

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS

UDP – Policy Framework Chapter 9 Design

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
<p>Mod - Mod/PF/D/1</p> <p>UDP – Policy D1 General Design Considerations</p> <p>IR – Policy Framework paragraphs 9.1-9.4 pages 138-139.</p>	<p>“Policy D1 ALL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS SHOULD MAKE A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND QUALITY OF LIFE THROUGH HIGH QUALITY DESIGN, LAYOUT AND LANDSCAPING. IN PARTICULAR THEY SHOULD:</p> <p>(1) BE WELL RELATED TO THE EXISTING CHARACTER OF THE LOCALITY IN TERMS OF DESIGN, SCALE, MASSING, HEIGHT AND MATERIALS;</p> <p>(2) PROVIDE A QUALITY SETTING FOR THE DEVELOPMENT;</p> <p>(3) RETAIN, AND WHERE APPROPRIATE ENHANCE, IMPORTANT ECOLOGICAL AND LANDSCAPE FEATURES;</p> <p>(4) NOT INTRUDE ON TO PROMINENT SKYLINES;</p> <p>(5) RELATE TO EXISTING NATURAL AND BUILT FEATURES, LANDMARKS OR VIEWS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO THE AREA;</p> <p>(6) INCORPORATE ADEQUATE DESIGN ARRANGEMENTS FOR SERVICING, WASTE HANDLING, RECYCLING AND STORAGE;</p> <p>(7) ALLOW FOR FLEXIBILITY TO ADAPT TO MEET CHANGING NEEDS AND CIRCUMSTANCES.</p> <p>(8) NOT HARM THE AMENITY OF PROSPECTIVE OR EXISTING USERS</p>	<p>“Policy D1 ALL DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS SHOULD MAKE A POSITIVE CONTRIBUTION TO THE ENVIRONMENT AND QUALITY OF LIFE THROUGH HIGH QUALITY DESIGN, LAYOUT AND LANDSCAPING. IN PARTICULAR THEY SHOULD:</p> <p>(1) BE WELL RELATED TO THE EXISTING CHARACTER OF THE LOCALITY IN TERMS OF DESIGN, SCALE, MASSING, HEIGHT AND MATERIALS;</p> <p>(2) PROVIDE A QUALITY SETTING FOR THE DEVELOPMENT;</p> <p>(3) RETAIN, AND WHERE APPROPRIATE ENHANCE, IMPORTANT ECOLOGICAL AND LANDSCAPE FEATURES;</p> <p>(4) NOT INTRUDE ON TO PROMINENT SKYLINES;</p> <p>(5) RELATE TO EXISTING NATURAL AND BUILT FEATURES, LANDMARKS OR VIEWS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO THE AREA;</p> <p>(6) INCORPORATE ADEQUATE DESIGN ARRANGEMENTS FOR SERVICING, WASTE HANDLING, RECYCLING AND STORAGE;</p> <p>(7) ALLOW FOR FLEXIBILITY TO ADAPT TO MEET CHANGING NEEDS AND CIRCUMSTANCES AND PROVIDE FOR ACCESS FOR THOSE WITH PHYSICAL DISABILITIES;</p>	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report</p>

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS

UDP – Policy Framework Chapter 9 Design

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
	<p>AND RESIDENTS.</p> <p>GOOD CONTEMPORARY DESIGN WHICH IS SYMPATHETIC OR COMPLEMENTARY TO ITS SETTING WILL BE WELCOMED.”</p>	<p>(8) NOT HARM THE AMENITY OF PROSPECTIVE OR EXISTING USERS AND RESIDENTS.</p> <p>GOOD CONTEMPORARY DESIGN WHICH IS SYMPATHETIC OR COMPLEMENTARY TO ITS SETTING WILL BE WELCOMED.”</p>	
<p>Mod - Mod/PF/D/2</p> <p>UDP - Paragraph 9.44a</p> <p>IR – Policy Framework paragraphs 9.10-9.11, pages 140-141</p>	<p>“9.44a It is important to conserve and integrate within development important existing landscape features such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rivers, canals and streams, • ponds reservoirs and mill dams, • wetlands, • woodland, or parkland trees • hedgerows • stone walls including field patterns • rock outcrops • Natural valley (especially glacial) landforms” 	<p>“9.44a It is important to conserve and integrate within development important existing landscape features such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rivers, canals and streams, • ponds reservoirs and mill dams, • wetlands, • woodland, or parkland trees • hedgerows • stone walls including field patterns • rock outcrops • Natural valley (especially glacial) landforms • <i>Species rich grassland</i> 	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p>
<p>Mod - Mod/PF/D/3</p> <p>UDP – Paragraph 9.52e</p> <p>IR – Policy Framework paragraphs 9.12-9.13, page 141.</p>	<p>9.52e The planning of routes and location of stops needs careful consideration. Successful public transport relies upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • routes which follow principal roads and streets through the heart of an area • stops located where activity is concentrated, near shops or road junctions • clear walking routes to the stops. <p>Bus stops should be located and</p>	<p>9.52e The planning of routes and location of stops needs careful consideration. Successful public transport relies upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • routes which follow principal roads and streets through the heart of an area • stops located where activity is concentrated, near shops or road junctions • clear walking routes to the stops. <p>Bus stops should be located and</p>	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector's report</p>

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – Policy Framework Chapter 9 Design

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
	<p>designed to be accessible both for pedestrians but also to enable close docking by buses. Particular care needs to taken to ensure bus stops are located away from car parking which could inhibit bus access to stops.</p>	<p>designed to be accessible both for pedestrians but also to enable close docking by buses. Particular care needs to be taken to ensure bus stops that car parking is located so as not to cause inconvenience or obstacles to buses and their users are located away from car parking which could inhibit bus access to stops.</p>	
<p>Mod - Mod/PF/D/4</p> <p>UDP - Policy D11 & paragraph 9.81</p> <p>IR – Policy Framework paragraphs 9.19-9.22, pages 142-143</p>	<p>“Policy D11 ON CORRIDORS DEFINED AS ‘GATEWAY ROADS’ ON THE PROPOSALS MAPS DEVELOPMENT ALONGSIDE OR HIGHLY VISIBLE FROM THESE CORRIDORS SHOULD BE OF THE HIGHEST POSSIBLE STANDARD IN DESIGN, MATERIALS, LANDSCAPING AND BOUNDARY TREATMENT AND SHALL TAKE ACCOUNT OF DETAILED GATEWAY DESIGN GUIDANCE WHERE APPLICABLE”</p> <p>9.81 Over the life of the Plan initiatives will be taken by the Council, in partnership with other bodies and the private sector, to improve the appearance of these important routes and points into the District. In order to create a unified and identifiable image for these routes the Council will take opportunities as resources allow to prepare gateway design guides and proposals, promote partnership agreements with the private and voluntary sectors and carry out environmental and other improvements. An initial scheme is under implementation on Manchester Road as part of the Manchester Road guided bus initiative. Other priorities include the</p>	<p>“Policy D11 ON CORRIDORS DEFINED AS ‘GATEWAY ROADS’ ON THE PROPOSALS MAPS DEVELOPMENT ALONGSIDE OR HIGHLY VISIBLE FROM THESE CORRIDORS SHOULD BE OF THE HIGHEST POSSIBLE STANDARD IN DESIGN, MATERIALS, LANDSCAPING AND BOUNDARY TREATMENT AND SHALL TAKE ACCOUNT OF DETAILED GATEWAY DESIGN GUIDANCE WHERE APPLICABLE”</p> <p>“9.81 Over the life of the Plan initiatives will be taken by the Council, in partnership with other bodies and the private sector, to improve the appearance of these important routes and points into the District. In order to create a unified and identifiable image for these routes the Council will take opportunities as resources allow to prepare gateway design guides and proposals, promote partnership agreements with the private and voluntary sectors and carry out environmental and other improvements. Any guidance produced would be subject to consultation and could be adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance. The guidance would be a</p>	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report</p>

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – Policy Framework Chapter 9 Design

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
	M606 corridor and other principal routes and links into the District from the motorway system.”	material consideration in determining planning applications. An initial scheme is under implementation on Manchester Road as part of the Manchester Road guided bus initiative. Other priorities include the M606 corridor and other principal routes and links into the District from the motorway system.”	
Mod - Mod/PF/D/5 UDP – Policy D12 Tall Buildings IR – Policy Framework paragraphs 9.23-9.25, pages 143-144.	<p>“Policy D12 PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR TALL BUILDINGS WHERE THEY SIGNAL THE LOCATION OF AN INTERSECTION OF THE BRADFORD OUTER RING ROAD AND A PRIMARY RADIAL ROAD, THE CITY CENTRE, THE THORNTON ROAD CORRIDOR AND THE STAYGATE AREA SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) THE PROTECTION OF KEY VIEWS AND VISTAS AS MAY BE DEFINED (2) BE IN KEEPING WITH AND DO NOT DETRACT OR DAMAGE IMPORTANT HERITAGE ASSETS (3) NOT CREATE UNACCEPTABLE OVERSHADOWING OF ADJOINING PROPERTY THROUGH LOSS OF DAYLIGHT OR SUNLIGHT (4) BE SHOWN NOT TO CREATE UNACCEPTABLE LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS INCLUDING WIND TURBULENCE (5) BE OF AN APPROPRIATE FUNCTION 	<p>“Policy D12 PLANNING PERMISSION WILL BE GRANTED FOR TALL BUILDINGS WHERE THEY SIGNAL THE LOCATION OF AN INTERSECTION OF THE BRADFORD OUTER RING ROAD AND A PRIMARY RADIAL ROAD, THE CITY CENTRE, THE THORNTON ROAD CORRIDOR AND THE STAYGATE AREA SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) THE PROTECTION OF KEY VIEWS AND VISTAS AS MAY BE DEFINED (2) BE IN KEEPING WITH AND DO NOT DETRACT FROM OR DAMAGE IMPORTANT HERITAGE ASSETS (3) NOT CREATE UNACCEPTABLE OVERSHADOWING OF ADJOINING PROPERTY THROUGH LOSS OF DAYLIGHT OR SUNLIGHT (4) BE SHOWN NOT TO CREATE UNACCEPTABLE LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS INCLUDING WIND TURBULENCE (5) BE OF AN APPROPRIATE FUNCTION FOR THE LOCALITY 	

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – Policy Framework Chapter 9 Design

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
	<p>FOR THE LOCALITY</p> <p>(6) BE OF HIGH QUALITY DESIGN</p> <p>(7) WHERE THE CONSTRUCTION OF A LOWER BUILDING WOULD BE INCONGRUOUS</p> <p>(8) BE LOCATED WHERE THERE IS GOOD PUBLIC TRANSPORT PROVISION AND WHERE OTHER NON-CAR MODES COULD BE ENCOURAGED</p> <p>(9) THE BUILDING SHOULD RELATE TO THEIR CONTEXT INCLUDING BOTH TOPOGRAPHY AND BUILT FORM, AND AFFECT ON THE SKYLINE.”</p>	<p>(6) BE OF HIGH QUALITY DESIGN</p> <p>(7) WHERE THE CONSTRUCTION OF A LOWER BUILDING WOULD BE INCONGRUOUS</p> <p>(8) BE LOCATED WHERE THERE IS GOOD PUBLIC TRANSPORT PROVISION AND WHERE OTHER NON-CAR MODES COULD BE ENCOURAGED</p> <p>(9) THE BUILDING SHOULD RELATE TO THEIR CONTEXT INCLUDING BOTH TOPOGRAPHY AND BUILT FORM, AND AFFECT EFFECT ON THE SKYLINE.”</p>	
<p>Mod - Mod/PF/D/6</p> <p>UDP - Paragraph 9.92B</p> <p>IR – Policy Framework paragraphs 9.26-9.27, page 144</p>	<p>“9.92b Important heritage assets include conservation areas as assessed, listed buildings and their settings, scheduled ancient monument s and the World Heritage site and its buffer zone.”</p>	<p>“9.92b Important heritage assets include conservation areas as assessed, listed buildings and their settings, scheduled ancient monument s and the World Heritage site and its buffer zone.”</p>	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report</p>
<p>Mod - Mod/PF/D/7</p> <p>UDP – Paragraph 9.109</p>	<p>“9.109 In the interests of amenity, poster advertisements/hoardings will not normally be acceptable in or adjacent to, predominantly residential areas, or at an entrance point into a residential area or in the open countryside. Within commercial and industrial areas</p>	<p>“9.109 In the interests of amenity, poster advertisements/hoardings and mobile ‘A’ hoardings will not normally be acceptable in or adjacent to, predominantly residential areas, or at an entrance point into a residential area or in the open countryside.</p>	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report</p>

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – Policy Framework Chapter 9 Design

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
<p>IR – Policy Framework paragraphs 9.32-9.33, pages 145-146.</p>	<p>they will only be allowed if they are in scale with adjacent buildings or screen unsightly land or buildings, and should at least maintain and, where necessary, enhance the character and appearance of the local environment. In mixed commercial/residential areas much greater care should be taken in the siting of poster advertisements.”</p>	<p>Within commercial and industrial areas they will only be allowed if they are in scale with adjacent buildings or screen unsightly land or buildings, and should at least maintain and, where necessary, enhance the character and appearance of the local environment. In mixed commercial/residential areas much greater care should be taken in the siting of poster advertisements.”</p>	
<p>Mod - Mod/PF/D/8</p> <p>UDP - Paragraph 9.113</p> <p>IR – Policy Framework paragraphs 9.34-9.35, pages 146-147</p>	<p>9.113 Telecommunications systems have developed rapidly in the past decade and have become an essential element of modern life. Current planning guidance is set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 8 “Telecommunications” (December 1992), supplemented by Circular 04/99 ‘Planning for telecommunications’. The Government’s general policy on telecommunications is to facilitate the growth of new and existing systems, whilst at the same time protecting the amenity in both urban and rural areas, recognising the potential adverse effect of such developments.”</p>	<p>“9.113 Telecommunications systems have developed rapidly in the past decade and have become an essential element of modern life. Current planning guidance is set out in Planning Policy Guidance Note 8 (Revised) “Telecommunications” (December 1992 August 2001), supplemented by Circular 04/99 ‘Planning for telecommunications’. The Government’s general policy on telecommunications is to facilitate the growth of new and existing systems, whilst at the same time protecting the amenity in both urban and rural areas, recognising the potential adverse effect of such developments.”</p>	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report</p>
<p>Mod - Mod/PF/D/9</p> <p>UDP – Policy D16 Paragraph 9.116 Telecommunications</p>	<p>“Policy D16</p> <p>PROPOSALS FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE LIGHT OF TECHNICAL AND OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDED THAT</p>	<p>“Policy D16</p> <p>PROPOSALS FOR TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEVELOPMENT WILL BE CONSIDERED IN THE LIGHT OF TECHNICAL AND OPERATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDED THAT THESE ARE NOT OUTWEIGHED</p>	<p>For the reasons set out in the Inspector’s report</p>

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS

UDP – Policy Framework Chapter 9 Design

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
IR – Policy Framework paragraphs 9.36-9.44, pages 147-149.	THESE ARE NOT OUTWEIGHED BY: (1) ADVERSE EFFECT ON THE APPEARANCE OR CHARACTER OF ITS SURROUNDINGS IN TERMS OF ITS SCALE, DESIGN AND SITING; (2) ADVERSE EFFECT ON THE AMENITY OF ADJOINING RESIDENTIAL AREAS.	BY: (1) ADVERSE EFFECT ON THE APPEARANCE OR CHARACTER OF ITS SURROUNDINGS IN TERMS OF ITS SCALE, DESIGN AND SITING; (2) ADVERSE EFFECT ON THE AMENITY OF ADJOINING RESIDENTIAL AREAS.	
	9.116 DEVELOPERS WILL HAVE TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THE AVAILABILITY OF AND THE BENEFITS AND IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVE SITES AND DEVELOPMENTS, INCLUDING MAST SHARING HAVE BEEN INVESTIGATED.	9.116 DEVELOPERS WILL HAVE TO DEMONSTRATE THAT THE AVAILABILITY AND SUITABILITY OF AND THE BENEFITS AND IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVE SITES AND DEVELOPMENTS, INCLUDING MAST SHARING HAVE BEEN INVESTIGATED.	
	9.117 The policy seeks to balance the protection of amenity in urban and rural areas with the needs of telecommunications development.	9.117 9.116 The policy seeks to balance the protection of amenity in urban and rural areas with the needs of telecommunications development.	
	9.118 Under the policy, applicants will have to show evidence that opportunities for mast sharing and alternative sites have been fully explored; and siting and design have carefully been considered along with appropriate measures to avoid adverse impact; including landscaping and screening.	9.118 9.117 Under the policy, applicants will have to show evidence that opportunities for mast sharing and alternative sites have been fully explored; and siting and design have carefully been considered along with appropriate measures to avoid adverse impact; including landscaping and screening.	
	9.119 Major telecommunications installations will present particular	9.119 Major telecommunications installations will present particular	The Council will also consider the suitability of the alternative sites with regard to technical and

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – Policy Framework Chapter 9 Design

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
	<p>problems when proposed in Countryside locations which have been identified as being high or highest quality landscape for example Special Landscape Areas. While having regard to the special needs and technical problems of telecommunications development: In such locations, proposals will need to show that, no more environmentally acceptable alternatives exist and that every attempt has been made to minimise obtrusiveness by siting and design.</p> <p>9.120 There is much public concern around the possible adverse health impacts of telecommunication development, in particular the effect of electro magnetic fields (EMFs) from masts. The Stewart Report published in May 2000 examined the health effects from the use of mobile phones, base stations and transmitters. In respect of base stations the report concluded that “the balance of evidence indicates that there is no general risk to the health of people living near to base stations on the basis that exposures are expected to be small fractions of the guidelines.” However, gaps in current scientific knowledge led the group to recommend a precautionary approach to the use of mobile phone technologies. In line with the approach recommended by the report, all mobile phone base stations will have to meet the guidelines of the International</p>	<p>9.119 9.118 <i>operational requirements. In order to promote mast and site sharing the Council has compiled a register of telecommunications sites.</i></p> <p>Major telecommunications installations will present particular problems when proposed in Countryside locations which have been identified as being high or highest quality landscape for example Special Landscape Areas. While having regard to the special needs and technical problems of telecommunications development: In such locations, proposals will need to show that, no more environmentally acceptable alternatives exist and that every attempt has been made to minimise obtrusiveness by siting and design.</p> <p>9.120 9.119 There is much public concern around the possible adverse health impacts of telecommunication development, in particular the effect of electro magnetic fields (EMFs) from masts. The Stewart Report published in May 2000 examined the health effects from the use of mobile phones, base stations and transmitters. In respect of base stations the report concluded that “the balance of evidence indicates that there is no general risk to the health of people living near to base stations on the</p>	

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – Policy Framework Chapter 9 Design

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
	<p>Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) for limiting the exposure to electromagnetic fields. Clear exclusion zones should be in place around all base station antennas to prevent the public from exposure to radio frequency radiation above ICNIRP guidelines. (These exclusion zones relate to an area directly in front of and at the height of the antenna). All applicants should include with their applications, a statement to certify that the apparatus complies with the ICNIRP guidelines, and should also indicate for each site its location, height of the antenna, the frequency and modulation characteristics, and details of power output.”</p>	<p>basis that exposures are expected to be small fractions of the guidelines.” However, gaps in current scientific knowledge led the group to recommend a precautionary approach to the use of mobile phone technologies. <i>The Government accepted the ‘precautionary approach’ as set out in the Stewart Report and incorporated into Revised PPG8.</i> In line with the approach recommended by the report <i>as incorporated in revised PPG8</i>, all mobile phone base stations will have to meet the guidelines of the International Commission on Non-Ionising Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) for limiting the exposure to electromagnetic fields. Clear exclusion zones should be in place around all base station antennas to prevent the public from exposure to radio frequency radiation above ICNIRP guidelines. (These exclusion zones relate to an area directly in front of and at the height of the antenna). All applicants should include with their applications, a statement to certify that the apparatus complies with the ICNIRP guidelines, and should also indicate for each site its location, height of the antenna, the frequency and modulation characteristics, and details of power output.</p> <p>9.120 <i>The Council is committed to producing supplementary</i></p>	

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – Policy Framework Chapter 9 Design

Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No.	Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>)	Proposed Modification	Reason for Modification
		<i>planning document on telecommunications development.”</i>	