

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

PLANNING SERVICE
RECEIVED
21 MAR 2014

For Office Use only:

Date		83
Ref		

Core Strategy Development Plan Document

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

Publication Draft - Representation Form

PART A: PERSONAL DETAILS

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

	1. YOUR DETAILS*	2. AGENT DETAILS (if applicable)
Title	Mr	
First Name	[REDACTED]	
Last Name	Watson	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)		
Address Line 1	[REDACTED]	
Line 2	[REDACTED]	
Line 3	Ilkley	
Line 4		
Post Code	LS29 [REDACTED]	
Telephone Number	[REDACTED]	
Email Address	[REDACTED]	
Signature:	[REDACTED]	Date: 19/3/2014

Personal Details & Data Protection Act 1998

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

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

For Office Use only:

Date

Ref

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

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

Section

5.3

Paragraph

64

Policy

HO3

4. Do you consider the Plan is:

4 (1). Legally compliant

Yes

No

X

4 (2). Sound

Yes

No

X

4 (3). Complies with the Duty to co-operate

Yes

No

X

5. Please give details of why you consider the Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please refer to the guidance note and be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

The policy envisages the creation of 1,600 new dwellings in Wharfedale including 800 in Ilkley. This is unsound as it fails to take into account the latest guidance for the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which in paragraph 24 (ref ID 3-24-20140306) states that the Local authority should take into account windfall allowance. This is particularly the case in Ilkley where the unique combination of large Victorian and Edwardian properties means that these sites are regularly redeveloped to provide additional dwellings. Since 2004 some 500 new dwellings have been provided by this route. This must be taken into account when assessing local need in Ilkley and to date this has not been the case. Ilkley allocation in Policy HO3 is thus unsound.

The Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) does not support development of the scale proposed in Wharfedale and Ilkley in particular. HRA 6.3.4 states that this level of development will have an adverse impact on the internationally important South Pennine Moors SPA. Additionally the HRA is incomplete (e.g. 6.4.9) and is therefore unsound. There are major issues on Ilkley Moor relating to fire risk (HRA 6.4.10 and cat predation (HRA 6.4.14) for example. All step one tests on the likely impact on South Pennine Moor SPA (of which Ilkley Moor forms a major part) show significant risks from development (HRA 7.2). Step two tests (HRA 7.2) indicate that the scale of the impact is likely to be high on Ilkley and Romalds Moor (which form major local features to Ilkley and critical to tourism which is designated as a local growth feature), the effects are likely to be long lasting and threaten the viability of habitats and species over a sustained period and the natural ecological dynamics of the site are threatened. HRA 8.3.1 states that reducing the scale of housing allocations particularly for settlements within 2.5km of the SPA (which includes all of the proposed Ilkley allocations) is necessary to satisfy the Habitats Regulations. Furthermore HRA 8.3.2 states that the housing allocations should be located more than 2.5km from the SPA boundary. This would rule out any additional non windfall development in Ilkley. Finally the policy

H03 is legally non compliant as it will not meet the Habitats Regulations.

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

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

As windfall development should be taken into account in Ilkley this would more than meet the need over the Local Plan timescale. Accordingly the number of new housing allocations in Ilkley should be reduced from 800 to 75. The balance would be made up of windfall development.

To meet the need for legal compliance and to meet the Habitats Regulations the number of new allocations should be restricted to brownfield sites in the centre of Ilkley more than 2.5km from the edge of the internationally important South Pennine Moor. Accordingly the number of new housing allocations should be reduced from 800 to 75 in Ilkley.

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

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

Please be as precise as possible.

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

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

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

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

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

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

9. Signature:

Date:

19/3/2014

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

For Office Use only:

Date			
Ref			

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

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

Section	3	Paragraph	102	Policy	SC7
---------	---	-----------	-----	--------	-----

4. Do you consider the Plan is:

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

5. Please give details of why you consider the Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please refer to the guidance note and be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Policy SC7 envisages green belt releases to deliver housing growth allocations in policy HO3. The policy will see the creation of 1,600 new dwellings in Wharfedale including 800 in Ilkley. The policy SC7 is unsound as it fails to take into account the latest guidance regarding the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In particular it fails to recognise the importance that the Government attaches to Green Belt land (NPPF Section 9 para 79). In particular with regard to Ilkley (which is a historic Victorian Spa Town) and with a local moor made well-known by the eponymous song the Green Belt should preserve the setting and special character of historic towns (NPPF Section 9 para 80). NPPF section 9 para 89 states that Local Authorities should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate for the Green Belt. The overall policy SC7 combined with HO3 envisages that 11,000 new dwellings should come from release of green belt land (Local Plan 5.3.30). This is unsound, not sustainable and not compliant with the NPPF.

The SHLAA May 2013 indicates that with a combination of windfall development (which can now be taken into account – NPPF para 24) of 750 over a fifteen year time scale and Greenfield/brownfield developments of which 263 are already identified this would more than meet the assessed need for housing allocation within Ilkley (800) without the need for any additional allocations from greenbelt land.

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

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

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

The policy SC7 should be altered in combination with policy HO3 and should be modified with respect to the number of housing allocations for Ilkley. At present the policy calls for 800 allocations for Ilkley but this should be reduced to 75. All potential allocations from greenbelt land should be classified as unsuitable in Ilkley. The policy HO3 must take into account windfall development (typically 750 over a fifteen year time horizon) in Ilkley. Policy SC7 and HO3 must be modified to fully protect the existing Green Belt in Ilkley and prohibit any changes to existing green belt boundaries over the timeframe of the Local Plan.

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

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

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

X

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

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

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

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

9. Signature

Date:

19/3/2014

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

For Office Use only:

Date

Ref

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

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

Section

3

Paragraph

60

Policy

SC4

4. Do you consider the Plan is:

4 (1). Legal ly compliant

Yes

No

X

4 (2). Sound

Yes

No

X

4 (3). Complies with the Duty to co-operate

Yes

No

X

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

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

The policy designates Ilkley as a principal town. However this is unsound and is not justified. Ilkley does not have the markers of a principal town. It is significantly smaller than the other principal towns (e.g one third the size of Keighley). Few administrative council services have been retained at Ilkley, it has no emergency medical facilities and is more of a commuter town than focus of employment (Section 2 para 52). Ilkley should not be designated as a principal town.

Ilkley is identified as having an important role in tourism (Sub Area Policy WD1). However much of the tourism is generated from the attractive surroundings of Ilkley. This would be significantly downgraded if the greenbelt development envisaged in policy H03 is allowed to proceed. There is an essential problem at the heart of policy SC4 which designates Ilkley as a principal town and so has a substantial housing development allocated (800 dwellings) but this development would contradict the objective to further develop Ilkley as a tourist centre. More local housing would add to already substantial pressure on car parking in Ilkley which would also make life more challenging for those seeking to expand their offers for tourists.

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

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

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

The policy S04 should be modified with Ilkley no longer designated as a principal town. The number of dwellings planned in Ilkley should then be scaled back to 75.

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

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

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

X

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

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

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

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

9. Signature

Date

19/3/2014

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

For Office Use only:

Date

Ref

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

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

Section

4.3

Paragraph

E1

Policy

WD1

4. Do you consider the Plan is:

4 (1). Legally compliant

Yes

No

X

4 (2). Sound

Yes

No

X

4 (3). Complies with the Duty to co-operate

Yes

No

X

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

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

The policy HO3 calls for the creation of 1,600 new dwellings in Wharfedale including 800 in Ilkley. In section 4.3 E1 the policy calls for development to maximise the use of non car modes of transport and reduce the overall need to travel. In the Local Infrastructure Plan (LIP) October 2013 paragraph 4.3.6 has a strategic objective which calls for development to be in locations that reduce the need to travel and minimise the need to travel by car. It further adds that in so doing overcrowding within the existing housing stock should be reduced. LIP 5.2.2 confirms that even in the short term the district is not forecast to create enough jobs to meet the demands of the population. Paragraph 5.2.2 also identifies problematic congestion on routes used by Ilkley residents even before any additional dwellings are built in Ilkley.

So, we already have congested roads and overcrowding on commuter trains (LIP 5.5.1) and it is admitted that Ilkley is not a major town for employment growth. The policy calls for less car journeys and reduced need for travel. Accordingly housing allocations in HO3 are unsound and dwelling development should not be in commuter towns like Ilkley, Addingham and Burley.

Additionally the LIP seems to confuse areas. Under 5.5.1. summary of issues in Wharfedale it refers to the remaining infrastructure topics not posing any issues to planned housing growth in Airedale. How is this relevant to Wharfedale? Likewise in 5.5.2 under education it talks of additional primary and secondary school places in Airedale which has little relevance to issues in Wharfedale. If there are these basic errors how many more are spread throughout the analysis and which therefore calls into question the soundness of analysis and hence policy.

LIP 5.5.4 admits that the dwelling growth will result in additional trip generation and implies that this is in all forms of transport. This is at odds with the policy objectives outlined in 4.3 E1.

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

LIP Section 5.5.6 suggests that there are no major transport issues in Wharfedale. However this is a fundamental error. At present the rail links to Leeds in particular are overcrowded on the commuter trains and there is limited prospect of additional capacity due to platform sizes, Leeds station issues and single line issues. A key arterial route is the A65 – the LIP admits this already has severe overcrowding and it fails to take into account (as required) the Leeds Council Local Plan which foresees 2,300 new dwellings in Aireborough which will severely impact the A65 and so make existing congestion even worse. As studies have confirmed that each new dwelling leads to an additional 8 car journeys per day there is a clear dichotomy at the heart of the policy. The policy WD1 aims to reduce the overall need for travel but unless the dwellings are relocated to where the jobs are then the need for both car and public transport journeys will increase substantially on a network which is already overloaded. This is not sustainable or deliverable.

Under LIP 6.2 it confirms that transport is of paramount importance to realise the level of residential and commercial growth set out in the plan. It confirms that in all sub areas including Wharfedale the existing network is vulnerable. It confirms that growth should not overburden capacity. However the proposed dwelling developments in Wharfedale will overburden capacity particularly when taken into account with the 2,300 dwellings planned in Aireborough by the Leeds Local Plan. Proposed dwelling allocation under HO3 is thus unsound.

Additionally it should be noted that there is a £752 million plus funding gap for infrastructure improvements to enable the local plan to be delivered. Given the relentless focus on public expenditure it is highly unlikely that this funding gap will be closed any time soon. WD1 paragraph B indicates that additional schools will be required (local schools are already full) and that there are deficiencies in open and recreational space in Ilkley. No money has been allocated to this at all in the Local Plan and accordingly the plan is unsound. It is not sustainable as it envisages using up green belt land for housing in Ilkley when there is already a deficiency in open space. Accordingly the plan should be revisited and made more deliverable by moving proposed dwelling development away from commuter towns (like those in Wharfedale) and in to the major centres of employment like Bradford so that more people can walk to work which would enable policy in LIP 4.3.6 to be met.

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

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

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

The Policy WD1 in combination with policy HO3 should be revisited and dwellings relocated from commuter towns like Ilkley, Burley and Addingham and into areas of major employment growth like Bradford centre. It is suggested that the 800 dwellings planned for Ilkley should be reduced to 75.

Green Belt changes should be prohibited in Ilkley to keep open space and minimise the impact on transportation through lower housing allocations.

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

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

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

X

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

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

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

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

9. Signature

Date:

19/3/2014

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) : Publication Draft

PART C: EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY MONITORING FORM

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

Please place an 'X' in the appropriate boxes.