

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	[REDACTED]	
Line 3	Ilkley	
Line 4	[REDACTED]	
Post Code	LS29 [REDACTED]	
Telephone Number	[REDACTED]	
Email Address	[REDACTED]	
Signature:	[REDACTED]	Date: 30 <sup>th</sup> 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	5.2	Paragraph	All	Policy	TR2
---------	-----	-----------	-----	--------	-----

**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.**

If Menston it did not have the benefit of the railway station and the connections to Leeds and Bradford it would have no parking problems.

The current car park provision is absolutely inadequate and incapable of practical expansion.

Whilst there is parking provision for about 130 cars at the station the surrounding narrowish streets and the bus route of Station Road/Cleasby Road are extensively used by commuters travelling to the station from out of the district, to the inconvenience of residents, many of how do not have off-street parking.

The station is extensively used by commuters living in Otley and its surrounding villages, Burley Woodhead and beyond to settlements even in the Aire valley. It is a fact that commuters will drive to Menston rather than Guiseley because they have a better chance of gaining a seat on the train even though Guiseley is closer to their home, similarly people from Baildon drive to Menston to catch the Leeds train.

Similar parking issues are prevalent at Burley-in-Wharfedale with even less station parking and the same inadequate on-street parking.

The Bradford Transport Report mentions that Park and Ride schemes may help reduce parking problems at the stations in Wharfedale but makes no recommendations as to how this aspiration can be achieved and with respect to the highly congested situations at Menston and Burley this is unlikely to be the answer. Commuters as noted come from a wide area. It should be noted that because of the professional nature of much of the employment the return journey often can be late in the evening.

Parking restrictions have failed to alleviate the problem as the streets beyond and closer to the stations are used and the commuters simply walk from where they can park for free.

The proposed new development in Menston will be at the extremities of the village (the only major land mass available) and the temptation (pushed by topography) to drive to the station and park will compound the problem. Introducing charges at the car park (Policy TR2/E) will make little difference to the capacity problem other than to worsen the parking in the surrounding area.

The free bus service to the station from High Royds is about to be withdrawn by the developers and this and the topography will tempt many to drive either to the station or to further clog the roads to Leeds or Bradford.

The policy TR2 advocates use of public transport to stations (without taking into account local topography – hills!) and the introduction of park and ride facilities for town centres but fails to address parking issues adjacent and beyond stations other than the introduction of charges.

**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.**

The policy should include a statement that development should not take place where the developers cannot demonstrate a long term solution to the extra parking in and around railway stations arising from development proposals, in areas where car parking is already a significant problem.

The alternative of a new station and park and ride facilities should be considered.

*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 type="checkbox"/>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<input checked="" 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:**

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.*

<b>9. Signature:</b> 	<b>Date:</b> 30 <sup>th</sup> 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.**