

Bradford Local Plan

Core Strategy Examination

Further Statement Relating to Burley in Wharfedale For :

Matter 1 – S Pennine Moors (Policy SC8)

Matter 2 – Revised Settlement Hierarchy (Policy SC4)

**Matter 3 – Revised Spatial Distribution of Development
(Policies HO3, & WD1)**

In Response to The Following Submissions:

(PS/J002)	Jeff McQuillan
(PS/J007)	Burley Parish Council
PS/J005	Alan Elsegood (WARD)
(PS/J018)	Mark Elseworth
(PS/J027)	Cllr Jack Rickard
(PS/J020)	NLP on behalf of CEG
(PS/J015)	ID Planning on behalf of B Bannister
PS(J/016)	ID Planning on behalf of J Rothery

May 2016

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This statement sets out the Council's response to Examination hearing statements to the MIQs issued by the Inspector made by various parties relating to Burley in Wharfedale and is designed to assist the Inspector in considering the soundness of the Core Strategy and the questions posed within matters 1, 2 and 3.
- 1.2. The Council has already submitted position statements for each matter and has responded in full to the representations made at main modifications stage within its Statement of Consultation. The Council's further statements therefore merely make supplementary points particularly in relation to new matters raised by participants or points of clarification.
- 1.3. The Council have not sought in these further statements to address matters which were not the subject of main modifications and which the Inspector has made clear will not be subject to further discussion within the hearings.

2. Response to PS/J002 (Jeff McQuillan)

- 2.1. With regards to Mr McQuillan matter 2 submission, the Council has previously stated and re-affirms that although green belt land releases will be necessary to meet the housing requirements at Burley and Menston these are not of a scale which would lead to the merger of the settlements or indeed of any settlements within Wharfedale.
- 2.2. With regard to his matter 3 submission the Council can confirm that it is working with the Parish Council to support its emerging Neighbourhood Plan and would point out that one of the basic conditions that such a Plan must meet is general conformity with the strategic policies contained within the development plan (which is the responsibility of the Council to produce). The emerging Neighbourhood Plan will need to conform to the relevant policies within the Core Strategy.
- 2.3. The Council also take the view that the opportunities for new development to support and assist in the delivery of new local infrastructure such as additional schools capacity is a relevant and material planning consideration whether it be at Local Plan or planning allocation stages. However, any planning application or any possible site allocation would be assessed in relation to all material considerations and not just schools provision and infrastructure improvements that such a proposal may bring.

3. Response to PS/J007 (Burley Parish Council)

- 3.1. The Parish Council in their matter 2 submission make a number of points some of which are dealt with in the Council's own matter 2 statement (PS/K002) and also in its main modifications statement of engagement. However the Council wishes to make the following additional points which dispute some of the Parish Council's assertions:

- The designation of the village as a Local Growth Centre is not based purely on the revised HRA and does pay attention to the nature of the village which is considered by the Council to be a well-connected and sustainable location for growth;
- The revised HRA does indicate that the proposed level of development at Burley can be accommodated without adversely affecting the integrity of the SPA / SAC and this has also been conformed in the main modifications representation by Natural England (see their response to matter 1a in PS/J031);
- The revised HRA (PS/G004h) does indicate that the precautionary approach which underpinned the Burley housing apportionment at the Publication Draft stage is not justified or required;
- The Council considers that there are no other constraints which mean that the proposed higher housing requirement cannot be met.

3.2. With regards to their matter 3 statement the Council wish to make the following points:

- The Council has consulted on both the upgraded settlement hierarchy status for Burley and the amended housing apportionment as part of its main modification consultation;
- The increase in the Burley's housing apportionment is not based solely on the existing population size of the settlement. The settlement is a well-connected and sustainable location for growth;
- The Council will be seeking to prioritise the delivery of brown field sites but must ensure that housing need overall is met, that it maintains a 5 year land supply and that it facilitates a significant boost to housing delivery. The Core Strategy's policies have to be based on the amount of genuinely deliverable and developable brown field land in the district;
- The Council has set out the exceptional circumstances for green belt release and there are suitable and sustainable options for green belt release around the village. Green belt release as part of a new Local Plan is consistent with national planning policy.
- The Broadway Malayan report was designed to take a broad strategic look at the potential or otherwise for sustainable green belt releases and does not indicate that such releases cannot be achieved if necessary around the village. A more detailed green belt review will be included as part of work on the Allocations DPD;
- The Council does not consider that there are any heritage reasons which would prevent the delivery of the required housing at Burley and points out that no objections on this matter have been received from Historic England (formerly English Heritage);
- The Council considers that any landscape impacts can be addressed at Allocations DPD stage and this will be informed by the Council's Landscape Character SPD and any other relevant evidence. However the SPD does not rule out development in this area, nor is it its role to do so. Moreover there are no formal local landscape designations around the village within the RUDP. New development can be designed to incorporate landscape improvement and can include new strong edges to the settlement taking account of the landscape character contained in the councils SPD;

- The Parish Council has misread and wrongly interpreted Policy SC5. The wording of SC5 which sets out a sequence for allocating sites makes it clear that it is subordinate to the housing targets set in Policy HO3. In other words once the housing apportionment has been set, Policy SC5 requires the Council when looking at which sites should meet the apportionment to look at deliverable sites options in the prescribed sequence. If there are insufficient suitable sites within the settlement, Policy SC5 allows for local green belt deletions such as those identified within the SHLAA to be pursued.

4. Response to PS/J018 (Mark Elseworth) , PS/J027 (Jack Rickard) and PS/J005 (Alan Elsegood (WARD))

- 4.1. The Council does not wish to make any further comment with regards to the above submissions as the issues raised in the main repeat those which were the subject of consideration at the earlier hearings or relate to the issue of the district wide housing requirement which is not a matter within the new hearings.

5. Response to PS/J020 (NLP on behalf of CEG), ID Planning on behalf of Jeffrey Rothery (PS/J016) and on behalf of Bruce Bannister (PS/J015)

- 5.1. NLP have submitted a further hearing statement for matter 3 which supports the main modifications which result in a higher housing apportionment of 700 units. The Council agrees with the points made within the submission which firstly underline the sustainable nature for the settlement for the level of growth envisaged, that secondly indicate that Burley is now correctly positioned as a Local Growth Centre within the Core Strategy's settlement hierarchy, and that thirdly highlight the absence of any significant infrastructure or environmental constraints which would prevent its delivery.
- 5.2. The Council notes the points raised by ID Planning on behalf of their clients which support the re-instatement of Menston and Burley as Local Growth Centres and their modified higher housing apportionments.

6. Response to PS/J021 (Ross McGibbon)

- 6.1. The Council has no additional comments to make in relation to this hearing submission.