City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

www.bradford.gov.uk

For Office Use only:			
Date			
Ref			

Core Strategy Development Plan Document

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

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	**Councillor**	
First Name	[redacted]	
Last Name	**Smith**	
Job Title (where relevant)	-	
Organisation (where relevant)	-	
Address Line 1	[redacted]	
Line 2		
Line 3	**Ilkley**	
Line 4	[redacted]	
Post Code	**LS29** [redacted]	
Telephone Number	[redacted]	
Email Address		
Signature:		**Date:** **30th March 2014**

Personal Details & Data Protection Act 1998
Regulation 22 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012 requires all representations received to be submitted to the Secretary of State. By completing this form you are giving your consent to the processing of personal data by the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council and that any information received by the Council, including personal data may be put into the public domain, including on the Council's website. From the details above for you and your agent (if applicable) the Council will only publish your title, last name, organisation (if relevant) and town name or post code district.
Please note that the Council cannot accept any anonymous comments.

For Office Use only:			
Date			
Ref			

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

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

Section	4.3	Paragraph	All	Policy	WD2

4. Do you consider the Plan is:

4 (1). Legally compliant	Yes		No	?
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.

There is no mention of investment in Sub Area Policy WD2 in secondary education in the valley though there is a passing reference in para 4.3.2 of a new secondary school in Ilkley. (This was not a new school but a modest re-modelling of Ilkley Grammar School on its existing site). Because of site constraints this school cannot be extended and a new school has long been recognised as necessary to support any housing growth in the area. The lack of finance and suitable sites in the valley has handicapped such a solution. There is nothing in the Core Strategy or its associated evidence base that offers any solutions to this problem.

Even if Ilkley gets a new or extended school pupils in Menston are likely to remain, as now, a priority status 2 area with no guaranteed access for our pupils to the school. Menston Secondary pupils would therefore continue to be expected to go to Guiseley School in the Leeds Metropolitan Council area. This school however is known to be filling up due to the many developments which are ongoing in Guiseley and High Royds. As these pupils live nearer than Menston pupils, as Leeds closely follow a distance criteria, they will have preference for access to the school. It is not clear if Leeds are able or are willing to increase capacity at this school so even without the proposed developments in the LDF plan there is rightfully considerable anxiety as to whether future access to Menston pupils will be restricted to this School. Bradford has very limited influence on this situation.

Alternative Local Leeds schools includes St Mary's Catholic School which currently has no space for children of other faiths and Prince Henry's in Otley which is now an Academy and is also fully subscribed, drawing its pupils from Otley, Bramhope, Pool and surrounding villages, so there is real uncertainty as to future access opportunities, which has always been modest, for Menston pupils.

Other options are fraught with difficulty.

The idea of sending Menston secondary aged pupils to outside the valley such as Titus Salts School (at Saltaire) is unlikely to be practical as surplus spaces in this school is no longer an issue CSBAR p.51.

Furthermore this school cannot be reached directly by Public Transport from Menston and any transport would have to allow for a difficult car journey over the moor, travel on the very congested A6038 road by car or with two bus journeys, or by rail with a change.

This school and any other Bradford Community School would be more than 3 miles away new travelling costs would be incurred by Bradford Council.

People who live, or choose to live, in Wharfedale where all Wharfedale schools have good reputations for education that would not be easily persuaded to seek education further away will the inevitable collapse of house prices and undermine the prospect of new development in the area.

Some Burley pupils attending the two Burley Primary schools whose transition is to Ilkley are now being financially disadvantaged because their nearest school, by a small margin, is Guiseley.

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.

Policy WD2 should be redrafted to include that "no development in Wharfedale should take place until it is confirmed that the necessary educational facilities are, with certainty, available locally within Wharfedale including Guiseley and Otley.

necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. Please be as precise as possible.

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

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

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

To ensure that a local, democratically elected voice is heard.

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:	[redacted]	**Date:**	**30th March 2014**

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) : Publication Draft

PART C: EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY MONITORING FORM

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

Please place an 'X' in the appropriate boxes.