[**Development of retirement living accommodation, consisting of 47 No apartments (use class C3) with vehicular access, substation, landscaping, boundary treatments, amenity space and car parking provision**](https://planning.bradford.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=S9VSX0DHLQT00&prevPage=inTray)

Baildon Town Council (BTC) strongly supports the concept of retirement living apartments in this central and sensitive location within Baildon. However, BTC asks the Planning Authority to seek the following amendments prior to approval.( see below)

The support of BTC for this application is therefore conditional on the following amendments (in our comments) being accepted:

**Scale of Development**.

Our primary issue to that 47 apartments are too many for this site and 26 on-site car park spaces will be insufficient for residents, visitors and staff. BTC is opposed to any spaces in the retained public car park being leased to McCarthy Stone. Fewer apartments would reduce the parking and traffic issues.

This development will result in the loss of a large number of well used car parking spaces in the village centre. Residents and businesses in Baildon are very concerned about the economic impact on the centre of such a change. **BTC strongly opposes the proposal in the application that this loss of parking is exacerbated further through the proposal to lease 6 spaces** of the remaining reduced public parking provision , due to the development being unable to provide sufficient parking spaces for the development without such provision.

BTC consequently believes that the scale of the development is detrimental to the local economy unless steps are taken to reduce the projected car parking demand arising from this proposal. This is most likely to be achieved by a small decrease in the number of units to be provided on this site, such that the need to reduce the public car parking provision ( already reduced by more than half) through lease of an additional 6 spaces, is no longer required.

To emphasise, Baildon Town Council is wholly opposed to the lease of car parking spaces by the developer in the lower public car park , and considers that this must be avoided.

**Parking and Traffic Issues**

1. The reduction in parking places in Baildon village centre has been raised as a concern by many residents. BTC considers that McCarthy Stone must ensure that all parking associated with the residential development be confined to the residential development area itself.
2. BTC requests that Bradford Council reviews how to maximise improved parking opportunities throughout the village centre and that Bradford Council requires McCarthy Stone to make a financial contribution to support the outcomes of such a review. Maintaining adequate parking is vital in Baildon centre due to the topography ( ie built on an extremely steep hill ) and demography of Baildon Town as a whole (older that average age) This application reduces the parking in a central location and will have a damaging impact on the economic sustainability of Baildon unless steps are taken to replace the spaces lost.
3. BTC fully supports Bradford Council’s Highway Development Control Officer’s comments about the out of date and inadequate Traffic Surveys (dating back to 2015 and 2016 and only being based on day time and week day data only). BTC feels strongly that more up to date surveys must be done before this application can be approved.
4. BTC has significant concerns about the impact of this development will have on **pedestrians and traffic on Hallcliffe** when the development is operational. BTC agrees with Bradford Council’s Highway Development Control Officer comments -under the Section on Access - all pavements being subject to “Local Highway Authority specification”.
5. Further to the above comments **during the construction phase** BTC requests that all construction traffic be required to only use Baildon Road for access into the village centre. Previous recent experiences have shown that large vehicles using other roads into the village (including Hallcliffe) cause significant problems and risks for pedestrians and other traffic.
6. We welcome the more appropriate siting of the **sub station** however it is vital that this does not take up any public parking spaces.
7. The application describes at length the obvious reasons why projected cycle usage by residents may be very low. We therefore propose that the “Cycle store” be renamed “ Cycle store / garage” so that the on-site manager ( and others if space permits ) can park here thus reducing car parking pressure elsewhere, whilst still providing cycle storage space if required, ie it becomes multi-purpose and flexible) .

**Materials and design**

Detailed comments are provided at Appendix 1

**Planting**

Appropriate planting is of significant importance to the development in this sensitive, central location and BTC requests that the town council is consulted on the final planting scheme.

**Community Benefit**

This is a major development for Baildon and although we understand that the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is not applicable to such a development, we also note that McCarthy Stone have always been interested in making a contribution to community benefit within Baildon. BTC proposes McCarthy Stone make a financial contribution for community benefit as a condition of approval of the application, and for the detail of that to be agreed with BTC and Bradford Council. This could help considerably to deliver the replacement community facility which is currently stalled due to a funding shortfall.

**Environmental Measures**

BTC notes with great disappointment the failure to maximise environmental measures and we ask Bradford Council to require features which generate and conserve energy eg. solar panels and air source heat pumps.

**Errors and amendments**

It is disappointing to note a series of typological and factual errors in the application which do nothing for the credibility of the application:

* The Heritage Statement has spelt Ian Clough Hall incorrectly on every page of the report.
* The application describes the land where the development is to be built as previously ‘hotel and leisure’. It was a Council owned library.
* The Transport Statement suggest that the library and office space has been relocated to the Baildon Club. This has not yet happened.
* There is a reference to the bus services on ‘Bury New Road’ – this is in Manchester.
* There is reference to the area being well served with 4 buses per hour. This is incorrect.
* The Heritage Statement suggests that a listed structure (the Stocks) cannot be seen from the development – this is incorrect.
* Where is the “Checklist of desirable design qualities” (4.29)? It is not to be found in 4.26 as stated.

**Process**

BTC has resolved to use Bradford Council’s ‘Local Council Charter’ section 1.5 to refer the application to either a Planning Panel or the Regulatory and Appeals Committee based on material objections to the planning application and a member will attend to report BTC’s view.

**Appendix 1 Detailed Design and Materials Comments**

In such a sensitive location (perhaps the most sensitive for Baildon) then there should be a greater expectation of high-quality materials and design. It is not acceptable to just make an improvement on the ‘negative impact of ICH’ (4.27 Heritage Statement) as described in the Conservation Area Assessment. This development must make a positive contribution to the Conservation Area (NPPF para 212) ie it must preserve those elements of the setting that make a positive contribution or better reveal the asset.

1. BTC believes that inter-divisibility has not been given proper consideration or is dismissed as not relevant. It is relevant because this building is in several prominent approaches to the village – it is a landmark permanent building which will contribute to an overall impression of Baildon on all travellers.
2. Reconstructed stone (Cromwell split faced weathered) rather than natural stone has been specified. Baildon Town Council hopes that samples will be required as a pre-condition of planning.
3. There is no specification for the mortar appearance/treatment, BTC hopes that this information will be provided to Bradford Council Conservation Officers prior to approval.
4. Window design (with a good depth of recess and reveal) are not fully detailed, BTC hopes that this information will be provided to Bradford Council Conservation Officers prior to approval.
5. Balconies on stilts specified for the rear of the development (facing the church) but there is one drawn on the front at lowest point on Browgate approach.
6. The elevation facing south down Browgate is unattractive with very small openings which are inappropriate for this significant approach into the village and more detail on design should be given.
7. As this is a Conservation Area, BTC hopes that balcony design could reference balcony design on adjoining buildings rather than standard design Juliet balconies or modern styles.