

## Planning Policy

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 January 2016 13:41  
**To:** Planning Policy  
**Subject:** Core Strategy - Local Plan

Dear Sirs,

Can I firstly comment that I have found some difficulty in finding the area that allows me to make a comment on the proposed plans for additional houses in Ilkley. However, if I am in the right place for this, can I register my complete opposition to an additional 800+ houses in Ilkley .

The council is tackling this situation from entirely the wrong angle in that there is a total acceptance that we need this number of houses for future needs. This is not true as the rise in population is entirely due to the phenomenal rise in immigration, over 600,000 per year I understand. There actually is no rise in population, in fact there is a slight fall, without this immigration level. Therefore irrespective of any political persuasion as a body the Council should oppose any Government edict to expand.

The proposed number for Ilkley would increase the housing stock by around 7%, therefore every service would have to be increased by a similar amount. There is no provision for this.

There is an erosion of green belt land. Why? Green belt provides shelter for wildlife, grows food, provides quiet areas for recreation, walking, cycling. It transpires oxygen, absorbs carbons and pollutants. It adds a grace and tranquillity to the landscape. Without green belt land then urban sprawl would result. Has any planner been to America and seen the result of a lack of "fire break"? Mile upon mile of urban development. A desert of buildings. Perhaps the proposers of "The Core Strategy" ought to live there for a while to experience what could be the result of their ideas.

Ilkley is a "dormitory town". It has no industry, no real commercial activity. It is acknowledged by Bradford Council as a Tourist town. Therefore almost all of the occupants of the new houses will travel to their workplace. This adds pollution and congestion. The A65 is full to capacity now so the prospect of a further 1600 cars minimum is daunting to say the least.

If the vehicles are not travelling to Leeds/Bradford then they clogging up the town itself. Has anybody from the planning department taken any notice of the current discussions about parking in Ilkley?

School places. As I understand it no extra school places will be provided until there is a demonstrated need. How ridiculous, 800 houses will have at least 800 children in education. Wouldn't that double the size of Ilkley Grammar school as it is now? At least the Victorians built an infrastructure at the same time as houses and in addition made provision for green parks and open areas.

Ilkley may be viewed as having all the Moors to go at but not everybody can get there and surely we need somewhere to breath and enjoy nature nearer the town. Even London has something like 4% of its area as parkland.

Ashlands fields are up for development. Any Ilkley person will tell you that both these areas are liable to flooding and even in normal times are boggy. Does nobody ever listen to this simple source of information? Does anybody ever ask?

If we were to increase the number of residents in Ilkley then why aren't shops encouraged to utilise floors above the retail areas for flats? Indeed with the current decline in retail area due to the rise in online shopping maybe even some current shops could be converted.

I love Ilkley, I was born and bred here. People move here because of its good education, open space, facilities, fair housing stock and a myriad of other things. The proposed development will destroy that and then the people that can afford it will move out to the next "nice place to live". None of the developers, planners or anybody else involved in its destruction will live here. Look at "developed" towns around, would you like to live there?. Ilkley is a cash cow for Bradford, we pay our council tax and get precious little in return. I know Ilkley is not unique in having to fight expansion of their town which returns me now to my second paragraph. Anybody elected to any authority be it member of parliament or local councillor is elected to speak on behalf of the people. Simply, this level of development is not wanted.

Thank you for taking the time to read my opposition to the Local Plan.

■ Rayner