



Bingley Town Council, Myrtle Place, Bingley, BD16 2LF

Minutes of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group meeting held at The Hub, Myrtle Place, Bingley on Monday 9th January 2023

Councillors present: Gibbons (PG), Williams (SW)
Councillors absent: Beckwith, Dawson, Truelove

Non-member Councillors in attendance: None

Non Councillor members present: John Dekker (JD), Tony Urwin (TU)

In attendance: Eve Haskins (EH, Town Clerk), Lee Searles (LS,

Consultant)

Members of the public: None

Start: 6.30pm Finish: 8.35pm

2223/48 Apologies for Absence

Resolved to receive apologies, and to approve the reasons for absence, from Andrew Quarrie and Councillor Mark Truelove.

2223/49 Disclosures of interest

None received.

No written requests for dispensation received.

2223/50 Minutes

Resolved to confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 28th November 2022.

2223/51 Confidential items to be discussed in confidence after item 2223/58

No item to be discussed in confidence after item 2223/58, following exclusion of the press and public, due to its sensitive nature.

2223/52 Public Participation

None.

2223/53 Draft Neighbourhood Plan

The draft Plan was discussed, and the following highlighted:

- LS reported that since the last meeting the town centre boundary was amended/other changes
 made as agreed at the meeting, and now awaiting consultation responses on the proposed
 Local Green Space and Built Heritage Local Character Buildings and Structures for any further
 changes.
- Agreed that LS and EH to liaise to ensure that all current and historic documents are available
 on the Teams site for the document designer and on the website for the public (including
 relevant dates on the latter).
- Agreed that the following amendments are made to the headings 'Social Objectives' and
 'Environmental Objectives' under Section 24, Table 1 Bing5 respectively, to ensure that the
 Plan is seen to be mindful of these objectives: 'Encourages growing working community to
 remain within Bingley area and benefit from local, internally generated, economic growth and

socialising'; and 'Contributes to reduced travelling requirements going out of and in to the Bingley area': LS to make the amendments accordingly.

2223/54 AECOM documents

SW confirmed that AECOM documents have been amended to incorporate the town centre boundary and other changes as previously agreed, which have now been sent to Locality for approval. Agreed that SW to liaise with Iain Cunningham at Bradford Council regarding the town centre boundary, the progress of the Plan as a whole prior to the Regulation 14 consultation and for an update on the Levelling Up bid for Bingley.

2223/55 Property owners' initial consultation

SW confirmed that the amended letter was sent out to landowners for responses on the Green Spaces and Character Buildings and Structures proposals in the Plan. Each response was discussed as follows:

- One response to the Green Space proposal, from the landowner of site number 18 Fields to the north and west of Five Rise Farm (ruins): the objection consisted of two main parts, (i) that the space did not have public access, and (ii) that it was not connected with Five Rise Locks in any way. The Working Group considered this and agreed that the Plan should continue to try to offer protection via the Green Space nomination for this space as it would be to the detriment of the town if it were to be infilled with housing or industrial buildings. LS advised strengthening the justification in the tables for these sites: agreed that SW and TU to work on amending the inclusion of site 18 to upgrade the information/justification provided.
- Several responses to Character Buildings and Structures proposals received regarding the stone walls in Priestthorpe:
 - One owner sent two responses, one asking why the walls should be seen as a special structure and not all other walls in Bradford, and suggesting that this is a revenue making scheme. The Working Group acknowledged that a few responses expressed the concern that the heritage site would be a precursor to a designated heritage site, which may end up costing the owners money, however highlighted that this is not the Plan's aim. Agreed that this needs to be made clear within the consultation document, and agreed that all responders to be advised that responses to their queries will be included in the consultation document.
 - A response regarding the walls at Wingfield Court, and gate posts: the Working Group agreed that this should remain as part of Bingley's historical heritage, however also highlighted that the listing of the walls is confusing as it is not sufficiently comprehensive or specific.
 - Another response regarding the walls asked for more clarification: agreed that the walls' document therefore needs upgrading also for clarity. LS advised that the Plan needs to address why this wall and not others.
 - Another response regarding the walls asked whether the owners of the locations where
 the post boxes were sited have been consulted: SW confirmed that only the Royal Mail
 has been consulted regarding the post boxes rather than individual site owners also.
 Another noted that the 'historic ambience' of the post boxes has already gone due to
 the communications boxes being placed next to them.
- A response to the Character Buildings and Structures regarding the proposal to protect Eldwick Church stated that the church has gone through significant renovation and change: agreed that it is the frontage which the Plan aims to protect/preserve, similarly to the old Bankfield Hotel (Mercure), therefore need to be more specific - JD to liaise with the responder regarding this.
- Several responses to the Beck Houses proposal, including several issues:
 - o The description comes from hearsay regarding the history, rather than proven evidence.
 - 1 and 2 Beck Houses were taken as the original buildings, therefore omitted numbers 3,
 3A, 4 and 5 on the initial consultation: these owners have now been sent a letter.

- Responses outline the existence of a covenant which seeks to protect the colour etc. Working Group agreed that the covenant would not be relevant to a planning application, and also that the Plan can seek to protect the colour even if it is not original. LS advised that the Plan needs to justify the inclusion of heritage assets, including why it is valuable in the community: all agreed that this section of the Plan needs to be reviewed to tighten up the justifications included.
- Another response to the Plan itself queried why all terrace houses had not been included: agreed that this is not the focus of the policy, and that Bradford Council would need to determine heritage status as the district authority.

2223/56 Regulation 14 Consultation

• Design of Plan:

SW confirmed that the Plan designer has been agreed, and they have been given access to Parish Online to investigate the inclusion of maps: EH to ensure that they have access to the Teams site, once all documents are confirmed as up to date.

Consultation questions:

PG confirmed that she has begun to investigate the use of Survey Monkey: agreed that 9 or 10 specific questions to be asked, with a comment form at the end – PG to arrange this to circulate to all.

• Timescales:

SW confirmed that the Plan needs to go through the design process, consultation with Iain Cunningham, and be approved by the Full Council again in its fresh iteration prior to going to Regulation 14: agreed that EH to gain advice from YLCA on whether the pre-election period restrictions will impact on the consultation period.

• Consultation approach/events:

Previously agreed that postcards to be sent to residents as part of the designer's spec, directing the public to the Survey Monkey questions, and a public facing event to be organized for a Saturday to be held at the Hub.

2223/57 Next Meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group

The next meeting of the Neighbourhood Plan Working Group will be held on 7th February 2023 at 6.30pm at the Hub, Myrtle Place, Bingley, with the consultant attending via Teams.

2223/58 Exclusion of press and public

No items to be discussed in confidence due to their confidential nature.