FULL NAME	ORGANISATION	COMMENTS ON THE BURLEY IN WHARFEDALE NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN AT REGULATION 16
Planning	Sport England	Government planning policy, within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), identifies how the planning
Administration		system can play an important role in facilitating social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities.
Team		Encouraging communities to become more physically active through walking, cycling, informal recreation and formal
		sport plays an important part in this process. Providing enough sports facilities of the right quality and type in the
		right places is vital to achieving this aim. This means that positive planning for sport, protection from the unnecessary
		loss of sports facilities, along with an integrated approach to providing new housing and employment land with community facilities is important.
		It is essential therefore that the neighbourhood plan reflects and complies with national planning policy for sport as
		set out in the NPPF with particular reference to Pars 73 and 74. It is also important to be aware of Sport England's
		statutory consultee role in <b>protecting playing fields</b> and the presumption against the loss of playing field land. Sport
		England's playing fields policy is set out in our Planning Policy Statement: 'A Sporting Future for the Playing Fields of
		England'.
		http://www.sportengland.org/playingfieldspolicy
		Sport England provides guidance on <b>developing planning policy</b> for sport and further information can be found via
		the link below. Vital to the development and implementation of planning policy is the evidence base on which it is founded.
		http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/planning-for-sport/forward-planning/
		Sport England works with local authorities to ensure their Local Plan is underpinned by robust and up to date
		evidence. In line with Par 74 of the NPPF, this takes the form of assessments of need and strategies for indoor and
		outdoor sports facilities. A neighbourhood planning body should look to see if the relevant local authority has
		prepared a playing pitch strategy or other indoor/outdoor sports facility strategy. If it has then this could provide
		useful evidence for the neighbourhood plan and save the neighbourhood planning body time and resources gathering
		their own evidence. It is important that a neighbourhood plan reflects the recommendations and actions set out in
		any such strategies, including those which may specifically relate to the neighbourhood area, and that any local investment opportunities, such as the Community Infrastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.
		investment opportunities, such as the community inhastructure Levy, are utilised to support their delivery.
		Where such evidence does not already exist then relevant planning policies in a neighbourhood plan should be based
		on a proportionate assessment of the need for sporting provision in its area. Developed in consultation with the local
		sporting and wider community any assessment should be used to provide key recommendations and deliverable

actions. These should set out what provision is required to ensure the current and future needs of the community for sport can be met and, in turn, be able to support the development and implementation of planning policies. Sport England's guidance on assessing needs may help with such work.

http://www.sportengland.org/planningtoolsandguidance

If **new or improved sports facilities** are proposed Sport England recommend you ensure they are fit for purpose and designed in accordance with our design guidance notes.

http://www.sportengland.org/facilities-planning/tools-guidance/design-and-cost-guidance/

Any **new housing** developments will generate additional demand for sport. If existing sports facilities do not have the capacity to absorb the additional demand, then planning policies should look to ensure that new sports facilities, or improvements to existing sports facilities, are secured and delivered. Proposed actions to meet the demand should accord with any approved local plan or neighbourhood plan policy for social infrastructure, along with priorities resulting from any assessment of need, or set out in any playing pitch or other indoor and/or outdoor sports facility strategy that the local authority has in place.

In line with the Government's NPPF (including Section 8) and its Planning Practice Guidance (Health and wellbeing section), links below, consideration should also be given to how **any new development**, especially for new housing, will provide opportunities for people to lead healthy lifestyles and create healthy communities. Sport England's Active Design guidance can be used to help with this when developing planning policies and developing or assessing individual proposals.

Active Design, which includes a model planning policy, provides ten principles to help ensure the design and layout of development encourages and promotes participation in sport and physical activity. The guidance, and its accompanying checklist, could also be used at the evidence gathering stage of developing a neighbourhood plan to help undertake an assessment of how the design and layout of the area currently enables people to lead active lifestyles and what could be improved.

NPPF Section 8: <a href="https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities">https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/8-promoting-healthy-communities</a>

PPG Health and wellbeing section: https://www.gov.uk/guidance/health-and-wellbeing

		Sport England's Active Design Guidance: <a href="https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign">https://www.sportengland.org/activedesign</a>
Robert Ellis	Wakefield Council	No comment
Joanne Siddall	Burley & Woodhead CE Primary School	On map 6 local green spaces (page 55), there is a letter k placed over Burley and Woodhead Primary School field. As this does not relate to anything else in the document, please could it be removed.
Richard Askham	Courthouse Planning Consultancy	I believe we have maintained a good working relationship with the Parish Council throughout their Plan making process.
		I believe it's unfortunate that ALL their work with regards identifying the best or most suitable sites to satisfy the housing needs of Burley, as they and the local community believe, have been lost as Bradford Council have restricted/removed their ability to allocate such sites. As I understand it this restriction is only in place prior to the selective review of the green belt which is to be carried out by Bradford Council. When this Review of the Green Belt is in process then that would seem to be the appropriate time for the local community to "feed in" their valuable input and therefore that is why I proffer the following additional Policy which would allow the Neighbourhood Plan to utilise its wealth of local knowledge and to contribute positively to the identification of their preferred sites.  I would proffer that the Neighbourhood Plan should be revised and a new policy set included which sets out their "preferred options" for housing. I understand that the "selective" green belt review needs to be the prime mechanism but I also think its embodied in NPPF and other guidance that there should be a reliance on a good working relationship with local communities and their elected bodies and that this relationship should enable a proper and realistic input into the identification of the "preferred housing sites/options".
		Therefore the following Policy should be included: BW18  The Plan (Neighbourhood Plan) will identify their "preferred sites" for housing development, which will be sufficient to satisfy the needs of Burley In Wharfedale and the c700 homes that have been identified in the Core Strategy. In so doing they will have particular regard to the other Policies in their Plan and to the principles of the green belt, that is the maintenance of the openness of the green belt and its 5 main purposes and resist any clear incursions into the open green belt.
		We would also like to take this opportunity to remind you that the Parish Council have in the past recognised the merits of various sites and included them in their Plans.

Lisa Llewellyn	Whilst I am in broad support of a lot of what is contained in the Neighbourhood Plan, and appreciate the Parish
	Council's efforts, the following and the additional attachments are some points I would like to be addressed.
	Section 1.8 needs further clarification and addition of some points, within the context of what's required under NPPF guidelines:
	Bradford Council's Local Plan and Core Strategy haven't been delivered or adopted yet. This needs to be made clear in this section of the Neighbourhood Plan.
	It is important, to help address some of the community's infrastructure concerns, that we need contractual assurances from BDMC and Developers, as appropriate, regarding infrastructure improvements to educational facilities, travel infrastructure (rail, road and cycle networks), medical facilities, etc. Such infrastructure improvements should be delivered at commencement of development works, or within a reasonably short time-frame. Contracts for early delivery would ensure infrastructure improvements are delivered and not reneged upon.
	This is a fundamental part of the NPPF's sustainable development policy.
	As mentioned on page 8, the Burley In Wharfedale Neighbourhood Plan is in conformity with the 2005 Replacement Unitary Development Plan (RUDP); however, it's in the process of being replaced by the Local Plan.
	The fact that Bradford MDC don't yet have an adopted Local Plan that sets out a Core Development Strategy, or that details Land Allocations and detailed proposals for specific areas, which will include housing and employment uses, is an important point.
	<ul> <li>The community are being asked to comment on the Neighbourhood Plan, without having sight of a finalised Local Plan and Core Strategy.</li> </ul>
	<ul> <li>Until these plans are finalised, we should not allow any developments on Green Belt land.</li> <li>The absence of BDMC's Local Plan has meant some developers are trying to exploit housing opportunities which exist within the Green Belt.</li> </ul>
	P8 CONT The Neighbourhood Plan is to cover until 2030. It has been suggested that a significant number of homes could be

built on Green Belt land and the Green Belt will be reviewed.

It's also important for BMDC and the Parish Council to take into consideration other reports requested and prepared for BMDC by their appointed local architect. An example of this is the report done for BMDC relating to the potential development of land at Sun Lane and Ilkley Road (Manor Park Bends), Burley in Wharfedale. The report is summarised at the end with:

"Having assessed all of the relevant submitted information, we believe that the proposed development does not comply with either of these CBMDC policies and that it would adversely affect the distinctive and sensitive existing landscape character of the Wharfedale area."

(Source: copy of BMDC architect's report located at <a href="http://brag.addins4webplus.co.uk/projects/update-on-the-land-adjacent-to-sun-lane/">http://brag.addins4webplus.co.uk/projects/update-on-the-land-adjacent-to-sun-lane/</a> shared by Burley Residents Action Group.)

As Green Belt and preserving "field patterns, tree cover and "the wider context of moorland, river and woodland" (part of Policy BW2) are important to the community, it is worth acknowledging in the Neighbourhood Plan that other sources of relevant documents exist and will be taken into consideration by the Parish Council.

I understand that Burley Residents Action Group have requested details of all Brown and Green Field sites within the Bradford district. However, they have been told that BMDC can't supply this information, which is rather concerning. I also understand the Housing Minister has halted the Core Strategy document, pending further investigation. It is therefore worth noting in the Neighbourhood Plan that it will be important for the Parish Council and the Burley community to have sight of a list/diagram of both Brown and Green Field development sites that lie within the entire Bradford district. This should be included as an appendix to the Neighbourhood Plan.

Once we have the listing of Brown and Green Field sites across the whole of the district, the Council need to justify any subsequent Green Belt development, and to provide evidence that these homes are required in that location (as opposed to building on Brown and Green Field sites elsewhere in the district).

### Page12

This section recognises a community concern that there should be:

"No large-scale developments which would distort the existing balance of existing life"

The slight problem with this is that one person's view of "large-scale" and another's may be slightly different. I may say anything over about 40 houses/apartments is "large-scale", someone else may not. Certainly, many people would class the potential 300/500+ homes on Sun Lane/Ilkley Road (Manor Park Bends) as a large-scale development.

Somewhere within the Neighbourhood Plan it is worth trying to give some guidance on what's classed as large-scale, preferably in consultation with the community.

#### P20

As the Core Strategy has not yet been approved, it needs to be made clear in this section that the 700 is still to be confirmed.

#### P30

Policy BW3 is an important part of the plan. It needs an additional point which says that it will not only comply with national/local policies but will also take consideration of community views/preferences.

Policy BW3 relates to land outside of the existing settlement area and within the Green Belt and is of key importance to the community. There are current planning proposals for a significant number of the new (potential) 700 homes to be constructed on Green Belt land, which is not popular within the community.

BMDC need to take account of and reflect local views (as outlined in the draft Neighbourhood Plan and relevant recent/subsequent planning application objections) when publishing the new Land Allocation document on specific sites. The community have expressed views on the SHLAA sites it would like to see developed in preference to others (see Appendix 1 – Analysis of Questionnaires, Section Two – Building Development). The community is reliant on Burley Parish Council to influence the range of sites prior to publication, in line with this. It is also reliant on the Parish Council to reflect local views when reviewing planning applications.

Para 4.24, and Para. 4.25 of the Neighbourhood Plan states as follows:

"4.24 The main issues raised by local people during the consultation were:

- the need for new homes to be spread over several sites, not in one big estate-type development; and
- the lack of affordable homes to buy or rent.
- provision for a growing percentage of elderly residents

4.25 The vision for Burley is to ensure that the village continues to feel focussed around a village centre and avoids sprawl along the main commuter routes to Menston, Otley or Ilkley. This means that new housing should be well integrated into the village, avoiding a single large development that is perceived as a separate place. This will ensure that residents in the new homes feel integrated with the existing community. Dispersing new housing development across a range of sites will help to ensure that these sites are of a size that avoids dominating the local area."

I'm very much in support of the views expressed in 4.24 (page 37).

#### SEA

The Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) states that there will be no impact upon Waste Management.

Section 3 in Table 1, in particular, is incorrect in that there is no reference in the Neighbourhood Plan or SEA to implications for Waste Management by further developments in/around the village, including the addition of a potential 700 new homes.

We have already seen instances of increased flooding and drainage problems as development has taken place. It has been notable in the centre of the village (as well as elsewhere). For example, in the last year or two there have been instances of poor drainage during heavy rainfall that have led to high levels of water flowing down Station Road, leading to flooding around the Red Lion. It necessitated them knocking a hole in the wall, which then caused Long Meadows to flood – the first time in the 20 years since that road was built. (I understand that contributing factors to this flooding problem included the removal of trees and drainage areas due to developments at Scalebor Park and Moor Lane, and poor gutter/drain clearing maintenance).

Another cause for concern re waste management would be any developments on/near the Green Belt area on Ilkley Road. This Green Belt area has always been an overflow (crossing/closing Ilkley Road) for the River Wharfe. If there was any development on this Green Belt area, how might any flooding from the River Wharfe be impacted and how would waste management keep the area and Ilkley Road accessible?

(We also get flooding on the A660, within the Parish Boundary, between Burley and Otley, and the A65 Bradford Road, between Burley and Menston. This suggests waste management drainage on all these roads can't handle it.)

Another member of the village has spoken to Yorkshire Water, who advised that the sewers between Burley In Wharfedale and it's Effluent Treatment Plant are at capacity. This therefore invalidates the existing Waste

	Management assessment provided. The SEA and Neighbourhood Plan should acknowledge that further investigation and assessment is required.
	In addition, BMDC and the Parish Council should make it a contractual requirement of any developments that expansion to waste management capacity is funded in total, or most part, by developers, working with Yorkshire Water.
Bob Felstead	The Burley In Wharfedale Neighbourhood plan, is in conformity with the 2005 RUDP, however this is in the process of being replaced by the Local Plan. Conformity to the RUDP is therefore moot in point 1.11.
	Bradford don't yet have a Local Plan that sets out a Core Development strategy, or that details Land Allocations and detailed proposals for specific areas, which will include housing and employment uses. Yet, we as a community are being asked to comment on detail, without having any access to, or site of the Local Plan and Core Strategy.
	The absence of a Local Plan for the district, has allowed developers the opportunity to exploit housing opportunities which exist within the Green Belt.
	Section 1.15 The plan covers the period to 2030. It's noted that a significant number of homes are to be built on Green Belt Land. As quite clearly stated, this needs to be reviewed.
	It's also important to reflect on other reports requested and prepared for BDMC by their appointed local architect. These alternative views are not represented or mentioned anywhere within the Neighbourhood Plan. The article is located at http://brag.addins4webplus.co.uk/projects/update-on-the-land-adjacent-to-sun-lane/
	A little while ago, a member of BRAG (Burley Residents Action Group) requested details of all Brown and Green field sites within the Bradford district. BRAG received a reply stating that this information either 'didn't exist, or could not be supplied.' In consideration of the housing ministers halt to green belt developments within and around Burley, we clearly need to have site of an index of both brown and green field development sites that lie within the entire Bradford district.
	The Council need to justify any Green Belt development, and to produce evidence that these homes are actually required.

For example; 10 years post development, a local adjacent housing development at (High Royds, Menston) still have many unsold properties. This development is on our doorstep and uses the same rail and road networks that server Leeds and Bradford, which a prominently featured throughout the Neighbourhood Plan.

#### Section 3.8

The best way to conserve and enhance the character of Burley in Wharfedale is to have a cluster of new sites of no more than fifty houses in each. This would provide the best method to integrate new housing to the existing settlement.

Local opinion does not support large scale development. The Vision must reflect the views of local people expressed in the public consultations and not those proposed by public agencies and private developers.

Burley's Neighbourhood Plan is a test case which should demonstrate how much power local people have on local matters. We should not be saddled with developments that undermine that vision.

#### P30

This is a central policy in the plan because this impacts on the area outside of the existing settlement area and within the Green Belt. This is where most of the new 700 homes are most likely to be constructed.

The policy clearly supports the view that any amount of homes put forward is acceptable. Burley residents have consistently stated that large development sites are not in the interests of the community and are contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan.

The council need to reflect and represent robust local views when publishing the Land Allocation document on specific sites. Burley Parish Council must influence the range of sites prior to publication, thus ensuring conformity to the Neighbourhood Plan.

Para 4.24, and Para. 4.25 of the Neighbourhood Plan states as follows:

- 4.24 The main issues raised by local people during the consultation were:
- the need for new homes to be spread over several sites, not in one big estate-type development; and
- the lack of affordable homes to buy or rent.
- provision for a growing percentage of elderly residents
- 4.25 The vision for Burley is to ensure that the village continues to feel focussed around a village centre and avoids

sprawl along the main commuter routes to Menston, Otley or Ilkley. This means that new housing should be well integrated into the village, avoiding a single large development that is perceived as a separate place. This will ensure that residents in the new homes feel integrated with the existing community. Dispersing new housing development across a range of sites will help to ensure that these sites are of a size that avoids dominating the local area.

If the Neighbourhood Plan is to mean anything, then the voice of Burley people needs to be respected by Bradford Council as it prepares to publish the Land Allocation Plan, including the Green Belt review. Already, local people have expressed views on those SHLAA sites it would like to see developed in preference to others. Refer to Section Two – Building Development of the Appendix 1 – Analysis of Questionnaires

### P28

The statement about 'take account of' is far too weak and needs to go further to ensure that new dwellings sit well in design terms with adjoining areas. There is a need to include words and phrases like 'scale', 'massing' and 'urban grain' and 'density'.

New homes should be limited to two storeys in height and enhance visual enhance the area, and connect with existing housing.

#### P12 and 17

The SEA states that there will be no impact upon Waste Management. I understand; having spoken to Yorkshire Water, that the sewers between Burley In Wharfedale and it's Effluent Treatment Plant are at capacity, consequently this invalidates the existing Waste Management assessment provided.

The details within section 4.2 and 5.4 present contradictory evidence. Section 4.2 states that there is a waste management impact, whilst section 5.4 states that there is not. Which is it?

The comment form and submission process is too prescriptive. It requires one comment only per submission. This will be off putting for many who may otherwise have wish to express their opinions.

### Whole document

Comment forms are only available in Microsoft Word's (.doc) format, and many people will not have the software required to open this type of document. Both forms should have been supplied in the more widely used PDF and/or Rich Text Format (.rtf) which come bundled on all MAC's and PC's.

	1	
		Whilst I accept that these documents are available elsewhere, most people are most likely to complete an online submission. Having said this, people who don't have access to Microsoft Word will find it difficult to respond; and if time poor, might not be able to visit elsewhere to obtain copies.
		Lastly; as a general observation, the original online location for all documents was initially reported as located at: https://www.bradford.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/neighbourhood-areas/?Folder=Burley-in-Wharfedale.
		This has since been changed to https://bradford.moderngov.co.uk/mgConsultationDisplay.aspx?ID=85, a location which I personally had to request by email. The old web link should have had a redirect to the new web page. Here again it's a case of transparency, which clearly hasn't been the case.
		SECTION 1.8
		This section inadequately details what's required under NPPF guidelines.
		garantee gar
		Bradford Council's Local Plan and Core Strategy have not yet been delivered or adopted.
		We need contractual assurance from BDMC and Developer's regarding infrastructure improvements to educational facilities, travel infrastructure – rail and road networks, medical facilities etc.
		This is a fundamental part of the NPPF's sustainable development policy.
		It's duly noted that the village community have little or no influence on the scale of any proposed development, consequently how can the Neighbourhood plan positively shape or support local development?
Melanie Lindsley	Coal Authority	As you will be aware the Neighbourhood Plan area lies within the current defined coalfield.
		According to the Coal Authority Development High Risk Area Plans, there are recorded risks from past coal mining
		activity in the form of 5 mine entries. The mine entries are recorded as being located in the southern part of the plan
		area. It is noted that the Neighbourhood Plan does not propose to allocate sites for future development and
		therefore the Coal Authority has no specific comments to make.
Jeff McQuillan		The aim of this comment is to strengthen the Policy and to support the parish council. This is a crucial policy in the
		document because this impacts on the area outside of the settlement area and within the current Green Belt. This is

where most of the new 700 dwellings are likely to be built. The policy, as it stands, is weak and lends support to the view that any size of site being put forward is acceptable. The views of the residents of Burley have been sought and there is a clear message that large development sites are contrary to the vision of the Neighbourhood Plan. Bradford Council should respect those strong local views and not seek to challenge that in its interpretation of 'general conformity'. Bradford Council has an opportunity to shortly publish the sites where development should take place in its Land Allocation Development Plan document. It is hoped that Burley Parish Council will influence the range of sites prior to publication to ensure that the local community's views are considered. Para 4.24, and Para. 4.25 of the Neighbourhood Plan states as follows: 4.24 The main issues raised by local people during the consultation were: • the need for new homes to be spread over several sites, not in one big estate-type development; and • the lack of affordable homes to buy or rent. • provision for a growing percentage of elderly residents 4.25 The vision for Burley is to ensure that the village continues to feel focussed around a village centre and avoids sprawl along the main commuter routes to Menston, Otley or Ilkley. This means that new housing should be well integrated into the village, avoiding a single large development that is perceived as a separate place. This will ensure that residents in the new homes feel integrated with the existing community. Dispersing new housing development across a range of sites will help to ensure that these sites are of a size that avoids dominating the local area.

Already, local people have expressed views on those SHLAA sites they would like to see developed in preference to others. Refer to Section Two – Building Development of the Appendix 1 – Analysis of Questionnaires. Bradford Council should, in time, publish a strategy as to how allocated housing land will be released during the plan period of the Local Plan (up to the year 2030) in accordance with Policy HOS 4 of the Core Strategy. Green Belt land should only be released as a last resort and this should be accompanied by a periodic review of the overall target figure of 42,000 Bradford Council has set. These are matters that people are concerned about and although they do not form part of the Neighbourhood Plan, they are matters that are materially relevant to Burley and the quality of life for its residents.

### Proposal Map

There is an error on the Proposals Map with regards to Local Green Space The area of important green space between Malt Shovel and Burley House along Main Street should be included. It is included as 'Local Green Space' on Map 6 of the Neighbourhood Plan. (Page 55) This site is locally known as the 'village green' and is an important feature in this historic part of the village.

#### Vision

The Vision is the crucial part of the Plan. That is based on what the scope of the Plan can have. I support the Parish

	1	7
		Council in trying to get the strongest statement possible, given the limitations of the Plan as established by Government Regulations. The statement about 'new developments' is problematic and this depends whether the new sites lie within the settlement area or without. It also depends on the scale of such developments and where they lie. Large sites are likely to be in the Green Belt as it currently stands; these are difficult to integrate and unlikely to conserve or enhance the character of the village. If sites must be outside the settlement area, then the best way to conserve and enhance the character of Burley in Wharfedale is to have small clusters of new sites (maximum of fifty
		dwellings each) that respects the pattern and grain of the existing settlement using natural facing materials, making strong connections in design, movement of traffic, and scale and massing of dwellings. Attention to the detail is
		important. There is strong local feeling against large, bolted-on sites, and the parish council has expressed this with regards to a current planning application for many dwellings outside the settlement area. It is accepted that this will be decided on its own merits in due course, unless it is withdrawn. Para.1.20 of the Plan re-states this position as
		follows: 'No large-scale developments which would distort the existing balance of existing life'. The Vision should strongly reflect the views of local people expressed in the public consultations and not weakened by the views of public agencies and private developers.
Paula Bedford	Highways England	"no formal comments at this point with regard to the Burley in Wharfedale Neighbourhood Development Plan proportion of the wider picture on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport.
Heather Jones		I note the plan proposes the creation of 60 new allotments: "3.21 The Parish Council have proposed that up to sixty additional allotments could go on the disused recreation field site on Iron Row."  This seems good use of the land.
		Do we have an estimate of how much vehicle traffic 60 allotments might generate? If the plan is that the allotments would be accessed via Iron Row, there may be some issues (outlined below). At the very least, a vehicle turning circle to be built as part of the allotment development would seem sensible. Alternatively a different access route avoiding Iron Row needs to be created.
		<ol> <li>The field is currently accessed by pedestrians via Iron Row, an unadopted narrow cul-de-sac lined with old cottages and the listed stone gateposts for Greenholme Mills, which constrict the width of the road.</li> <li>Iron Row, which has no footpaths, currently has a lot of pedestrian traffic down to the recreation field on the right</li> </ol>
		hand side. There is occasional horse traffic, and it is only lightly used by vehicles at present, (mainly domestic traffic to the houses on Iron Row, plus a few vehicles belonging to people using the recreation field). At present I would say that the vehicles, pedestrians and horses co-exist without problem, as the vehicles which use Iron Row are not too
		frequent and most drivers are careful and considerate. But an increase in the number of vehicles would be problematic.  3. Iron Row is unadopted, so who is responsible for maintaining the road surface etc? An increase in vehicle traffic
		would increase the maintenance burden - is this reasonable?

		4. Iron Row, a cul de sac, is narrow with no turning space. To get back to the Main Street, vehicles usually execute 3 point turns in the road (usually beyond the stone gateposts). But space is tight, and even cars frequently mount the verges in order to turn around. Alternatively, drivers carry out a 3 point turn using the unmade road area approaching Spring Gardens across the end of the terrace of Iron Row cottages. Again this is not easy, with poor sightlines and the risk of collision with the listed stone gateposts, the old iron post and several stone walls. This area is also where residents put their wheelie bins for collection, and so one day a week it is full of wheelie bins (with a few bins left there on other days too). A purpose-built turning circle in the field proposed for allotments would therefore
Michelle Saunders	North Yorkshire County Council	seem an appropriate part of any allotment development.  As a neighbouring authority NYCC's principal interest is in relation to strategic cross boundary issues. Officers from our service areas have reviewed the documentation and have the following comments to make.  Strategic Policy and Economic Growth
		The North Yorkshire County Council Plan sets an ambition that North Yorkshire is a place with a strong economy and a commitment to sustainable growth that enables our citizens to fulfil their ambitions and aspirations with a priority of 'enhancing the environment and developing tourism and the green economy, by promoting and improving the county's environmental, ecological and heritage assets to deliver a high quality natural and built environment' the inclusion, within the Burley-in-Wharfedale Neighbourhood Plan, of the development of new a new foot bridge into North Yorkshire (Objective 6), and the enhancement of Green Infrastructure along the shared boundary of the River
		Wharfe can help contribute to the achievement of the ambition and priorities set out in the North Yorkshire County Council Plan.  It could be helpful therefore to acknowledge, within Section 2, the shared border with North Yorkshire County Council to the north of the Neighbourhood Plan area. This will help provide the broader geographical context and help further with the consideration of Objective 6 which seeks to 'increase access by foot and cycle through the parish into adjoining areas'.
Linda Kelly		SECTION BW3 Object to the Council's decision that Burley in Wharfedale needs to build 700 more homes. Also object to the plan that most of these homes will be built on the green belt, outside the current village. The consistent view of Burley residents is that large developments are not in the interest of the community for a whole host of reasons including infrastructure, education, transport as well as the look and feel of the village.
		Para 4.24, and Para. 4.25 of the Neighbourhood Plan states as follows: 4.24 The main issues raised by local people during the consultation were: • the need for new homes to be spread over several sites, not in one big estate-type development; and • the lack of affordable homes to buy or rent.

		provision for a growing percentage of elderly residents
		4.25 The vision for Burley is to ensure that the village continues to feel focussed around a village centre and avoids sprawl along the main commuter routes to Menston, Otley or Ilkley. This means that new housing should be well integrated into the village, avoiding a single large development that is perceived as a separate place. This will ensure that residents in the new homes feel integrated with the existing community. Dispersing new housing development across a range of sites will help to ensure that these sites are of a size that avoids dominating the local area.
		Bradford Council, please respect the views of the people of Burley. We have already views on those SHLAA sites it would like to see developed in preference to others. Refer to Section Two – Building Development of the Appendix 1 – Analysis of Questionnaires
Oliver Walton	Natural England	Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening and Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Natural England welcomes the inclusion of the assessment reports and broadly concurs with the conclusions. However we note that Objective 2 of the plan refers to meeting the future housing needs through the 700 dwelling target referred to in the Bradford Core Strategy. We advise that you note that the Bradford Core Strategy has not been adopted and as a result there is potential for the Neighbourhood Plan to come forward ahead of the Core Strategy. In this eventuality the Neighbourhood Plan would need to assess this target in a Habitats Regulations Assessment and a Strategic Environmental Assessment and include any necessary mitigation or compensation. Where Neighbourhood Plans could have significant environmental effects, they may require a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) under the Environment Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. Further guidance on deciding whether the proposals are likely to have significant environmental effects and the requirements for consulting Natural England on SEA are set out in the National Planning Practice Guidance at: http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/strategic-environmental-assessment-and-sustainability-appraisal/sustainability-appraisal-requirements-for-neighbourhood-plans Where a neighbourhood plan could potentially affect a European protected site, it will be necessary to screen the plan in relation to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations (2010), as amended (the 'Habitats Regulations'). One of the basic conditions that will be tested at Examination is whether the making of the plan is compatible with European obligations and this includes requirements relating to the Habitats Directive, which is transposed into the Habitats Regulations.  In accordance with Schedule 2 of The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012, a neighbourhood plan cannot be made if the likelihood of significant effects on any European Site, eit

		measures may need to be incorporated into the neighbourhood plan to ensure that any likely significant effects are avoided in order to secure compliance with the Regulations.  Other advice Natural England recognises that some proposals in the plan potentially impact the special qualities of Nidderdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). Objectives involving the regeneration of Greenholme Mills and the proposed River Wharfe footbridge lie within the setting of the AONB, therefore consideration of landscape and visual impacts should be considered early in the design process. We would like to see reference to this in the plan. Other objectives involving improved access to the natural environment and increased green infrastructure are commended.  Further general advice on the consideration of Neighbourhood planning and the natural environment is provided at Annex A.
Bridget Turner		Section 3.7 and 3.11  There seems to me to be discrepancy between the desire stated in 3.7 to "protect open spaces and preserve the natural and built heritage of the area", and the alleged need to build 700 houses as stated in 3.11. This number of houses, wherever they are built, will inevitably affect the open space and the natural heritage of the area. As stated in 1.15, which Green Belt land is suitable for development needs to be reviewed. I believe that wherever possible Green Belt land should be preserved, for the sake of nature, wildlife, farming, flood defences and for the well-being of humans. As is noted in 4.24 and 4.25, there is a need for affordable homes for first time buyers and suitable accommodation for elderly people. If new housing is built in Burley-in-Wharfedale, it should fulfil the needs of these groups of people and where possible development on Green Belt should be avoided.
Richard Irving	ID Planning (on behalf of Jeffery Rothery)	I act on behalf of Mr Jeffrey Rothery who owns land off Hag Farm Road which lies within the Burley-in-Wharfedale Neighbourhood Plan area and which is being promoted for residential development and which is identified by red edging on the attached plan. The site would form a small scale extension to the settlement and would not harm the character of Burley-in-Wharfedale. I have set out my comments below in accordance with the format of the Council's comments sheet. The comments all relate to the Submission Neighbourhood Development Plan.  Our Vision for Burley-Wharfedale Support and Object We support the general aims set out in the vision for Burley-in-Wharfedale. However, in relation to the growth of the village where it is advised this must be proportionate to its infrastructure it is maintained this statement does not fairly reflect the situation relating to the level of growth noted elsewhere in the document and the support given to growth of the village across a range of sites rather than a large single development (paragraph 4.25 of the submission document).

The vision states that whilst the village will grow, this must be proportionate to its infrastructure. This part of the vision is considered to be misleading given the level of growth will be determined through the Core Strategy which as stated in Objective 2 of the submission document, identifies a growth target for the village of 700 dwellings. Given the level of growth will be determined by the Core Strategy, the vision statement may lead a reader to deduce that growth could be limited if infrastructure needs cannot be met, when it is the case that as part of the growth of the village any deficiencies in infrastructure will have to be met to deliver the requisite amount of housing. The vision should duly identify that the village will grow in accordance with the Core Strategy and that infrastructure improvements will be delivered to ensure the growth target is met.

Whilst it is appreciated the vision should not be overly specific, it is maintained the wording should also more accurately reflect the growth aims stated within the document which seeks a dispersed pattern of growth through the development of small / medium scale sites rather than an large single urban extension to the village which will not conserve and enhance the character of the village in accordance with the vision. The vision states that new developments will be designed to conserve and enhance the character of Burley-in-Wharfedale, but this part of the vision does not clearly identify the plan's support for a dispersed pattern of growth. It is maintained the plan's support for the development of a number of smaller sites across the village rather than a single large development site should form part of the vision as it is a key part of the plan.

Section 3 – Key Issues – Protecting the Distinctive Character of Burley-in-Wharfedale (paragraph 3.2) Support

This key issue relates to the open areas that surround the village and seeks to preserve the distinctive character and settlement pattern of the village. We support this key issue and consider the submission document's support for a dispersed pattern of development will assist in meeting this aim.

Section 3 – Key Issues – Minimising the Impact of New Development, Particularly on the Surrounding Countryside (paragraph 3.3)

Object

This key issue refers to recent landscaping being poorly landscaped and the neighbourhood plan seeking to ensure that new development makes a positive contribution to the character of the parish and minimises its impact on the surrounding countryside. Whilst we do not object to the contents of paragraph 3.3 we do not consider the issues highlighted in paragraph 3.3 go far enough in relation to minimising the impact of new development on the surrounding countryside.

Paragraph 4.25 of the submission document states that the vision for Burley seeks to ensure the village continues to feel focused around the village centre and that new housing should be well integrated into the village, avoiding a single large development that is perceived as a separate place. It states that dispersing new housing development across a range of sites will help to ensure that these sites are of size that avoids dominating the local area. The support for a dispersed pattern of development is clearly part of minimising the impact of new development on the countryside and should form part of this key issue.

Section 4 – Development outside the Settlement Boundary and Local Landscape – Policy BW2 – Development Outside the Settlement Boundary

Object

Whilst we do not object to the five criterion set out in Policy BW2 which seek to guide development outside the settlement boundary, it is assumed this policy will be applied to sites which are currently outside the settlement boundary but will be allocated for development to meet the growth needs set out in the Core Strategy. It is maintained that it would be appropriate for wording within this policy to be included which provides support for the dispersed pattern of growth highlighted at paragraph 4.25 given there is no policy within the plan which seeks to deliver this stated aim.

Section 4 – Objective 2 – To meet housing needs - Paragraphs 4.24 – 4.25 Support

Paragraph 4.25 states that new housing should be well integrated into the village, avoiding a single large development that is perceived as a separate place. It is stated that this objective will ensure that residents in the new homes feel integrated with the existing community and by dispersing new housing development across a range of sites will ensure that sites are of a size that avoid dominating the local area.

We support this objective, but it is maintained this should be reflected in a policy. Whilst the neighbourhood plan is not proposing to identify housing allocations, it is within the remit of the plan to guide where and what type of development would be supported. We consider this should be reflected in the vision, objectives and a policy given it is a key part of the plan in relation to meeting the village's housing needs and reflects comments made by local people during earlier consultations (paragraph 4.24).

Section 4 – Policy BW13 – Walking and Cycling Routes and Bridlepaths Support

Policy BW13 requires that development proposals should protect and enhance the existing pedestrian and cycling

		network and bridlepaths with every opportunity being taken to improve the inter-linking of the network so that it becomes more useful to the public. We support this policy, which seeks to deliver improved sustainable methods of transport for the village. Reference should also be made to the importance of Sustrans and the importance of delivering routes as part of the planning process.
Richard Irving	ID Planning (on behalf of Bruce Bannister)	I act on behalf of Mr Bruce Bannister who owns land to the east of Bradford Road which lies within the Burley-in-Wharfedale Neighbourhood Plan area and which is being promoted for residential development and which is identified by red edging on the attached plan. The site would form a small scale extension to the settlement and would not harm the character of Burley-in-Wharfedale.
		I have set out my comments below in accordance with the format of the Council's comments sheet. The comments all relate to the Submission Neighbourhood Development Plan.
		Our Vision for Burley-Wharfedale Support and Object
		We support the general aims set out in the vision for Burley-in-Wharfedale. However, in relation to the growth of the village where it is advised this must be proportionate to its infrastructure it is maintained this statement does not fairly reflect the situation relating to the level of growth noted elsewhere in the document and the support given to growth of the village across a range of sites rather than a large single development (paragraph 4.25 of the submission document).
		The vision states that whilst the village will grow, this must be proportionate to its infrastructure. This part of the vision is considered to be misleading given the level of growth will be determined through the Core Strategy which as stated in Objective 2 of the submission document, identifies a growth target for the village of 700 dwellings. Given the level of growth will be determined by the Core Strategy, the vision statement may lead a reader to deduce that growth could be limited if infrastructure needs cannot be met, when it is the case that as part of the growth of the village any deficiencies in infrastructure will have to be met to deliver the requisite amount of housing. The vision should duly identify that the village will grow in accordance with the Core Strategy and that infrastructure improvements will be delivered to ensure the growth target is met.
		Whilst it is appreciated the vision should not be overly specific, it is maintained the wording should also more accurately reflect the growth aims stated within the document which seeks a dispersed pattern of growth through the development of small / medium scale sites rather than an large single urban extension to the village which will not

conserve and enhance the character of the village in accordance with the vision. The vision states that new developments will be designed to conserve and enhance the character of Burley-in-Wharfedale, but this part of the vision does not clearly identify the plan's support for a dispersed pattern of growth. It is maintained the plan's support for the development of a number of smaller sites across the village rather than a single large development site should form part of the vision as it is a key part of the plan.

Section 3 – Key Issues – Protecting the Distinctive Character of Burley-in-Wharfedale (paragraph 3.2) Support

This key issue relates to the open areas that surround the village and seeks to preserve the distinctive character and settlement pattern of the village. We support this key issue and consider the submission document's support for a dispersed pattern of development will assist in meeting this aim.

Section 3 – Key Issues – Minimising the Impact of New Development, Particularly on the Surrounding Countryside (paragraph 3.3)

Object

This key issue refers to recent landscaping being poorly landscaped and the neighbourhood plan seeking to ensure that new development makes a positive contribution to the character of the parish and minimises its impact on the surrounding countryside. Whilst we do not object to the contents of paragraph 3.3 we do not consider the issues highlighted in paragraph 3.3 go far enough in relation to minimising the impact of new development on the surrounding countryside.

Paragraph 4.25 of the submission document states that the vision for Burley seeks to ensure the village continues to feel focused around the village centre and that new housing should be well integrated into the village, avoiding a single large development that is perceived as a separate place. It states that dispersing new housing development across a range of sites will help to ensure that these sites are of size that avoids dominating the local area. The support for a dispersed pattern of development is clearly part of minimising the impact of new development on the countryside and should form part of this key issue.

Section 4 – Development outside the Settlement Boundary and Local Landscape – Policy BW2 – Development Outside the Settlement Boundary
Object

		Whilst we do not object to the five criterion set out in Policy BW2 which seek to guide development outside the settlement boundary, it is assumed this policy will be applied to sites which are currently outside the settlement boundary but will be allocated for development to meet the growth needs set out in the Core Strategy. It is maintained that it would be appropriate for wording within this policy to be included which provides support for the dispersed pattern of growth highlighted at paragraph 4.25 given there is no policy within the plan which seeks to deliver this stated aim.
		Section 4 – Objective 2 – To meet housing needs - Paragraphs 4.24 – 4.25 Support
		Paragraph 4.25 states that new housing should be well integrated into the village, avoiding a single large development that is perceived as a separate place. It is stated that this objective will ensure that residents in the new homes feel integrated with the existing community and by dispersing new housing development across a range of sites will ensure that sites are of a size that avoid dominating the local area.
		We support this objective, but it is maintained this should be reflected in a policy. Whilst the neighbourhood plan is not proposing to identify housing allocations, it is within the remit of the plan to guide where and what type of development would be supported. We consider this should be reflected in the vision, objectives and a policy given it is a key part of the plan in relation to meeting the village's housing needs and reflects comments made by local people during earlier consultations (paragraph 4.24).
		Section 4 – Policy BW13 – Walking and Cycling Routes and Bridlepaths
		Support Policy BW13 requires that development proposals should protect and enhance the existing pedestrian and cycling network and bridlepaths with every opportunity being taken to improve the inter-linking of the network so that it becomes more useful to the public. We support this policy, which seeks to deliver improved sustainable methods of transport for the village. Reference should also be made to the importance of Sustrans and the importance of delivering routes as part of the planning process.
Richard Irving	ID Planning (on behalf of Banner Investments)	I act on behalf of Banner Investments who owns land to the east of Bradford Road which lies within the Burley-in-Wharfedale Neighbourhood Plan area and which is being promoted for residential development and which is identified by red edging on the attached plan. The site would form a small scale extension to the settlement and would not harm the character of Burley-in-Wharfedale.

I have set out my comments below in accordance with the format of the Council's comments sheet. The comments all relate to the Submission Neighbourhood Development Plan.

Our Vision for Burley-Wharfedale Support and Object

We support the general aims set out in the vision for Burley-in-Wharfedale. However, in relation to the growth of the village where it is advised this must be proportionate to its infrastructure it is maintained this statement does not fairly reflect the situation relating to the level of growth noted elsewhere in the document and the support given to growth of the village across a range of sites rather than a large single development (paragraph 4.25 of the submission document).

The vision states that whilst the village will grow, this must be proportionate to its infrastructure. This part of the vision is considered to be misleading given the level of growth will be determined through the Core Strategy which as stated in Objective 2 of the submission document, identifies a growth target for the village of 700 dwellings. Given the level of growth will be determined by the Core Strategy, the vision statement may lead a reader to deduce that growth could be limited if infrastructure needs cannot be met, when it is the case that as part of the growth of the village any deficiencies in infrastructure will have to be met to deliver the requisite amount of housing. The vision should duly identify that the village will grow in accordance with the Core Strategy and that infrastructure improvements will be delivered to ensure the growth target is met.

Whilst it is appreciated the vision should not be overly specific, it is maintained the wording should also more accurately reflect the growth aims stated within the document which seeks a dispersed pattern of growth through the development of small / medium scale sites rather than an large single urban extension to the village which will not conserve and enhance the character of the village in accordance with the vision. The vision states that new developments will be designed to conserve and enhance the character of Burley-in-Wharfedale, but this part of the vision does not clearly identify the plan's support for a dispersed pattern of growth. It is maintained the plan's support for the development of a number of smaller sites across the village rather than a single large development site should form part of the vision as it is a key part of the plan.

Section 3 – Key Issues – Protecting the Distinctive Character of Burley-in-Wharfedale (paragraph 3.2) Support

This key issue relates to the open areas that surround the village and seeks to preserve the distinctive character and settlement pattern of the village. We support this key issue and consider the submission document's support for a dispersed pattern of development will assist in meeting this aim.

Section 3 – Key Issues – Minimising the Impact of New Development, Particularly on the Surrounding Countryside (paragraph 3.3)

Object

This key issue refers to recent landscaping being poorly landscaped and the neighbourhood plan seeking to ensure that new development makes a positive contribution to the character of the parish and minimises its impact on the surrounding countryside. Whilst we do not object to the contents of paragraph 3.3 we do not consider the issues highlighted in paragraph 3.3 go far enough in relation to minimising the impact of new development on the surrounding countryside.

Paragraph 4.25 of the submission document states that the vision for Burley seeks to ensure the village continues to feel focused around the village centre and that new housing should be well integrated into the village, avoiding a single large development that is perceived as a separate place. It states that dispersing new housing development across a range of sites will help to ensure that these sites are of size that avoids dominating the local area. The support for a dispersed pattern of development is clearly part of minimising the impact of new development on the countryside and should form part of this key issue.

Section 4 – Development outside the Settlement Boundary and Local Landscape – Policy BW2 – Development Outside the Settlement Boundary
Object

Whilst we do not object to the five criterion set out in Policy BW2 which seek to guide development outside the settlement boundary, it is assumed this policy will be applied to sites which are currently outside the settlement boundary but will be allocated for development to meet the growth needs set out in the Core Strategy. It is maintained that it would be appropriate for wording within this policy to be included which provides support for the dispersed pattern of growth highlighted at paragraph 4.25 given there is no policy within the plan which seeks to deliver this stated aim.

Section 4 – Objective 2 – To meet housing needs - Paragraphs 4.24 – 4.25

	Support
	Paragraph 4.25 states that new housing should be well integrated into the village, avoiding a single large development that is perceived as a separate place. It is stated that this objective will ensure that residents in the new homes feel integrated with the existing community and by dispersing new housing development across a range of sites will ensure that sites are of a size that avoid dominating the local area.
	We support this objective, but it is maintained this should be reflected in a policy. Whilst the neighbourhood plan is not proposing to identify housing allocations, it is within the remit of the plan to guide where and what type of development would be supported. We consider this should be reflected in the vision, objectives and a policy given it is a key part of the plan in relation to meeting the village's housing needs and reflects comments made by local people during earlier consultations (paragraph 4.24).
	Section 4 – Policy BW13 – Walking and Cycling Routes and Bridlepaths Support
	Policy BW13 requires that development proposals should protect and enhance the existing pedestrian and cycling network and bridlepaths with every opportunity being taken to improve the inter-linking of the network so that it becomes more useful to the public. We support this policy, which seeks to deliver improved sustainable methods of transport for the village. Reference should also be made to the importance of Sustrans and the importance of delivering routes as part of the planning process.
Samuel Naylor	Section 1.21 I don't believe our village warrants a large scale housing development, or developments, but I am particularly worried that in future years kids in Burley will not get into Ilkley Grammar School and will be shipped out of the area to secondary school. I cannot see how there is adequate secondary school provision in the area.
Katie Rigarlsford	Section 1.15 I do not believe that sufficient consideration has been given to the availability of brown field sites in our district, and the council are using green belt as an easy alternative
	I strongly believe we need a thorough review of the sites in the area before our fields are built on.
	I also do not believe that there is sufficient road and transport infrastructure or provision of public services, such as hospital services, doctors surgeries and schools to support this new development.

	I am also concerned that the area for proposed development is close to river level. Some of these field areas flood most years and increasingly in recent years the village of Burley has flooded severely. I am highly concerned that the additional building on this land could cause severe flooding at this and other sites across Burley.
Adrian Wheway	Section 1.8 This section does not detail what's required under NPPF guidelines. I don't believe that the Core Strategy has been delivered or adopted. Please can we have contractual assurance from BDMC and Developer's regarding infrastructure improvements to educational facilities, travel infrastructure – rail and road networks, medical facilities etc?  This is an essential part of the NPPF's sustainable development policy.  It would appear that this is purely a paperwork exercise and that we have little influence on the scale of any development.
	How can the Neighbourhood plan positively shape or support local development?  Section 1.11-1.12  The Burley In Wharfedale Neighbourhood plan conforms with the 2005 RUDP, however this is in the process of being replaced by the Local Plan.
	Currently, Bradford does not have a Local Plan that sets out a Core Development strategy, or that details Land Allocations and detailed proposals for specific areas, which will include housing and employment uses. Yet, we as a community are being asked to comment on detail, without having any access to, or site of the Local Plan and Core Strategy documentation.
	The absence of a Local Plan for the district, has allowed developers the opportunity to exploit housing opportunities which exist within the Green Belt.
	Section 1.14 The 'Local Plan/Core Strategy' is not currently available, so we cannot examine it. Section 1.15 The plan covers the period to 2030. It's noted that a significant number of homes are to be built on Green Belt Land.

As quite clearly stated, this needs to be reviewed.

It's also important to reflect on other reports requested and prepared for BDMC by their appointed local architect. These alternative views are not represented throughout the Neighbourhood Plan. The article is located at http://brag.addins4webplus.co.uk/projects/update-on-the-land-adjacent-to-sun-lane/

A little while ago, BRAG (Burley Residents Action Group) requested details of all Brown and Green field sites within the Bradford district. BRAG received a reply stating that this information either 'didn't exist, or could not be supplied.' In consideration of the housing ministers halt to green belt developments within and around Burley, we clearly need to have site of an index of both brown and green field development sites that lie within the entire Bradford district.

Equally, the Council need to justify any Green Belt development, and to produce evidence that these homes are actually required. For example; 10 years post development, a local adjacent housing development at (High Royds, Menston) still have many unsold properties. This development is on our doorstep and uses the same rail and road networks that server Leeds and Bradford, which a prominently featured throughout the Neighbourhood Plan.

#### Section 3.8

I believe that the best way to conserve and enhance the character of Burley in Wharfedale is to have new sites of no more than fifty houses in each. This would provide the best method to integrate new housing to the existing settlement.

Local opinion does not support large scale development. The Vision must reflect the views of local people expressed in the public consultations and not those proposed by public agencies and private developers.

Burley's Neighbourhood Plan is a test case which should demonstrate how much power local people have on local matters. We should not be saddled with developments that undermine that vision.

#### BW1

The statement about 'take account of' seems bland and needs to go further to ensure that new dwellings sit well in design terms with adjoining areas. There is a need to include words and phrases like 'scale', 'massing' and 'urban grain' and 'density'.

New homes should be limited to two storeys in height and enhance visual enhance the area, and connect with

existing housing.

#### BW3

This is a central policy in the plan because this impacts on the area outside of the existing settlement area and within the Green Belt. This is where most of the new 700 homes are most likely to be constructed.

The policy clearly supports the view that any amount of homes put forward is acceptable. Burley residents have consistently stated that large development sites are not in the interests of the community and are contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan.

The council need to reflect and represent robust local views when publishing the Land Allocation document on specific sites. Burley Parish Council must influence the range of sites prior to publication, thus ensuring conformity to the Neighbourhood Plan.

Para 4.24, and Para. 4.25 of the Neighbourhood Plan states as follows:

- 4.24 The main issues raised by local people during the consultation were:
- the need for new homes to be spread over several sites, not in one big estate-type development; and
- the lack of affordable homes to buy or rent.
- provision for a growing percentage of elderly residents

4.25 The vision for Burley is to ensure that the village continues to feel focussed around a village centre and avoids sprawl along the main commuter routes to Menston, Otley or Ilkley. This means that new housing should be well integrated into the village, avoiding a single large development that is perceived as a separate place. This will ensure that residents in the new homes feel integrated with the existing community. Dispersing new housing development across a range of sites will help to ensure that these sites are of a size that avoids dominating the local area. If the Neighbourhood Plan is to mean anything, then the voice of Burley people needs to be respected by Bradford Council as it prepares to publish the Land Allocation Plan, including the Green Belt review. Already, local people have expressed views on those SHLAA sites it would like to see developed in preference to others. Refer to Section Two – Building Development of the Appendix 1 – Analysis of Questionnaires.

### **Comment Forms**

The comment form is very prescriptive, and requires one comment only per submission. This will be off putting for many who may otherwise have wish to express their opinions.

		Comment forms are only available in Microsoft Word's (.doc) format, and many people will not have the software to open these documents. Both would have been better supplied as editable PDF's and/or supplied in Rich Text Format (.rtf).
		Whilst I accept that these documents are available elsewhere, most people are most likely to complete an online submission. Having said this, those people without adequate software cannot respond using the supplied .doc format; and if time poor, might not be able to visit elsewhere to obtain copies.
		Lastly; as a general observation, the original online location for all documents was initially reported as located at: https://www.bradford.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/neighbourhood-areas/?Folder=Burley-in-Wharfedale.
		This has since been changed to https://bradford.moderngov.co.uk/mgConsultationDisplay.aspx?ID=85, a location which I had to request. The old link should have had a redirect to the new web page. Here again it's a case of having a transparent process in place.
		No notification of this change has been made.
Clare Davey		Objection to large scale developments in small villages ruining countryside and with insufficient infrastructure. There is already too much traffic in the village and shops and infrastructure is unable to cope.
Heather Lockwood		Insufficient consideration has been given to pdl sites in the District and the Council are using the Green Belt as an easy alternative. There ought to be a thorough review of all sites before any fields are developed. Congestion in the village and flooding are a concern and there is a far greater issue with secondary school places than with Primary. Are there any guarantees that the promised school will be developed? The scale and nature of Burley has already grown substantially in the recent past altering what residents liked about the village.
Christopher Darley	Litchfields (on behalf of CEG)	In conclusion, whilst CEG welcome the publication of the Formal Consultation Draft of the Burleyin-Wharfedale Neighbourhood Plan, it contains significant failures, when assessed against the 'basic conditions' which such a plan should satisfy.
		The plan fails to comply with the emerging Bradford Local Plan Core Strategy (incorporating Main Modifications) which has been found sound by the Government appointed Inspector. It continues to be drafted on a premise of delivering the lower and now obsolete housing target and needs to be redrafted to reflect the Core Strategy and the requirement to support the delivery of 700 homes. Whilst the plan is correct not to allocate sites to deliver the

Kellie Holdsworth	Walton & Co (on behalf of Mr & Mrs Wrigglesworth and Mr and Mrs Bottomforths)	required 700 new homes given the need for Green Belt release, it is erroneous in continuing to seek to influence the spatial distribution of those homes, given its support for a "dispersal" approach. Such an approach is however not based upon any form of technical evidence base or analysis and has the potential effect of predetermining, or indeed undermining the ability of Bradford Council's Land Allocations DPD to properly assess and consider the most appropriate location, or locations, for the delivery of housing based upon a detailed analysis. Public support for a dispersal approach does not amount to technical evidence and in any event no weight should be given to such support as it was forthcoming on the basis of a requirement to deliver 200 homes, which would have very different consequences than the dispersal of the now higher figure. Indeed the consequences of the dispersal of the higher figure have not been considered by the Parish Council (nor an SEA produced to that effect). By advocating a dispersed approach the plan also fails to acknowledge or account for the benefits of delivering the majority of the required homes on a single large site. Those benefits are highlighted in this letter.  Finally it is considered that a number of the policies in the plan fail to accord with the detailed wording of the NPPF, whilst in other cases there is unnecessary replication of policies of the Core Strategy. An audit of all of the policies of the draft Neighbourhood Plan should be undertaken against these documents as part of the preparation of a basic conditions statement. The outcome of these revisions to the draft plan is the need to carry out a further round of public engagement and consultation, based upon a clear premise of a plan positively supporting the delivery of 700 new homes. This should take place as a stage in advance of future submission of the plan to Bradford Council.  The site on Main Street the A65 is considered suitable for a Local Green Space designation in accordance with Paragraph 77 of th
		The sites known as BU/08 in SHLAA 3, Main Street A65 should be allocated as Local Green Space and there is a substantial amount of Heritage assessments supporting the assertion.
		Paragraph 4.5 of The Neighbourhood Plan should be amended to include the importance of preserving the rural and historic character of the eastern entrance to the village. Paragraph 4.7 bullet 1 "Civic Zone" should make reference to the importance of the substantial number of Listed Buildings in the area of the above mentioned site.
Birgit Schluckbier		Support to the Parish Council for producing the Neighbourhood Plan and seeking to support and shape local development. Concern relating to paragraph 4.25 and the promotion of the dispersal method of allocating sites in the village. This approach may have been appropriate for the delivery of a smaller housing target but not now that the Core Strategy requires 700 dwelling to be built. The delivery of such a significant number of houses is best

	approached in one large development so that there is: a clear focus on required additional infrastructure, less impact on green spaces in the existing part of village, a clear focus of landscaping funding and mitigation and an
	opportunity to allow for additional community provisions. Concern that 700 houses being spread across multiple smaller sites would prevent a coherent and consistent approach to infrastructure, landscaping or community
	provisions for the village as each site would simply do the minimum required without looking at the impact on the
	village as a whole. Concern that if several sites were chosen, these could be promoted in the already sensitive area between Burley and Menston where there is a real danger that boundaries of the two villages will effectively merge.
Simon Longfield	Section 3.8
	Developments outlined in the Neighbourhood Plan, as I understand it, will result in the loss of 26.64 hectares of
	Green Belt land. Having lived in Burley-in-Wharfedale for the last 13 years it appears the ever-increasing pressure for more roads, housing and commercial development means it is more vital than ever to protect the Green Belt that we
	have. Development on Green Belt land should be tightly controlled so that it can fulfil its main purpose: to serve as a
	buffer between towns and the countryside. The proposals for the construction of 500+ new houses on Green Belt
	land immediately to the West of the village would bring our village much closer to Ben Rhydding and Ilkley, which
	itself is required to build 1000+ homes that will no doubt mean construction Eastwards, thereby bringing us much closer together.
	The best way to conserve the character of Burley-in-Wharfedale is to have clusters of new sites of no more than say fifty houses in each. This would provide the best method to integrate new housing into the village.
	It has been the Government's stance for some time now that councils should use their Local Plan to safeguard their
	local area against urban sprawl and protect the green lungs around towns and cities. Measures introduced by the
	Government have righty so in my view ensured Green Belt boundaries be altered ONLY in exceptional cases through the preparation or review of councils' Local Plans.
	The requirement for new homes throughout the Wharfe Valley region provides suitable incentive to regenerate damaged, derelict land as well as brownfield sites within existing urban areas surrounded by Green Belt (not least for
	example the Greenholme Mill development in the village). At the same time, Green Belts bring social, environmental and economic benefits, while offering people the chance to tap into natural capital on their doorsteps. Our Green
	Belt in the Wharfe Valley is a cherished asset and shouldn't be overlooked for its contribution towards cattle
	rearing/food production, flood prevention, climate change mitigation, attracting tourism and much more.
	Local opinion does not support large scale development. Future Plans must reflect the views of local people
	expressed in the public consultations and NOT those proposed by public agencies and private developers.
	Section 3.4 and 3.5
	The transport links and infrastructure provision within Burley-in-Wharfedale and surrounding areas (in particular the

Rail service and car park provision) are already stretched.

- 1. Consequently there will be very limited scope to increase the level of employment in the village given the transport and infrastructure limitations. There are only a small number of businesses in the village and local area as it is, hence the plans for the development of the Green Belt, as currently set out, will add significant volume to the existing commuter base (most of whom travel to Leeds, Bradford and further afield).
- 2. The A65 passing the village towards Ilkley and thereon to the Yorkshire Dales and Lake District not only experiences significant congestion at weekends and holiday periods but is generally congested most weekdays given the limited access to points to Ilkley more generally tail backs to the Burley-in-Wharfedale bypass roundabout (by the Generous Pioneer public house) are common place.
- 3. The village train station has no spare capacity for parking as evidenced by surrounding streets already having commuters' cars abandoned there most days. The proposed 700+ new homes would undoubtedly have (on average) more than more car per household. Regrettably people do not have the inclination or time to walk long distances these days such is the distance between the proposed development and the station (approximately 1.4 kilometres), it is a fair assumption to make that residents will take their cars before attempting to catch the already overcongested Rail service. Quite where this additional volume of new cars will park (or be abandoned) is beyond comprehension?
- 4. Rail capacity the developers are suggesting additional train carriages and services will be added to the existing network. This raises questions regarding the adequacy existing platform lengths for the number of additional carriages required, but also the amount of power that can be supplied to the Wharfe Valley line (I understand Network Rail has already confirmed in writing that no more carriages will be permissible as it cannot deliver sufficient additional power to the lines to run them).

### Policy BW2

As I understand it this is a central policy in the plan because this impacts on the area outside of the existing settlement area and within the Green Belt. This is where most of the new 700 homes are most likely to be constructed.

The proposals for the construction of 500+ new houses on Green Belt land immediately to the West of the village would bring our village much closer to Ben Rhydding and Ilkley, which itself is required to build 1000+ homes that will no doubt mean construction Eastwards, thereby bringing us much closer together.

The main issues raised by local people during the consultation were:

• the need for new homes to be spread over several sites, not in one big estate-type development; and

	• the lack of affordable homes to buy or rent.
	provision for a growing percentage of elderly residents
	provision for a growing percentage of claserty residents
	The policy clearly supports the view that any amount of homes put forward is acceptable. Burley-in-Wharfedale
	residents have consistently stated that large development sites are not in the interests of the community and are
	contrary to the Neighbourhood Plan.
	The council need to reflect and represent robust local views when publishing the Land Allocation document on
	specific sites. Burley Parish Council must influence the range of sites prior to publication, thus ensuring conformity to
	the Neighbourhood Plan.
Chris Turner	Section 3.7 and 3.11
	I'm concerned that not enough work has been done, in identifying brown sites, as opposed to potential declassifying
	current green-belt sites for development. Section 3.7 says "protect open spaces and preserve the natural and built
	heritage of the area", but and the apparent need to build 700 houses as stated in 3.11 is, in my opinion, in conflict
	with this aim. The number of houses in question, will affect our open spaces and our natural heritage, not to mention
	the character of the village. Section 1.15, alludes to Green Belt land being reviewed as suitable for development. Until
	and unless brown sites have been assessed, I believe that green-belt land should be preserved and only used for
	development in extreme circumstances. Plans need to take wild-life, flood-defences and our human need for green
	space into account. Also, as described in 4.24 and 4.25, provision needs to be made for affordable housing. I'm not
	convinced that there is enough provision for first-time buyers and the retired being considered in current proposals.
Sarah	The local plan and core strategy are not yet finished so how can we possibly comment on this plan!
Constantine	
	We should not allow any developments on Green belt land until we know the content of the final local plan and core
	strategy.
Judith Longfield	1. As a Burley-in-Wharfedale resident, I am concerned about being asked for my opinion on the Neighbourhood Plan
	for Burley when at the current time, BMDC has an unadopted Core Strategy (or as it is referred to in the proposal, the
	'emerging Core Strategy'). The proposal states the Neighbourhood Plan has to support the strategic development
	needs, including those for housing and economic development, as set out in Bradford's planning policies (currently
	the RUDP) and that the 'emerging Core Strategy' needs to be taken into account. How can we, as a community,
	comment on a Neighbourhood Plan for Burley without sight of or access to a Local Plan or an adopted Core Strategy
	for the Bradford district?
	2. The proposal states that a significant propher of hereas will result be built as seen built level 10 states that a
	2. The proposal states that a significant number of houses will need to be built on green belt land. It states that a

		green belt review will be required by BMDC but it is very concerning that the proposal appears to be content with the possibility of a large number of houses being built on green belt land. Statements within the proposal declare that one of the Plan's objectives is to conserve and enhance the character of Burley. This will be difficult to achieve if a large swathe of green belt land were to be released for housing.
		3. The proposal states that from the feedback received from the consultation meetings held with local residents, there is no support for large scale housing developments within the village. It is of great concern that this is not mentioned in 'The Vision' statement. The feedback from local people revealed an overwhelming desire for small scale housing developments within the village. Given the immense impact a housing growth target of 700 houses will have on the village, it is imperative that the opinions of Burley residents regarding this point should be strongly reflected as an objective in the Neighbourhood Plan.
John Flemming	Gladman Developments Ltd	This section highlights the key issues that Gladman would like to raise with regards to the content of the BIWNP as currently proposed. It is considered that some policies do not reflect the requirements of national policy and guidance, Gladman have therefore sought to recommend a series of alternative options that should be explored prior to the Plan being submitted for Independent Examination.
		Vision Whilst noting the importance of the Green Belt, it is important to note that the Plan should not set out in its vision the aim to retain the existing Green Belt boundary. It is important to note that the recent Housing White Paper recommends that Local Plans should be reviewed every 5 years which in turn may result in the redrawing of Green Belt boundaries to meet future development needs where these locations no longer fulfil the five purposes of Green Belt. Whilst it is not the place of a neighbourhood plan to redraw Green Belt boundaries this will be a matter for BCC to consider following any decision to release further land from the Green Belt. It is important therefore that the Neighbourhood Plan does not undermine the potential future need for development in this regard as the Plan's vision could quickly become out of date should this occur.
		Policy BW2 Development outside the Settlement Boundary Following the issues raised above, whilst noting the settlement is contained by the existing Green Belt boundary it is important that suitable flexibility/support is provided within the Policy to ensure that the Plan will be supportive of any future decision of BCC to release land from the Green Belt in a future Local Plan review or Site Allocations DPD.
		Policy BW15 Green Infrastructure Whilst Gladman generally support the Parish Council's ambition to improve the biodiversity assets of the

	neighbourhood plan area. It is important that this policy should not prevent the delivery of sustainable development opportunities being delivered where these would lead to enhanced or improvements to biodiversity assets and landscape features or improve existing assets.  The loss of some features may be required to ensure the deliverability of a development proposal overall and in these circumstances it is quite often the case that the loss of biodiversity assets will normally be compensated for through the replacement of similar features within a development proposal.  Notwithstanding the above, we would question why it is necessary to protect all green spaces when the majority of land is already protected by virtue of its current designation of Green Belt.  Conclusions
	Gladman recognises the role of neighbourhood plans as a tool for local people to shape the development of their local community. Whilst we support many of the policies aims and objectives in principle, we feel that the Plan would benefit from additional modifications to the Plan to ensure that it allows for flexibility going forward and ensures the Plan is capable of reacting positively to changes that may occur over the plan period.
Katherine Naylor	Section 1.15 I am unclear as to the availability of brown field sites within the district, and therefore highly dubious about whether there is a clear need to release green belt sites for development, or whether in fact this is being proposed as an easy way to get developers to build large scale sites which they may otherwise not be interested in.
	Section 1.11 and 1.12 How can we comment on this plan when the local plan and core strategy are not finalised?
	Until these plans are finalised, we should not allow any developments on Green Belt land. Section 1.20 and 1.21 "No large-scale developments which would distort the existing balance of existing life"
	I am pretty sure in the context of Burley everyone will think 500 houses near Sun Lane is large scale
	The impact on schools and other infrastructure in Burley will be immense and devastating. POLICY BW2

		I struggle to see how the current planning application for 500 plus houses off Sun Lane can be deemed to comply with any of the matters mentioned in paras 4.24 and 4.25 etc
		"4.24 The main issues raised by local people during the consultation were:
		<ul> <li>the need for new homes to be spread over several sites, not in one big estate-type development; and</li> <li>the lack of affordable homes to buy or rent.</li> </ul>
		provision for a growing percentage of elderly residents
		4.25 The vision for Burley is to ensure that the village continues to feel focussed around a village centre and avoids sprawl along the main commuter routes to Menston, Otley or Ilkley. This means that new housing should be well integrated into the village, avoiding a single large development that is perceived as a separate place. This will ensure that residents in the new homes feel integrated with the existing community. Dispersing new housing development across a range of sites will help to ensure that these sites are of a size that avoids dominating the local area."
		I support of the views expressed in 4.24 (page 37).
		4.3 Table 1 (pg 12); 5.4 Table 2 (pg 17)
		The Strategic Environment Assessment (SEA) states that there will be no impact upon Waste Management.
		There are recent examples of flooding due to poor drainage – for example Station Road, the Red Lion and knock on effects into Long Meadows.
		The A65 often floods and the fields where the development is proposed are flood prone.
Amanda		Section 1.15
Stainton		Not enough consideration has been given to the availability and use of brownfield sites in the area which would
		provide the required homes without destroying the green belt that makes the area rural rather than urban. It is too easy to stretch the boundaries of the village without consideration of wider implications of concentrated
		development. There is a need to review all sites in the area before fields are built on.
Lucille Adie	CBMDC	The plan would benefit from:
		A reduction in text to try and ensure it is simpler and easier to read, understand and be applied in the determination of development proposals.
		Further editorial control to delete lower case text that is unrelated to policies being promoted in the plan, or are more suited to submission or companion documents.

		Considerable parts of Section 2 are unrelated to the policies promoted in the Plan.
		The text devoted to objectives is excessive and repetitive in Sections 3 and 4.
		Detailed consultation material should be deleted from the plan and included in the Consultation Statement.
		Specific points aiming to improve precision and clarity and to prevent misinterpretation have been detailed in the
		attached matrix.
Suzanne Kidger	Otley Town Council	OTC wished to record its support for the comprehensive cover of the plan. A list of policies would have been useful at the beginning of the document.
		Given the importance of the Wharfedale Greenway and its connectivity between the various Parish/Town Councils
		and Lead Authorities it is considered that the policy should specifically mention protecting the route of the Greenway
		- not just be in supporting text as an action for the Parish Council.
Simon Hoare		I have just been reading through the information on the Public Consultation.
		In summary the consultation document sets out a number of valid points around attempting to preserve and improve the village which is great.
		However Bradfords Core strategy of an additional 700 homes will fundamentally change the village.
		The level of development of 700 new homes in the village is far far to many. This level of development is not wanted by the people of Burley in Wharfedale.
		Of course this debate has been on going for several years. The fundamental issue for me is the same as debated last year around the development of the green field site at Sun Lane.
		The Village just can't sustain the numbers of people that will come with this development.
		I have a couple of questions.
		1. Bradfords Core strategy is mentioned and the requirement for 700 additional houses in Burley. Is the evidence/calculation behind this figure available?
		2. What constitutes a view that needs protecting? With reference to view B from the bridle path at Sun Lane looking toward the moor?

	I live on the bridleway if I turn to look over the Valley the view is spectacular. This will be gone if the CEG proposal goes ahead. Why is this view less important or how do we get it to be as important?
	3. What is the position of the Parish Council in relation to the recent comments by the Government specifically on green field site development in the Shipley Constituency?
Peter Cartwright	SECTION 1.8
	This section does not have the correct details as stated in the NPPF guidelines. The council and developers need to give contractual assurances regarding the upgrades to infrastructure, making certain there are enough school places for all the children to attend the local primary and secondary schools. There are also no details of how the road and rail networks are going to cope with the additional traffic flow, our doctor's surgery is full to bursting what plans are in place to cope with two to three thousand more people living in the suburb of Burley as it can no longer be described as a village.
	SECTION 1.11 AND 1.12 B-I-W neighbourhood plan complies with the 2005 RUDP, this is currently in the process of being replaced by a local development plan, Conformity to the RUDP is a moot point in section 1.11 Bradford haven't yet adopted a local development plan including details of the land allocations for all areas regarding housing an employment needs. (having Ilkley as a growth area needing all these new jobs / housing to support these jobs cannot be justified) As members of the community we are being asked to comment on a plan that is not there. Developers have jumped on the back of these plans and submitted plans for large developments on greenbelt land.
	SECTION 1.14 there is no adopted 'Local Plan/Core Strategy' until this plan has appeared we cannot examine the plan. Further work is required on the local plan. core strategy
	SECTION 1.15 This plan covers building up to 2030 the plan states there is going to be lots of building on greenbelt. This needs to be reviewed as the government have stated they still want to protect the greenbelt.
	It's also important to reflect on other reports requested and prepared for BDMC by their appointed local architect. These alternative views are not represented throughout the Neighbourhood Plan. The article is located at <a href="http://brag.addins4webplus.co.uk/projects/update-on-the-land-adjacent-to-sun-lane/">http://brag.addins4webplus.co.uk/projects/update-on-the-land-adjacent-to-sun-lane/</a>

Bradford council has been asked for a copy of all the brownfield and greenfield sites across the Bradford district. I believe the council say this information does not exist, taking into account the governments concern reprotecting greenbelt perhaps this piece of work need undertaking so the use of brownfield sites across the district can be priorities first over unnecessary and maybe unwanted building on greenbelt. (I note that Leeds Council have said they have overstated their housing demand by 20%, Have Bradford reconsidered their figures for housing demand now Brexit is upon us.

I.E all the housing of the development at Menston (High Royds) hasn't been sold after 10 years. People living on this development use the same roads and railway networks which feature in our local development plan.

#### SECTION 3.8

Small housing developments no larger than 50 homes are the are the correct way to keep the village feel of Burley. Large developments will cause increased traffic congestion and major issues with parking throughout Burley

Burley residents do not want large scale developments smaller scale is far better than idea than large scale building site. This development plan must respect the views of Burley residents. Large developers said that Burley was in favour of these plans however the form they gave people to fill in only allowed positive comments there was no room for negative comments.

We want the council to take into account local people opinions rather than just rail road us with their opinion and those of large house builder of the number and types of homes we want.

### POLICY BW1

Any new dwellings will have to blend in well with the existing local developments design There is a need to include words and phrases like 'scale', 'massing' and 'urban grain' and 'density'. In this part of the document.

New homes should be limited to two storeys in height and enhance visual enhance the area, and connect with existing housing. This is true where Bradford landscape architects have said that the building of 500 homes on one plat should be turned down as it is not in the keeping with the rest of the village and the surrounding countryside.

#### **POLICY BW3**

Looks like most of the 700 homes are going to be built on greenbelt which is not acceptable because of the number

of homes which I do not think this council can justify and the impact on greenbelt..

It look like the policy is large scale housing developments are fine yet Burley residents have always said smaller more minable developments are far better traffic congestions could be minimised and the developments merge in better with the local community. The local development plan should reflect the will of the Burley residents.

These points need to be taken into consideration when publishing the land allocation document for specific sites. The Parish council must have some say of the which sites should be allocated for building before the document is published.

Para 4.24, and Para. 4.25 of the Neighbourhood Plan states as follows:

4.24 The main issues raised by local people during the consultation were:

- the need for new homes to be spread over several sites, not in one big estate-type development; and
- the lack of affordable homes to buy or rent.
- provision for a growing percentage of elderly residents

4.25 The vision for Burley is to ensure that the village continues to feel focussed around a village centre and avoids sprawl along the main commuter routes to Menston, Otley or Ilkley. This means that new housing should be well integrated into the village, avoiding a single large development that is perceived as a separate place. This will ensure that residents in the new homes feel integrated with the existing community. Dispersing new housing development across a range of sites will help to ensure that these sites are of a size that avoids dominating the local area. If the Neighbourhood Plan is to mean anything, then the voice of Burley people needs to be respected by Bradford Council as it prepares to publish the Land Allocation Plan, including the Green Belt review. Already, local people have expressed views on those SHLAA sites it would like to see developed in preference to others. Refer to Section Two – Building Development of the Appendix 1 – Analysis of Questionnaires

### Burley NDP Comment Form(s)

The comment form is very prescriptive, and requires one comment only per submission. This will be off putting for many who may otherwise have wish to express their opinions.

Comment forms are only available in Microsoft Word's (.doc) format, and many people will not have the software to open these documents. Both would have been better supplied as editable PDF's and/or supplied in Rich Text Format

(.rtf).
Whilst I accept that these documents are available elsewhere, most people are most likely to complete an online submission. Having said this, those people without adequate software cannot respond using the supplied .doc format; and if time poor, might not be able to visit elsewhere to obtain copies.
Lastly; as a general observation, the original online location for all documents was initially reported as located at: <a href="https://www.bradford.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/neighbourhood-areas/?Folder=Burley-in-Wharfedale">https://www.bradford.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/neighbourhood-areas/?Folder=Burley-in-Wharfedale</a> .
This has since been changed to <a href="https://bradford.moderngov.co.uk/mgConsultationDisplay.aspx?ID=85">https://bradford.moderngov.co.uk/mgConsultationDisplay.aspx?ID=85</a> , a location which I had to request. The old link should have had a redirect to the new web page. Here again it's a case of having a transparent process in place and no notification of this change has been made.