proceed with caution so that we don't rush into things that don't work</p>
TPS 16	3	Keep the surrounding areas separate so that districts/villages do not merge together.
TPS 17	2	These plans can only be drawn up effectively by working in partnership with major services, e.g. health, education, transport,

		<p>recreation.</p> <p>There needs to be a health impact assessment made a s major government, local authority and NHS target in reducing inequalities.</p>
TPS 18	4	<p>The release of the Green Belt is a concern. Also employment issues and transport to be looked at. Wildlife and environmental issues will always be a concern.</p>
TPS 19	1 and 3	<p>Concerned about merging villages in the West and loss of Green Belt on the West side of the District.</p> <p>Development of the city centre and the East makes more sense as transport infrastructure is more in place. There are also large sites near the motorway.</p>

11.0 OPTION FORM ANALYSIS

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

- Bingley should be a Principal Town
- Thornton & Queensbury should be Local Service Centres
- Dispersed employment areas
- Need good transport
- Need good infrastructure
- Poor infrastructure in Wharfedale
- Against release of the Green Belt
- Identity and respect communities
- Concern regarding the merging of villages
- Health Impact assessment needed
- Concern for wildlife and environment
- Support development in City Centre and East Bradford

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

	THORNTON 5 March 08
OPTION 1	2
OPTION 2	3
OPTION 3	3
OPTION 4	1
COMBINATION OF THE OPTIONS	9
NONE OF THE ABOVE	0
NO COMMENT	1
TOTAL	19

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

www.bradford.gov.uk

**LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK – CORE STRATEGY
FURTHER ISSUES & OPTIONS
SPECIAL NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM
Wednesday 5 March 2008 – Thornton Primary School**

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 = 8

Question	Results				
	1	2	3	4	5
A Presenters / Speakers					
i. Was the level of detail provided appropriate?	0	0	4	2	2
ii. Were the introductory presentations an appropriate length?	0	2	3	2	1
iii. Please rate the overall quality of the introductory presentations and speakers	0	0	3	3	2
iv. Was the content of the DVD appropriate for the event?	1	3	3	1	0
B. Workshop Sessions					
i. Were the workshops an appropriate length?	0	0	3	3	3
ii. Please rate the overall quality of the facilitators	0	0	3	3	2
C. Organisation					
i. Please rate the overall organisation and management of the event on the day	0	0	3	1	3
ii. Please rate the communication and background material provided leading up to the event	0	2	1	4	1
D. Venue					
i. Was the venue convenient and easy to get to?	1	0	3	1	4
ii. Please rate the overall quality of the venue?	0	0	4	0	4
iii. Please rate the quality of the refreshments	0	0	1	4	2
TOTALS	2	7	31	24	24

BEST FEATURES OF THE EVENT

The best feature of the event was deemed to be the workshop and discussion element which allowed people to enough time to ask questions, raise concerns and get their points across. Delegates generally liked the plans of the growth points and the way in which in the information was presented. One delegate commented that the staff at the event were excellent.

AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

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

- Dress code for the presenters could be improved
- Introduction video had insufficient detail
- Bit more clarity needed around the different options
- Only possible when more information is available

Produced by the
City of Bradford Metropolitan
District Council

Local Development
Framework Group

June 2008

City of Bradford MDC

www.bradford.gov.uk