

Local Government
Boundary Commission
For England
Report No.415

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND

CHAIRMAN

Sir Nicholas Morrison KCB

MEMBERS

Lady Bowden

Mr J T Brockbank DL

Mr R R Thornton CBE DL

Mr D P Harrison

Professor G E Cherry

THE RT. HON. MICHAEL HESELTINE MP
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

1. In a letter dated 16 October 1978 Craven District Council requested us to review the boundary between the district of Craven in the non-metropolitan county of North Yorkshire and the City of Bradford in the metropolitan county of West Yorkshire with a view to the transfer of the parish of Kildwick from the City of Bradford to Craven district.
2. Craven District Council contended that the proposed boundary reflected the pattern of community life and was conducive to the effective operation of local government and associated services. The parish of Kildwick adjoined the village of Farnhill in Craven District and looked to the villages of Skipton, Glusburn and Sutton, also in Craven District, for social and shopping needs. A poll of electors held by Kildwick Parish Meeting had produced an overwhelming majority in favour of the requested change which was simple and small scale and involved fewer than 80 electors.
3. Also enclosed with the request were letters from North Yorkshire County Council, from the City of Bradford Metropolitan Council and from West Yorkshire Metropolitan County Council. North Yorkshire County Council supported Craven District Council's request. The City of Bradford Metropolitan Council took the view that as there were other anomalies in their boundary they would want, if possible, to deal with all adjustments to it at the same time but at a later date. West Yorkshire Metropolitan County Council concurred with the City Council's views.
4. We considered Craven District Council's request as required by section 48(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, having regard to the Department of the Environment Circular 33/78 and to our own Report No. 287.
5. Though we were minded to undertake a review, we thought that the requirements of the circular might not be fully met, in respect of paragraph 12, which indicates that reviews involving Metropolitan districts will normally be undertaken only if, inter alia, there is broad agreement amongst the authorities concerned. The views of the City of Bradford Metropolitan Council and of the West Yorkshire Metropolitan County Council were not completely clear from the evidence available. It appeared to us that they had no objection of substance to the proposed boundary change but considered a review at that time would be premature. Before reaching a decision therefore we asked these two authorities to clarify their attitude.
6. Their replies indicated that both councils thought the boundary in the vicinity of Kildwick was unsatisfactory and that their objections were solely on timing. There was therefore broad agreement among the authorities that the present boundary was defective and it appeared to us that it could be improved without interfering with the overall pattern of local government in the area.

7. We accordingly considered that a prima facie case for a review had been presented and decided to accede to the request of Craven District Council.

8. On 8 May 1979 we issued a consultation letter announcing the start of the review. The letter was addressed to Craven District Council and copies were sent to the City of Bradford Metropolitan Council, West Yorkshire Metropolitan County Council, North Yorkshire County Council, Kildwick Parish Meeting, other parish councils and parish meetings in both districts, the Members of Parliament for the constituencies concerned, the headquarters of the main political parties, the Regional Health and Water Authorities, the Regional Office of the Department of the Environment, and to the editors both of local newspapers circulating in the area and of the local government press. Craven District Council were asked to arrange for the publication for two successive weeks in local newspapers of a notice announcing the start of the review and to place a copy of the notice on display at places where public notices were customarily displayed. The District Council were invited to prepare a detailed scheme for the boundary change which they proposed and to publish the scheme in accordance with the requirements of paragraph 6 of our Report No. 287.

9. On 9 November 1979 Craven District Council submitted to us their detailed scheme. Subsequent to the announcement of the review and before their publication of the detailed scheme the District Council received comments from Austwick Parish Council, Clapham-cum-Newby Parish Council, Emsay-with-Eastby Parish Council, Glusburn Parish Council, Sutton-in-Craven Parish Council, and Kildwick Parish Meeting, and in the same period we received comments from the City of Bradford Metropolitan Council, Emsay-with-Eastby Parish Council, Glusburn Parish Council, Ilkley Parish Council, Steeton-with-Eastburn Parish Council, Sutton-in-Craven Parish Council, the Yorkshire Water Authority, and the Sutton-in-Craven Branch of the Women's Institute. None of these raised any objection to the proposed change and eight expressed positive support. Following publication of the District Council's detailed scheme we received comments from the City of Bradford Metropolitan Council, North Yorkshire County Council, West Yorkshire Metropolitan County Council and Glusburn Parish Council. Both North Yorkshire County Council and Glusburn Parish Council gave support to Craven District Council's detailed scheme and West Yorkshire Metropolitan County Council had no objections. The City of Bradford Metropolitan Council, however, raised objections of substance which they had not previously brought up and asked us to reject Craven District Council's scheme on the grounds that whilst it was desirable, as the District Council argued, to join the communities of Kildwick (in the City of Bradford) and Farnhill (in Craven District) this should be achieved by transferring the latter to Bradford.

10. We considered all the representations we had received, including the objections to Craven District Council's scheme from Bradford City Council, but we concluded that a case had been made for the change suggested. We decided therefore to publish draft proposals adopting Craven District Council's scheme.

11. On 21 January 1981 we issued our draft proposals which we sent to all those who had received our consultation letter, or commented on Craven District Council's scheme. Notices were inserted in the local press and displayed on public notice boards announcing that the draft proposals had been published and could be inspected at the offices of Bradford City and Craven District Councils. Comments on the draft proposals were invited by 23 March 1981.

12. We received eight comments in response to our draft proposals. North Yorkshire County Council, Craven District Council, Cowling Parish Council, Embsay-with-Eastby Parish Council and Glusburn Parish Council all supported the draft proposals as did the City of Bradford Metropolitan Council who had previously opposed the change. West Yorkshire Metropolitan County Council re-affirmed their previous decision not to object to our draft proposals. The remaining comment was from a local school teacher who felt that in the interests of the children's education, Kildwick should remain in the city of Bradford.

13. We were satisfied that in the interests of effective and convenient local government the boundary between Craven District and the City of Bradford should be realigned as indicated in our draft proposals. We decided therefore to confirm our draft proposals as our final proposals.

14. Details of these final proposals are set out in Schedules 1 and 2 to this report. Schedule 1 specifies the proposed changes in local authority areas and Schedule 2 specifies the consequential adjustments to the existing electoral arrangements. The proposed boundary is shown on the attached map.

15. Copies of this report and of the map are being sent to Craven District Council and the City of Bradford Metropolitan Council and will be available for public inspection at the council's main offices. Copies of this report, which includes a small sketch plan, are being sent to those who received the consultation

letter or made comments on our draft proposals.

L.S.

SIGNED: NICHOLAS MORRISON (CHAIRMAN)

PHYLLIS BOWDEN

TYRRELL BROCKBANK

G E CHERRY

D P HARRISON

R R THORNTON

LESLIE GRIMSHAW (SECRETARY)

4 June 1981

SCHEDULE 1

PROPOSALS FOR THE REALIGNMENT OF THE ADMINISTRATIVE BOUNDARY BETWEEN THE
COUNTY OF NORTH YORKSHIRE AND THE METROPOLITAN COUNTY OF WEST YORKSHIRE
IN THE VICINITY OF KILDWICK

Description of the area of land proposed to be transferred from
Bradford Metropolitan District in the Metropolitan County of
West Yorkshire to Craven District in the County of North
Yorkshire:

the whole of the parish of Kildwick

SCHEDULE 2

PROPOSALS FOR THE REVISED ELECTORAL ARRANGEMENTS CONSEQUENT UPON THE PROPOSED REALIGNMENT OF THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN THE DISTRICT OF CRAVEN IN NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY AND THE CITY OF BRADFORD IN THE METROPOLITAN COUNTY OF WEST YORKSHIRE

It is proposed:-

1. that the Skipton Rural No.1. electoral division, as defined in the County of North Yorkshire (Electoral Divisions) Order 1973 and the Aire Valley ward of the district of Craven, as defined in the District of Craven (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1977, shall be altered by the addition of that part of the City of Bradford district which is within the realigned boundary of the district of Craven as defined in Schedule 1, and that the number of councillors for the said electoral division and the said ward shall be unchanged.

2. that the Keighley No.3. electoral division as defined in the Metropolitan County and Districts of West Yorkshire (Electoral Divisions and Wards) Order 1973, and the Craven ward of the City of Bradford (Electoral Arrangements) Order 1979, shall be altered by the separation of that part of the City of Bradford District which is within the realigned boundary of the district of Craven, as described in Schedule 1 and that the number of councillors representing the said electoral division and the said ward shall be unchanged.

PRINCIPAL AREA REVIEW



Extract from
PLAN SE 04

LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION
FOR ENGLAND
FINAL PROPOSAL

EXISTING COUNTY AND DISTRICT BOUNDARY — — — —
PROPOSED COUNTY AND DISTRICT BOUNDARY —————

