

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	B1	Policy	SC3
---------	---	-----------	----	--------	-----

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.

Menston is situated on the boundary of the Leeds District with the former hospital High Royds (previously known as Menston West Riding Asylum) immediately to the south. This mental hospital was built in the late 19th century and housed in the region of 3000 patients at its peak and provided employment for a great many local residents. The hospital closed in 1993 and the land and buildings are within the Leeds City boundary and Leeds City Council control.

Under Leeds Planning the hospital has, and still is, undergoing major development creating upwards of 500 new homes and adding circa 2000 to the population with the detrimental effects on Menston village of reducing employment, adding to road and rail congestion, reducing available secondary school places, adding to infant and pre-school requirements and Health Services. However as High Royds is within the Leeds boundary the infrastructure of the village has not been improved or adjusted to cater for this expansion and indeed many of the 106/278 proposals agreed at the time of planning permission seem to have been abandoned by Leeds.

Strategic Core Policy SC3 states *“Planning decisions as well as plans, strategies, investment decisions and programmes should be based on A) Effective collaboration between the Council, local planning authorities, the District’s Town and Parish Councils, partners and communities within the District Leeds City Region and beyond.*

Effectively Menston has expanded by 500 plus houses at High Royds that are not referred to in para A or elsewhere in Policy WD1 when determining house numbers in Menston

It is clearly evident that any collaboration between Leeds City Council and Bradford Council has not been effective when assessing the needs for development in Menston, particularly when allocating a requirement for 400 new houses. There has been no dialogue between local cross-boundary communities or their elected representatives. For this reason the WD 1 policy above is unsound following the inadequate statements of intent in Policy SC3.

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.

We consider that para B1. in Policy SC3 is inadequate and needs strengthening to ie “firmly consider and appropriately respond to strategic cross boundary issues”. It is essential that when determining housing numbers the effect of developments in the whole local area, whatever the Local Authority, needs to be part of the calculation.

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?

	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
Yes	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:

We can bring local knowledge to support our arguments

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:	Catriona Hanson	Date:	26 March 2014
	Parish Clerk		