

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	

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 would not suffer any major parking problems if it did not have the benefit of the railway station and the connections to Leeds and Bradford from it. As it is at present the car park provision is grossly inadequate and incapable of expansion. Consequently the surrounding streets are used by commuters travelling to the station from out of the district. 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, similarly people from Baildon drive to Menston to catch the Leeds train. The Bradford Transport Report used in the evidence base does mention in para 7.98 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 situation at Menston this is unlikely to be the answer. Commuters as noted come from a wide area. Further because of the professional nature of much of the employment the return journey often can be late in the evening which would require the Scheme to operate for long and probably uneconomic hours. Parking restrictions have failed to alleviate the problem as the streets beyond and closer to the village are used and the commuters simply walk from where they can park for free.

Any new development in Menston will be at the extremities of the village (the only major land mass available) and the temptation to drive to the station will be such that the problems will exacerbate. Introducing charges at the car park (Policy TR2/E) will make little difference to the capacity problem other than the 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 too will tempt many to drive.

The policy TR2 advocates use of public transport to stations 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.

We consider that 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.

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		