

Braford Core Strategy Further hearings

Further statement for the Hearings

FAO Tony Blackburn Programme Officer

22/04/16

With regard to Matter3 -Section C ---[ii] {and iii} i.e. infrastructure, facilities, traffic and transport

The question posed is ---Does the amended distribution of development properly reflect policy constraints....

The inspector's question as in 2015 is still ---Is the plan sound?

Sirs,

With respect, as regards to the amendment -----the plan Menston as a Local Growth centre is far from sound; indeed it is seriously flawed and the descriptor of "robust" could never be accurately applied

I will tabulate a few comments to illustrate the lack of soundness of this proposed plan, I know Menston very accurately.

- Green belt---IF this is allowed to be the Plan then, the Green Belt safeguarding aspect of maintaining the discreet settlement of Menston as an entity will fail; there will be no demarcation of Menston and individually characterised neighbouring villages along the "...key road and public transport corridor"... of communication----an identifiable visible fact. ref: MM7/SC4 Pg.3

There is no exceptional circumstance to justify Green Belt being destroyed and the merging of 2 villages to create a new dishevelled non-functional township of urban sprawl.

- Employment—With reference to Menston as a Local growth centre----Has the Inspector sight of a document confirming the location/s of the 1600 new jobs [originally 2,300]?

How close is Menston to these hubs of employment?

Has the Inspector noted as presented 2015 March meeting, re the strategic housing plan needs to reflect the demographic needs of 65years+ =25% of population; 45+ years =53%

Menston needs housing to reflect the former, which will in turn release housing stock for the working population /higher earning salaried population

Let's look at good practice and mimic it in BMDC---i.e. Create the job plan and build the places of work, where there is a 21stcentury infrastructure of transport in place, get the schools and health provision in place etc and then build the houses to suit employee needs—[in places e.g Cambridgeshire such entity of planned township is visible]

- Education—Menston Primary school since 2014 has dual form entry—there is no known plan for these extra children in Secondary Phase. March 2015 meeting told us every 1900 houses generates 384 pupils----Is the Inspector confident these children will get their education entitlement especially in days of withdrawing school travel assistance, Will there be a Secondary school?

Government policy and encouragement is walk to school !

Re Cross-border issues –in this area of Education the opportunity has closed down as Leeds has already built hundreds of new houses in Guiseley -A65 corridor, these houses are in the catchment area of the Secondary school which Menston has relied on ---Fact!

Tranmere Primary school and others in Guiseley have extended to cope with Highroyds children but no more secondary provision has been built.

Ilkley GS had no land to rebuild so extended but Burley, Ilkley and Addingham can overflow these extensions!

BMDC in March 2015 meeting said *“a new school may be necessary...”*—Is the Inspector in receipt of any evidence to confirm the progress in planning and budgeting to provide quality 21st education of our future workforce, for the new jobs somewhere in BMDC

Or is BMDC envisaging a population dip as of 1991----2001 as tabled March 2015

- Transport The latest traffic study of 2010 is an old not current document. Does the inspector have sight of a later edition? [I know he will have one commissioned by WARD] my personal request cannot ascertain if there is one for my perusal. This year a new supermarket is nearly complete on the kerbside of the A65 on the edge of Menston.

The Inspector will remember Menston is a “Choke point” on the A65

It is important the Inspector knows that every non rain -sodden weekend the standing traffic queues are from Burley roundabout through to JCT roundabout in Rawdon about 5miles; the rush hours are equally horrendous!

The nearest motorway to the proposed Local Growth centre is 35-40 minutes away even at 7:30am Saturdays –a congested urban journey!

It is impossible to improve the A65 –e.g Narrow railway bridge at Menston!

The Train station in Menston will continue until 2030 to deny full access to Disabled persons, they can go to Ilkley but not return to the village as the station has only a bridge and it is nearly a mile walk back to the parked car! ---Pushchairs are equally disadvantaged! The Inspectors knows about the size limitations of trains because of the size of the Station and all the Car Parking problems

The plan is to build houses and then call it a Local Growth Centre or Vice Versa---it is not relevant for the Village need.

3:19 It does not help to say how suitable Menston is in terms of facilities !! In reality we have an aged Community centre which needs so much refurbishment; 12 Main

Street shops only 8 with full time opening; a library which may close; no Secondary education.

The developers may say they may improve something but if there is no available land for e.g a park and ride !!!they become empty promises.

Is the proposed plan sound –No---it does not answer the need to build relevant or relevant affordable housing

Menston has no land to create jobs and no brownfields at all

Menston continually and sympathetically infills with houses and house extensions everywhere. How much is the village growing?---The answer is considerably-- BMDC will know through the Community Charge revenue

BMDC across its whole district boasts 1,379 subscribers to “On-line Plan -It” brochure-----
How does this reflect the number of Internet capable houses? And how do others access their communication up=date now BMDC is closing its libraries including Menston? how does BMDC keep in contact/ inform the thousands of other households with no internet access or Library with Internet?

With respect the proposed, revised spatial distribution and location of development is NOT appropriate and will remain so until matters are in order e.g. where and what are the new jobs –it would be better that they be substantial career opportunities. Secondly, near to these jobs there needs to be quality housing and All the necessary services and infrastructure—this starts to seem logical

IF we simply respond to the Government demand to build with no other aspects fully planned for, all we will do is destroy Green Belt for the sake of meeting a target number!

Why would it be at all sensible to take well used farmed hillsides above Menston with difficult drainage issues due to the land formations and build houses to dominate a character village which has grown to full capacity in many aspects e.g .transport corridors. Menston will continue to naturally increase in size by filling gardens and niches with new homes. Please reconsider and return this proposal for another version

Thank You

Susan Rix

Member of Menston Community Association Committee