

City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council

PLANNING SERVICE
RECEIVED
31 MAR 2014

City of Bradford Gov. Unit

For Office Use only:

Date

Ref

Gore 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	MRS	
First Name	[REDACTED]	
Last Name	DREW	
Job Title (where relevant)	[REDACTED]	
Organisation (where relevant)	[REDACTED]	
Address Line 1	[REDACTED]	
Line 2	[REDACTED]	
Line 3	ILKLEY	
Line 4	[REDACTED]	
Post Code	LS 29	
Telephone Number	[REDACTED]	
Email Address	[REDACTED]	
Signature	[REDACTED]	Date: 27 th 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.

Per 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	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4 (2). Sound	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4 (3). Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.

Government policy is not to use green belt land yet the plans ARE to build on it. Therefore it is unsound.

No account is taken of other builds eg where one large house and garden was converted to 6 or more houses.

Doesn't they come under some Habitats Protection Law?

Where does the "need" for another 800 houses come from? How, and on what grounds was it derived?

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	15.3	Policy	CORE STRATEGY
---------	---	-----------	------	--------	---------------

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	

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.

School places. No new school places have put in place to cope. When it was suggested that Ilkley Grammar School be built on a new site near Couteauxes Way structural engineering problems were highlighted eg the railway embankment had to be strengthened; drainage was poor and the fact that this land was prone to flooding. An unsound site.

Doctors Surgeries. No plans to accommodate more patients.

Trains and Busses. Already horrendous at peak times and holidays.

The A65 is also horrendous. A bottleneck through Ilkley frequently happens. Everytime a by-pass is mentioned it is discredited.

Car Parking We who live here experience difficulty parking in our own town all year round. Instead of houses we need a car park that can accommodate existing inhabitants – and tourists who benefit our traders but are put off by "nowhere to park".

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	5.2	Paragraph	62	Policy	H03
---------	-----	-----------	----	--------	-----

4. Do you consider the Plan is:

4 (1). Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
4 (2). Sound	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4 (3). Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

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.

Jlley Moor is world famous and the views both towards it and from it are stunning. This would be harmed by more buildings. Also it is a habitat for flora and fauna unique to this environment. It is well looked after and attracts tourists to the area. This would have a detrimental affect on businesses in the town - ie - if more building takes place.

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	6	Policy	SC4
---------	---	-----------	---	--------	-----

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	

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.

Ilkley as a "major town" is unsound. Ilkley has been described variously as, "a retirement town", "an old peoples town", a "tourist town" – never a high industrial nor employment town. - it's also a commuter town (see comments on transport issues), section 3 para 15-3 (CORE STRATEGY)

It does not have the resources of a "major town" i.e. no full time police station, hospital nor administrative facilities. The Town Hall (!) is now barely even open part time. Not really a Town Hall at all. Therefore not really a Town Hall.

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.

Acknowledge the basic infrastructure and address how it would cope - eg schools, health, transport, parking, economics, policing + administrative issues. THE IMPACT.
Acknowledge re-developments not mentioned and the potential for more to be done and not taken into account.
Addresses the fact that Ilkley is a tiny part of Bradford and not typical.
Look into brownfield sites and improve their environment. →
JUSTIFY using green belt. (We all know it's cheaper - but ethically!)

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?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<input type="checkbox"/>	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: [REDACTED] Date: 27th 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.

1. Do you live within or have an interest in the Bradford District?