

**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>Section 4.3</b>	Paragraph	<b>All</b>	Policy	<b>WD2</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 are concerned that no investment is mentioned in Sub Area Policy WD2 in secondary education in the valley** though there is a passing reference in para 4.3.2 of a new secondary school in Ilkley. As this school because of site constraints cannot be extended a new school has long been recognised as necessary to support any housing growth in the area. Unfortunately the lack of finance and suitable sites in the valley has so far resisted any likelihood of this happening. There is nothing in the Core Strategy or its associated evidence base that offers any solutions to this problem.

Even if Ilkley gets a new school we in Menston have been advised that we would remain, as now, a priority status 2 area with no guaranteed access for our pupils to the school. Menston Secondary pupils would therefore continue to be expected to go to Guiseley School in the Leeds Metropolitan Council area. This school however is known to be filling up due to the many developments which are ongoing in Guiseley and High Royds. As these pupils live nearer than Menston pupils, as Leeds closely follow a distance criteria, they will have preference for access to the school. It is not clear if Leeds are able or are willing to increase capacity at this school so even without the proposed developments in the LDF plan there is rightfully considerable anxiety as to whether future access to Menston pupils will be restricted to this School. **Bradford has very limited influence on this situation.**

**Alternative Local Leeds schools** includes St Mary’s Catholic School which currently has no space for children of other faiths. The only other local Leeds schools is Prince Henry’s in Otley which is now an Academy and is also fully subscribed, drawing its pupils from Otley, Bramhope, Pool and surrounding villages, so there is real uncertainty as to future access opportunities, which has always been modest, for Menston pupils.

**Other options are not promising.** The idea of sending Menston secondary aged pupils to outside

the valley such as Titus Salts School (at Saltaire) is unlikely to be practical as surplus spaces in this school is no longer an issue CSBAR p.51. Furthermore this school cannot be reached directly by Public Transport from Menston and any transport would have to allow for a difficult car journey over the moor, travel on the very congested A6038 road by car or with two bus journeys, or by rail with a change. This school and any other Bradford Community School would be more than 3 miles away new travelling costs would likely be incurred by Bradford Council. Further Wharfedale schools all have good reputations for education that would have to be borne in mind when trying to persuade parents to have their children educated outside the Wharfe valley. These problems therefore undermine the prospect of any new development in the area.

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.

**Policy WD2 should be redrafted to include that “no development in Wharfedale should take place until it is confirmed that the necessary educational facilities are, with certainty, available locally within Wharfedale including Guiseley and Otley.**

*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: Catrina Hanson

Parish Clerk

Date:

26 March 2014