



Date		
Ref		

Core Strategy Development Plan Document

Regulation 20 of the Town & Country (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012.

Publication Draft - Representation Form

PART A: PERSONAL DETAILS

* If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation in box 1 below but complete the full contact details of the agent in box 2.

	1. YOUR DETAILS*	2. AGENT DETAILS (if applicable)
Title	Mr	
First Name	[REDACTED]	
Last Name	Hickie	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)		
Address Line 1	[REDACTED]	
Line 2	[REDACTED]	
Line 3	Ilkley	
Line 4		
Post Code	LS29 [REDACTED]	
Telephone Number	[REDACTED]	
Email Address	[REDACTED]	

Signature:

Signed by email

Date:

8 March 2014

Personal Details & Data Protection Act 1998

Regulation 22 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012 requires all representations received to be submitted to the Secretary of State. By completing this form you are giving your consent to the processing of personal data by the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council and that any information received by the Council, including personal data may be put into the public domain, including on the Council's website. From the details above for you and your agent (if applicable) the Council will only publish your title, last name, organisation (if relevant) and town name or post code district. Please note that the Council cannot accept any anonymous comments.

For Office Use only:			
Date			
Ref			

PART B – YOUR REPRESENTATION - Please use a separate sheet for each representation.

3. To which part of the Plan does this representation relate?

Section	5.3	Paragraph	64	Policy	HO3
---------	-----	-----------	----	--------	-----

4. Do you consider the Plan is:

4 (1). Legally compliant	Yes		No	No
4 (2). Sound	Yes		No	No
4 (3). Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes		No	No

5. Please give details of why you consider the Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please refer to the guidance note and be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The Plan includes the development of 800 homes on green belt land around Ilkley.

These plans are inconsistent with the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular:

- NPPF Para 79, stating the importance of green belts
- NPPF Para 80, especially “to prevent towns merging into one another; to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns”
- NPPF Para 83 – “once established, green belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances”.

In addition, the whole of Ilkley comes within the 2.5km habitats protection zone designated under the HRA (Section 3 para 106).

The proposed developments on green belt land will irreversibly alter the visual appeal of the Wharfedale valley in this area, particularly destroying the view from the popular tourist attraction of the Cow and Calf Rocks. They will quite clearly be a major factor in bringing Ilkley and Burley closer together, ultimately contributing to the two towns merging in contravention of the NPPF.

Ilkley occupies a unique position at the end of a railway line from Leeds and on the A65 (popular with weekend ramblers and tourists), and on the edge of the Yorkshire Dales National Park. Ilkley Moor is itself an area of breathtaking beauty with national standing. It is regularly used as a film and TV location. All of this will be severely compromised by the scale of the development.

6. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to the soundness. (N.B Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination).

You will need to say why this modification will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

In order to make this plan sound and compliant, existing brown field sites **must** be identified and used, most likely to the south of Ilkley Moor in areas within Keighley and Bingley etc.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. Please be as precise as possible.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

7. If your representation is seeking a modification to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

8. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt when considering to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

9. Signature:

Signed by email

Date:

8 March 2014

For Office Use only:			
Date			
Ref			

PART B – YOUR REPRESENTATION - Please use a separate sheet for each representation.

3. To which part of the Plan does this representation relate?

Section	5.3	Paragraph	64	Policy	HO3
---------	-----	-----------	----	--------	-----

4. Do you consider the Plan is:

4 (1). Legally compliant	Yes		No	No
4 (2). Sound	Yes		No	No
4 (3). Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes		No	No

5. Please give details of why you consider the Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please refer to the guidance note and be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The Plan includes the development of 800 homes on green belt land around Ilkley.

These plans are unsound as Ilkley lacks the infrastructure to make a development on this scale feasible and sustainable for the following reasons:

- The existing schools and medical facilities in Ilkley are insufficient to meet the scale of the development.
- At an estimated 8 car journeys per household per day, the A65 will not have the capacity to handle an additional 6400 journeys per day. It is already a bottleneck for through-traffic, frequently becoming jammed with tail-backs right back to the Generous Pioneer roundabout, and almost to Addingham. There is a risk of more local journeys leading to gridlock and/or accidents.
- Ilkley is not a centre of employment, so the new residents will be adding to the commuter traffic probably into Leeds, and the commuter trains are already overcrowded at peak times.
- Other aspects of the local infrastructure are equally not able to absorb the scale of the proposed development – eg car parking, council services (such as libraries, sport and leisure), local policing etc

6. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to the soundness. (N.B Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination).

You will need to say why this modification will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Notwithstanding my objection to any development on green belt land, the scale of the proposed development is unsound and should be reduced to a scale that is consistent with the local infrastructure available. For the sake of the quality of life all concerned, the development should be sympathetic to the needs of existing and future residents between whom there will be inevitable competition for scarce infrastructure resources.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. Please be as precise as possible.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

7. If your representation is seeking a modification to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

8. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt when considering to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

9. Signature: Signed by email Date: 8 March 2014

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) : Publication Draft

PART C: EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY MONITORING FORM

Bradford Council would like to find out the views of groups in the local community. Please help us to do this by filling in the form below. It will be separated from your representation above and will not be used for any purpose other than monitoring.

Please place an 'X' in the appropriate boxes.