

Consultation Responses

An analysis of the consultation responses received by the Council shows that there were 68% responses in favour of Option 1 and 32% responses in favour of Option 2.

The number of responses and the means of submission is set out below:

Email response	Website response	Posted response
41	150	329
8%	29%	63%

Option 1 – Consultation Responses - Reasons

The reasons stated in the Consultation forms in respect of Option 1, for the boundaries to remain in the same place were as follows:

The largest proportion of responses in favour of Option 1 stated that the residents from the proposed new residential development would use the facilities and services within Bramley, therefore it was appropriate for the financial benefit from the new development (the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) money and the precepts) to be received by the Bramley Parish Council.

It was stated on a number of consultation responses that the extra income from the proposed new development should come to Bramley in order to develop their infrastructure as opposed to it going to Ravenfield where there is little infrastructure and as such it was felt that this would not be used by the new residents within the proposed new development.

It is also stated on a number of responses that Ravenfield is not adequate size for the influx of new people, and as such they will have no option but to use other services and amenities, with the children not being able to attend Ravenfield schools for example, but will have to attend other schools.

A similar argument was put forward in some responses to the effect that the extra income from the new development should go to Bramley to keep it “thriving”, and not to Ravenfield as there are few services in Ravenfield, which will therefore not be used by the new residents. The counter argument was put forward in favour of option 2 (to move the boundary to increase the area of Ravenfield Parish Council) and this is set out below.

A further main reason stated within the consultation for the boundaries to remain the same was that the traffic produced by the proposed new development would go through Bramley and therefore any improvements to infrastructure and services should be within Bramley also, therefore the Bramley Parish Council should receive the income from the Community Infrastructure Levy and also the precept from the

proposed new houses. Allied to this it was felt that the money could be used to provide more parking within Bramley. In this regard it was felt by many responses that Bramley would suffer the detriment of increased traffic, therefore it should also receive the benefit of increased income.

Other reasons given in the consultation responses were that the boundary has been historically in the place it currently is and should remain the same.

A number of responses stated that they felt that the main motivation for this application by Ravenfield Parish Council was that they wanted to ensure that the financial benefit from the new Residential Development went into Ravenfield as opposed to Bramley. Clearly a number of the residents of Bramley who stated they preferred option 1 for the boundary to remain the same, were opposed to this.

Other consultation responses stated that they agreed with the reasons referred to within the Bramley Parish Council Newsletter which referred to this application as a “land grab” by the Ravenfield Parish Council. It stated that the Ravenfield Parish Council had only become interested in this piece of land and made this application to move the boundary when it became clear that there would be a substantial development on the land. The reference to “land grab” and “greed” appeared in a number of consultation response clearly mainly from the Bramley residents.

Some responses stated that they could see no reason for the boundary to be moved, other than a financial one in favour of Ravenfield Parish Council, and they felt that Bramley should not be “pressured to give land away”. Linked to this, some responses stated that Bramley should keep “ownership” of the relevant land and others stated that the “status quo” should be retained, as they could see no reason to change things.

A small number of responses stated that they felt that this application to move the boundary was premature, in that currently there are no houses on the land, and as such there are no parishioners to consult with as to their views.

Option 2 – Consultation Responses - Reasons

The main consultation response in favour of Option 2, as proposed by the Ravenfield Parish Council petition to move the current Boundary and reduce the area of the Bramley Parish Council, is as stated by the Parish Council when making their application. This was essentially that as the proposed new residential development will be geographically closer to Ravenfield, the new residents will use the facilities within Ravenfield, and therefore Ravenfield should retain the financial benefit of the CIL money and the precepts. Some of these responses state that the new residents will be part of the Ravenfield community and will be using Ravenfield services and amenities and therefore should contribute to them.

It is stated on a number of the consultation responses that the new residents will use the existing facilities such as the doctors surgeries, shops etc. within Ravenfield, as they will be closer to the Ravenfield services as opposed to the Bramley ones. It is stated that these services are already under a lot of pressure and the increase in

demand on them from the new residents should mean that any extra income goes to Ravenfield Parish Council.

Some consultees state that the Ravenfield Parish Council will have difficulty providing sufficient amenities unless they have the funding made available by including the new houses within their parish boundaries. Similar to this some people state that Bramley already has good facilities therefore the new money should come to Ravenfield Parish Council in order to improve theirs, as they need the investment.

It is stated on a number of responses that the new residents will want their addresses to be Ravenfield, and therefore they should contribute to the Parish.

A number of responses state that the new development is a natural extension to Ravenfield geographically and that the new development is closer to the centre of Ravenfield, whereas it would be on the edge of the Bramley Parish.

It is argued in some responses that the proposed new development will be within the "accepted" area of Ravenfield as opposed to being in Bramley, and that things have changed greatly since the previous "historic" boundaries were established. In this respect some consultees argue that the current boundaries are illogical, having different sides of the relevant road in separate parishes, and that the proposed changes represent the most sensible option.

Some responses states that there will be major disruption to Ravenfield in respect of the building of the proposed new development, and as such there should be a benefit to the local community and this should mean that Ravenfield Parish Council receive the precept and CIL money, as there will be more impact on Ravenfield than Bramley.