

Bradford Local Plan - Core Strategy Partial Review (Preferred Options)

Housing and Infrastructure Workshop

Tuesday 3rd September 2019

Workshop Notes - Part 1

What are your views on how the plan addressed housing growth?

- Some general support for using SM as a baseline for calculating housing need.
- Considered by some that there are other demographic factors which support an uplift in affordable housing numbers.
- Economic growth ambitions - it was argued by some that the council has not uplifted the baseline figure to reflect growth aspirations - no evidence was given as to what the uplift should be.
- Suggested that the overall requirement should be higher and that the plan was not being ambitious enough. Possibly should be closer to levels set out in the existing Core Strategy (2017).
- Ambitious growth targets viewed as being important to attract infrastructure investment.
- There was a view that provision should be guided more by the market.
- Difficult to accurately forecast economic change – particularly in light of Brexit.
- Concerns about the future of the Bradford economy – needs to avoid being a commuter city for Leeds.
- Viability of sites, particularly within the Bradford urban area, was viewed as being a factor that will influence future housing delivery.

Your views on the approach to determining distribution?

- Housing Distribution - it was argued that in Wharfedale Ilkley as a principle town should accommodate a greater level of growth than places like Burley which have seen a much less reduction in housing numbers. This is because Ilkley as a principle town will have a greater level of services and access to local jobs.
- Housing Distribution – was noted that several settlements had their housing requirement reduced to zero e.g. East Morton and Oakworth. A query was raised regarding future growth and development in such settlements. They were viewed as being popular locations to live.
- City Centre - there was a suggestion that the city centre and its regeneration should be more focussed towards employment uses rather than residential. It was questioned whether there was a market for city centre living
- Affordable housing - question on how the distribution has considered the viability of delivering affordable housing - e.g. development in Wharfedale will have greater financial viability to deliver affordable housing than other areas such as Bradford city centre.
- Plan period - questions about transition and weight given to emerging policies in light of current/future planning applications and housing numbers. Also clarification

needed on what counts towards the new plan.

Will the housing policies support the delivery of the right type, size and mix of housing?

- The affordable housing policy HO11 needs to be stronger in requiring on site affordable housing rather than off site commuted sums.
- Small sites - it was also argued a more sustainable approach in line with NPPF requirements would be to look for small sites for SME builders in a larger range of settlements, resulting from the GBR and rounding off opportunities identified in small settlements with limited harm to GB.
- Housing Density - It was suggested that achieving higher densities on some sites may not be possible due to the typography of the district. This was likely to result in lower densities thus not achieving the required housing numbers on such sites.
- Housing Mix - needs to be more balanced in terms of smaller houses
- Housing Mix – was considered that areas should be mixed in terms of housing types. Also greater understanding is needed of the value of the social and environmental elements in creating communities where people want to live.
- Affordable housing – how will the Council enforce this (delivery is often lower than policy target)? Need a transparent approach to viability assessments.
- How is the housing mix going to be enforced?
- Not on the basis of previous developments.
- The emerging Housing & Neighbourhood Design Guide SPD was considered a good piece of work and would assist in helping to deliver good quality development

Others Issues Raised

- Settlement hierarchy - it was suggested this should be considered through the CSPR. In particular in light of updated HRA evidence/Infrastructure evidence and impact on places like Burley in Wharfedale. It was therefore considered that there is new evidence to justify looking at this again.
- Concerns around the plan period and should the forward plan reflect recent planning permissions and build out.
- Numbers don't take into consideration delivery figures during current plan period – overlap between current core strategy and new 2020 plan period needs explanation.
- Should be greater linkages to where housing is provided and where people work.

Workshop Notes - Part 2

What are the key infrastructure priorities to support housing growth?

- Distribution - potential for using funding such as CIL to help deliver more housing on PDL/ex industrial land - i.e. pay for decontamination.
- Delivery - the council should work closer with Homes England in terms of support to incentive bringing forward land and sites.
- CIL - needs to be reconsidered in light of needs for sites to fund education and latest viability evidence etc
- Use CIL to support local needs – contribution which goes to parish Councils is too

low – is there a policy solution?

- Needs to address transport issues across the District – domination of private car – public transport capacity and affordability needs to be addressed.
- Lack of healthcare improvements to meet increasing needs.
- Lack of sufficient education provision and potential need to allocation sites for schools?
- Need to consider the impacts of pupils travelling across local authority boundaries to access schooling, in particular to/from Wharfedale and Leeds. Has resulted in increased car usage.
- Education is important – not just places but quality.
- Utility capacity including the sewer system a potential issue in some locations.
- Social infrastructure important and not often prioritised – has a key role in supporting safe communities
- Infrastructure location is important – also ensuring that consideration is given to building density near existing infrastructure.
- Green infrastructure can play a role in counteracting pollution.
- The public perception of infrastructure is important – public transport for example.
- Currently a lack of identified resources to deliver adequate infrastructure to support housing.
- Committed improvements, particularly in respect of the area's rail network need to be brought forward as soon as possible. Suggested that more train services should stop at Apperley Bridge station.
- Broadband infrastructure – should be made easier for providers to install broadband infrastructure within the district through a review policies towards utilities works on highway.
- Leeds City Region links - considered that better links with the wider Leeds City Region were needed in order to help economic benefits for the district. The introduction of a tram/train or tram was suggested. Noted that the economies of cities with tram networks were performing well.
- Highway improvements – required at several local required at several locations on the highway network, particularly within the Bradford urban area, to ease traffic flow – e.g. at Four Lane Ends and within the city centre.
- Northern Powerhouse Rail - this project together with associated redevelopment opportunities is viewed as being vital for delivery of the Council's wider Economic Strategy

Can these be categorised / prioritised? Short, Medium and Long Term?

- Short term – bus and trains
- Medium term – drainage, education, better joined up thinking, energy
- Long term – improve infrastructure constraints

What do you consider the key information and intelligence gaps in infrastructure planning?

- Air quality impacts need to be fully understood.

- Need to plan for education places early and prior to finalising housing
- Need to review / address affordability in Airedale / Wharfedale.
- Need to ensure that key Leeds City Region documentation/plans are considered in preparing the Local Plan and Local Infrastructure Plan including Leeds City Region Infrastructure Map/Plan, Leeds City Region Connectivity Study, and West Yorkshire Transport Plan 2040.

Other Issues Raised

- Windfall - arguments for higher & lower levels than assumed. Evidence of conversions of buildings suggests a higher allowance starting from year 1 of the plan is needed. Too high as windfall is considered high due to absence of sites.
- Windfall figures need to be supported/justified.
- Green Belt Review – the need for it was queried due to the proposed reduction in housing numbers. It was felt that there was sufficient brownfield/previously developed land to accommodate the proposed levels of housing growth without encroaching into the Green Belt. Therefore, it was suggested that a review was unnecessary. The timescale for the review was also raised.