

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Policy Framework Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

| SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No. | Inspector's Recommendation | CBMDC Decision and Reasons | Mod Ref |
|--|---|--|-----------------|
| <p>SD- SD/PF/UR/1</p> <p>UDP –Paragraph 4.1</p> <p>IR –Policy Framework Paragraphs 4.1- 4.2, Page 24</p> | I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP. | <p>Decision : Accept</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report.</p> | N/A |
| <p>SD- SD/PF/UR/2</p> <p>UDP – Policy UR1 & Paragraph 4.4 Primacy of the Development Plan</p> <p>IR –Policy Framework Paragraphs 4.3- 4.4, Pages 24-25</p> | I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of Policy UR1 | <p>Decision : Accept</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report.</p> | Mod/P F/UR/1 |
| <p>SD- SD/PF/UR/3</p> <p>UDP – Policy UR2 & Paragraph 4.12 Promoting More Sustainable Development</p> <p>IR –Policy Framework Paragraphs 4.5- 4.10, Pages 25-26</p> | <p>I recommend that the RDDP be modified by the deletion of the first sentence of paragraph 4.12 and its substitution with the following:</p> <p>For major or significant developments (sites over 0.4ha) the proponent will be expected to produce a sustainability appraisal.</p> | <p>Decision : Accept</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report.</p> | Mod/P F/UR/2 |

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Policy Framework Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

| SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No. | Inspector’s Recommendation | CBMDC Decision and Reasons | Mod Ref |
|---|---|--|--------------------|
| <p>SD- SD/PF/UR/4</p> <p>UDP – Policy UR3 The Local Impact of Development</p> <p>IR –Policy Framework Paragraphs 4.11-4.12, Page 26</p> | <p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP, other than to correct the grammatical error.</p> | <p>Decision : Accept</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report.</p> | Mod/P F/UR/3 |
| <p>SD- SD/PF/UR/5</p> <p>UDP –Paragraph 4.16</p> <p>IR –Policy Framework Paragraphs 4.13-4.14, Page 27</p> | <p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP.</p> | <p>Decision : Accept</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report.</p> | N/A |
| <p>SD- SD/PF/UR/6</p> <p>UDP – Policy UR4 Sequential Approach to Accommodating Development</p> <p>IR –Policy Framework Paragraphs 4.15-4.20, Pages 27-29</p> | <p>I recommend that the RDDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>[a] POLICY UR4 – delete and replace with the policy as drafted on page 4 of the published proposed changes dated January 2003, but with the phrase “OTHER WELL LOCATED SETTLEMENTS” replaced with the words “OR IN MENSTON, BURLEY, STEETON OR THORNTON”.</p> <p>[b] Paragraph 4.18 – add a new sixth sentence, to read “Other over-riding reasons for permitting development on greenfield land would be where the site is relatively more sustainable than alternative previously-developed land, or where there is a shortfall of housing land in the District”.</p> | <p>Decision : Accept in part</p> <p>Reasons : Accept part (a) of the recommendation for the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report.</p> <p>Do not accept part (b) of the recommendation. Policy UR4 aims to minimise development on unallocated Greenfield sites. The proposed addition provides further exceptions which could weaken the policy and allow Greenfield windfall. The policy sets out clearly what overriding reasons for allowing on greenfield land and follows the general thrust of national and regional guidance in particular PPG3 . The proposed additional text does not provide clarity in where such situations arise, rather it goes further than those situation outlined Under UR4 and is in conflict with the Inspectors approach elsewhere in consideration of housing supply and monitoring. The housing chapter is drafted whereby supply is monitored and</p> | Mod/P F/UR/4 |

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Policy Framework Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

| SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No. | Inspector’s Recommendation | CBMDC Decision and Reasons | Mod Ref |
|--|---|---|-----------------|
| | | mechanisms are put in place to tackle over or under supply which does not result in the development of Greenfield windfall sites. The proposal to use the trigger of a shortfall of housing as an overriding reason conflicts both this general approach and with the Inspector’s recommendations elsewhere relating to monitoring which have been accepted by the Council (see SD/PF/H/2 & SD/PF/H/7). | |
| <p>SD- SD/PF/UR/7</p> <p>UDP – Policy UR5 & Paragraph 4.19 & 4.20 Safeguarded Land</p> <p>IR –Policy Framework Paragraphs 4.21-4.23, Pages 29 – 30</p> | <p>I recommend that the RDDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>Paragraph 4.20 - delete “other sites all of which are not appropriate for development in the Plan period but would be reconsidered for development at Plan review”.</p> | <p>Decision : Accept</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report.</p> | Mod/P F/UR/5 |
| <p>SD- SD/PF/UR/8</p> <p>UDP – Policy UR6 & Paragraph 4.24 Planning Obligations & Conditions</p> <p>IR –Policy Framework Paragraphs 4.24-4.27, Pages 30 – 31</p> | <p>I recommend that the RDDP be modified as follows:</p> <p>[a] Paragraph 4.23a - delete “would” in the three places where it occurs, and replace with “could”;</p> <p>[b] Paragraph 4.24 - delete.</p> | <p>Decision : Accept</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report.</p> | Mod/P F/UR/6 |

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Policy Framework Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

| SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No. | Inspector’s Recommendation | CBMDC Decision and Reasons | Mod Ref |
|---|--|--|-----------------|
| <p>SD- SD/PF/UR/9</p> <p>UDP – POL/DW/UR7 and POL/DW/UR8:</p> <p>Site - mxd use areas & new mixed use areas or action areas</p> <p>IR –Policy Framework Paragraphs 4.28-4.31, Pages 31- 32</p> | <p>I recommend that the RDDP be modified as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">POLICIES UR7 and UR8 - delete and replace with a single policy</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">POLICY URx</p> <p>WITHIN THE AREAS DESIGNATED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP AS MIXED USE AREAS, DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS WILL BE PERMITTED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PROVISIONS SET OUT IN THE CONSTITUENCY VOLUMES OF THE PLAN. NEW MIXED USE AREAS MAY BE IDENTIFIED DURING THE LIFE OF THE PLAN, WHERE THESE ARE CONSIDERED TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL OR ENVIRONMENTAL REGENERATION OF THE DISTRICT.</p> | <p>Decision : Accept</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report.</p> | Mod/P F/UR/7 |
| <p>SD- SD/PF/UR/10</p> <p>UDP – POL/DW/UR9, POL/DW/UR10, POL/DW/UR11 and paragraph 4.45a</p> <p>IR – Policy Framework Paragraphs 4.32-4.35, Pages 32- 33</p> | <p>I recommend that the RDDP be modified as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">[a] Proposals Map - delete the Area Based Regeneration Strategies designation.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">[b] Paragraph 4.45a – delete and replace with</p> <p style="padding-left: 80px;">Within the above SRB areas, Estate Action Areas and the New Deal (Trident) area, and where village design statements exist, which have been prepared in the proper manner and are consistent with the plan, proposals for new development should have regard to these approved planning frameworks.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">[c] Paragraph 4.48 - delete the last sentence.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">[d] Add a policy for action areas</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">POLICY URx</p> <p>WITHIN AREAS DESIGNATED AS ACTION AREAS NEW</p> | <p>Decision : Accept</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report.</p> | Mod/P F/UR/8 |

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Policy Framework Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

| SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No. | Inspector’s Recommendation | CBMDC Decision and Reasons | Mod Ref |
|---|--|---|--------------------|
| | DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDED THAT THEY ARE IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND DISPOSITION OF USES SET OUT IN THE RELEVANT CONSTITUENCY VOLUME OF THE PLAN, AND HAVING REGARD TO THE DETAILED PLANNING GUIDANCE. | | |
| SD - SD/PF/UR/11 UDP – Policy Omission 1 Empty Homes IR – Policy Framework Paragraphs 4.36-4.37, Page 31 | I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP | Decision : Accept Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report. | N/A |
| SD- SD/PF/UR/12 UDP – POM/57 Site - Housing Improvement IR – Policy Framework Page 34 | I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP. | Decision : Accept Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report. | N/A |

INSPECTORS REPORT – STATEMENT OF DECISIONS
UDP – Policy Framework Chapter 4 Urban Renaissance

| SD Ref UDP – Case Ref IR – Page No. | Inspector’s Recommendation | CBMDC Decision and Reasons | Mod Ref |
|--|---|--|--------------------|
| <p>SD - SD/PF/UR/13</p> <p>UDP – Policy Omission 65 Telecommunications & Transport</p> <p>IR – Policy Framework Paragraphs 4.40-4.41, Page 35</p> | <p>I recommend that no modification be made to the RDDP</p> | <p>Decision : Accept</p> <p>Reasons : For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report.</p> | <p>N/A</p> |