

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	H03
---------	-----	-----------	----	--------	-----

**4. Do you consider the Plan is:**

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

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

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

I think this is a fault in the Soundness of the Plan

**Local Needs:** (Section 5.3, paragraph 64, policy H03)

In my opinion there

- Has been no attempt to assess local needs - see
- Seems to be a fundamental flaw in the strategy - it does not set out positive measures for minimising Green Belt changes. For example more than 25% of the District's new homes will be built on Green Belt - and for Ilkley this will be at least 55%).
- Any disturbance - none noted in the Plan - does not seem to **'add any value to green issues'** - such as the protection of wildlife habitat, (Ilkley comes within the 2.5km Habitats Protection Zone - designated under the HRA - see Section 3 Paragraph 106).
- **There is not sufficient minimisation** of additional travel arising from development **nor of boosting tourism.**

All of these issues are not mitigated given the scale of new buildings being proposed as well as the inevitable yet necessary though as yet unidentified infrastructure needed. (Please see Section 3 Paragraphs 103 - 116 Policy SC8)

- Housing numbers have been apparently being reduced on account of a 'Habitats Regulations Assessment' - but only by just over 35% in Ilkley compared to the rest of the Wharfe Valley, that bit in the CBMDC area, where the reduction is just over 55% - but no explanation is given as yet - so it remains unclear from the strategy therefore how the figure of 800 houses was calculated.
- Then there is the v. big and pertinent issue (probably political too, unfortunately) that for job hunters/changers with good jobs in Leeds, Bradford etc. (and who have quite a bit of disposable income) then Ilkley is quite attractive currently - great houses, pleasant area to bring up children, decent schools, and the Moorland etc.). I can speak to this personally - though I moved here a long time back. All this explains the general prices etc., in Ilkley as well as the strong housing demand; (somewhat exhibited by the ongoing process of re-development of large individual property sites!). By the way in my opinion this has led to a windfall of around 500 new homes - at least so since 2004 - though apparently such figures are sadly and somewhat unfortunately excluded from any density calculations. It seems to me that it would be better to go to Harrogate now and let Ilkley, (and therefore Bradford), miss out on this type of relocation/move.

**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.**

Reassess local needs

Recalculate Housing density

Recognise unique nature of Ilkley as an attractive dormer settlement

Do NOT build on Green Belt

Plan and commit to improve Infrastructure including schools and medical facilities

***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?**

<b>No</b>	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:**

Truth is I would not mind (if I am available) being present but this section puts me off....
--

***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.***

<b>9. Signature:</b>		<b>Date:</b>	27 <sup>th</sup> March 2014
----------------------	---	--------------	-----------------------------

