



**Intelligent Plans**  
and examinations

# **Report on Ilkley Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020 - 2030**

**An Examination undertaken for Bradford Council with the support of  
Ilkley Town Council on the submission version of the Plan.**

Independent Examiner: Andrew S Freeman BSc (Hons) DipTP DipEM FRTPI

Date of Report: 19 January 2022

## Contents

	Page
<b>Main Findings - Executive Summary</b>	3
<b>1. Introduction and Background</b>	3
• Ilkley Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020-2030	3
• The Independent Examiner	4
• The Scope of the Examination	4
• The Basic Conditions	5
<b>2. Approach to the Examination</b>	5
• Planning Policy Context	5
• Submitted Documents	6
• Site Visit	6
• Written Representations with or without Public Hearing	6
• Modifications	6
<b>3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights</b>	7
• Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area	7
• Plan Period	7
• Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation	7
• Development and Use of Land	8
• Excluded Development	8
• Human Rights	8
<b>4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions</b>	8
• EU Obligations	8
• Main Issues	9
• Issue 1 - Sustainable Residential Development	10
• Issue 2 - Services and Facilities	11
• Issue 3 - Cultural Landscape	12
• Issue 4 - Traffic, Transport and Sustainable Access	14
• Issue 5 - Sustainable Economic Development	14
• Issue 6 - Social Inclusion	14
• Other Matters	14
• Conclusions on the Main Issues	15
<b>5. Conclusions</b>	15
• Summary	15
• The Referendum and its Area	15
• Overview	15
<b>Appendix: Modifications</b>	17

## **Main Findings** - Executive Summary

From my examination of the Ilkley Neighbourhood Development Plan (the Plan) and its supporting documentation, including the representations made, I have concluded that subject to the policy modifications set out in this report, the Plan meets the Basic Conditions.

I have also concluded that:

- the Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body – Ilkley Town Council;
- the Plan has been prepared for an area properly designated – the Ilkley Designated Neighbourhood Development Plan Area – Figure 1 on Page 6 of the Plan;
- the Plan specifies the period to which it is to take effect – 2020-2030; and
- the policies relate to the development and use of land for a designated neighbourhood area.

I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum on the basis that it has met all the relevant legal requirements.

I have considered whether the referendum area should extend beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates and have concluded that it should not.

## **1. Introduction and Background**

### *Ilkley Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020-2030*

- 1.1 The civil parish of Ilkley is located in the north of the Metropolitan District of Bradford approximately 15 km north of Bradford and 23 km northwest of Leeds. Most of the town lies to the south of the River Wharf and the A65 which run roughly in an east-west direction through the area. Beyond the built-up area to the south is the famous Ilkley Moor which rises to a high point on the southern boundary of the area.
- 1.2 There has been a Town Council in Ilkley since May 2018. However, in its former capacity as Ilkley Parish Council, a formal application was made to Bradford Council requesting designation as a neighbourhood area and the area was designated in November 2013.<sup>1</sup> There followed a variety of events aimed at publicising the intention to prepare a neighbourhood plan and at engaging local people in the process. Work over the following years led to the publication of a Preferred Option Draft Neighbourhood Development Plan in 2017 and the submission version of the Plan in mid-2021. The submission version has an overarching vision, nine broad objectives and 21 detailed policies.

<sup>1</sup> See paragraph 3.4 below.

### *The Independent Examiner*

- 1.3 As the Plan has now reached the examination stage, I have been appointed as the examiner of the Ilkley Neighbourhood Development Plan by Bradford Council with the agreement of Ilkley Town Council.
- 1.4 I am a chartered town planner and former government Planning Inspector with over forty years' experience. I have worked in both the public and the private sectors. I am an independent examiner and do not have an interest in any of the land that may be affected by the draft Plan.

### *The Scope of the Examination*

- 1.5 As the independent examiner I am required to produce this report and recommend either:
- (a) that the neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum without changes; or
  - (b) that modifications are made and that the modified neighbourhood plan is submitted to a referendum; or
  - (c) that the neighbourhood plan does not proceed to a referendum on the basis that it does not meet the necessary legal requirements.
- 1.6 The scope of the examination is set out in Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) ("the 1990 Act"). The examiner must consider:
- Whether the plan meets the Basic Conditions.
  - Whether the plan complies with provisions under Section 38A and Section 38B of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) ("the 2004 Act"). These are:
    - it has been prepared and submitted for examination by a qualifying body, for an area that has been properly designated by the local planning authority;
    - it sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land;
    - it specifies the period during which it has effect;
    - it does not include provisions and policies for 'excluded development'; and
    - it is the only neighbourhood plan for the area and does not relate to land outside the designated neighbourhood area.
  - Whether the referendum boundary should be extended beyond the designated area, should the plan proceed to referendum.

- Such matters as prescribed in the Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) (“the 2012 Regulations”).
- 1.7 I have considered only matters that fall within Paragraph 8(1) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act, with one exception. That is the requirement that the Plan is compatible with the Human Rights Convention.

### *The Basic Conditions*

- 1.8 The “Basic Conditions” are set out in Paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act. In order to meet the Basic Conditions, the neighbourhood plan must:
- have regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State;
  - contribute to the achievement of sustainable development;
  - be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan for the area;
  - be compatible with and not breach European Union (EU) obligations (under retained EU law);<sup>2</sup> and
  - meet prescribed conditions and comply with prescribed matters.
- 1.9 Regulation 32 of the 2012 Regulations prescribes a further Basic Condition for a neighbourhood plan. This requires that the making of the neighbourhood development plan does not breach the requirements of Chapter 8 of Part 6 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017.<sup>3</sup>

## **2. Approach to the Examination**

### *Planning Policy Context*

- 2.1 The Development Plan for this part of Bradford Council, not including documents relating to excluded minerals and waste development, includes the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document (adopted July 2017) and the saved policies from the Replacement Unitary Development Plan (update statement July 2017). In addition, Bradford Council is in the process of preparing a single Bradford District Local Plan covering the period 2020 – 2038. This has now reached the Preferred Options stage.

---

<sup>2</sup> The existing body of environmental regulation is retained in UK law.

<sup>3</sup> This revised Basic Condition came into force on 28 December 2018 through the Conservation of Habitats and Species and Planning (Various Amendments) (England and Wales) Regulations 2018.

2.2 The planning policy for England is set out principally in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) offers guidance on how this policy should be implemented. A revised NPPF was published in July 2021 and all references in this report are to the July 2021 NPPF and its accompanying PPG.

### *Submitted Documents*

2.3 I have considered all policy, guidance and other reference documents I consider relevant to the examination, including those submitted which comprise:

- the draft Ilkley Neighbourhood Development Plan 2020-2030;
- a map which identifies the area to which the proposed Neighbourhood Development Plan relates – Figure 1 on Page 6 of the draft Plan;
- the Consultation Statement, January 2021;
- the Basic Conditions Statement, November 2020;
- all the representations that have been made in accordance with the Regulation 16 consultation;
- Local Green Space Assessment, undated;
- the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report, Version 3, November 2020 prepared on behalf of the Town Council; and
- the request for additional clarification sought in my letter of 8 November 2021 and the responses of 7 December from Ilkley Town Council and 19 November and 13 December from Bradford Council.<sup>4</sup>

### *Site Visit*

2.4 I made an unaccompanied site visit to the Neighbourhood Plan Area on 24 November 2021 to familiarise myself with it and visit relevant sites and areas referenced in the Plan and evidential documents.

### *Written Representations with or without Public Hearing*

2.5 This examination has been dealt with by written representations. There was one request for representations to be heard at a hearing session. However, I considered hearing sessions to be unnecessary as the consultation responses clearly articulated the objections to the Plan and presented arguments for and against the Plan's suitability to proceed to a referendum.

### *Modifications*

2.6 Where necessary, I have recommended modifications to the Plan (**PMs**) in this report in order that it meets the Basic Conditions and other legal

---

<sup>4</sup> View at: <https://www.bradford.gov.uk/planning-and-building-control/planning-policy/neighbourhood-areas/?Folder=Ilkley>

requirements. For ease of reference, I have listed these modifications separately in the Appendix.

### **3. Procedural Compliance and Human Rights**

#### *Qualifying Body and Neighbourhood Plan Area*

- 3.1 The Ilkley Neighbourhood Development Plan has been prepared and submitted for examination by Ilkley Town Council, which is a qualifying body for an area that was designated by Bradford Council on 5 November 2013.<sup>5</sup>
- 3.2 The Ilkley Neighbourhood Development Plan is the only neighbourhood plan for Plan area and does not relate to land outside the designated Neighbourhood Plan Area.

#### *Plan Period*

- 3.3 The Plan specifies clearly the period to which it is to take effect, which is from 2020 to 2030.

#### *Neighbourhood Plan Preparation and Consultation*

- 3.4 Details of plan preparation and consultation are set out in the Town Council's Consultation Statement dated January 2021. Application for designation as a neighbourhood area was first made in June 2012. Following statutory publicity, the Neighbourhood Area was approved by Bradford Council on 9 October 2012. Subsequent to this approval, an error in the boundary was noted. A revised application was therefore made on 15 May 2013 and approved by the Council on 5 November 2013.
- 3.5 Towards the start of the Neighbourhood Plan process, in November 2014, a public meeting was held to generate publicity and engage local people. Attendees divided into six discussion groups on a variety of topics. A questionnaire survey was subsequently carried out.
- 3.6 By the autumn of 2017, a Preferred Option Development Plan had been prepared. This was publicised for informal consultation in October 2017. The consultation led to the clarification of key issues and preparation of a draft Plan.
- 3.7 Formal consultation under Regulation 14 was initially carried out between 7 November 2019 and 19 December 2019. However, there was a misunderstanding about which statutory consultees and local bodies

---

<sup>5</sup> At the full meeting of Ilkley Parish Council on 4 December 2017, it was resolved that from 21 May 2018 the Council was to be known as Ilkley Town Council. The decision was made under the provisions of section 245 of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) and the Neighbourhood Plan Area designation of 2013 is therefore preserved for the purposes of the Town Council.

should be approached. As a result, and although the content of the Plan had not changed, a second period of consultation was carried out between 18 February 2020 and 30 March 2020.

- 3.8 During the Regulation 14 consultation period, a total of 117 representations were made. Details of these representations, and amendments to the Plan made as a result, are set out in Appendix 8 of the Consultation Statement. The majority (89) of the responses were made by local residents. In addition, there were 28 representations from 15 statutory consultees, consultants and other bodies.
- 3.9 At the Regulation 16 stage (16 July to 15 September 2021) and including comprehensive comments from Bradford Council, responses were received from some 31 different parties representing residents, businesses, statutory consultees and other bodies.
- 3.10 I am satisfied that, at both the Regulation 14 and the Regulation 16 stages, the consultation process met the legal requirements and there has been procedural compliance. Regard has been paid to the advice on plan preparation and engagement in the PPG.

#### *Development and Use of Land*

- 3.11 Subject to **PM2** (Policy INDP2),<sup>6</sup> the Plan sets out policies in relation to the development and use of land in accordance with Section 38A of the 2004 Act.

#### *Excluded Development*

- 3.12 The Plan does not include provisions and policies for “excluded development”.

#### *Human Rights*

- 3.13 Ilkley Town Council is satisfied that the Plan does not breach Human Rights (within the meaning of the Human Rights Act 1998). From my independent assessment, I see no reason to disagree.

## **4. Compliance with the Basic Conditions**

#### *EU Obligations*

- 4.1 On behalf of the Town Council, the Preferred Option Draft Ilkley Neighbourhood Development Plan was screened for Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) in 2017. In this regard, it is relevant that the southern half of the Neighbourhood Area is within the South Pennine Moors Special Protection

---

<sup>6</sup> See paragraph 4.13 below.



Area (SPA)/Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and there could have been effects arising from the inclusion of four housing and one employment allocation within the emerging Plan.

- 4.2 The 2017 screening assessment concluded that SEA would not be required. However, the sites allocated in the Plan could have had implications for the SPA/SAC. Natural England commented that an assessment should be made of the constraints of each site identified as far as attractiveness to SPA birds is concerned.
- 4.3 To address the concerns of Natural England, a full HRA was carried out on behalf of the Town Council. This concluded that there would be likely significant effects arising from the housing and employment site allocations. Taking into account all the evidence, the Town Council decided to delete the four housing and one employment allocation from the Plan.
- 4.4 A further screening assessment was carried out in 2020. This was on the submission version of the Plan in which the allocations have been omitted. It is concluded that based on the revised proposals, SEA is not required. With regard to HRA, the policies set out in the Plan will not have significant effects either alone or in combination. From my independent assessment of these matters, I have no reason to disagree.

#### *Main Issues*

- 4.5 Having regard for the Ilkley Neighbourhood Development Plan, the consultation responses and other evidence, and the site visit, I consider that there are six main issues relating to the Basic Conditions for this examination. These concern:
- Sustainable Residential Development;
  - Services and Facilities;
  - Cultural Landscape;
  - Traffic, Transport and Sustainable Access;
  - Sustainable Economic Development; and
  - Social Inclusion.
- 4.6 Before I deal with the main issues, I have a few observations to make with regard to the representations. First, the Ilkley Neighbourhood Development Plan should be seen in the context of the wider planning system. This includes the Bradford Core Strategy Development Plan Document and the saved policies from the Replacement Unitary Development Plan, as well as the NPPF and PPG. It is not necessary, and it would be inappropriate, to repeat in the Neighbourhood Plan matters that are quite adequately dealt with elsewhere.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> See NPPF, Paragraph 16 f).

- 4.7 Secondly, the Neighbourhood Development Plan does not have to deal with each and every topic raised through the consultation. In this regard, the content of the Neighbourhood Development Plan and the scope of the policies is largely at the discretion of the qualifying body, albeit informed by the consultation process and the requirements set by the Basic Conditions.
- 4.8 Thirdly, my central task is to judge whether the Neighbourhood Development Plan satisfies the Basic Conditions. Many of the representations do not demonstrate or indicate a failure to meet those conditions or other legal requirements. Similarly, many of the suggested additions and improvements are not necessary when judged against the Basic Conditions.
- 4.9 The following section of my report sets out modifications that are necessary in order to meet the Basic Conditions. Some of the proposed modifications are factual corrections.<sup>8</sup> Others are necessary in order to have closer regard to national policies and advice. In particular, plans should contain policies that are clearly written and unambiguous.<sup>9</sup> In addition, the policies should be supported by appropriate evidence.<sup>10</sup>

#### *Issue 1 - Sustainable Residential Development*

- 4.10 Policy INDP1 (New Housing Development within Ilkley) raises a number of matters that need to be the subject of recommended modifications:
- The policy covers land within the built-up area of Ilkley (land not currently within the Green Belt). For clarity, there should be reference to Figure 4 where Green Belt and non-Green Belt areas can be identified.
  - Under Criterion a), there would be support for new housing that re-uses previously developed land *and* buildings. However, this is a drafting error. The reference should be to previously developed land *or* buildings.
  - Criterion b) refers to the loss of protected open spaces. For clarity, an applicant or decision maker would need to know what are the qualifying spaces. Text needs to be added to make this clear.
  - Criterion c) refers to identified community facilities. These are set out in Policy INDP2. For clarity, there should be cross-reference within Policy INDP1.

---

<sup>8</sup> Modifications for the purpose of correcting errors is provided for in Paragraph 10(3)(e) of Schedule 4B to the 1990 Act.

<sup>9</sup> NPPF, Paragraphs 15 and 16.

<sup>10</sup> PPG Reference: 41-041-20140306.

- Criterion d) affords protection to a listed building and/or Conservation Area. However, the same consideration applies to all heritage assets. Heritage assets should be referred to in the policy.
- Criterion e) on design guidance references the Core Strategy and the Ilkley Design Statement. However, the evidence indicates<sup>11</sup> that the Homes and Neighbourhoods Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document is also of relevance and should be referred to in the policy. To accord with national guidance, it should further be mentioned that regard be had to the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code.
- For clarity, when referring to the town centre (Criterion f)i)), cross-reference should be made to Figure 13.<sup>12</sup>
- Criterion g) makes reference to starter homes. However, these are not starter homes as defined in the NPPF. The criterion needs re-wording.

4.11 Proposed modifications to the policy are set out under **PM1**. With these modifications in place, there would be appropriate clarity, accuracy and regard for the evidence and the NPPF.

#### *Issue 2 - Services and Facilities*

4.12 Policy INDP2 aims to protect and enhance existing community facilities. There are two categories that warrant further consideration. The first is health care (Coronation Hospital and Ilkley Health Centre). The second is the hotel category.

4.13 With regard to health care, service provision is the responsibility of the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. I appreciate that the residents of Ilkley would wish to see the retention of local service. However, I am aware that major service changes such as the loss of a hospital or clinic are the subject of clear patient involvement and consultation duties. In this instance, protection is not the function of the planning system. The related sites should be deleted from the policy.

4.14 As for Craiglunds Hotel, I do not regard this as a community facility. It is a commercial operation. There is no evidence to show that the provisions of the policy should apply. The hotel should be deleted from the policy (proposed modification **PM2**).

4.15 I note that the car park of Sacred Heart Catholic Church, Stockeld Road (INDP2/8) is the subject of a proposed housing allocation. I accept that the parking area is worthy of protection but recognise that this position may be overtaken by events if the housing allocation is ultimately adopted.

---

<sup>11</sup> See Regulation 16 representations, Bradford Council.

<sup>12</sup> The Figures in the Plan are in need of re-numbering.

- 4.16 Policy INDP3 is similar to Policy INDP2 but is directed at protecting and enhancing recreational facilities. The loss of recreational facilities will not be supported unless, amongst other things, the development is for alternative sports or recreational provision. On a small point, the policy refers, incorrectly, to sports *and* recreational provision (not "or"). This would be corrected under proposed modification **PM3**. In addition, and given its deletion from Policy INDP/10/2 (see below), East Holmes Field and Skateboard Park should be added to the policy.
- 4.17 Policy INDP4 concerns allotments and community gardens and includes the circumstances where "redevelopment" would be supported. The term redevelopment is incorrect since it implies knocking down and building again. It would be more accurate to refer to the partial or complete loss of the allotments (proposed modification **PM4**).
- 4.18 The policy continues by referring to provision in a location accessible to future plot holders; but since it is not possible to know from where future plot holders will come, the text needs amendment. This is also covered in proposed modification PM4.

### *Issue 3 - Cultural Landscape*

- 4.19 In Policy INDP5 Encouraging High Quality and Zero Carbon Design, there are several instances where two considerations are mentioned. Through the use of "and", the text indicates that both considerations apply. However, the considerations are different (for example, topography and layout). As such, "or" should be used to cover either eventuality. There is one instance where "and" should be used instead of "or" (quality and character).
- 4.20 Criterion k) would require all new developments to generate a minimum of 10% of their regulated energy use on-site from renewable and low carbon sources. I would normally expect such matters to be determined through the Building Regulations. In addition, government policy is against the setting of additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings.<sup>13</sup> As such, the requirement should be omitted.
- 4.21 For clarity, Criterion n) of the policy should be split into two to address the different points that are made. Also, for succinctness, reference to sustainable drainage systems in Criterion r) should be deleted. This repeats a point made in Criterion l).
- 4.22 Proposed modification **PM5** addresses these various points.
- 4.23 Policy INDP6 sets general principles for new development in Ilkley's Conservation Areas. Amongst other things, key views are to be protected.

---

<sup>13</sup> Written statement to Parliament by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government on 25 March 2015.

For clarity and to assist in decision making, these should be referenced in the policy. As such, a link should be provided to the Conservation Area Appraisals where the details are to be found (proposed modification **PM6**).

- 4.24 Under Policy INDP7, new development in the Ben Rhydding Conservation Area should ensure that the special characteristics of the area are preserved *and* enhanced. In this regard, there is no evidence to suggest that both preservation and enhancement are necessary. Proposals that preserve the special characteristics of the area would also be acceptable if enhancement were not possible. To preserve or enhance would accord with the statutory test contained in primary legislation.<sup>14</sup> Proposed modification **PM7** is appropriate. Policies INDP8 and INDP9 should be similarly modified (**PM8** and **PM9**).
- 4.25 Proposed modification PM9 would also secure a link to the Middleton Conservation Area Appraisal. This is where details of the “significant views and vistas” are to be found, as mentioned in the policy. The link would provide clarity and assist in decision making.
- 4.26 I now turn to the designation of land as Local Green Space (Policy INDP10). Given that there are proposed sites within the Green Belt, I have considered whether any additional local benefit would be gained by designation.<sup>15</sup> I appreciate that the relevant spaces are characterised as being of particular importance to the local community. However, there is no evidence to suggest that there could be exceptions to Green Belt policy, exceptions that would be harmful to the objectives of designation. In the circumstances, the Green Belt sites should be deleted.
- 4.27 On the question of ownership, there are several spaces where the ownership is uncertain and where direct contact with owners has not been made. Guidance on this matter is to be found in the PPG.<sup>16</sup> Qualifying bodies are expected to contact landowners at an early stage about proposals to designate any part of their land as Local Green Space. Landowners will have opportunities to make representations in respect of proposals in a draft plan.
- 4.28 Protection consistent with that in respect of Green Belts is a significant constraint. In my opinion, it does not provide sufficient regard to government guidance to rely on general publicity as a form of communication in this matter. As such, sites 10/4, 10/7, 10/13, 10/14, 10/15 and 10/18 should be deleted.
- 4.29 There is one site (Ashlands Field (10/16)) where the owner, Bradford Council, has objected to the proposed designation. On the evidence before me,<sup>17</sup> I think it unlikely that the site would be allocated for

---

<sup>14</sup> Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 69(1)(a).

<sup>15</sup> PPG Reference ID: 37-010-20140306.

<sup>16</sup> PPG Reference ID: 37-019-20140306.

<sup>17</sup> Ilkley Town Council’s answers to my questions, 7 December 2021.

residential development. Designation as Local Green Space would be appropriate.

- 4.30 I appreciate that designations should endure beyond the end of the Plan period;<sup>18</sup> but in the event of a proven need for housing on this site, supported by up-to-date evidence, an alternative designation under the Bradford District Local Plan would not be precluded.
- 4.31 In reviewing the Ashlands Field site, I have noticed that the western boundary overlaps with land occupied by Ashlands Primary School. This error would be corrected through proposed modification **PM10** under which reference the other necessary amendments to Policy INDP10 would also be effected.

#### *Issue 4 – Traffic, Transport and Sustainable Access*

- 4.32 Policy INDP14 twice uses the term “sustainable multi-modal transport”. However, there is no clarity over the meaning of this phrase. Under proposed modification **PM11**, the more telling phrase “sustainable, diverse transport modes” would be used.

#### *Issue 5 - Sustainable Economic Development*

- 4.33 Policy INDP20 (Economy and Employment) needs amendment to reflect changes in the Use Classes Order.<sup>19</sup> Added clarity is also needed as the policy does not set out the circumstances under which a change of use or loss of a site would be permitted. Proposed modification **PM12** refers.

#### *Issue 6 – Social Inclusion*

- 4.34 Policy INDP21 (Meeting the Needs of All) is not sufficiently succinct.<sup>20</sup> In Criterion f), there is a long example referencing the Wheatley Lane Recreation Ground and why it should not be developed. This explanation has no place within the policy and should be relegated to the text within the Background/Justification. Proposed modification **PM13** refers.

#### *Other Matters*

- 4.35 There are some policies that have not been the subject of commentary in the above report. These are Biodiversity and Ecology (Policies INDP11-13); Sustainable Access (Policy INDP15) and Sustainable Economic Development (Policies INDP16-19). To a greater or lesser extent, these topics are covered in NPPF Section 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment), Section 9 (Promoting sustainable transport), and Section 6 (Building a strong, competitive economy). I find that there has

---

<sup>18</sup> NPPF, Paragraph 101.

<sup>19</sup> The Background/Justification also needs amendment as indicated in the Town Council’s answers to my question; but as this does not affect the Basic Conditions, this can be carried out by the Town Council of its own volition.

<sup>20</sup> PPG Reference ID: 41-041-20140306.

been regard for national policy and that the Basic Conditions have been met.

### *Conclusions on the Main Issues*

- 4.36 Changes to the policies are necessary in the interests of clarity, the requirement to have the support of sufficient evidence and to have regard to national policies and advice. With the proposed modifications in place, the Basic Conditions would be met. Other non-material amendments, including suggestions and corrections set out in the representations, can be incorporated into the final version of the Plan.<sup>21</sup> Similarly any factual updates to reference the 2021 NPPF can be made.

## **5. Conclusions**

### *Summary*

- 5.1 The Ilkley Neighbourhood Development Plan has been duly prepared in compliance with the procedural requirements. My examination has investigated whether the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements for neighbourhood plans. I have had regard for all the responses made following consultation on the Neighbourhood Development Plan and the evidence documents submitted with it.
- 5.2 I have made recommendations to modify a number of policies and text to ensure the Plan meets the Basic Conditions and other legal requirements. I recommend that the Plan, once modified, proceeds to referendum.

### *The Referendum and its Area*

- 5.3 I have considered whether or not the referendum area should be extended beyond the designated area to which the Plan relates. The Ilkley Neighbourhood Development Plan as modified has no policy or proposals which I consider significant enough to have an impact beyond the designated Neighbourhood Development Plan boundary, requiring the referendum to extend to areas beyond the Plan boundary. I recommend that the boundary for the purposes of any future referendum on the Plan should be the boundary of the designated Neighbourhood Development Plan Area.

### *Overview*

- 5.4 It is evident that a considerable amount of time and effort has been devoted to the development and production of this Plan and I congratulate those who have been involved. The Plan should prove to be a useful tool for future planning and change in Ilkley over the coming years.

---

<sup>21</sup> PPG Reference ID: 41-106-20190509.

*Andrew S Freeman*

Examiner



## Appendix: Modifications

<b>Proposed modification number (PM)</b>	<b>Page no./ other reference</b>	<b>Modification</b>
PM1	Page 20	<p>In Policy INDP1:</p> <p>Insert "(Figure 4)" after "Green Belt" in the opening paragraph.</p> <p>In Criterion a), substitute "or" for "and".</p> <p>Regarding Criterion b), add text to the Background/Justification to explain what are the protected open spaces.</p> <p>At the end of Criterion c), insert "(Policy INDP2)".</p> <p>In Criterion d), substitute "heritage asset" for "listed building and/or Conservation Area".</p> <p>Change the end of Criterion e) so that it reads "...Core Strategy, the Ilkley Design Statement and the Homes and Neighbourhoods Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document. Regard should also be had to the National Design Guide and the National Model Design Code;".</p> <p>In Criterion f)i), add "(Figure 13)" after "town centre".</p> <p>Substitute the following for Criterion g):            "This mix should include affordable housing and dwellings that would create downsizing opportunities. Development heavily favouring houses of one size or type will not be supported."</p>
PM2	Page 25	Delete from Policy INDP2 and from the Policies Map the NHS sites 2/18 and 2/19; also, Craiglunds Hotel (2/39).
PM3	Page 28	In Policy INDP3 c), change "sports and recreation" to "sports or recreation".

		Add to the policy and the Policies Map "INDP3/13 East Holmes Field and Skateboard Park"
PM4	Page 29	In Policy INDP4, replace "redevelopment" with "partial or complete loss".  Replace "accessible for existing and future plot holders" with "convenient for plot holders".
PM5	Page 31	In Policy INDP5 Criterion b), change the text to read "street scene or impact" and "topography or layout".  In Criterion d), change "quality or character" to "quality and character".  Delete the final sentence of Criterion k).  Give the second sentence of Criterion n) a separate criterion number.  Delete the second sentence of Criterion r).
PM6	Page 34	In Policy INDP6 and in reference to key views, provide a link to the relevant Conservation Area Appraisals.
PM7	Page 37	In the opening sentence of Policy INDP7, replace "preserved and enhanced" with "preserved or enhanced".
PM8	Page 39	In the opening sentence of Policy INDP8, replace "preserved and enhanced" with "preserved or enhanced".
PM9	Page 42	In the opening sentence of Policy INDP9, replace "preserved and enhanced" with "preserved or enhanced".  In reference to significant views and vistas, provide a link to the Middleton Conservation Area Appraisal.
PM10	Page 45	In Policy INDP10, delete the sites that are in the Green Belt (10/2 and 10/15).  Delete sites 10/4, 10/7, 10/13, 10/14, 10/15 and 10/18.

		On the Policies Map, re-draw the western boundary of site 10/16 to omit land in the occupation of Ashlands Primary School.
PM11	Page 61	In Policy INDP14, replace the usages of "sustainable multi-modal transport" with "sustainable, diverse transport modes".
PM12	Page 74	Replace the opening sentence of Policy INDP20 with the following: "The following existing employment areas, falling within Use Classes B2, B8 and E(g), will be protected for employment uses. Planning permission for uses outside these classes will only be supported when the criteria in Policy EC4 of the Local Plan Core Strategy are met."
PM13	Page 76	In Criterion f) of Policy INDP21, delete the second sentence and all following text. Incorporate the gist of the text within the Background/Justification.