



Intelligent Plans
and examinations

Report on the Neighbourhood Plan for Bingley 2023 – 2038

An Examination undertaken for the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council with the support of Bingley Town Council on the February 2025 submission version of the Plan.

Independent Examiner: Andrew S Freeman BSc (Hons) DipTP DipEM FRTPI

Date of Report: 11 March 2026

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Office 10, 5 Argyle Street, Bath BA2 4BA

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

Contents

Main Findings - Executive Summary	4
1. Introduction and Background.....	4
Neighbourhood Plan for Bingley 2023 - 2038	4
The Independent Examiner	5
The Scope of the Examination	5
The Basic Conditions.....	6
2. Approach to the Examination.....	6
Planning Policy Context	6
Submitted Documents.....	7
Site Visit.....	8
Written Representations with or without Public Hearing	8
Modifications	8
3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights	8
Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area	8
Plan Period.....	8
Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation	8
Development and Use of Land	9
Excluded Development.....	9
Human Rights.....	9
4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions	10
Assimilated Obligations	10
Main Issues.....	10
Issue 1 – Community Facilities	11
Issue 2 – Built Environment.....	12
Issue 3 – Bingley Town Centre	12
Issue 4 – Business Investment.....	13
Issue 5 – Housing	13
Issue 6 – Movement and Green Infrastructure	13
Issue 7 - Landscape and Heritage	14
Other Policies	15
Other Matters	15
5. Conclusions	16
Summary.....	16
The Referendum and its Area	16
Overview	16

Appendix: Modifications 17

Main Findings - Executive Summary

From my examination of the Neighbourhood Plan for Bingley (the Plan) and its supporting documentation, including the representations made, I have concluded that subject to the policy modifications set out in this report, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.

I have also concluded that:

- the Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – Bingley Town Council;
- the Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated – The Bingley Neighbourhood Area – Figure 1 on page 6 of the Plan;
- the Plan specifies the period to which it is to take effect – 2023 - 2038; and
- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum on the basis that it has met all the relevant legal requirements.

I have considered whether the referendum area should extend beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates and have concluded that it should not.

1. Introduction and Background

Neighbourhood Plan for Bingley 2023 - 2038

- 1.1 Bingley is a market town and civil parish in West Yorkshire. It is administered at the parish level by Bingley Town Council and falls within the jurisdiction of the metropolitan borough of the City of Bradford. Bradford is about 5 miles away to the southeast. Bingley is sited on the River Aire and the Leeds and Liverpool Canal. The built-up part of the parish tends to be in the southern part of the Neighbourhood Plan Area. To the north are extensive moorland areas including Bingley Moor.
- 1.2 The parish was designated as a neighbourhood area in August 2017. Since that time, plan preparation has proceeded under the auspices of a neighbourhood plan working party comprised of town councillors and volunteers. The principal consultation and engagement event was a major community consultation carried out in September 2019. Over time, a draft Plan has been formulated which contains a draft vision, 6 objectives to achieve the vision and twelve detailed policies.

The Independent Examiner

- 1.3 As the Plan has now reached the examination stage, I have been appointed as the examiner of the Neighbourhood Plan for Bingley by the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council (Bradford Council) with the agreement of Bingley Town Council.
- 1.4 I am a chartered town planner and former government Planning Inspector with over fifty years' experience. I have worked in both the public and the private sectors. I am an independent examiner and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the draft Plan.

The Scope of the Examination

- 1.5 As the independent examiner I am required to produce this report and recommend either:
- (a) that the neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum without changes; or
 - (b) that modifications are made and that the modified neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum; or
 - (c) that the neighbourhood plan does not proceed to a referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.
- 1.6 The scope of the examination is set out in Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) ("the 1990 Act"). The examiner must consider:
- Whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions;
 - Whether the Plan complies with provisions under Sections 38A and 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ("the 2004 Act"). These are:
 - it has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body, for an area that has been properly designated by the local planning authority;
 - it sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land;
 - it specifies the period during which it has effect;
 - it does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development'; and
 - it is the only neighbourhood plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area.
 - Whether the referendum boundary should be extended beyond the designated area, should the plan proceed to referendum.

- Such matters as prescribed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) (“the 2012 Regulations”).
- 1.7 I have considered only matters that fall within Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act, with one exception. That is the requirement that the Plan is compatible with the Human Rights Convention.

The Basic Conditions

- 1.8 The “Basic Conditions” are set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the neighbourhood plan must:
- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
 - contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
 - be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;
 - not breach, and be otherwise compatible with, assimilated obligations¹; and
 - meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.
- 1.9 Regulation 32 of the 2012 Regulations prescribes a further Basic Condition for a neighbourhood plan. This requires that the making of the Neighbourhood Development Plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.²

2. Approach to the Examination

Planning Policy Context

- 2.1 The Development Plan for this part of the Bradford Council area, not including documents relating to excluded minerals and waste development, is the Core Strategy, adopted in July 2017. There is also the Shipley and Canal Road Corridor Area Action Plan, and the Bradford City Centre Area Action Plan, both adopted in December 2017; and eight made neighbourhood plans. There is an emerging Local Plan in the form of

¹ See: The Retained EU Law (Revocation and Reform) Act 2023 (Consequential Amendment) Regulations 2023, which replaced the previous reference to ‘EU’ obligations.

² This revised Basic Condition came into force on 28 December 2018 through the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018.

the Local Plan 2020 – 2038. This has reached the Preferred Options stage.

- 2.2 The planning policy for England is set out principally in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) offers guidance on how this policy should be implemented. Neighbourhood Plans submitted on or before 12 March 2025 may be examined under the NPPF December 2024 transitional arrangements.³ However, whilst the Plan was submitted on 11 March 2025, the Qualifying Body has elected to submit its Plan with reference to the updated December 2024 NPPF, and all references in this report are therefore to that version. Accordingly, I see no need for the inclusion of paragraph 2.6.2 of the Plan, which is likely to confuse readers in its explanation of the relevance of previous NPPF policies. I recommend it is removed from the Plan. **(PM1)**⁴

Submitted Documents

- 2.3 I have considered all policy, guidance and other reference documents I consider relevant to the examination, including those submitted which comprise:

- the draft Neighbourhood Plan for Bingley 2023 - 2038, February 2025;
- a map which identifies the area to which the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan relates;
- the Consultation Statement (Consultation Report), February 2025;
- the Basic Conditions Statement, February 2025;
- all the representations that have been made in accordance with the Regulation 16 consultation;
- the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Opinion, May 2022;
- the Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Opinion (incorporating Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) considerations), June 2022;
- the Habitats Regulations Assessment, December 2023;
- the Habitats Regulations Assessment (v2), February 2024;⁵ and
- the request for additional clarification sought in my letter dated 11 December 2025 and the responses from Bingley Town Council dated 15 January 2026 and 2 February 2026.⁶

³ Paragraph 239, NPPF December 2024.

⁴ Proposed Modification (**PM**)– see paragraph 2.6 below and the Appendix to this report.

⁵ View at: <https://www.bradford.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/neighbourhood-areas/?Folder=\DesignatedNeighbourhoodAreas\Bingley\BingleyReg16>

⁶ View at: <https://www.bradford.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/neighbourhood-areas/?Folder=\DesignatedNeighbourhoodAreas\Bingley\BingleyReg17>

Site Visit

- 2.4 I made an unaccompanied site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan Area on 8 February 2026 to familiarise myself with it and visit relevant sites and areas referenced in the Plan and evidential documents.

Written Representations with or without Public Hearing

- 2.5 This examination has been dealt with by written representations. I considered hearing sessions to be unnecessary as the consultation responses clearly articulated the objections to the Plan and presented arguments for and against the Plan's suitability to proceed to a referendum.

Modifications

- 2.6 Where necessary, I have recommended modifications to the Plan (**PMs**) in this report in order that it meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. For ease of reference, I have listed these modifications separately in the Appendix.

3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights

Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area

- 3.1 The Neighbourhood Plan for Bingley has been prepared and submitted for examination by Bingley Town Council, which is a qualifying body for an area that was designated by Bradford Council on 30 August 2017.
- 3.2 It is the only Neighbourhood Plan for the Bingley Neighbourhood Area and does not relate to land outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Plan Period

- 3.3 The Plan specifies clearly the period to which it is to take effect, which is from 2023 to 2038.

Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation

- 3.4 Details of plan preparation and consultation are set out in the Town Council's Consultation Report (Consultation Statement) dated February 2025. The early stages of formulating the Plan focussed on a major community consultation carried out in September 2019. Later activity was, in part, hampered by the Covid epidemic.
- 3.5 Regulation 14 consultation was carried out between 12 February 2024 and 4 April 2024. The principal consultation and engagement events included promotion through social media, a press article, a consultation postcard, a

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Office 10, 5 Argyle Street, Bath BA2 4BA

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

neighbourhood development plan survey and drop-in events. General consultation took place as described in Paragraphs 81 to 87 of the Consultation Report. Consultation with statutory consultees and other public bodies is addressed in Appendix B.

- 3.6 The main issues and concerns raised are discussed in Paragraphs 88 to 99 of the Consultation Report and the accompanying tables; also a description of how those issues and concerns were considered and addressed. Eighteen different general comments were made on the Plan. Responses were also received from residents, statutory consultees and the City of Bradford.
- 3.7 At the regulation 16 stage (21 July 2025 to 1 September 2025), representations were made by 16 different parties. One was an agent acting for a local landowner, four were from residents and 11 were from statutory consultees or other public bodies. In addition, detailed comments were made by Bradford Council. I have taken all those responses into account in making my recommendations.
- 3.8 I am satisfied that, at both the Regulation 14 and the Regulation 16 stages, the consultation process met the legal requirements and there has been procedural compliance. Regard has been paid to the advice on plan preparation and engagement in the PPG.

Development and Use of Land

- 3.9 The Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in accordance with Section 38A of the 2004 Act.

Excluded Development

- 3.10 The Plan does not include provisions and policies for “excluded development”.⁷

Human Rights

- 3.11 Bingley Town Council is satisfied that the Plan does not breach Human Rights (within the meaning of the Human Rights Act 1998). From my independent assessment, I see no reason to disagree.

⁷ The meaning of ‘excluded development’ is set out in s.61K of the 1990 Act.
Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Office 10, 5 Argyle Street, Bath BA2 4BA
Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions

Assimilated Obligations

- 4.1 The Neighbourhood Plan was screened for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) by consultants acting for Bingley Town Council, which found that it was unnecessary to undertake SEA. Having read the Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Opinion, I support this conclusion.
- 4.2 The Neighbourhood Plan for Bingley was further screened for Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA), which also was not triggered. Part of the South Pennines Moors Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the South Pennine Moors Phase Two Special Protection Area (SPA) lie within or abut the northern section of the Neighbourhood Plan Area. In addition, the North Pennine Moors Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and the North Pennine Moors Special Protection Area (SPA) lie within 10 to 15 km of the neighbourhood area boundary.
- 4.3 However, it is concluded that the Neighbourhood Plan for Bingley, either individually or in combination, will not have any significant impact on any European designated nature site within 20 km of the Neighbourhood Plan boundary. Natural England agreed with this conclusion.⁸ From my independent assessment of this matter, I have no reason to disagree.

Main Issues

- 4.4 Having regard for the Neighbourhood Plan for Bingley, the consultation responses and other evidence, and the site visit, I consider that there are seven main issues relating to the Basic Conditions for this examination. These concern:
- Community Facilities
 - Built Environment
 - Bingley Town Centre
 - Business Investment
 - Housing
 - Movement and Green Infrastructure
 - Landscape and Heritage
- 4.5 Before I deal with the main issues, I have a few observations to make with regard to the representations. First, the Neighbourhood Plan for

⁸ Email dated 24 January 2024 in Appendix 3 of the Habitats Regulation Assessment (v2).
Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Office 10, 5 Argyle Street, Bath BA2 4BA
Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84

Bingley should be seen in the context of the wider planning system. This includes the Core Strategy as well as the NPPF and PPG. It is not necessary to repeat in the Neighbourhood Plan matters that are quite adequately dealt with elsewhere.⁹ Having said that, there may be scope to give emphasis to matters particularly relevant in the context of Bingley.

- 4.6 Secondly, the Neighbourhood Plan does not have to deal with each and every topic raised through the consultation. In this regard, the content of the Neighbourhood Plan and the scope of the policies is largely at the discretion of the qualifying body, albeit informed by the consultation process and the requirements set by the Basic Conditions.
- 4.7 Thirdly, my central task is to judge whether the Neighbourhood Plan satisfies the Basic Conditions. Many of the representations do not demonstrate or indicate a failure to meet those conditions or other legal requirements. Similarly, many of the suggested additions and improvements are not necessary when judged against the Basic Conditions.
- 4.8 The following section of my report sets out modifications that are necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions. Some of the proposed modifications are factual corrections.¹⁰ Others are necessary in order to have closer regard to national policies and advice. In particular, plans should be succinct and contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous.¹¹ A decision maker should be able to apply them consistently and with confidence when determining planning applications. In addition, the policies should be supported by appropriate evidence.¹²

Issue 1 – Community Facilities

- 4.9 Policy BING1 and the tables on pages 35 and 36 of the Plan involve the retention of community facilities. There are a number of matters that need to be corrected. These relate to consistent and accurate terminology; also, correct attribution to Use Classes.
- 4.10 The tables identify a large number of facilities used by the community. Many are described in general terms, such as “local shops”. Others, including the public houses, are essentially commercial enterprises subject to the vagaries of the market. This begs the question as to whether they can be regarded as community facilities and whether it is reasonable to seek to continue their use through the policy.
- 4.11 I accept that the identified facilities are used by the community. Support for an alternative use could depend on unsuccessful marketing of the premises over a period of six months. This does not strike me as too

⁹ See NPPF Paragraph 16 f).

¹⁰ Modifications for the purpose of correcting errors is provided for in Paragraph 10(3)(e) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act.

¹¹ NPPF, Paragraphs 15 and 16 d).

¹² PPG Reference ID: 41-041-20140306.

onerous. I appreciate that retention of the uses is important to the community. I am also aware that many alternative uses could be introduced through permitted development rights. In the circumstances, and subject to the necessary changes in proposed modification **PM2**, the policy is deserving of support.

Issue 2 – Built Environment

- 4.12 Policy BING2 concerns design in new development in Bingley. The policy is supported by, amongst other things, Table 2: Summary of Design Codes – Key Guidance. “Shared spaces” are mentioned in the context of Overarching Design Code PRO1. However, Active Travel England does not support shared spaces. There is no evidence to the contrary. As such, the reference should be removed.
- 4.13 In Policy BING2 itself, “regard” to shopfront codes and to overarching design codes is sought under points 3 and 4. Elsewhere, the term “where relevant and feasible is used”. This latter term covers a wider range of circumstances and, for clarity and consistency, should be used in reference to Shopfront Codes and Overarching Design Codes.
- 4.14 Amendments dealing with the above matters are set out in proposed modification **PM3**.

Issue 3 – Bingley Town Centre

- 4.15 In Policy BING3 (Bingley Town Centre), ground floor uses will not be supported where this would cause impacts on the vitality and viability of the town centre (Point e). I can envisage circumstances where there could be some relatively minor negative effect but where the proposal would still be acceptable. Reference to “significant negative impacts” would be more appropriate.
- 4.16 In the text supporting the policy (Paragraph 8.6.14), there is reference to possible mountain bike circuits (Point e). This is an aspirational point¹³ that should be deleted from the reasoned justification to Policy BING3. At the discretion of the Councils¹⁴, this reference could be moved into Table 1, Aspirations for towns and villages within Bingley Parish, within the section for Bingley under the theme for Sport and Recreation.
- 4.17 In response to representations by Bradford Council, I have considered whether the former magistrates’ courts should be excluded from the Town Centre Boundary (Figure 6). Further evidence on this matter has been submitted by the Town Council.¹⁵ This evidence sets out a sound case for the Town Council’s proposals. I accept that local people do not regard this site as part of the town centre. In all the circumstances, no modification

¹³ See PPG Reference ID: 41-004-20190509

¹⁴ See paragraph 4.36 below.

¹⁵ See response dated 15 January 2026 to my questions.

to the town centre boundary is necessary. Other necessary amendments are included within proposed modification **PM4**.

Issue 4 – Business Investment

- 4.18 Policy BING4 (Current and Future Employment Sites and Buildings) is light on the detail that would help the decision maker apply the policy consistently and with confidence. Alternative wording has been suggested by Bradford Council and forms the content of proposed modification **PM5**.

Issue 5 – Housing

- 4.19 In reference to Policy BING6 (New Housing in Bingley), the content of Paragraphs 10.7.1 and 10.7.2 could be construed as only requiring regard to the Bingley Housing Needs Assessment when formulating their proposals, whereas applicants should have regard to the wider policy and evidence context. The position can be made clear by re-wording within the policy. Alternative wording suggested by Bradford Council would be acceptable to the Town Council.¹⁶
- 4.20 Further amendment of the policy is also needed to ensure that the wording reflects the policy approach of Bradford Council, principally through the adopted Core Strategy. Again, alternative wording has been suggested by Bradford Council and is acceptable to the Town Council.¹⁷
- 4.21 Appropriate amendments to the policy are set out in proposed modification **PM6**.

Issue 6 – Movement and Green Infrastructure

- 4.22 Turning to Policy BING8 (Local Green Space), the wording indicates that no inappropriate development will be permitted other than in very special circumstances. Government policy (NPPF, paragraph 108) states that policy and decisions should be consistent with national policy for Green Belts. For the avoidance of doubt, this form of wording should be used.
- 4.23 In regard to Site 5, Giles Wood, this includes a small triangle of land owned by the Canal and River Trust. The Trust is concerned that the designation could threaten the ability of the organisation to undertake works on land in its ownership, necessary for public benefit and to support the waterways and their use.
- 4.24 I acknowledge that the Trust is a statutory undertaker with defined responsibilities under the legislation. Further, in my opinion, the Trust is unlikely to carry out any development that would be incompatible with the aims of Policy BING8. To ensure that its work is unfettered, exclusion of

¹⁶ See response dated 15 January 2026 to my questions.

¹⁷ See response dated 15 January 2026 to my questions.

its land from the proposed site to be designated would be appropriate. To this, the Town Council has no objection.¹⁸

- 4.25 I have considered whether the designation of Site 13, Gilstead Moor (The Craggs) would be appropriate given that it enjoys protection as a Local Wildlife Site. However, whether or not its wildlife value could become degraded over time, I saw that the site has much more to offer than any richness of its wildlife. I accept that this site satisfies the criteria set out in Paragraphs 106 and 107 of the NPPF, and in Planning Practice Guidance.
- 4.26 As to Site 20, North Bog, this now has designation as a National Nature Reserve. To my mind, no additional public benefit would be gained from its designation as Local Green Space.
- 4.27 I have concluded that Site 20 (North Bog) should be deleted. The boundary of Site 13 (Gilstead Moor (The Craggs)) should be amended to omit land owned by the Canal and River Trust. Other than that, the sites proposed for designation meet the criteria set out in the NPPF. The necessary amendments to the policy are set out in proposed modification **PM7**.

Issue 7 - Landscape and Heritage

- 4.28 In regard to Policy BING11 (Milner Field Estate Special Character Area), I note that the Plan now includes the policy statements from the Milner Field Estate Special Character Area supporting document (Table 5). However, there is no link to this document within the policy. For clarity, this matter would be resolved by adding an additional clause to the policy (new clause a)).
- 4.29 With regard to enabling development, and in answer to my question 15, the Town Council has responded in the following terms:¹⁹

*We acknowledge that the delivery of NDP policy objectives for the Special Character Area, including the restoration of key assets and the development of a potential tourism resource, will require funding that could be generated through enabling development. We are keen to ensure that enabling development is supported where appropriate and have proposed some wording at the end of the policy to address this. The criteria in the policy are not equal and enabling development would not be supported if it delivered against only part b) of the policy as set out below. [Incorporated into proposed modification **PM8** which follows]*

Provided part a) is met in combination with improving one or more assets listed in d) or meeting the requirements of c) then this would provide a basis for supporting enabling development. We feel that meeting the requirement of part

¹⁸ See response dated 15 January 2026 to my questions.

¹⁹ The part numbers to which reference is made are the part numbers that are proposed to be revised through proposed modification **PM8**.

b) in isolation would not provide sufficient benefit to support enabling development.²⁰

- 4.30 To my mind, this is a reasonable approach in support of enabling development and is recommended.
- 4.31 The revised policy wording also includes reference to Assets Numbers 19 to 24 which were omitted in error. Policy statements for Assets 20 to 24 also need to be added to Table 5. All matters are addressed through proposed modification **PM8**.
- 4.32 Finally, Policy BING12 aims to safeguard distinctive local views and vistas. However, for the benefit of both applicants and decision takers, clarity will be needed as to the precise point from which the views and vistas referenced in the policy should be observed. The arc of vision to be protected under the policy also needs to be understood. Insufficient detail in this regard is contained within the Plan.
- 4.33 In response to my concerns, as raised in my questions²¹, the Town Council has prepared a revised Policies Map and revised version of Appendix C. I am satisfied that these show the detail necessary for a proper interpretation of the policy. They are recommended through proposed modification **PM9**.

Other Policies

- 4.34 There remain a number of policies that have not been the subject of commentary in the above report. These are Policies 5 (Supporting Small and Start-up Businesses), 7 (Walking and Cycling Routes), 9 (Green Infrastructure Principles) and 10 (Non-Designated Heritage Assets: Bingley Character Buildings and Structures of Local Heritage Interest).
- 4.35 To a greater or lesser extent, these topics are covered in NPPF Sections 6 (Building a strong, competitive economy), 9 (Promoting sustainable transport), 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment) and 16 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment). I find that there has been regard for national policy and that the Basic Conditions have been met.

Other Matters

- 4.36 All policy areas have been considered in the foregoing discussion. With the modifications that I have recommended, the Plan would meet the Basic Conditions. Other minor changes (that do not affect the Basic Conditions), including those suggested by Bradford Council as well as

²⁰ See response dated 15 January 2026 to my questions.

²¹ See the questions posed to the Town Council in my email dated 11 December 2025.

consequential amendments, corrections and up-dates, could be made prior to the referendum at the Councils' discretion.²²

5. Conclusions

Summary

- 5.1 The Neighbourhood Plan for Bingley has been duly prepared in compliance with the procedural requirements. My examination has investigated whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements for neighbourhood plans. I have had regard for all the responses made following consultation on the Neighbourhood Plan and the evidence documents submitted with it.
- 5.2 I have made recommendations to modify a number of policies and text to ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum.

The Referendum and its Area

- 5.3 I have considered whether or not the referendum area should be extended beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates. The Neighbourhood Plan for Bingley as modified has no policy or proposals which I consider significant enough to have an impact beyond the designated Neighbourhood Plan boundary, requiring the referendum to extend to areas beyond the Plan boundary. I recommend that the boundary for the purposes of any future referendum on the Plan should be the boundary of the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

Overview

- 5.4 It is evident that a considerable amount of time and effort has been devoted to the development and production of this Plan and I congratulate those who have been involved. The Plan should prove to be a useful tool for future planning and change in Bingley over the coming years.

Andrew S Freeman

Examiner

²² PPG Reference ID: 41-106-20190509.

Appendix: Modifications

Proposed modification number (PM)	Page no/ other reference	Modification
PM1	Page 8	Delete paragraph 2.6.2.
PM2	Pages 34 to 36	<p>Substitute the following for the first paragraph of Policy BING1:</p> <p>“Proposals that would lead to the loss of the facilities listed on pages 35 to 36, being sui generis uses or uses within Use Classes E or F, will not be supported unless:”.</p> <p>Change the title of the tables on pages 35 and 36 from “Community Facilities” to “Facilities used by the community”.</p> <p>Change the heading of the first column from “Community Facilities in F2 Use” to “Local Community and Learning Facilities in Use Class F”.</p> <p>Change the heading of the second column from “Important Facilities in Sui Generis Class Use that support sustainable neighbourhoods” to “Important sui generis uses that support sustainable neighbourhoods”.</p> <p>Change the heading of the third column from “Important facilities in E Class Use that support sustainable neighbourhoods” to “Important facilities in Use Class E that support sustainable neighbourhoods”.</p> <p>Check that all the facilities listed are in the correct column.</p>
PM3	Pages 39 and 47	<p>With regard to Policy BING2, and within Table 2, Overarching Design Codes PRO1 – Improvements to streets and footpaths, delete the reference to “shared spaces”.</p> <p>In the policy itself, in regard to both Point 3 (Shopfront Codes) and Point 4 (Overarching Design Codes), insert</p>

		"Where relevant and feasible," at the beginning of the points.
PM4	Pages 53 and 56	In the final sentence of Policy BING3 (Point e), change the wording so that it reads "where this will cause significant negative impacts on the vitality and viability of the town centre." From Paragraph 8.6.14, delete point e) (discussions with St Ives Estate).
PM5	Page 59	Replace the wording of Policy BING4 with that set out in the Town Council's response dated 15 January 2026 to my questions (Question 5).
PM6	Page 64	Replace the wording of Policy BING6 with that set out in the Town Council's response dated 15 January 2026 to my questions (Questions 6 and 7).
PM7	Page 72	In the opening paragraph of Policy BING8, change the wording after "Local Green Spaces" to read "where development proposals should be consistent with national policy for Green Belts. No development will be permitted within them that would harm their green character and reason for designation". From Site 5 (Giles Wood), remove the land owned by the Canal and River Trust. Remove Site 20 (North Bog). Make necessary consequential changes to the Plan.
PM8	Page 83	Replace the wording of Policy BING11 with the revised policy wording set out in the Town Council's response dated 15 January 2026 to my questions (Question 15). ²³

²³ View at:

[https://www.bradford.gov.uk/Documents//DesignatedNeighbourhoodAreas/Bingley/BingleyReg17/Examiner's%20Procedural%20Matters%20and%20Questions%20\(11.12.2025\).pdf](https://www.bradford.gov.uk/Documents//DesignatedNeighbourhoodAreas/Bingley/BingleyReg17/Examiner's%20Procedural%20Matters%20and%20Questions%20(11.12.2025).pdf)

PM9	Page 84	In connection with Policy BING12, substitute for the Policies Map and Appendix C the versions appended to the Town Council's email dated 2 February 2026. ²⁴
-----	------------	---

²⁴ View at: <https://www.bradford.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/neighbourhood-areas/?Folder=\DesignatedNeighbourhoodAreas\Bingley\BingleyReg17>

Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd, Office 10, 5 Argyle Street, Bath BA2 4BA

Registered in England and Wales. Company Reg. No. 10100118. VAT Reg. No. 237 7641 84