

# CITY OF BRADFORD MDC LOCAL PLAN FRAMEWORK

## EXAMINATION OF THE BRADFORD LOCAL PLAN CORE STRATEGY PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATIONS

### SCHEDULE OF MATTERS, ISSUES & QUESTIONS FOR EXAMINATION

***Deadline for submission of further statements: 22 April 2016***

***Hearings commence: 17 May 2016***

#### **Hearing sessions**

Victoria Hall  
Victoria Road  
Saltaire  
BD18 3JS

Inspector:

Stephen J Pratt BA(Hons) MRTPI

**Programme Officer:**

**Tony Blackburn**  
15 Ottawa Close  
Blackburn  
BB2 7EB

Telephone no: 01254-260286

e-mail: [tony.blackburn@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:tony.blackburn@bradford.gov.uk)

Web-site:

[http://www.bradford.gov.uk/bmdc/the\\_environment/planning\\_service/local\\_development\\_framework/core\\_strategy\\_dpd\\_examination.htm](http://www.bradford.gov.uk/bmdc/the_environment/planning_service/local_development_framework/core_strategy_dpd_examination.htm)

**CITY OF BRADFORD MDC**  
**EXAMINATION OF THE BRADFORD LOCAL PLAN CORE STRATEGY**  
**PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATIONS**

**SCHEDULE OF MATTERS, ISSUES & QUESTIONS FOR EXAMINATION**

1. The Bradford Local Plan Core Strategy was submitted for examination in December 2014. Following a series of hearings held in March 2015 to discuss the main issues relating to the soundness of the plan, the Council prepared several Proposed Main Modifications to the plan. These were subject to public consultation between 25 November 2015-20 January 2016 and representations were received on many of the Proposed Modifications.
2. Representations on Proposed Main Modifications to a local plan are normally dealt with in writing. However, some of the representations raise new points and issues that were not fully debated during the earlier hearings. Consequently, the Inspector intends to hold a short series of hearings focussing on some of the key changes to the submitted plan. As with the earlier hearings, in addition to the Council, only those parties who have made representations on the Proposed Main Modifications are entitled to participate at the resumed hearings. Some parties have raised points similar to their original representations on the submitted plan or commented on parts of the plan which are not proposed to be changed; these matters will not be discussed at the resumed hearings. If the Inspector needs any further information on matters not covered at the resumed hearings, he will request it from participants.
3. The Inspector has prepared this Schedule of Matters, Issues & Questions (MIQs) to focus the discussion at the resumed hearing sessions. It reflects some of the main issues raised in the representations and in the Council's responses related to the Proposed Modifications to the submitted plan, along with guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework<sup>1</sup> (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance<sup>2</sup> (PPG). **All participants should be aware of this published guidance**, along with the Inspector's Guidance Notes, published previously<sup>3</sup>.
4. This Schedule lists the main Matters, Issues and Questions to be addressed during the resumed hearings. The Council is requested to respond on all MIQs, referring to information in the documents and evidence already in the examination library (limited to **3000 words** per Matter). Other participants should have included all the main points and supporting information in their representations on the Proposed Main Modifications. If participants wish to submit further statements (limited to **3000 words**) they should only respond on specific MIQs relevant to points made in their representation(s).
5. **Statements should address relevant Matters, Issues & Questions**, rather than repeating points made in the original representations or making new points, and **should not introduce new issues or include further evidence or material. Statements should only address issues relating to the relevant Proposed Main Modifications, and should not cover matters already discussed at the earlier hearing sessions.** Further statements are not needed unless they relate to the legal requirements or soundness of the Plan, as set out in this Schedule of MIQs. If they wish, participants can rely on their original representation(s).
6. All further statements should be received by the Programme Officer **no later than Friday 22 April 2016**. **All matters that participants wish to put before the Inspector or refer to at the hearings should be submitted by these deadlines.** The Inspector is unlikely to accept further/new information/evidence once the hearing sessions commence, since this could disrupt the progress of the hearings and disadvantage participants.

---

<sup>1</sup> National Planning Policy Framework [DCLG; March 2012]

<sup>2</sup> Planning Practice Guidance [DCLG; March 2014]

<sup>3</sup> Inspector's Guidance Notes (Examination Document: PS/A003b)

7. Detailed agendas for the hearings will be issued shortly before they commence, based on the MIQs for Examination and the responses received. However, the Inspector is unlikely to introduce new issues or questions that do not arise from the matters and issues identified.
8. **Participants should let the Programme Officer know whether they wish to participate at a particular hearing session by the same date as that set for further statements ie no later than Friday 22 April.** Anyone can attend the public hearings as an observer, but only those listed in the programme can participate in the relevant hearing session. **Normally, only those who seek some change to the Plan are entitled to participate in the hearing sessions,** but others may be invited if they can contribute positively to the discussion or assist the Inspector.
9. This Schedule of MIQs is based on current national planning policy (*as at 18 March 2016*). Participants should keep up-to-date with the latest situation by checking the Council's Examination website<sup>4</sup>.
10. In carrying out this Examination, the Inspector will aim to work in a pragmatic and supportive manner with the Council and other participants, with the aim of delivering a positive outcome. He will expect all participants to act in a similarly co-operative manner, adopting a positive approach to the examination process. Any queries that participants wish to raise should be addressed to the Programme Officer.

---

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.bradford.gov.uk/bmdc/the\\_environment/planning\\_service/local\\_development\\_framework/core\\_strategy\\_dpd\\_examination.htm](http://www.bradford.gov.uk/bmdc/the_environment/planning_service/local_development_framework/core_strategy_dpd_examination.htm)

## **BRADFORD LOCAL PLAN CORE STRATEGY - EXAMINATION**

### **PROPOSED MAIN MODIFICATIONS**

#### **SCHEDULE OF MATTERS, ISSUES AND QUESTIONS FOR EXAMINATION**

##### **MATTER 1 – SOUTH PENNINE MOORS (Policy SC8 and associated policies<sup>5</sup>)**

The Council has reviewed and updated the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) and has consequently amended the approach towards the South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC in Policy SC8.

***Key issue:***

***Is the revised approach towards the South Pennine Moors appropriate, effective, positively prepared and justified with soundly based evidence, including the updated Habitats Regulations Assessment, and in line with the latest national guidance and good practice (NPPF/PPG)***

- a. Is the revised approach towards new development in the South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC and its Zone of Influence appropriate, effective, positively prepared, justified, soundly based and consistent with the latest national policy?
- b. Is the updated HRA evidence and Sustainability Appraisal soundly based and are there any outstanding issues from Natural England or other relevant parties?
- c. Have the implications of the revised approach towards the South Pennine Moors SPA/SAC been reflected in the proposed amendments to the text accompanying Policy SC8 and other associated policies and accompanying text (eg. Policies WD1 & EN1-EN2)?
- d. Have the implications of the revised HRA evidence for the overall strategy, the settlement hierarchy, spatial location and distribution of development and other key aspects of the development strategy been fully considered and explained?

---

##### **MATTER 2: REVISED SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY (Policy SC4 and associated policies<sup>6</sup>)**

The Council proposes to amend the Settlement Hierarchy in the submitted plan to include Burley-in-Wharfedale and Menston in the category of Local Growth Centres.

***Key issue:***

***Is the proposed settlement hierarchy in terms of the amended status and role of Burley-in-Wharfedale and Menston appropriate, justified, effective, positively prepared, soundly based and consistent with the latest national policy?***

- a. What is the basis and justification for the revised settlement hierarchy, and is it based on up-to-date and robust evidence?
- b. Does the revised settlement hierarchy reflect the existing and future status, role and function of the relevant settlements?
- c. What are the implications of including Burley-in-Wharfedale and Menston in the category of Local Growth Centres in terms of their future role and levels of growth, and are there any cross-boundary implications?

---

<sup>5</sup> including Main Modifications 19-37 & 113-120

<sup>6</sup> including Main Modifications 7-13

### **MATTER 3: REVISED SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF DEVELOPMENT**

(Policy SC5 and associated policies, including Policies BD1, AD1, WD1, PN1 & HO3<sup>7</sup>)

The Council proposes to amend the Spatial Distribution and Location of Development in the submitted plan in respect of the Regional City of Bradford (including Shipley & Canal Road Corridor, Shipley and Bradford North-East), Airedale (including Silsden and Baildon), Wharfedale (including Ilkley, Burley-in-Wharfedale and Menston) and South Pennine Towns and Villages (including Haworth).

**Key issue:**

***Is the proposed revised spatial distribution and location of development appropriate, effective, deliverable, locally distinctive and justified by soundly-based, robust, proportionate and credible evidence, particularly in terms of delivering the proposed amount of housing, employment and other development, and is it positively prepared and consistent with the latest national policy?***

**a. Regional City of Bradford**

- i. Why has the apportionment of development to the Regional City of Bradford (including **Shipley & Canal Road Corridor** [3,200-3,100], **Shipley** [1,250-750] and **Bradford North-East** [4,700-4,400]) been reduced from 28,650-27,750 dwellings?
- ii. Does the amended distribution of development properly reflect policy constraints (eg. Green Belt), physical constraints, such as flooding, infrastructure, facilities, traffic and transport, heritage, landscape and environment (including the updated HRA), the latest land availability information, and cross-boundary implications?
- iii. Is the amended distribution of development likely to be deliverable over the plan period, and does it reflect an appropriate balance between brownfield and greenfield land?

**b. Airedale**

- i. Why has the apportionment of development to the Airedale sub-area (including **Silsden** [1,000-1,200] and **Baildon** [450-350]) been increased from 8,350-8,450 dwellings?
- ii. Does the amended distribution of development properly reflect policy constraints (eg. Green Belt), physical constraints, such as flooding, infrastructure, facilities, traffic and transport, heritage, landscape and environment (including the updated HRA), the latest land availability information and cross-boundary implications?
- iii. Is the amended distribution of development likely to be deliverable over the plan period, and does it reflect an appropriate balance between brownfield and greenfield land?

**c. Wharfedale**

- i. Why has the apportionment of development to the Wharfedale sub-area (including **Ilkley** [800-1,000], **Burley-in Wharfedale** [200-700], **Menston** [400-600]) been increased from 1,600-2,500 dwellings?
- ii. Does the amended distribution of development properly reflect policy constraints (eg. Green Belt), physical constraints, such as flooding, infrastructure, facilities, traffic and transport, heritage, landscape and environment (including the updated HRA), the latest land availability information, and cross-boundary implications?
- iii. Is the amended distribution of development likely to be deliverable over the plan period, and does it reflect an appropriate balance between brownfield and greenfield land?

**d. South Pennines Towns & Villages**

- i. Why has the apportionment of development to the South Pennines Towns & Villages (including the Local Service Centres [1,200-1,100] and **Haworth** [500-400]) been reduced from 3,500-3,400 dwellings?
- ii. Does the amended distribution of development properly reflect policy constraints (eg. Green Belt), physical constraints, such as flooding, infrastructure, facilities, traffic and transport, heritage, landscape and environment (including the updated HRA), and the latest land availability information?
- iii. Is the amended distribution of development likely to be deliverable over the plan period, and does it reflect an appropriate balance between brownfield and greenfield land?

---

<sup>7</sup> including Main Modifications 38-42, 44-47, 51-52; 56; 75-88

**MATTER 4- OTHER POLICIES & OTHER MATTERS**

4.1 **Other Policies** - to be decided

4.2 **Other Matters** - Other matters not yet specified

---

SJP/TB v.1 21.03.16

---