

**BRADFORD LOCAL PLAN CORE STRATEGY - EXAMINATION**

**PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS**

**EXAMINATION HEARINGS – AGENDA**

**TUESDAY 17 MAY 2016 (morning session)**

- i. **Inspector’s introduction**
- ii. **City of Bradford MDC - Opening Statement**

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

---

**EXAMINATION HEARINGS – AGENDA**

**TUESDAY 17 MAY 2016 (afternoon session)**

**MATTER 2: REVISED SETTLEMENT HIERARCHY**  
**(Policy SC4 and associated policies<sup>2</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. General matters:
  - i. What is the basis and justification for the revised settlement hierarchy, and is it based on up-to-date and robust evidence?
  - ii. Does the revised settlement hierarchy reflect the existing and future status, role and function of the relevant settlements?
  - iii. 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?
- b. Further specific points relating to **Burley-in-Wharfedale** and **Menston**.

---

<sup>1</sup> including Main Modifications 19-37 & 113-120

<sup>2</sup> including Main Modifications 7-13

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

## **PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS**

### **EXAMINATION HEARINGS – AGENDA**

**WEDNESDAY 18 MAY 2016**

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

**(Policy SC5 and associated policies, including Policies BD1, AD1, WD1, PN1 & HO3<sup>3</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. General matters**

- i. Why have the apportionments to some sub-areas and settlements been adjusted and is there sufficient evidence to justify the amended distribution of development across Bradford?
- ii. In drawing up the revised apportionments, did the Council consider the balance between new housing and employment development; impact on the Green Belt; constraints such as flood risk and drainage, environment, heritage, landscape and biodiversity (including the updated HRA); infrastructure, including road capacity, transport accessibility and existing services and facilities; the availability of sites; the balance between brownfield and greenfield sites; and cross-boundary implications?

#### **b. Regional City of Bradford**

- i. Why has the apportionment of development to the Regional City of Bradford been reduced from 28,650-27,750 dwellings (including **Bradford North-East** [4,700-4,400], **Shipley & Canal Road Corridor** [3,200-3,100] and **Shipley** [1,250-750])?
- 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, and cross-boundary implications?
- iii. Having regard to the latest land availability information, 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?
- iv. Further detailed points relating to **Bradford North-East, Shipley & Canal Road Corridor, and Shipley.**

#### **c. Airedale**

- i. Why has the apportionment of development to the Airedale sub-area been increased from 8,350-8,450 dwellings (including **Silsden** [1,000-1,200] and **Baildon** [450-350])?
- 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 cross-boundary implications?
- iii. Having regard to the latest land availability information, 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?
- iv. Further detailed points relating to **Silsden and Baildon.**

---

<sup>3</sup> including Main Modifications 38-42, 44-47, 51-52; 56; 75-88

**d. Wharfedale**

- i. Why has the apportionment of development to the Wharfedale sub-area been increased from 1,600-2,500 dwellings (including **Ilkley** [800-1,000], **Burley-in Wharfedale** [200-700] and **Menston** [400-600])?
- 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 cross-boundary implications?
- iii. Having regard to the latest land availability information, 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?
- iv. Further detailed points about **Ilkley, Burley-in-Wharfedale and Menston.**
- v. **Addingham** - has the Council reviewed the level of development proposed for this settlement following the outcome of the updated Habitats Regulations Assessment and latest land availability assessment?

**e. South Pennines Towns & Villages**

- i. Why has the apportionment of development to the South Pennines Towns & Villages been reduced from 3,500-3,400 dwellings (including the Local Service Centres [1,200-1,000] and **Haworth** [500-400])?
- 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)?
- iii. Having regard to the latest land availability information, 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?
- iv. Further detailed points relating to **Haworth.**

**BRADFORD LOCAL PLAN CORE STRATEGY - EXAMINATION**  
**PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS**  
**EXAMINATION HEARINGS – AGENDA**  
**FRIDAY 20 MAY 2016**

**MATTER 4 – OTHER POLICIES & OTHER MATTERS**

(to be determined)

- iii. **Council's Closing Remarks**
- iv. **Inspector's Closing Remarks**