

Local Development Framework for Bradford

# Core Strategy

## Further Issues and Options

### Consultation Event Log

Riddings Hall, Ilkley  
(15th March 2008)

June 2008





<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>1.0 EVENT OVERVIEW</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2.0 LIST OF ORGANISATIONS AND GROUPS INVITED</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>3.0 LETTER OF INVITE</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4.0 BOOKING FORM</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>5.0 DELEGATE LIST</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>6.0 EVENT PROGRAMME</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>7.0 PROMPT SHEETS FOR OFFICERS</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>8.0 FACILITATOR NOTES</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>9.0 OPTIONS FORM</b>	<b>46</b>
<b>10.0 OPTIONS FORM FEEDBACK</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>11.0 OPTION FORM ANALYSIS</b>	<b>54</b>
<b>12.0 EVALUATION FORM</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>13.0 EVALUATION FORM FEEDBACK</b>	<b>58</b>

## 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 Ilkley 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. A five-minute DVD that outlined the 4 spatial options for development was intended to be shown at this event, but unfortunately it did not work. 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 12 delegates completed a form. These have been analysed and used to inform later events.

## 2.0 LIST OF ORGANISATIONS AND GROUPS INVITED

---

This event was jointly organised with Keighley Areas Co-ordinators Office. In addition to the invite list below, a local councillor sent out over 600 letters to local residents informing them of 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

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 Dynamos
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 Womens 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 Community Housing Trust	Bradford Vision
	Bradford Wildcats F C



Bradford Womens 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 & Childrens 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
Clayton Heights Community Group	Eccleshill Local History Group

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
Friends of Swain House	Harbourne Residents Group

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 Mens Club & Institute	Lowerhouse Close Residents
Idlethorpe Indoor Bowlers Club	Making Space

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
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
Neighbourhood Watch Co-ordinator	Q2 Regeneration Limited

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 Womens 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
Ryecroft Community Centre	St John The Evangelist Catholic Primary

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
TFD Youth and Community Centre	Thorpe Edge Women's Self Help Group

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	
Westbourne Mothers & Toddlers	

### 3.0 LETTER OF INVITE

## City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

[www.bradford.gov.uk](http://www.bradford.gov.uk)

### Department of Environment and Neighbourhoods

Neighbourhood Support Service  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor, Jacobs Well  
BRADFORD  
West Yorkshire BD1 5RW

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

Date: 11/03/2008

Dear Sir or Madam,

#### Your District in 2026

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

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

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

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



Further information on the Local Development Framework is available on the Council's website at [www.bradford.gov.uk/ldf](http://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](mailto: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](mailto:helen.breen@bradford.gov.uk)), or Edward Broadhead on 01274 432499 (or [edward.broadhead@bradford.gov.uk](mailto: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](http://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](mailto: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**

<b>Name:</b>	
<b>Address:</b>	
<b>Organisation:</b>	
<b>Telephone:</b>	
<b>Email:</b>	

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**  
**8<sup>th</sup> 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](http://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](http://www.bradford.gov.uk)**SPECIAL NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM****CORE STRATEGY CONSULTATION****RIDDINGS HALL, ILKLEY – 15 MARCH 2008 10am – 1pm****DELEGATE LIST**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>ORGANISATION</b>
Alan David Elsegood	Menston Community Association
Alex Cockshott	Ilkley Civic Society
Andrew Wilson	Resident
Audrey Brand	Menston Community Association
Barry Brand	Menston Community Association
C V Barton	Transport 2000
Charlotte Scaife	Resident
Chris Battersby	Resident
Chris Dale	Ilkley Parish Council
Cllr Anne Hawkesworth	Ward Councillor for Ilkley Portfolio Holder for the Environment
Cllr Chris Greaves	Ward Councillor for Wharfedale
Colin McCann	Resident
Dale Cordingley	Resident
David Wilson	Resident
Fiona Scaife	Resident
Gordon Metcalfe	Menston Parish Council
Graham Wilson	Resident

<b>NAME</b>	<b>ORGANISATION</b>
Harvey Bosomworth	Resident
Howard Scaife	Resident
Jean Langtry-Langton	Resident
Jean Wilson	Resident
John Cockshott	Friends of the Manor House
John D Anderson	Fairtrade Bradford; Windhill Community Centre
Judy Hutton	Ilkley CVS
Kate Brown	Ilkley Parish Council
Kathy Best	Ilkley Parish Council
Matthew Scaife	Resident
Mr Drury	Resident
Mr J Drake	Resident
Mr Varley	Resident
Mrs Bosomworth	Resident
Mrs McInnes	Resident
Mrs Varley	Resident
Noel Hutton	Ilkley CVS
Pauline Dixon	Ilkley Parish Council
Peter Langtry-Langton	Resident
Peter Ward	Menston Community Association
Rob Ryde	Resident
Robert Warren	Rance, Booth & Smith
Robin Wright	Resident
Roger Miall	Resident
Ruth A Anderson	Fairtrade Bradford; Windhill Community Centre
Sandy Macpherson	Save Us Pub & Ben Rhydding Action Group

<b>NAME</b>	<b>ORGANISATION</b>
Steven Proctor	Resident
Susan Hinchcliffe	Prospective Labour Parliamentary Candidate for Shipley
Tony Burkitt	Ramblers Association
W McInnes	Resident
Wilfed Shaw	Ilkley Design Statement Group

Additional list of delegates that signed in on the day:

<b>NAME</b>	<b>ORGANISATION</b>
P. Maufe	Resident
Mr. J.F Wilson	Resident
L Nerarkar	Menston Resident
D. Banks	Resident
M Railey	Resident
C. Jones	Burley Parish Council
Cllr Martin Smith	BMDC
Colin Carpenter	Ilkley Civic Society

## 6.0 EVENT PROGRAMME

## City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

[www.bradford.gov.uk](http://www.bradford.gov.uk)

### SPECIAL NEIGHBOURHOOD FORUM

#### LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK CORE STRATEGY FURTHER ISSUES AND OPTIONS CONSULTATION

RIDDINGS HALL, ILKLEY, 15<sup>TH</sup> MARCH 2008, 10am – 1pm

#### PROGRAMME

10.00am	<b>Registration and Refreshments.</b>
10.30am	<b>Welcome and Introduction:</b> By the Neighbourhood Forum Area Co-ordinator setting out the aims of the event and proceedings
10.35pm	<b>Purpose of the Consultation:</b> Isha Ahmed (Team Leader) 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	<b>Questions and Introduction to Workshops</b>
11.00am	<b>Workshop Session 1:</b> Discussion focused on Options 1 & 2 (as detailed in the Core Strategy Summary Leaflet) for the location of development
11.45am	<b>Refreshments break.</b>
12.00pm	<b>Workshop Session 2:</b> Discussion focused on Options 3 & 4 (as detailed in the Core Strategy Summary Leaflet) for the location of development
12.45pm	<b>Summary and where next:</b> Isha Ahmed will summarise key issues raised on the day and set out the next steps in developing the LDF Core Strategy.
1.00pm	<b>Lunch and Refreshments</b>

## **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 1<sup>st</sup> workshop session will discuss Options 1 & 2, there will then be a break and the 2<sup>nd</sup> 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. **31,000<sup>1</sup>** 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 **54,840<sup>2</sup>** dwellings to be provided between 2004 – 2026. – A significant increase of more than 23,000 homes despite the longer timeline of 2026.

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

**Table 1: Comparison of net housing requirement for Bradford District**

<b>Draft RSS</b>	<b>Proposed Changes</b>
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	
<b>Total 2004 – 21 = 31,420</b>	<b>Total 2004 – 21 = 41,340</b> <b>(9,920 more a 32% increase than draft RSS)</b>
	2021 – 26 = 5yrs x 2700 dwellings = 13,500
	<b>Total housing requirement from 2004 – 26 is 54,840 dwellings.</b>

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:**

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

**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 sites<sup>3</sup>
- Replacement UDP Safeguarded Land Sites<sup>4</sup>

<sup>2</sup> This figure is based on more recent population projections

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

<sup>4</sup> Sites identified in the RUDP as potential areas of search for future development

- 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.

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/Shirole/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:** Isha Ahmed, Helen Longfield, Michelle Greenwood, Lucille Adie and Emma Crossland Stephen CMBDC Planning Service; Cllr Anne Hawkesworth, Cllr Chris Greaves, Jeff Bennet and Noreen Akhtar, Shipley Area Coordinator's Office in the Chair.

### 1. Welcome & Introductions

Jeff welcomed residents and Councillors to the meeting, and gave information on the format and venue.

### 2. Background.

Cllr Hawkesworth set out the key issues for Wharfedale. The government were asking Bradford Council to find land for 2,700 additional new homes per year. The existing planning document, the Unitary Development Plan, (UDP) has land allocated for 1,400 new homes per year. Bradford Council has objected to this figure during the first phase of consultation. 4 options are being set out suggesting different ways this land could be provided. These options are not set in stone. Cllr Hawkesworth suggested residents should consider which option would most effectively protect the character of Wharfedale.

Isha Ahmed, Senior Planner explained that the Council is looking at 4 ways of providing the land needed to accommodate housing growth. Some of the options have been formed in response to discussions with residents last year. The Council expects to reach agreement on the preferred option by the end of the year. The work on housing is being accompanied by proposals for providing additional land for employment. Isha addressed questions from residents:

### 3. Question & Answer Session:

1. "The predictions for housing need are nonsense"

A: The estimate of housing need is based on figures supplied by the Office of National Statistics showing that the population of the district is likely to increase by 110,000 by 2026. This is accounted for one third by "natural growth" (high birth rate), one-third by internal migration – residents moving into Bradford from other parts of the UK and one third by international migration. Since 2001, the overall population of the district has already increased by 5000.

2. "Bradford will disappear under the proposals put forward in the Regional Spatial Strategy- there is too much emphasis on Bradford as part of the Leeds City Region. We need to



strengthen the identity of Bradford as a city and concentrate new development in the centre.

3. Have the Council considered the issue of commuting and the road network?

A: Discussions with infrastructure providers will follow.

4. "We are opposed to erosion of the greenbelt. Land will be needed to grow food more locally to prevent shortages and increasing food prices".

A: Some release of greenbelt land is likely to be needed. There is only so much intensification that can be accommodated.

5. How many houses will be demolished to make way for new houses?

A: 50,000 is a net figure. We must replace any homes that are demolished.

6. Does the 50,000 include voids, (homes that are currently empty).

A: The 50,000 is additional to the existing housing stock, including voids.

7. "The big issue (in Ilkley) is parking and roads. If we don't sort these out, everything else will be irrelevant".

A: If we don't plan for development, and then refuse applications as they come in, Developers will appeal and decisions will be made on an "ad hoc" basis. This could possibly result in even less control over greenbelt releases.

8. "If there are no rules, we will be in the worst position of all". I like Greenbelt, but want to have somewhere for my kids to live. The issue is good design.

9. " All new development should be as near carbon neutral as possible, and sited close to effective public transport networks. There is a need to for more smaller" homes to reflect reduction in family sizes.

10. What proportion of new homes will be "affordable"?

A: This will relate to the housing needs assessment currently being undertaken. There is a need to build "lifetime homes" to reflect the needs of an aging population. The key issue is whether future development will be focused or dispersed.

11. Is there any flexibility in the timing of this?

A: 2026 is tied in with the current planning framework. Further into the future, needs will be harder to predict. There will be an early review at regional level to look at likely demand.

Noreen thanked everyone for their questions and the meeting split into 4 groups.

Jeff concluded the meeting by thanking everyone for their attendance and input.

**WORKSHOP SESSION:** 4 Spatial Options  
**TIME:** 10.00 to 13.00  
**GROUP:** A  
**FACILITATOR:** Isha Ahmed  
**NOTE TAKER:** Area Coordinator

### Introduction

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

### General

- No options are right for Wharfedale
- Need to consider infrastructure first – problem is infrastructure providers won't consider infrastructure until they know what the demand is.
- Need to consider Leeds and Bradford together.
- Communications is a key issues within the urban area.

### 1st Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 1 and 2

#### Option 1

- Ilkley – why is it defined as a principal town, not anywhere else?
- Focused v dispersed development
- Green Belt will be broken
- Border towns with Leeds and Harrogate will have joined up development – implications and impacts – are discussions occurring with other areas?
- Infrastructure implications for Ilkley
- No choice for individuals
- Conversions are not included in the figure.

#### Option 2

- Will include Bingley as a Principal Town
- Will development be in proportion to current population of towns?

- Employment zones are focused to attract the Leeds population.
- The character of the current towns needs to be retained.
- A lot of areas are already full to capacity.
- Infrastructure has to be addressed before any option is considered.
- Identify areas with current infrastructure capacity for development first.
- Infrastructure issues have not been resolved.
- The more housing is distanced from employment, the more pressure there will be on infrastructure.

### **2<sup>nd</sup> Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 2 and 3**

#### Option 3

- Holistic approach linking all aspects of people's lives.
- Holistic adjustments to people's lifestyles
- CBMDC should go back to the Government
- Esholt OR Holmewood may be better but not both
- Change the threshold for developers to provide more affordable housing
- Towns and villages need to be linked by infrastructure,

#### Option 4

- Transport links geared to serve Leeds – links not internal
- Jobs and community should be geographically linked.
- Continue to protect existing employment zones and not give in to developers' arguments for more housing.
- More focus on city centre
- Cannot forget areas, dispersal models are good
- Some areas may become too dormant to be feasible.

[Out of time]

**WORKSHOP SESSION:** 4 Spatial Options  
**TIME:** 10.00 to 13.00  
**GROUP:** B  
**FACILITATOR:** Helen Longfield  
**NOTE TAKER:** Area Coordinator

### Introduction

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

### Overarching Issues

- Transport
- Health
- Education
- Employment
- Environment
- Concern about no being able to make a point about how numbers have been derived.
- Jewels in the crown, Haworth, Saltaire
- Ilkley Moor – to be protected.

### 1st Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 1 and 2

#### Option 1

- Employment – shown on flood plain, employment sites = housing development
- Market demand – do people want to live in the centre of Bradford?
- Affordable housing – planners responsibility – young people unable to afford.
- Employment – should be near housing and need to be combination
- Housing in Bradford- flats that people don't want to live in.
- Allocation of land – builders only want to build in particular areas.
- Baildon – schools closed, parents drive.
- Ilkley – middle school site not developed.
- Schools oversubscribed – insufficient capacity in schools.
- Doctors/dentists
- Multi-storey car parking needed near Ilkley station.

Option 2

- Query transport links – full to capacity.
- Assumption that every area has capacity/potential
- Is it a realistic option?
- Loss of identity – areas merge if expansion starts.
- School restrictions (catchment) -problems

**2<sup>nd</sup> Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 3 and 4**

Option 3

- Percentages
- Bingley not included – why? Same size as Ilkley – Bingley could be considered as a Principal Town (on options 3 and 4)
- Transport infrastructure – Airedale strengthened, but Wharfedale not.
- No potential employment growth – more pressure on transport.
- Keighley needs regeneration – employment needed in the town.

Option 4

- Greenway corridor – good idea as beneficial to the district as a whole.
- Bingley development also favoured.
- 3 Principal Towns rather than the growth points.
- Loss of green spaces – worry of merging towns/areas.
- Green areas prized - too much development of towns/urban spaces also a consideration.
- Develop south side of Bradford for employment – better motorway links,

[Out of time]

**WORKSHOP SESSION:** 4 Spatial Options  
**TIME:** 10.00 to 13.00  
**GROUP:** C  
**FACILITATOR:** Michelle Greenwood  
**NOTE TAKER:** Area Coordinator

### **Introduction**

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

### **1st Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 1 and 2**

- Why do it in the first place?
- Pre consultation stage not questioned – reasons for wishing to increase capacities.
- Government figures not based on local knowledge.
- Concerned over future food supplies – agricultural/rural development – impact on food prices.
- Improve road/rail links.
- Current infrastructure inadequate for existing use
- Environmental impact of new build – e.g. flooding.
- Affordability.
- New build needs to be of a good quality, not cardboard apartments
- Compulsory purchase on long term vacant properties
- Second properties
- Need for a national policy on vacant properties
- Most people travel to work.
- No development of employment/industrial in Wharfe Valley could create dormitory communities.
- Both options create problems.
- Demand on services – use of water etc, extraction from the Wharfe.
- Would there be enough capacity to bring any Greenfield sites into the plan.

### **Option 1**

- Ilkley and Keighley – 30% too much
- Not clear on division between Keighley and Ilkley
- Where would new housing go in Ilkley?

**Option 2**

- Preferable as it splits 3 ways rather than two.
- Not preferred re Burley and Menston.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 3 and 4**

- These exclude Bingley as a Principal Town
- Want new option – Bingley as a Principal Town
- Availability of land in Ilkley is an issue.
- Impact of Leeds on the District.
- Constrained by the geography.
- If rail links are developed – need for new local stations – parking.
- Implications for SuperCity initiative
- Consideration of Ilkley as a Local Service Centre.
- Where's the money coming from?
- Esholt/Holmewood – could build a railway station at Esholt.
- Take Menston and Burley out of Option 4 and put back into Local Service Centres.
- Crossing rivers –gridlock,
- Demand on landfill and recycling.

[Out of time]

**WORKSHOP SESSION:** 4 Spatial Options  
**TIME:** 10.00 to 13.00  
**GROUP:** D  
**FACILITATOR:** Emma Crossland Stephen & Lucille Adie  
**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

- More growth in Bradford close to employment sites
- Development in Canal Road Corridor could transform the city.

##### Weaknesses

- Approx. 5000 new homes in Wharfedale. Existing infrastructure (trains) cannot cope with current housing. Rail network cannot be increased due to capacity in Leeds.
- Limited and reducing employment, more people travelling. All employment growth outside Wharfedale.
- Release of Green Belt land – where is it?
- Building on Green Belt land is a long way from existing infrastructure.

##### Other Issues

- Schools already full.
- Impact schools etc in Leeds – need to look at regional crisis.
- Impact of growth of airport on local road network.
- Ilkley already congested
- Where is the leisure aspect – the countryside around Ilkley serves a large area.
- Using Green Belt avoids “intensification” in Ilkley.



Option 2

## Strengths

- More “joined-up” thinking – links with Masterplans
- More employment in Airedale
- Could allow for improved transport by extending M65.

## Weaknesses

- Growth in Baildon restricted by poor links with railway and topography.
- See Option 1 for Wharfedale –same issues.
- Dispersed model – urban sprawl.
- Still little employment – land costs in Wharfedale could discourage employment.

## Other Issues

- Double tracking railway – Guiseley to Shipley is essential.
- Infrastructure must come first – how?
- Do not forget sustainable transport
- Empty houses must be filled.

**2<sup>nd</sup> Workshop – Comparison of Spatial Options 3 and 4**Option 3

## Strengths

- Possible links Esholt to airport but depends on roads.
- Growth points – good links to developing rail networks.
- Esholt/Holmewood – reduces travel to work.

## Weaknesses

- Still high levels of housing in Wharfedale with associated infrastructure issues.

## Other Issues

- Most residents in Wharfedale work in Leeds – transport infrastructure needs to take account of this.
- Need more new jobs in Ilkley.
- Erosion of Dales.

Option 4

Strengths

- None or no time to discuss

Weaknesses

- Bradford should be centre for growth.

Other Issues

- None or no time.

[Out of time]

**9.0 OPTIONS FORM**

---

**Core Strategy Further Issues and Options**

**Consultation Workshop**

**Riddings Hall - 15th March 2008**

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

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

**OR a combination of the Options:**

**FURTHER COMMENTS:**

## 10.0 OPTION FORM FEEDBACK

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

QUESTION - WHICH SPATIAL OPTION DO YOU PREFER?		
Rep No.	Option 1,2,3,4 or Combination	<u>Comment</u>
RH 1		Option 3 – but make Bingley a Principal Town as in Option 2. Housing development <u>must</u> go hand in hand with infrastructure development (roads/railways/schools/doctors etc).
RH 2	4	Option 4 but Ilkley/Burley/Menston as Local Service Centres. But preferably <u>none of these</u> – physically not possible to accommodate large scale development in these areas.
RH 3		Even Option 4 is unacceptable despite being the least harmful to Wharfedale and Ilkley. None of the above options are acceptable as the basic population and household projections based on them are neither credible or reliable – Bradford has an unfortunate history of implementing these figures and it appears to be doing so again. The Council should not be hiding behind the fiction that it is the region or Government that is imposing these figures. They should be told that they are unacceptable and fought through the legal system as other authorities have done in the past if necessary.
RH 4	2 and 3	Option 3 but with at least 3 Principal Towns (Ilkley, Keighley and Bingley). Exclude gardens from the definition of Brownfield development. Keep gardens as a separate category.
RH 5	2 and 3	Bingley should be a Principal Town along with Ilkley and Keighley. Keighley need regeneration of town including employment. Keighley and Worth Valley Railway could be opened up to provide transport links to Keighley station during busy times.
RH 6	4	It would be good to spread housing/employment out of

		Bradford Centre to reduce concentration, to reduce car use, to regeneration other areas particularly SW of the District. Perhaps Keighley/Ilkley could accept more than 10%.
RH 7	1 and 4	None of the options tick all the boxes. More discussion needed with developers and planners regarding infrastructure, schools etc.
RH 8	1 and 4	Infrastructure is the critical aspect of this. IF that is addressed, then increased housing is possible. Great emphasis should be placed now on sustainable development, green designs, Freiburg model, carbon neutral etc.
RH 9	1, 3 and 4	Keighley, Bingley, Ilkley should not be treated as equal sized towns. Ilkley should be treated as a service centre and not as a Principal Town as in cannot cope.
RH 10		The whole proposition of constructing 50,000 additional housing units is unacceptable. Choosing options only divides the body of potential objectors to the overall unacceptable, unfounded, flawed proposition. Why is Bradford capitulating to a Government 'plan' which has not been through a process of democratic approval?
RH 11	2 and 4	Option 4 with Bingley as a town centre as Keighley and Ilkley
RH 12	1 and 4	Oppose all options for Wharfedale. <u>No Infrastructure</u> – road/rail already overcrowded, sewage/drainage, water supply not sustainable for more houses, schools already full, medical. <u>No employment opportunities</u> <u>Environmental Issues</u> – more houses, more cars, more CO2; more waste, lack of infill sites; more use of electricity, gas etc. Option 4 – Bring Bingley in. Develop on periphery of urban sites.
RH 13	4	Option 4 (and 3) tends to concentrate more building in areas which have space and better infrastructure. It is more dispersed and there is sensible focus on the M606 corridor and the Airedale corridor.

		<p>Infrastructure problems must be considered <u>before</u> any of the systems are finalised. This is the biggest single problem to be addressed, before deciding where and when homes are going to be built.</p> <p>A new station at Apperley Bridge would be a major asset to the area.</p>
RH 14	3 and part of 2	<p>I think Bingley should be considered as a Principal Town as it is equal in size to Ilkley. It also has better transport links to Keighley, Bradford and Leeds, including a bypass. I agree with the Sub Regional City and the proposals of growth for this in Option 3.</p> <p>I would encourage employment growth to be applied to the Ilkley area so that there are employment opportunities where the housing increases are.</p> <p>An opportunity for affordable housing for local residents would be greatly appreciated.</p>
RH 15	3 and 4	<p>We must find employment land close to the M62 (warehousing etc). Other employment sites must be protected particularly near to housing to reduce the need to travel.</p> <p>Keighley is a former industrial town. Ilkley is not, so Keighley should be regenerated though the Airedale Corridor scheme. Ilkley should have a 'science park' (the Spooner site on Railway Road would be a good start) to provide jobs for local people who are already in IT etc, and for the 150 school leavers in Ilkley each year.</p> <p>If Ilkley is to remain 'the jewel in Bradford's crown', it cannot take much more residential development. <u>In any event</u> the infrastructure in Ilkley must be improved.</p>
RH 16	3 and 4 with Bingley as a Principal Town	<p>Need for employment prospects in Ilkley and area (for example, service and science employers)</p> <p>With all options there must be addressed the question of infrastructure.</p>
RH 17	A modified Option 3	<p>My initial opinion is that the best solution would be Option 3 but with Bingley identified as an additional Principal Town, with the commensurate housing growth.</p> <p>I am very concerned about the implications for infrastructure</p>

		<p>in terms of transport, health provision, education and the environment.</p> <p>Why is there no employment growth for Wharfedale?</p>
RH 18	3 and 4	<p>Treating Ilkley separately from Addingham, Burley in Wharfedale and Menston is not practical because of the infrastructure which connects these settlements – road, rail schools etc.</p> <p>Treating the Wharfe valley as potential for development for <u>Bradford</u> simply because there is a railway line is illogical as the majority of rail use is to Leeds not Bradford and development would only increase the desirability for Leeds workers, and therefore resolving Leeds' issues not Bradford's.</p> <p>Development needs to be of a more intensive nature and Government should accept this is targeting development.</p> <p>The link with employment is essential so I welcome the proposals for the Aire Valley and the east of Bradford.</p>
RH 19	1 and 4	<p>Planners' control and relationship with developers should be more effectively utilised.</p> <p>Section 106 Agreements should be aimed at providing the infrastructure required to support future residential development.</p>
RH 20	4	<p>Bradford has a burgeoning population, without the industry to support it, and I believe all options will only exacerbate existing problems.</p> <p>The growth in the GB population should be taking place in areas more prosperous than the Bradford District.</p> <p>All options appear to be based upon figures emanating from unelected, unrepresentative Quangos.</p>
RH 21	4	<p>Infrastructure is the key to all future plans.</p> <p>Construct the Aire Valley motorway.</p> <p>Develop the Leeds/Bradford Corridor.</p> <p>Factor in Airport link/growth – jobs could follow.</p>
RH 22	3	<p>Shorter work to home links are</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Implicit in potential housing growth areas at Esholt, Holmewood, Canal Road Corridor etc.</li> <li>- VITAL to build homes needing little energy to run.</li> </ul>

		Where is Bradford's energy to come from in 2050? Subsidies needed for PU and solar thermal on roofs and massive insulation.
RH 23	1	Option 1 is the only alternative if push comes to shove. But I feel it mustn't be at the expense of our Green Belt – we shall need it in the future for our sustainability for food/food production.
RH 24	4	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cannot stress enough that infrastructure <u>must</u> match any increase in building.</li> <li>2. In Ilkley, the infrastructure cannot cope now with all the infill building – garden grabbing on “brownfield” sites. This has been huge in Ilkley and does not seem to be a factor in population needs.</li> <li>3. Ilkley's distinctive architecture is disappearing. So many sites now have 2 or more houses or apartment blocks where once there was one large house. It is unfortunately only a minority that have been sympathetically split to suit modern needs.</li> <li>4. Affordable housing – why should people expect to live in Ilkley? Most youngsters work their way up through the housing market.</li> <li>5. I think BMDC should tie in housing with the employment centres – cut down on travel.</li> <li>6. The Moor should be protected and the riverside. Ilkley is a TOURIST town. If it ceases to be attractive it will just die and be a dormitory for Leeds and Bradford.</li> <li>7. It [Ilkley] needs green spaces.</li> <li>8. Where could you build a large housing estate? We have issues with flooding already. Flood plains are there with good reason. If all the villages end up being joined up in the Wharfe Valley we could end up being bigger than Bradford!</li> </ol>
RH 25	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Option 3 should include Bingley as a principal town, sharing the suggested 20% of total housing growth with Keighley (not Ilkley). They both have reasonable existing and potential employment source combined with public transport and road networks.</li> </ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ This option should also be considered side by side with Craven, Kirklees and Leeds District and the impact development there will have on Bradford infrastructure and services (e.g Guiseley development, and its effect on A65 transport links/rail services)</li> <li>▪ Because of its proximity to the M63 corridor and its link with the M1 and also rail links south of Leeds/Bradford/Kirklees triangle the major development regarding both housing and employment must if we are to take carbon footprint issues seriously be based in the south/south east/south west areas of the Bradford MDC area combined with strategic related improvements to the existing road/rail infrastructure.</li> <li>▪ Because in the main “Leeds” provides the main sources of employment for Ilkley/Burley/Menston it must be accepted now in 2008 that road/rail links at peak times have reached saturation point. There is no easy solution. More trains some say, but Leeds station which has been extended recently, can only cope with so many trains at a time. Whether trains are 3 carriages or 5, only six trains can sit on six lines at any time. There is very little, if any, opportunity to increase the number of lines into Leeds (unlike Bradford from the west. From the east there is the opportunity of a second city centre station on the old Marsh Lane goods sidings this in the wider spatial context east./southeast of Leeds has considerable development potential.</li> <li>▪ C &amp; D of my representations must be read together in wider “West Yorkshire’ considerations</li> <li>▪ Running alongside proposed increases in new housing there must be a central government initiative to ensure be it by existing legislative powers or new ones, to ensure void property in existing stock is put back into use and not allowed to stand empty beyond a reasonable period of time.</li> <li>▪ Finally may I ask that our M.P’s are kept fully advised of LDF research activity so that they can ensure that</li> </ul>
--	--	---

		supportive lobbying is effected in Westminster.
RH 26	Options 4 & Bingley as a Principal town	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Even Option 4 is unacceptable for the Wharfe Valley because of already overloaded infrastructure – roads, rail, schools already bursting.</li> <li>▪ Very limited opportunity for job growth</li> <li>▪ Environmental constraints – moors &amp; flood plain would wake for unsustainable development (see Inspectors Report for Middleton Hospital Site for example)</li> <li>▪ Ilkley dormitory for Leeds not Bradford.</li> </ul>
RH 27	4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Any expansion in Wharfe Valley must recognise that Leeds is the prime employment area and that transport infrastructure is already inadequate <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Roads already too busy during rush hour – journey times have ? over last 10 years – slightest impediment causes major snarl ups.</li> <li>2) Trains from Ilkley already full by time they reach Guiseley</li> <li>3) Guiseley passengers already driving to Menston in order to board trains to Leeds,</li> </ol> </li> <li>▪ Parking facilities in Ilkley town centre are just about adequate – a further 5000 or more cars would swamp existing facilities.</li> </ul>

## 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
- Housing development must go hand in hand with infrastructure development
- Exclude gardens from definition of Brownfield development
- Keighley & Worth Valley Railway could be re-opened to provide transport links to Keighley Station during busy times
- Sustainable development
- Green designs
- Ilkley should be treated as a Local Service centre not as a Principal Town
- Roads and railway are already overcrowded/ at capacity in Wharfedale
- Affordable housing
- Employment close to M62
- Need for employment prospects in Ilkley
- Ilkley should not be treated separately from Addingham, Burley-in Wharfedale, and Menston in terms of infrastructure
- Ilkley's distinctive architecture is disappearing
- Protect green spaces (in Ilkley)
- Options should be considered side by side with Craven, Kirklees and Leeds Districts
- Limited opportunity for job growth
- Environmental constraints.

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

	<b>ILKLEY 15 March 08</b>
<b>OPTION 1</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>OPTION 2</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>OPTION 3</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>OPTION 4</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>COMBINATION OF THE OPTIONS</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>NONE OF THE ABOVE</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>NO COMMENT</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>26</b>

**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 15 March 2008 – Riddings Hall, Ilkley**

**FEEDBACK FORM**

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

**A. Presentations/ Speakers**

i. Was the level of detail provided appropriate?

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

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

ii. Were the introductory presentations an appropriate length?

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

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

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

1 = poor and 5 = excellent (please circle)

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

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

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

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

**B. Workshop Sessions**

i. Were the workshops an appropriate length?

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

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

ii. Please rate the overall quality of the facilitators

1 = poor and 5 = excellent (please circle)

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

**C. Organisation**

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

**D. Venue**

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

**E. Please identify the best features of the event**

.....

.....

.....

.....

**F. Please identify any areas for improvement**

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

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

## 13.0 EVALUATION FORM FEEDBACK

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

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

**Total number of returned feedback forms = 5**

Question	Results				
	1	2	3	4	5
<b>A Presenters / Speakers</b>					
i. Was the level of detail provided appropriate?	2	1	5	3	1
ii. Were the introductory presentations an appropriate length?	1	0	7	2	2
iii. Please rate the overall quality of the introductory presentations and speakers	3	2	5	2	0
iv. Was the content of the DVD appropriate for the event?	DVD did not work				
<b>B. Workshop Sessions</b>					
i. Were the workshops an appropriate length?	3	1	8	0	0
ii. Please rate the overall quality of the facilitators	1	2	1	6	2
<b>C. Organisation</b>					
i. Please rate the overall organisation and management of the event on the day	2	2	2	6	0
ii. Please rate the communication and background material provided leading up to the event	2	1	2	5	2
<b>D. Venue</b>					
i. Was the venue convenient and easy to get to?	1	1	1	3	6
ii. Please rate the overall quality of the venue?	2	3	3	2	2
iii. Please rate the quality of the refreshments	0	1	3	5	3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>18</b>

**BEST FEATURES OF THE EVENT**

Delegates made the following comments as to what were the best features of this event:

- Meeting other (informed) residents
- Group discussion very well led and controlled. Council planners knew their material.
- Location
- Small discussion groups
- Relevant literature
- Being able to discuss in detail aspects of the 4 options with a planning/council officials
- Clear outline of options
- The council representative performed excellently and encouraged reasonably wide debate / contribution within flexible parameters.

**AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT**

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

- Not enough pre-publicity
- Better location – with facilities for group discussion
- The registration process so that there is not a backlog
- Bad timing – not giving enough time to read documents
- To make reading of literature a prerequisite of attendance.
- Badly organised
- The DVD not working
- Too much was spent in workshops talking about basic background policy issues – this should have been covered in more depth in the introductory remarks.
- To cover more overarching issues.
- To have a session for members of the public without people from residents' bodies.
- Inaudible workshops.
- Occasional forceful chairman (woman) ship is essential to keep groups focused on the job in hand





Produced by the  
City of Bradford Metropolitan  
District Council

Local Development  
Framework Group

June 2008

**City of Bradford MDC**

[www.bradford.gov.uk](http://www.bradford.gov.uk)