

**PART B – YOUR REPRESENTATION - Please use a separate sheet for each representation.**

**3. To which part of the Plan does this representation relate?**

Section	<b>4.3</b>	Paragraph	<b>E</b>	Policy	<b>WD1</b>
---------	------------	-----------	----------	--------	------------

**4. Do you consider the Plan is:**

4 (1). Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
4 (2). Sound	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4 (3). Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>

**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.**

**We note that there is a policy intention in Para E4 to improve the links from Wharfedale to Airedale, Craven, Leeds and Bradford.** This is a very laudable objective but we are unable to see any tangible highway improvements either in the Core Strategy or the associated evidence base with the possible exception of a new link road about Shipley.

**The Bradford Transport Report (BTR)** used in the Evidence Base already notes in 2010 Para 7.98 that significant and increasing delays, resulting from severe congestion, are apparent on the A65 at the junctions in Menston, Guiseley as well as Ilkley. This is already resulting on severe delays on the A65 corridor. The only solutions suggested are changes to the junctions on the A65 from Menston to the A6038. Junction improvements were only recently made at Menston and the delays at the A65/A6038 junction is unlikely to be reduced as the problem is severe congestion on the A65 in Guiseley which Leeds MDC have already admitted does not have an identifiable solution. Likewise the A6038 to Bradford via Hollins Hill to Shipley is also severely congested, see Para 7.94/5.

Para 7.94 also notes that already significant traffic flows exist on parallel routes to avoid congestion on these two roads. Unfortunately these are all minor country routes out of the valley which also suffer from weather disruption especially in the winter.

**The A660 likewise** has severe congestion at the junction with the Airport Road and from the approaches to the Leeds Road all the way into Leeds.

**The roads from Menston to Ilkley, Otley and Harrogate arguably** have spare capacity including the commuter period. This unfortunately is not particularly helpful as only a limited number of residents in Lower Wharfedale are employed in these areas

**The contention therefore in para C.3 that Wharfedale have excellent roads is clearly totally inaccurate with respect to the main corridor route the A65 and the A6038.** Further there are no

meaningful improvements to these routes recommended in the BTR or Core Strategy.

**Trains to Leeds**, is already one of the most congested in the country. This forced additional train capacity in 2011 to cope with increasing traffic was likely to be only a short term solution and future improvements due to constraints at Leeds City station have not been identified. Further the cost of any possible improvements, identified in the future, would be well in excess of any likely S.106 contributions and would require alternative sources of funding. Accepting that about 20% of residents in Wharfedale use the train into Leeds any material increase in housing in the area will be constrained by rail capacity.

It is accepted that there is room on the **trains to Bradford** arising from the lack of easily accessible employment in and about Bradford Centre. The conclusion therefore has to be that for Menston residents transport links are very heavily congested to areas of employment.

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 statement given in para C3 of the Sub Area Policy WD1, *that there are excellent road and rail links* is totally inaccurate and misleading and should be removed from the document.**

*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.*

<b>9. Signature:</b>	Catriona Hanson	<b>Date:</b>	26 March 2014
	Parish Clerk		