

**INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS**  
**UDP – Bradford North Chapter 13 Green Belt**

<b>SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.</b>	<b>Inspector’s Recommendation</b>	<b>CBMDC Decision and Reasons</b>	<b>Mod Ref</b>
<p><b>SD</b> – SD/BN/GB/1</p> <p><b>UDP</b> – BN/GB1.3</p> <p><b>Site</b> – Garden area to rear of Apperley Lane, Little London</p> <p><b>IR</b> – Bradford North, page 53 &amp; Addendum Report 1/9/04</p>	<p>I recommend that the RDDP be modified by inclusion in the Green Belt of the parcel of land defined by the track and a continuation of the rear garden boundary of the adjoining properties.</p> <p>The Council sought clarification on this, and the Inspector’s response in his letter dated 1/9/04 was:</p> <p>Replace the recommendation with “I recommend that the RDDP be modified by inclusion in the Green Belt of the parcel of land to the north-west of a line formed by the continuation of the rear garden boundary of the adjoining properties to the north-east until it reaches the existing Green belt boundary running to the south to join the track opposite 2 The Mews.”</p>	<p><b>Decision</b> : Accepted Inspector’s recommendation in clarification letter dated 1/9/04.</p> <p><b>Reasons</b> : For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s Report.</p>	MOD/BN /GB/2
<p><b>SD</b> – SD/BN/GB/2</p> <p><b>UDP</b> – SOM/BN/GB1/4, SOM/BN/UR5/4 &amp; SOM/BN/H1/4</p> <p><b>Site</b> – Land at Simpsons Green, Apperley Bridge</p> <p><b>IR</b> – Bradford North, pages 29 &amp; 30</p>	<p>I recommend that the RDDP be modified by designation of land at Simpsons Green, Apperley Bridge as safeguarded land under the terms of Policy UR5, and the deletion of the land from the Green Belt.</p>	<p><b>Decision</b> : Accepted</p> <p><b>Reasons</b> : In his report the Inspector discusses a number of substantive issues relating to the site. In paragraph 6.41 the potential impact of development on the character of the area is discussed. The Inspector concludes that development would change the character of the land but that in more distant views the site would be seen as an extension to the built up area. He concludes that the most significant and sensitive aspect – the potential impacts on the adjoining Conservation Area could be resolved through the incorporation of suitable areas of informal open space and inclusion of structural planting as screening. The Council accepts these conclusions.</p> <p>In paragraph 6.42 the Inspector suggests that the site is reasonably well located in relation to local services and to public transport but notes that many of these services are beyond walking distance. Whilst the Council accepts this general conclusion, it notes that the Inspector also concludes, correctly in the Council’s view, in paragraph 6.43 that the site is less sustainable than most sites within the urban area.</p> <p>In paragraph 6.42 the Inspector acknowledges that concerns have been raised about the effect of additional traffic on the highway network but concludes that it does not appear that these are so significant as to prevent development. The Council accepts this conclusion as it does not in itself contradict the Council’s viewpoint expressed at the inquiry that achieving a satisfactory access to the site is not straightforward and may limit the amount of development that the site could accommodate. The Council notes that if the land were to be allocated for housing in the future this could only be done on the basis of a detailed assessment of the impact of the development given</p>	MOD/BN /GB/3

**INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS**  
**UDP – Bradford North Chapter 13 Green Belt**

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector’s Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
		<p>the nature and state of the highway network and current or potential public transport services at that time.</p> <p>In paragraph 6.43 the Inspector addresses the issue of whether the site should be allocated for housing during this plan period. He concludes that while the land could be considered for development at some point, the site suffers from a number of disadvantages – its greenfield nature, its prominence from some viewpoints, and the fact that most sites within the urban area would be more sustainable. The Council agrees with this analysis.</p> <p>Having rejected the allocation of the site for housing development within this plan period, the Inspector turns his attention in paragraph 6.44 to the question of whether the site should, notwithstanding some its disadvantages, be designated as safeguarded land. He concludes that it should. The Inspector refers to his consideration of the general extent of the Green Belt earlier in his report and his conclusion that there is a need to remove a significant amount of land from the Green Belt and to safeguard it to accommodate development needs beyond the plan period up to 2026.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the land at Simpson’s Green should be removed from the Green Belt and designated as safeguarded land but does not agree in full with the reasoning contained in paragraph 6.44 of the Inspector’s Report. In particular the Council has not accepted the Inspector’s view that the plans should provide for a Green Belt which would endure as far ahead as 2026. Details of the Council’s full response on this matter is contained within SD/PF/PP/6.</p> <p>The Council does however accept that exceptional circumstances need to be demonstrated for land to be removed from the Green Belt and accepts the Inspector’s view in paragraph 6.44 that the need to safeguard land for development needs beyond the plan period is an exceptional circumstance which can justify such Green Belt deletions. This reflects the advice contained within PPG2 that when local planning authorities prepare new or revised plans, any proposals affecting Green Belt should be related to a timescale which is longer than that normally adopted for other aspects of the plan and that they should satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period.</p> <p>The Council has in SD/PF/PP/4 taken the view that it would be appropriate for the revised UDP to incorporate sufficient safeguarded land to provide a Green Belt which endures until 2021. Despite the fact that this is not as long a time period as that advocated by the Inspector, the Council still has to produce an adopted plan which</p>	

**INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS**  
**UDP – Bradford North Chapter 13 Green Belt**

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector’s Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
		<p>not only meets the overall requirement for 1390 new dwellings per year but which provides a further 7 years worth of safeguarded land assuming, as the Inspector does, that similar development rates ensue beyond the end of the plan period.</p> <p>In examining the totality of the changes recommended by the Inspector, the Council concludes that the land at Simpsons Green is needed as part of the portfolio of safeguarded land within the replacement UDP. This results partly from the Inspector’s recommendations elsewhere in his report to delete other areas of both allocated and safeguarded land, and partly from the increased strategic significance given by the Inspector to Bradford as the main urban area in meeting the District’s development needs. The elevation of the main urban area of Bradford to the top of the locational hierarchy effectively increases the chances of the site at Simpsons Green being needed to meet housing needs in the future, since extensions to the main urban area would now be given higher priority than similar extensions to other urban areas within the district. Given this new strategic context, the identification of the land at Simpson’s Green at this stage would both contribute to the required pool of safeguarded land and would help avoid the necessity for repeated changes to the Green Belt boundary in future reviews of the development plan in accordance with the advice within PPG2.</p> <p>In reaching its conclusion and in agreeing with the Inspector’s recommendation, the Council has had full regard to the disadvantages of the site as set out by the Inspector. Any future allocation of the site for development will need to be justified with reference to the availability or absence of other sites within the main urban areas which could be considered more sustainable.</p> <p>Having accepted the recommendation of the Inspector to remove the objection site from the Green Belt a consequential change will also be needed with respect to the adjoining land to the west which is currently also within the green belt and is an actively used and well maintained area of allotments. Should the objection site be removed from the Green Belt, the allotments would be left as an isolated island of Green Belt, which would no longer be performing any of the green belt functions set out within PPG2. The Council therefore concludes that these factors would be exceptional circumstances to also delete the allotments’ Green Belt designation, which would be an anomaly if it remained. As indicated above, the allotments are however both well used and maintained and valued by the local community. The land should therefore be given allotments designation under Policy OS6 of the plan which would provide appropriate protection from development.</p>	
<b>SD</b> – SD/BN/GB/3	With regard to the case to delete the site from the Green Belt and allocate for housing, the Inspector’s recommendation is:	<b>Decision</b> : Accepted	MOD/BN /GB/4

**INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS**  
**UDP – Bradford North Chapter 13 Green Belt**

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector’s Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
<p><b>UDP</b> – SOM/BN/GB1/5, SOM/BN/H1/5.02, SOM/BN/GB1/5.02 &amp; SOM/BN/OS4/5.02</p> <p><b>Site</b> – Land at Carr Bottom Road, Greengates</p> <p><b>IR</b> – Bradford North, pages 30, 31, 51 &amp; 53.</p>	<p>I recommend that the RDDP be modified by designation of land at Carr Bottom Road, Greengates as safeguarded land under the terms of Policy UR5 and the deletion of the land from the Green Belt. (page 31)</p> <p>With regard to the case for a parkland or recreation allocation, the Inspector’s recommendation is:</p> <p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP. (page 51)</p>	<p><b>Reasons</b> : In his report the Inspector discusses a number of substantive issues relating to the site. In paragraph 6.47 the Inspector suggests that the site is well located in relation to local services with Greengates centre being within walking distance. However, he acknowledges that access to the site is far from ideal. The Council accepts these conclusions.</p> <p>In paragraph 6.48 the Inspector addresses the issue of whether the site should be allocated for housing during this plan period. He concludes that while the land could be considered for development at some point, if a satisfactory access could be provided, but it would be inappropriate to allocate it for housing at the present time. The Council agrees with this analysis.</p> <p>Having rejected the allocation of the site for housing development within this plan period, the Inspector turns his attention in paragraph 6.49 to the question of whether the site should, notwithstanding some its disadvantages, be designated as safeguarded land. He concludes that it should. The Inspector refers to his consideration of the general extent of the Green Belt earlier in his report and his conclusion that there is a need to remove a significant amount of land from the Green Belt and to safeguard it to accommodate development needs beyond the plan period up to 2026.</p> <p>The Council accepts that the land at Carr Bottom Road should be removed from the Green Belt and designated as safeguarded land but does not agree in full with the reasoning contained in paragraph 6.49 of the Inspector’s Report. In particular the Council has not accepted the Inspector’s view that the plans should provide for a Green Belt which would endure as far ahead as 2026. Details of the Council’s full response on this matter is contained within SD/PF/PP/4.</p> <p>The Council does however accept that exceptional circumstances need to be demonstrated for land to be removed from the Green Belt and accepts the Inspector’s view in paragraph 6.49 that the need to safeguard land for development needs beyond the plan period is an exceptional circumstance which can justify such Green Belt deletions. This reflects the advice contained within PPG2 that when local planning authorities prepare new or revised plans, any proposals affecting Green Belt should be related to a timescale which is longer than that normally adopted for other aspects of the plan and that they should satisfy themselves that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period.</p> <p>The Council has in SD/PF/PP/4 taken the view that it would be appropriate for the revised UDP to incorporate sufficient safeguarded land to provide a Green Belt which</p>	

**INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS**  
**UDP – Bradford North Chapter 13 Green Belt**

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector's Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
		<p>endures until 2021. Despite the fact that this is not as long a time period as that advocated by the Inspector, the Council still has to produce an adopted plan which not only meets the overall requirement for 1390 new dwellings per year but which provides a further 7 years worth of safeguarded land assuming, as the Inspector does, that similar development rates ensue beyond the end of the plan period.</p> <p>In examining the totality of the changes recommended by the Inspector, the Council concludes that the land at Carr Bottom Road is needed as part of the portfolio of safeguarded land within the replacement UDP. This results partly from the Inspector's recommendations elsewhere in his report to delete other areas of both allocated and safeguarded land, and partly from the increased strategic significance given by the Inspector to Bradford as the main urban area in meeting the District's development needs. The elevation of the main urban area of Bradford to the top of the locational hierarchy effectively increases the chances of the site at Carr Bottom Road being needed to meet housing needs in the future, since extensions to the main urban area would now be given higher priority than similar extensions to other urban areas within the district. Given this new strategic context, the identification of the land at Carr Bottom Road at this stage would both contribute to the required pool of safeguarded land and would help avoid the necessity for repeated changes to the Green Belt boundary in future reviews of the development plan in accordance with the advice within PPG2.</p> <p>In reaching its conclusion and in agreeing with the Inspector's recommendation, the Council has had full regard to the disadvantages of the site as set out by the Inspector. Any future allocation of the site for development will need to be justified with reference to the availability or absence of other sites within the main urban areas which could be considered more sustainable.</p>	
<p><b>SD</b> – SD/BN/GB/4</p> <p><b>UDP</b> – SOM/BN/GB1/199 &amp; SOM/BN/E1/199.02</p> <p><b>Site</b> – Site B, Land adjacent to Gain Lane Employment Site (BN/E1.12)</p>	<p>I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the Green Belt designation and the allocation of the objection site for employment use under Policy E1. If the Council does not accept this I consider that the land should be designated as safeguarded land.</p>	<p><b>Decision</b> : Accepted E1 designation</p> <p><b>Reasons</b> : The Inspector gives detailed consideration to this site in his report. In paragraph 5.14, he concludes that the site fails to satisfy essential functions of, and purposes for including land within, the Green Belt. In paragraph 5.15, he states that the RDDP boundary of the Green Belt does not satisfy the criteria set out in PPG2, and that Woodhall Road forms a more acceptable, distinctive, robust and defensible boundary. The Council agrees with these conclusions. In paragraph 5.16, the Inspector recognises that exceptional circumstances are required to delete land from the Green belt, and he concludes that sufficient exceptional circumstances exist to warrant the deletion of the Green Belt designation.</p>	<p>MOD/BN /E/2</p> <p>MOD/BN /GB/6</p>

**INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS**  
**UDP – Bradford North Chapter 13 Green Belt**

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector’s Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
<p><b>IR</b> – Bradford North, pages 14 to 16 &amp; 54</p>		<p>The Council accepts that the objection site should be removed from the Green Belt, and designated as employment land, but does not agree in full with all the reasoning contained in paragraph 5.16. The Council accepts that exceptional circumstances need to be demonstrated for land to be removed from the Green Belt, however, a review of the Green Belt in itself cannot be considered as an exceptional circumstance. The Council does, however accept that decisions elsewhere in the plan which have led to the loss of employment land and the need to provide for replacement employment land in a strategic and accessible location are exceptional circumstances, which can justify such Green Belt deletions. The Council therefore accepts the Inspector’s recommendation to remove the objection site from the Green Belt for employment purposes.</p> <p><i>See also Statement of Decision on SOM/BN/OS4/199.01 &amp; BN/TM20.4.</i></p>	
<p><b>SD</b> – SD/BN/GB/5</p> <p><b>UDP</b> – SOM/BN/GB1/54, SOM/BN/H1/54, &amp; SOM/BN/UR5/54</p> <p><b>Site</b> – Land at Lower Fagley</p> <p><b>IR</b> – Bradford North, pages 31 &amp; 32</p>	<p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.</p>	<p><b>Decision</b> : Accepted</p> <p><b>Reasons</b> : For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s Report.</p>	
<p><b>SD</b> – SD/BN/GB/6</p> <p><b>UDP</b> – SOM/BN/OS4/199.01 &amp; BN/TM20.14</p> <p><b>Site</b> –Site A, Land adjacent to Gain Lane Employment Site, and Gain Lane Cycle Route</p>	<p>With regard to the case to delete the site from the green belt, and allocate it as a linear park, the Inspector’s recommendation is:</p> <p>I recommend that the RDDP be amended by the inclusion of the objection site as recreational open space on the Proposals Map.</p> <p>With regard to the case relating to the Cycle Route, the Inspector’s recommendation is:</p> <p>I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the relocation of</p>	<p><b>Decision</b> : Accepted both recommendations, but cycle route will not be relocated to the north of the beck, as the land to the south is to be allocated as recreational open space.</p> <p><b>Reasons</b> : In paragraph 12.26 the Inspector concludes that it would be helpful and appropriate to allocate Site A as recreational open space, similar to the allocation on the northern side of Fagley Beck, and the proposed cycle route could then be located to the south of Fagley Beck through the objection site. However, this site is currently designated as Green Belt, but the Inspector has not set out the exceptional circumstances why it should be removed from the Green Belt.</p>	<p>MOD/BN /GB/5</p>

**INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS**  
**UDP – Bradford North Chapter 13 Green Belt**

SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No.	Inspector's Recommendation	CBMDC Decision and Reasons	Mod Ref
<p><b>IR</b> – Bradford North, pages 45, 46, 51 &amp; 52</p>	<p>the cycle route, as shown on the Proposals Map, to the north of Fagley Beck, within the land allocated for recreational open space, unless land on the southern side of Fagley Beck is allocated for recreational open space as set out in my recommendation in relation to SOM/BN/OS4/199.01.</p>	<p>In paragraph 5.14 of the Inspector's Report into Bradford North, relating to Site B adjacent to the Gain Lane Employment site BN/E1.12, the Inspector concludes that the area covered by both the objection site and the adjacent site to the south (Site B) fails to satisfy the essential functions of, and the purposes for, including the land in the Green Belt, and in paragraph 5.15, he states that the RDDP boundary line of the Green Belt does not satisfy the criteria set out in PPG2, and that Woodhall Road forms a more acceptable, distinctive, robust and defensible boundary. The Council agrees with these conclusions.</p> <p>However, having accepted the recommendation of the Inspector to remove the adjoining land to the south from the Green Belt for employment purposes (Site B Ref: SOM/BN/E1/199.01) an anomaly arises with respect to the objection site. If the site to the south is removed from the Green Belt, the objection site would be left as a thin strip of Green Belt which would not perform any Green Belt function. In paragraph 3.20 of the Inspector's Report into the Policy Framework, the Inspector states that exceptional circumstances also justify adjustments to the Green Belt to remove anomalies in the original delineation of the Green Belt boundaries or which have arisen since the boundaries were first defined. As the deletion of the objection site from the Green Belt will resolve a boundary anomaly, this is an exceptional circumstance, therefore the Council accepts the Inspector's recommendation to remove the land from the Green Belt and allocate it as recreational open space.</p> <p><i>See also Statement of Decisions on SOM/BN/E1/199.02 &amp; SOM/BN/GB1/199.</i></p>	
<p><b>SD</b> – SD/BN/GB/7</p> <p><b>UDP</b> – SOM/BN/GB1/405, BN/GB6A.1, BN/GB6A.2, BN/GB6A.3 &amp; SOM/BN/GB7/405</p> <p><b>Site</b> - Esholt Sewage Treatment Works</p> <p><b>IR</b> – Bradford North, Pages 54 &amp; 55</p>	<p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.</p>	<p><b>Decision</b> : Accepted</p> <p><b>Reasons</b> : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's Report.</p>	