

Appendix 1

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS TO DRAFT MENSTON SPD:

N.B:- Where the Bradford MDC Response is noted as 'Highways' or 'Housing', please refer to page 248.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
1. Sport England Yorkshire (Mr H Peterson)	I support the provision of green/social infrastructure. The SPD should emphasise a need to advance green infrastructure proposals that not only relate to the outcomes of a PPG 17 assessment/outdoor playing pitch assessment, but that provide for a variety of open space typologies. There could be reference to the Sport England Active Places Database in identifying local deficiency. Mitigation measures could also be referred to.	The Open Space and Built Recreational Facilities SPD will set out an improved framework for assessing the provisions developers make to open space, and also, as far as possible, inform such provisions based on the Bradford City Council's Open Space, Sport, and Recreation Assessment. Therefore the Bradford City Council's Open Space, Sport, and Recreation Assessment will be primarily used to identify local deficiency. Various other types of open space typologies have been identified through work produced for the Open Space and Built Recreational Facilities SPD. Support noted.	Amended page 50 in referring to the Open Space and Built Recreational Facilities.
2. The Theatres Trust (Ms Rose Freeman)	No comment	N/A	No change required.
3. The Highways Agency (Mr Graham Titchener)	No comment	N/A	No change required.
4. Lancashire County Council (Mr Phil Megson)	No comment	N/A	No change required.
6. Mr R Ryde	Menston has a distinct edge representing an unambiguous division between village and countryside.	Agreed. The draft SPD presently reflects this division.	No amendment.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>This needs to be maintained. (12:2.15).</p> <p>The single storey developments along Hawksworth Drive should be seen as a reference for the new development to blend in with. I do not support three storey developments. (23:2.49).</p> <p>Vehicular access should be restricted, rather than encouraged. Do not have access via Hawksworth Drive. Derry Hill all one way to junction with Bingley Road. (24:2.51)</p>	<p>There will be no 3 storey development along Hawksworth Drive as the draft SPD clearly states on page 23, paragraph 2.49 that...'it will be appropriate to have some three storey development within the site but this must be restricted to the area adjacent to the existing three storey properties located on Dicks Garth Road'...</p> <p>As stated the single storey development along Hawksworth Drive 'should' rather than 'should not' be seen as a reference for development on Hawksworth Drive.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 51. Highways</p>	<p>Amended page 23, 2.49 accordingly to say that the single storey development along Hawksworth Drive 'should' rather than 'should not' be seen as a reference for development on Hawksworth Drive. This paragraph has also been amended so to state that...'it will be appropriate to have some three storey development within <i>one site</i>'...rather than 'site'.</p> <p>No amendment to the Bingley Road site density diagram on page 34 is required. It does not need to show the site area adjacent to Hawksworth Drive as being only suitable for medium/low density development, rather than higher density development too as is currently identified. However paragraph 3.30 on page 35 has been amended so to state that buildings should be only of single or two storey heights along Hawksworth Drive, regardless of their density.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>No mention of springs or that rain runoff will be increased by development. Draining should take into account natural springs. Keep the small stream in Derry Hill site as part of the development. (31:3.17).</p>	<p>Noted. Rain runoff will be increased through development.</p>	<p>Amended page 31, paragraph 3.17 so to say that 'A sustainable urban drainage system should be incorporated into the layout of both sites so to reduce the increased levels of runoff caused by the developments. Paragraph 3.17 also amended further to reiterate the points made below.</p> <p>Furthermore the Environment Agency has stated that although they do not object in principle to housing being developed in these areas, they would require detailed surface water treatment and drainage assessments to be carried out at planning application stage. This would be to ensure that the proposed developments didn't increase flood risk elsewhere and also used appropriate Sustainable Urban Drainage techniques. In addition to this the Environment Agency has also stated that every effort should be made to retain the small streams on the site.</p> <p>Bradford Metropolitan District Council concurs with this view and would request that such assessments accompany any</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>I support the landscape principles. (32:3.20).</p> <p>Wording referenced as being from the Menston Design Statement is inaccurate. Housing should be provided for</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Policy C1 of the Menston Design Statement more specifically</p>	<p>planning applications submitted.</p> <p>Existing springs within the Wharfedale area are referred to on page 10, paragraph 2.08 and page 18, paragraph 2.32. The existence of ponding on Derry Hill is also mentioned here.</p> <p>A review of a document to be produced by the Environment Agency, the Wharfe Flood Risk Management Strategy, which will be consulted on in December 2006 should also be referred to at application stage. It considers flood risk implications in the catchments including for example, wetland creation for floodwater storage, new defences etc and the implications of climate change. This document is important due to the implications of the Water Framework Directive. The Planning Section will have been consulted on this document beforehand.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>Amended page 33, paragraph 3.23 accordingly so to reflect the</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>pensioners who wish to downsize, therefore releasing larger houses back onto the market.</p> <p>Need accommodation for young families who wish to stay in the village. (33:323).</p> <p>The use of natural stone for boundary walls I support. Do not use reconstituted stone. Use natural stone for the construction of all new buildings if possible. (24:2.55/2.54/2.53).</p> <p>Both sites are uphill from the station. Therefore the 15min assertion is questionable from the end of each development, especially if carrying shopping, walking with children, or elderly. (20/22:2.49).</p>	<p>states that 'more priority should be given to providing smaller, more manageable housing suitable for pensioners and accommodation for young families who want to stay in the village'...'this may be provided by converting large houses to flats'.</p> <p>The SPD refers to the provision of dwellings suitable for occupation by older people.</p> <p>The SPD makes adequate provision of dwellings suitable for occupation as family homes.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>The 15 min assertion is based upon average walking speed, for the average person, under average circumstances. Thus the Meadowcroft access point has been judged to be 10 minutes from the station, where as the Derry Hill access point is 15 minutes. The far entrance of the Derry Hill site is 20 minutes from the station. Again these times are based upon average walking</p>	<p>finer points of the Menston Village Design Statement, Policy C1.</p> <p>No amendment.</p> <p>No amendment.</p> <p>No amendment.</p> <p>No amendment</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Evidence of ponding. You have identified a problem with drainage/ponding. However there is no mention of a function here or further on. (18/19:2.32/2.40).</p> <p>Safe and direct walking & cycling routes between the sites & schools/shops & Kirklands & station. (29:3.06).</p> <p>Enhance the existing footpath network to encourage access to the countryside. (29:3.10).</p> <p>Architectural principles- I support both paragraphs in full, especially the use of natural materials. (35:3.29/3.30).</p> <p>Replicate existing village/Menston style. (40:4.07-4.16).</p> <p>On street parking is not safe for children. Only use dedicated parking bays. (35:3.27).</p> <p>I support the Bingley Road reduction in density from 40</p>	<p>speed, for the average person, under average circumstances and have been verified as such.</p> <p>Please refer to the previous response relating to drainage/ponding.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No amendment</p> <p>No amendment</p> <p>No amendment</p> <p>No amendment</p> <p>No amendment.</p> <p>No amendment.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>housing units per hectare to 30. No high density developments on both sites. (34:3.25).</p> <p>As regards Derry Hill, I object to the increase in housing units from 28 per hectare to 35. It is further away from the village centre and located upon steeper ground. Reduce the density back to 28 housing units per hectare, i.e. only approximately 45 units. (34:3.25).</p> <p>I support this paragraph. Produce varied development, no 'estate' look. (30:3.16).</p> <p>Open space is essential in the centre of the sites, must be accessible and welcoming to other residents within the village. (30:3.15).</p> <p>Payment of commuted sums in lieu is unacceptable. These units must be on-site and 40% of the total development. (47:5.23).</p> <p>The SPD does not mention how or to whom affordable housing will be allocated. Those people living in the village should get priority as well as those individuals living within the Wharfe Valley and Bradford. (47:5.15-5.22/5.24-5.26).</p> <p>High Royds Village is an unknown evolving factor and must be taken into account when future proposals are submitted. (45:5.08).</p> <p>The existing community facilities, i.e. the library/community centre, doctor's surgery will need expanding/improving. According to paragraph 3.70 page 53 of the sustainability appraisal, Kirklands community centre is at near capacity now. It needs expanding. (45:5.03).</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 9.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>The 'Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document' is under revision and may well include reference to health and library facilities in the final draft. At present RUDP</p>	<p>No amendment.</p> <p>No amendment.</p> <p>No amendment.</p> <p>No amendment.</p> <p>No amendment.</p> <p>No amendment.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>policies CF2 and CF7A consider contributions made to community facilities in the event of development (see below).</p> <p>Policy CF2</p> <p>Where new housing proposals would result in an increased demand for educational facilities which cannot be met by existing schools and colleges, the Council will seek to enter into a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, in order to secure the provision of, or contribution towards, new or extended facilities.</p> <p>Policy CF7A</p> <p>Where major development proposals would result in an increased demand for built recreational facilities which cannot be met by existing facilities a developer may be required to enter into a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, in order to secure the provision of, or contribution towards, new or extended facilities. Please also refer to response number 8.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	There is no definition of contemporary contextual architecture; photos are not suitable examples to follow. The Menston style needs to be stressed in accordance with the Menston Conservation Area Assessment and the Menston Village Design Statement, pages 40/41, paragraphs 4.07-4.13. (42:4.30).	The Menston Village Design Statement and the Menston Conservation Area Assessment are endorsed by the SPD and considered to be site specific design guidance for any future proposals. As stated the SPD aims to provide guidance to direct the design of new housing within the two sites. Although it sets out a number of detailed requirements that will need to be followed by the new development, it does not form a detailed design code containing highly prescriptive dimensional and elemental design requirements. It is agreed that the photographic examples are inappropriate references.	Photographic examples on page 42 will be removed. Please refer to response 16.
	Developments should in no way resemble St Peters Court. I support the reference to the Wharfedale Landscape Assessment. (42:4.24-4.29).	Support noted. Stakeholder input does form an important element of the design guidance; as such the community's concerns that the development should not resemble St Peters Court have been taken into account.	No amendment.
		Support noted.	No amendment.
	The Menston Conservation Area Assessment will make	Support noted.	No amendment.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>sure development, especially Derry Hill, blends in with existing structures. (41:4.17-4.23).</p> <p>The section 278 works waiting restriction zone of study is too small and does not consider Brooklands Estate on the other side of the railway line. The study zone needs to include Brooklands or else the parking problem will just move there. (53).</p>	Highways	
7. Mr C S Hartley	Generally not enough sheltered housing in Menston, document doesn't mention whether it will be provided through either housing site.	Housing	
8. Mr James Harder	<p>Development will increase traffic on the A65, already one of the most congested roads in England.</p> <p>Menston area cannot sustain anymore properties, especially since the High Royds Development. The development would require further service provision in terms of schools, doctors, shops and station parking.</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>The 'Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document' is under revision and may well include reference to health and library facilities in the final draft. At present RUDP policies CF2 and CF7A are referred to at the application stage when considering contributions made to community facilities in the event of development (see below).</p> <p>Policy CF2</p> <p>Where new housing proposals would result in an increased demand for educational facilities which cannot be met by existing schools and colleges, the Council will seek to enter into a planning obligation under Section 106 of</p>	No amendment.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, in order to secure the provision of, or contribution towards, new or extended facilities.</p> <p>Policy CF7A</p> <p>Where major development proposals would result in an increased demand for built recreational facilities which cannot be met by existing facilities a developer may be required to enter into a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, in order to secure the provision of, or contribution towards, new or extended facilities.</p> <p>Cumulative and trans boundary impacts on public infrastructure will be assessed in relation to the High Royds development.</p> <p>At present in terms of primary healthcare provision in the village, there is currently a GP surgery adjacent to the Kirklands Community Centre on Main street. This practice is the sister branch of another surgery in Guiseley, where the practice manager of both surgeries is</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>based. In terms of capacity to absorb the demand created by new housing developments, the manager has advised that no new build solution will be required. However, other changes will be necessary such as a possible need to extend surgery opening hours (currently 8am – 7pm), bring in a shift system for staff, and increase staff levels. It is anticipated that the current provision could meet requirements.</p> <p>In terms of the new High Royds development, the practice manager stated that the majority of those moving in would probably attend the Guiseley branch of the practice.</p> <p>High Royds proposes to bring forward a private medical facility as well as a dental practice.</p> <p>Schools provision in relation to Menston straddles the boundaries of Bradford and Leeds local authorities. Primary school provision falls into the Bradford Local Authority area, with a primary school in the centre of the village. There are currently limited spaces available in the age 8-10 range, but these</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>spaces, as with any throughout the rest of the school, are under increasing pressure from the new High Royds development. There is currently no forecast available as to the number of spaces that will be taken at Menston Primary as a result of the development. No figures are available as they are likely to have been sent to Leeds due to the development been at their side of the local authority boundary.</p> <p>Children in Menston also attend the primary schools in the neighbouring village of Burley-in-Wharfedale (Burley & Woodhead C of E and Burley Oaks).</p> <p>However these schools are completely full due to recent multiple large housing developments and hence no capacity would be available there.</p> <p>It is therefore clear that additional capacity would be required in the area in terms of primary school provision. In terms of calculating this, the council would need to look at past trends in the area, the types of housing currently provided, and the types of housing going in the new</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>developments.</p> <p>Currently the council is able to accurately forecast the capacity in schools through a mixture of qualitative and quantitative methods tailored specifically to the area in question.</p> <p>Primary school provision in the neighbouring Leeds local authority includes Guiseley Infants school (currently with a 46 surplus places, according to the 2005 update to the Leeds School Organisation Plan, (Education Leeds, 2005), Hawksworth C of E (with 6 surplus spaces), and Tranmere Park Primary (with 18 surplus places). Consideration would therefore have to be given to whether children would attend these schools instead of those in the Bradford local authority area when assessing ability for existing provision to absorb pupils from the new developments.</p> <p>In terms of nursery school provision, it is currently non-statutory for the council to provide nursery places for 3-4 year olds, but this is in the process of changing. It is, however, likely that private</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>nurseries and playgroups will be seen as contributing to any provision likely to be required in the area. Currently in Menston there is one private nursery and a playgroup held in the community centre. A day care crèche facility is proposed as part of the High Royds development.</p> <p>In terms of secondary school provision in the area, the majority of children in the area attend either St Mary's Roman Catholic Comprehensive School on the Leeds side of the local authority boundary, or Guiseley School Technology College, also in the Leeds local authority area. Other nearby schools include Prince Henry's in Otley and Benton Park in Rawdon (both Leeds local authority) and Immanuel C of E Community College in Idle (Bradford local authority). Some children attend Ilkley Grammar School (Bradford local authority), but this school is currently oversubscribed and Menston falls into the second priority area after Addingham and Ilkley.</p> <p>Education Leeds who manage the schools provision within the Leeds local authority state that the secondary school provision in</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>this area is quite tight. Current surplus places are likely to be taken up by the new High Royds development, making the secondary schools in the area full – at Guiseley School Technology College there is a 2% surplus and at St Mary's Roman Catholic Comprehensive School there is a 1% surplus. Prince Henry's has a –2% surplus (all figures from the Leeds School Organisation Plan, (Education Leeds, 2005).</p> <p>Speculating that the new development may bring approximately 50 children of secondary school age (clearly dependent on the numbers and types of dwellings), there will be a likely shortage of 10 places per year group.</p> <p>Clearly therefore, a section 106 contribution towards primary and secondary school provision would be likely to be requested.</p> <p>No contribution towards education provision was made as part of the High Royds development.</p> <p>There is also a wide selection of independent school provision in the area. The closest primary</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>schools include Ghyll Royd in Burley-in-Wharfedale, Moorfield and Westville House in Ilkley, Lady Lane in Bingley, and Froebelian in Horsforth.</p> <p>Secondary Schools include Bradford Girls', Bradford Grammar, Leeds Girls', Leeds Grammar, Gateways in Harewood, and Ashville College in Harrogate. The amount of children who would attend such schools would need to be factored into any calculation of the shortage of spaces that would be generated in state-run schools as a result of the new developments.</p>	
9. Mr R Harder	<p>Development is too intensive for the village. Access on all roads into the village is dangerous and congested.</p> <p>Given the new High Royds development this new development will be too much. Menston is losing more green space yet again. If the development goes ahead it should be confined to one site only at the stated densities, or alternatively two sites at a lower density. This would prevent the village's amenities and structure from completely collapsing.</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>In paragraph 3.25 on page 34 the SPD states in relation to density that...'Current National Planning Guidance (PPG3) recommends that new housing development in England should have a density of 30 to 50 housing units per hectare. The Planning Inspector suggested that the Derry Hill site should have a density of 28 housing units per hectare and that the Bingley Road site should have a density of 46 housing units per hectare.</p>	No amendment.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>However the draft SPD states that the Derry Hill site should have an average density of 35 units per hectare and the Bingley Road site should have an average density of 30 units per hectare. There should also be density gradients within both sites. High density development on these sites would be inappropriate.</p> <p>The density stipulated within the SPD is different from that recommended by the inspector as a density of 28 units per hectare on Derry Hill wouldn't be in conformity with Policy H7 of the RUDP. Policy H7 of the RUDP states that residential development planning permission will only be granted if a density of 30 to 50 units per hectare net is proposed.</p> <p>Furthermore the average density of both sites has been determined by layout and hence altered for this reason also. Despite these alterations good design principles will still be adhered to within both sites.</p> <p>Since the draft SPD has been published new national housing</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>guidance has been released in the form of PPS 3. This now supersedes PPG 3 and will be the national guidance by which all future housing applications are assessed. PPS 3 also indicates 30 dwellings per hectare as a minimum.</p> <p>If an average density of 28 units per hectare was to be permitted for the Derry Hill site then it would set a precedent for future development and possibly result in further portions of greenbelt within the district needing to be utilised for housing development.</p> <p>There is no policy in the RUDP to ensure the sequential release of Phase 2 housing sites.</p>	
10. Mr W L Evans	Disagrees that Meadowcroft should be considered as a vehicular entry/exit point into the village highway system given that vehicles will inevitably use East Parade to access the school, co-op and main street. The Junction of East Parade and Main Street is already overloaded with traffic and as a result is a very dangerous junction. Meadowcroft should be used for pedestrian and cycling access only, however if vehicular access in Meadowcroft is adopted traffic to the village should be diverted away from East Parade into St Peters Way or Cleasby Road by making East Parade a one-way traffic system from Main Street to Hawksworth Drive.	Highways	
11. Mr & Mrs Willoughby	No comment.	No comment.	No change required.
12. Ms V Bevan	People already drive to Menston Station from far lesser distances than that of the proposed sites. Parking	Highways	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	availability at the station is already a problem and development of housing at these sites will only exacerbate this problem. Main Street will become busier and it will need to receive pavement improvements and signage that restricts parking. Highway safety is also an issue, as is traffic access and circulation within the village and on the A65. As this road is already extremely congested, how will the road network cope with yet more traffic? It will be very hard to encourage people to walk to the station regardless of any incentive offered. How will safe cycling and walking be integrated into the road and pavement improvements within the village?		
13. Mr Peirson	The proposed waiting restriction zone would only move the problem of road parked cars into adjacent roads.	Highways	
14. Mr B Dugdale	The developments are not required. The traffic caused by increased volumes of people trying to use the present system will lead to gridlock and consequently the use of inappropriate roads. A65 will become more congested. As the village infrastructure is put under increased strain further development will have to occur in order to alleviate this pressure, i.e. school expansion.	Highways Please refer to response number 8.	
15. Mr Brook	The basement assessment does not take full account of recent trends as regards traffic and parking. It has become dramatically more problematic over the last five years and at present the impact of the High Royds Development cannot be accurately predicted. The problems of access to the Derry Hill site are understated. Derry Hill is almost impassable, with the bend on Moor Lane and the junction from Moor Lane to Hillings Lane being very dangerous. Was the assessment carried out in the evening and at weekends when on-street parking is at its greatest? The amount of development proposed should be dramatically reduced	Highways	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>There should be no right of entry along Derry Lane from the Derry Hill site, access to the site should be by either a left or right turn from Derry Hill road. There should be no direct connection for road vehicles through Meadowcroft as this will encourage cars to drive into the village. If the Derry Hill site is connected to the Bingley road site via Derry Hill road and Derry Lane this will become a rat run from Ilkley.</p> <p>Downsize housing for pensioners.</p> <p>Having room for only one parking place per residential unit will encourage on-street parking. Therefore must incorporate better design that allows for more than one parking place per unit.</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>The 'Car Parking: what works where' guidance published by English Partnerships in May 2006 highlights suitable car parking approaches according to density of development and housing typology. This document also suggests that the street should be rediscovered as a location for car parking. This guide to residential car parking design evaluated residential parking solutions throughout England in contrasting locations. It noted within it that the rear court car parking solution default that has emerged since the completion of Poundbury is not always successful and can result in route duplication and reduced usage of front doors which in turn tends to reduce activity and hence security on streets.</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 3.27 so to be in conformity with Policy TM12... 'Off road parking will be provided at an average of 1.5 spaces per unit'.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>The guide identifies a number of rules that are applicable for car parking in any location. These can be summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aim for quality street design. Parking location is more significant than parking quantity. • A combination of on plot, off plot and on street parking should be formulated to suit location, topography and market. • Rediscover the street as an efficient and safe place to park. • Maximise the activity between the street and the house to encourage safer and friendlier places. • Don't park at the back of the block until on street and frontage options have been exhausted. • Avoid allocation of more than half of all parking spaces. • Provide cycle parking. <p>At the time of construction car parking provision within the sites will be provided in accordance with this or any other such similar</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>guidance published at the time. However in order to be in full conformity with Policy TM12 of the RUDP an average of 1.5 places per dwelling will have to be provided across both developments.</p> <p>Hence as paragraph 3.27 on page 35 states...'Parking will be on street, where road widths or dedicated bays will make parking on pavements unnecessary. Off road parking will be provided but only one space per unit. Additional 'undedicated' on street spaces will supplement limited off road parking'...the guiding principles of the draft SPD do not fully concur with Policy TM12.</p> <p>The Menston Village Design Statement does also state that...'No development should be permitted that would increase on street parking. Measures to encourage walking and cycling should be fully supported'...</p> <p>However the draft SPD in accordance with the 'Car Parking: what works where' guidance published by English Partnerships in May 2006 states that...'On street parking will be encouraged but road and street</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>The Bingley road site should use natural stone for the construction of new buildings in certain key locations, just as with the Derry Hill site.</p>	<p>widths must be designed to accommodate this. All new housing must be designed to accommodate secure cycle storage. Safe cycling and walking routes will be provided throughout the development sites and integrated into the adjacent movement system within the village'...</p> <p>The Replacement Unitary Development Plan under Policy TM12 (Parking Standards for Residential Development) states that...'Current guidelines require 1.5 spaces per dwelling to be incorporated into new residential schemes. Lower car parking standards may be applied to affordable units'...</p> <p>Therefore as stated previously in order to concur with Policy TM12 an average of 1.5 spaces per unit over both developments will need to be met through off street parking.</p> <p>The draft SPD is referring to both sites in saying that natural stone should be used for the construction of new buildings in certain key locations. As regards the use of materials, particularly natural stone the SPD</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 2.53 on page 24 to say that 'The use of natural stone for the construction of new buildings will be appropriate in certain key locations in both sites'.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>states the following:</p> <p>Menston is perceived as a stone built village and much on the context of the Derry Hill site is stone however this is not the case for the Bingley Road site. The use of natural stone for the construction of new buildings will be appropriate in certain key locations. Natural stone should be used on land mark buildings and development that is visible from the entry routes into both the village and the sites.</p> <p>Reconstituted stone should not be used. Either brick or render, both found on buildings close to both sites, should be used in preference to the use of artificial material.</p> <p>The Menston Conservation Area Assessment states that materials and techniques should be of the highest quality possible.</p> <p>In response to this the draft SPD states that...'This need not automatically require the use of natural stone for all buildings'...</p> <p>As regards building design overall the Menston Village Design Statement states that</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>new development must be attractive in its own right and sympathetic with the design and materials of nearby properties, whilst also acknowledging the traditional architectural character of the village.</p> <p>In response to this the draft SPD states that...'New development must demonstrate an understanding of context and must respect neighbouring buildings'...</p> <p>The Menston Village Design Statement also states that buildings which mimic other regional styles and materials should not be permitted.</p> <p>In response to this the draft SPD states that...'New development must not resort to pastiche and must not use artificial materials'...</p> <p>The Menston Village Design Statement further states that new buildings should respect property densities of nearby housing.</p> <p>In response to this the draft SPD states that...'New development must respect densities of nearby housing where this is consistent with planning policy and</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>appropriate in terms of wider contextual and socio-economic considerations'...</p> <p>As stated previously the density levels set for these sites are such that they're in conformity with both Policy H7 of the Replacement Unitary Development Plan and PPS 3, but also because they're appropriate for the context and layout of the site itself.</p> <p>Both sites should be developed using a common architectural language but should be distinct from each other.</p> <p>The Menston Village Design Statement states that architectural design should not include extravagant or unnecessary features.</p> <p>In response to this the draft SPD states that...'Architecture will be free of decorative non-functional elements. It must learn from context but not resort to the application of historical styles'...</p> <p>The Menston Village Design Statement also states that the existence of unsympathetic architectural design or style</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>should not be treated as precedence for further similar properties to be built.</p> <p>In response to this the draft SPD states that...'Poor quality development should not be treated as a reference for new development regardless of proximity to the sites'...</p> <p>The Menston Conservation Area Assessment focuses on the design of new development that can affect the quality and character of the conservation area. It contains a number of useful suggestions that would help to introduce a Menston flavour to the new development.</p> <p>For instance that it is important that scope be given to the inclusion of architectural invention and innovation as this can provide distinctive buildings that show an evolution of architectural history.</p> <p>In response to this the draft SPD states that...'New development will use a high quality contemporary architecture and avoid historical styles and pastiche'...</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		As stated previously it is important to recognise that good design is not intrinsically linked to either lower or higher levels of density. Good design principles will still be implemented in both sites regardless of their slightly differing and overall higher levels of density.	
17. Dr J M Roberts	<p>I strongly support some re-alignment of Moor Lane, which would reduce the acuteness of the bend. It may also allow for access to a dedicated car parking area for the Mount Pleasant cottages. This would eliminate present on-road parking. Access to the building site for pedestrians and cyclists could be here, subject to the footpath being upgraded.</p> <p>A housing density of 35 units per hectare on the Derry Hill site is too high given the nature of the site and the existing properties that surround it. The inspector's suggestion of 28 units per hectare seems reasonable. The SPD should revert to the planning inspector's original figure of 28 units per hectare.</p> <p>Particular reference should be made to upgrading the existing public footpath skirting the Derry Hill site.</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Refer to response number 9.</p> <p>The draft SPD states... 'Access to Countryside: Both sites will define a new edge where the countryside meets the village. The existing footpath network that runs through the site should be enhanced to encourage walking from the existing settlement through the new development to the countryside'...</p>	No amendment.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
18. Miss H F Greig	I am very concerned about the impact of these plans on traffic along Menston Main Street, especially near the school and the co-op. Traffic volumes will increase and as a result pedestrians/drivers will be at a greater risk unless speed and parking restrictions are imposed. Therefore more speed restrictions are required, for example an increased 20mph zone and double yellow lines to stop parking on Main Street near the school and the co-op. Main Street is a 'rat run' at present never mind when more houses are built.	Highways	
19. Mr E Sotherby	<p>I object to the number of properties being built on the areas which were protected green belt. The facilities and infrastructure of Menston cannot support such a high density. The amount of properties to be built on the Bingley Road site should be reduced.</p> <p>Bungalows should be built rather than two storey houses on the boundary of Hawksworth Drive so to be in keeping with the bungalow properties already there.</p> <p>The bungalows are essential as they to allow for the older population within the village to move out of their existing homes and make way for families.</p> <p>More landscaping is required to stop water from pooling along the boundary of the bungalows on Hawksworth Drive and the houses on Hawksworth Close. There is a problem from Autumn to Summer every year.</p> <p>The topography of the land rises towards Bingley Road; hence the houses on this site will be highly visible from the bungalows on Hawksworth Drive. The field should be graded lower by excavation as this would not only reduce overlooking but also the amount of water pooling along the adjacent Hawksworth Drive itself.</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 6, 8 and 9.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 6.</p> <p>Housing.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 6.</p> <p>Agreed. However due to the nature of the land this is inevitable.</p>	No amendment.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>The hedgerows situated along the back of Hawksworth Drive that then continue directly across the site towards Moor View should also be retained as they will help to reduce noise both during and after the build. They will also alleviate drainage problems by absorbing the excess water, drainage problems that will only have been exacerbated by hard landscaping.</p> <p>Permitted development rights should be removed to prevent buildings encroaching on the bungalows on Hawksworth Dive. This will also help with drainage.</p> <p>In addition to this no rear facing windows should</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 6. In addition to this the draft SPD in paragraph 2.47, page 22 states that... 'Where existing landscape features exist within a site boundary these should be incorporated where possible'. This needs rewording.</p> <p>Article 4 Directions are only issued by the Council in circumstances where specific control over development is required, primarily where the character of an area of acknowledged importance would be threatened. They are therefore more commonly applied to conservation areas, not individual domestic dwellings.</p> <p>Article 4 Directions are not issued without careful consideration, because the Council may be required to pay compensation in circumstances where you cannot obtain planning permission for development which otherwise would be treated as permitted development.</p> <p>In this case the removal of permitted development rights is not required.</p> <p>There is no guarantee that a</p>	<p>Amended paragraph 2.47 on page 22 so to say... 'Landscape features that currently exist within a site boundary should be incorporated where possible'.</p> <p>No amendment</p> <p>No amendment</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>overlook the bungalows, and no footpaths or roads should be allowed adjacent to the boundary of the bungalows on Hawksworth drive.</p> <p>No 3-storey properties should be permitted as this is not in keeping with the Bingley Road development.</p> <p>Cars should not be allowed through the village, with the Meadowcroft access route being for pedestrian use only. This will aid traffic congestion in the village as Meadowcroft is adjacent to the school and for this reason could cause a rat run of traffic from Bingley road, through the new development and into Meadowcroft. There should be a 20mph speed limit on the entire length of Hawksworth drive due to the possibility of it being used as a rat run.</p> <p>Page 24: 2.51. I object to vehicle access into the village.</p> <p>Page 34: 3.24: I object to vehicle access in the village. This needs to be kept to Bingley Road so to avoid nuisance and danger to residents and their children.</p> <p>Page 34: 3.25. I object to the density proposal for the Bingley Road site (30ha). There is severe pooling of water at the rear of 17 Hawksworth Drive; increased hard surfaces will only make this worse. The density requires that more, not less, drainage mechanisms are present (SUDS). Page 31: 3.17. There is no mention of drainage at the rear of 17 Hawksworth Drive, severe pooling from October to April each year, the Bingley</p>	<p>degree of overlooking won't occur. As the route hierarchy diagram on page 31 shows there are no routes running adjacent to Hawksworth Drive apart from the solely pedestrian access point at Meadowcroft.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 6.</p> <p>Highways. Please refer to response number 51.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number 6 and 9.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Road development. This needs to be addressed.</p> <p>Page 32: 3.2. I would object to 3 storey properties, the plan shows a line of housing at the rear of my property at 17 Hawksworth Drive, my property and surrounding properties are only one storey bungalows, therefore I would want buildings of equivalent height to be constructed here. I do not want a line of town houses (terraces). Only single one storey properties. I object to my property being overlooked.</p> <p>Page 23: 2.49. Properties have been identified as 2 storeys incorrectly. There is a one storey bungalow (No.1 Meadowcroft) and Hawksworth Drive bungalows within the blue area. Any 2 storey developments need to be further west than identified on the plan.</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 6.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>SPD amended accordingly to show number 33 and 35 Hawksworth Drive as being one storey units.</p>
20. Mr G Simpson	<p>Traffic accessing the Derry Hill site will result in Derry Lane becoming a main road. Regardless of that originating from the Derry Hill site itself, there will already be too much traffic travelling along Hawksworth drive solely as a result of the Bingley Road development.</p> <p>The adjoining corner of Derry Hill and Bingley Road should be changed so that traffic can go straight up Derry Hill and down Bingley Road. This would prevent an increase in traffic within the village and in turn around the school, children's home and village play areas. Given that traffic is to flow along Derry lane and Hawksworth Drive, where will it go from there? St Peters Way, which most people tend to avoid due to it having large road humps and being adjacent to the primary school, or East Parade, which always has a number of cars parked along it given its proximity to the school and co-op. The traffic could be directed down Cleasby Road, but again this is often used for parking by both residents</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>and villagers visiting the nursery or other shops. Each of these routes becomes impassable at varying times throughout the day as a result of any one of the factors aforementioned. Furthermore, if traffic was to travel up Cleasby Road, then it would have to negotiate the dangerous corner that adjoins it with Bingley Road.</p> <p>The mini-roundabout at the junction of Derry Lane together with the one way system up Derry Hill will exacerbate traffic levels along Derry Lane. This is primarily due to the fact that traffic from the new estate (approximately 300 cars), as well as diverted traffic from Derry Hill Gardens and Walker Road, will have no alternative but to travel along Derry Lane. This will not be acceptable for the residents of Derry Lane as it houses the highest proportion of children in Menston. Other children also use the road to walk to school as it's one of the safest in Menston.</p> <p>As there are two play areas adjacent to Derry Lane, the increased use of the road for vehicular access will further endanger the lives of local children. At present there are only two roads out of Menston, and these are already very congested.</p> <p>If this change of use must go ahead, you could make Derry Hill one way up to the roundabout, whilst making Derry Lane one way also, therefore making these roads safer for the children playing out after school.</p> <p>There are too many houses within the Menston area, with over 600 being built at the High Royds development, and a number at White Cross, Guiseley. Consequently the roads at present cannot, and in the future will not, be able to take the amount of extra traffic created by these developments. At peak times it can</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>now take 30mins to do a 5 minute car journey. There should be fewer houses built until all these road problems are resolved.</p> <p>The facilities in the village cannot cope with an influx of population. The doctors, dentist, and schools are already overloaded, and demand and pressure on these facilities will increase from the High Royds development alone. I don't think that any more houses should be built in Menston.</p> <p>At the moment I have a beautiful view of most of the village. Building houses on the designated sites will take away this view. As the Derry Hill and Bingley Road sites are both uphill sloping, the houses built there will graduate up these slopes and spoil the green field views visible from the centre of Menston.</p> <p>We do not have enough public transport to support the villagers at present. Therefore it is inevitable that new residents will have to use their own cars as a means of transportation. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that there are no direct buses at present going to Ilkley, Bradford or Shipley. Menston needs more buses that not only go to Otley and Leeds, but also Shipley, Bradford and Ilkley.</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 6.</p> <p>As these portions of land have been removed from the greenbelt and allocated as phase 2 housing sites development is inevitable. Unfortunately as a result views will be unavoidably and adversely affected.</p> <p>Highways</p>	<p>No amendment.</p>
21. Andy & Eileen Holder	<p>I am concerned that this development will potentially damage the 'village' culture and atmosphere of Menston. The recent development of the High Royds site will potentially place huge pressures on the surrounding infrastructure of Menston before the impact of the future development of these two additional sites is even considered.</p> <p>My main concerns surround the loss of village green belt</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 8.</p> <p>The loss of green belt is</p>	<p>No amendment.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>and environment.</p> <p>As regards to road infrastructure the A65 was already badly congested enough before the High Royds development, but I fear once the Derry Hill and Bingley Road housing sites become occupied the road will become gridlocked. What are the council doing to alleviate this problem? How will the village road infrastructure, let alone the main roads, possibly cope with this additional proposed housing. Is the council proposing new roads into the village to alleviate this pressure? The additional traffic will potentially put pedestrians and children at risk, therefore serious consideration should be given to road calming measures.</p> <p>In terms of rail services the full impact of the High Royds development upon Menston railway station is yet to be felt. Despite this the car park is already full midweek with Station Road and other surrounding streets being full with parked cars. The High Royds development will inevitably increase pressure on parking, but the additional proposed sites in Bingley Road and Derry Hill will I fear put intolerable additional pressure upon the car parking in and around the station. What are the council</p>	<p>unavoidable however the Council will seek to impose conditions or require obligations (known as S106 legal agreements) where development proposals would not be acceptable without the provision of physical infrastructure, the mitigation of adverse environmental impacts and/or the enhancement of the environment and social infrastructure.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>proposing with regard to the improvement of the rail services and parking? Regarding schools, I don't suppose the High Royds Development includes a new school? How therefore are the council going to manage the need for additional school places in infant, primary and secondary schools when I suspect that these classrooms are already high in numbers? Without additional school places being provided I suspect that the existing schools wouldn't be able to cope with the substantial increase in demand created by both the High Royds development and the subsequent development of both the Derry Hill and Bingley Road housing sites.</p> <p>In relation to medical service provision the local doctor's surgeries are already working at capacity, and I feel they could not cope with these proposed developments. Will the new High Royds development have its own Medical centre, and will resources be made available to improve the services at the Menston surgery?</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 8.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 8.</p>	
22. Mrs Susan Stead (Bradford Urban Wildlife Group)	<p>We support this document in terms of its content, in particular paragraphs 3.75 and 3.76 on page 54 of the sustainability appraisal which state that botanical surveys should be a prerequisite of any planning application submitted. However we do object to development on the sites as a whole.</p> <p>The Bradford Biodiversity Action Plan should also be given full consideration in the context of any application for planning permission.</p>	<p>Objections pertaining as to whether the sites should be developed as a whole, in other words reallocated as phase 2 housing sites in the first place, were dealt with at enquiry stage. Support noted.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 21. As stated here the Council will seek to impose conditions or require obligations (known as S106 legal agreements) where development proposals would not be acceptable without the</p>	<p>No amendment.</p> <p>No amendment.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>mitigation of adverse environmental impacts and or the enhancement of the environment and social infrastructure.</p> <p>The recent draft 'Planning Obligations' SPD reiterates this and references Planning Policy Statement 9 'Biological and Geological Conservation' and the Natural Environment and Countryside chapter of the Replacement UDP as the basis for assessing such contributions.</p> <p>A Local Biodiversity Action Plan for the Bradford District (draft) was prepared in 2003. However this is still in draft form and has not progressed any further towards possible adoption. Given this fact it carries considerably less weight as a means of assessing possible Section 106 contributions.</p> <p>The LBAP does however acknowledge the Council's role in the protection of these environments, and states that 'site and species protection policies, negotiations as part of the development control process and the using of planning conditions and Section 106 Agreements all provide</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>This is a useful document which places all the information in a suitable content, although there are a number of contradictions in the proposals for the housing sites. I support the biodiversity and sustainability framework principles (Paragraph 3.08/3.12) and the recommendations for phase two housing sites, i.e. bringing these sites forward from 2009 onwards. However the Inspectors recommendations in relation to policy H7 of 300 and 150 dwellings per hectare net on Bingley Road and Derry Hill respectively are unsuitable. This level of density would be too great, and subsequently not allow for the sites to accommodate sufficient levels of landscape and biodiversity measures. The current RUDP will have been replaced by the Local Development Framework when these sites come forward for development in 2009.</p> <p>These sites could be reincorporated back into the green belt following a further enquiry as the biodiversity and landscape requirements for both Derry Hill and Bingley Road will in fact respect the retention of the green belt.</p>	<p>mechanisms to protect, manage and enhance existing areas of wildlife importance and establish new areas for wildlife'. Therefore the Bradford Diversity Area Action Plan could be referred to in assessing such Section 106 contributions.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 9. Support noted.</p> <p>This is a possibility however the chances are negligible. Such a reallocation would only happen once the Housing and Employment Sites and Safe Guarded Land Allocations Development Plan Document had been formally consulted upon and adopted, by which time development may have already</p>	<p>No amendment.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	Development of these sites goes against the requirement to build on Brownfield sites. Menston is a village with a rural community and does not need this sort of development.	commenced on the sites under their present allocation. The inspector took such views into account at the enquiry stage before the site was reallocated as phase 2 housing land.	No amendment.
23. Mr A. Monaghan	<p>I'm opposed to paragraph 4.30 as it suggests that local architectural styles may not be taken into account. A specific reference should be included as to how the design of the buildings should be sensitive to the traditional architectural style of Menston village.</p> <p>As regards Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems, there is no consideration of springs, only rain run-off. Therefore the SPD should be amended and give full consideration to both in terms of their impact upon property within the area.</p> <p>I object to the suggestion that vehicles should have direct access to the village for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access via Moor Lane is on a bend. ▪ Derry Lane and Moor Croft are local roads, thus not suited to increased volumes of traffic. ▪ The danger that higher volumes of traffic will bring for both pedestrians and children. <p>Car access to Menston village from the housing sites should be made very difficult, where as pedestrian, cycle and pushchair access should be made very easy.</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 16.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 6. Furthermore springs are specifically mentioned in paragraph 3.75 of the Sustainability Appraisal.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p>	No amendment.
24. Mr & Mrs Caton	The proposals are the best of a bad job. We strongly object to the proposal that Meadow Croft and Derry	Meadowcroft will be solely a pedestrian access point.	Amended the Bingley Road Integration diagram on page 34.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Lane will be developed for motorised access.</p> <p>We believe that traffic should be kept away from the estate, school and Hawksworth Drive, otherwise it will become a 'rat-run' and dangerous to children in the estate play area and around the approaches to the school.</p> <p>We also feel the vehicular access to the Derry Hill site at the bend in Moor lane would be dangerous in the extreme, hence as with Meadow Croft this should be pedestrian, cycles and pushchairs etc only.</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p>	Removed the vehicular integration arrow.
25. Mrs G E Hall	<p>The mitigation suggested to deal with the extra traffic on the A65 is insufficient as improved access to and from Menston village at junctions will not remove traffic from the A65.</p> <p>There is no certainty that proposals to increase rail capacity will actually lead to an increase. Concrete agreement from the passenger transport authority to enhance rail provision is required; otherwise the sustainability of such measures will be greatly reduced, possibly to the extent that government sustainability criteria would no longer be met.</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p>	
26. Matthew Naylor (Yorkshire water)	<p>Yorkshire Water supports the use of SUDS. Although an adoption and maintenance plan should be in place prior to development.</p> <p>There is enough current spare capacity at Burley in Menston waste water treatment works to serve the two sites. However any development within the catchment prior to these sites being developed could take away some of this capacity. Yorkshire water will need to be informed of any proposed development so that we can</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 6.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	No amendment.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	create accurate population forecasts. This is to guide our planning process for creating additional capacity where and when it is necessary.		
27. J lee	<p>I am objecting to the proposed traffic structure, especially those measures relating to Moor Lane.</p> <p>Wildlife should be given greater consideration as there are a number of bird species and other mammals present within the area. Moor Lane is the gateway to Ilkley Moor, which is world renown and enjoyed by walkers, joggers, visitors and residents. It is important to leave something for the next generation, not just another built up area.</p> <p>It is almost impossible for heavy goods vehicles, which will need access to the sites, to drive down Moor Lane without damaging the trees. Moor Lane already has a notice saying 'Unsuitable for Heavy Goods', with the trees having preservation orders on them.</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number 22.</p> <p>Highways</p>	
28. Jonathan Brown	<p>I object to the SPD and the proposed development because it fails to preserve the character of the village and landscape of the area.</p> <p>The SPD makes repeated assumptions about the impact of the High Royds development, e.g. planned mitigation of congestion problems.</p> <p>No decisions about the number and nature of houses should be taken until the true impact of the High Royds development and the two other major new developments in Guiseley is known, i.e. until these sites are occupied. Otherwise it cannot be claimed that any genuine consideration for the future of the village is being considered, merely that a paper exercise using many assumptions has been carried out.</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 16.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number 8 and 9.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>A council test carried out before Scalebor park was developed proved that traffic on the upper Ilkley Road at the top of Moor Lane exceeds the level that caused the need for the by-pass, and this is before High Royds is fully occupied. For these reasons the SPD does not meet its objective in safeguarding Menston.</p> <p>Plans for any development must ensure the character of the area is maintained, thus including dry stone walls and green spaces.</p> <p>The housing must be affordable, as it is a lack of available affordable housing which is stated as having contributed to outward migration.</p> <p>My objections could be resolved if the SPD was reconsidered when the High Royds and Guiseley sites are fully occupied, that way their impact upon the area in terms of traffic and amenities can be properly assessed beforehand.</p> <p>Also if the scale of the development were such that it genuinely safeguarded the character of the landscape and was limited to approximately 30 affordable houses.</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number 16 and 1.</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>Please refer to response number 8.</p> <p>Housing Please refer to response number 9 and 16.</p>	
29. Philip Davies (Conservative MP, Shipley)	<p>On behalf of the local residents I wish to make the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about the density of housing proposed, especially Derry Hill. ▪ Concerned about overlooking, particularly effecting the existing Bungalows on Hawksworth Drive. ▪ Existing roads would have to cater for more traffic and so would need upgrading/making 	<p>Please refer to responses number 9, 6, 16, and 8.</p> <p>Highways</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>safer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All new properties should be in keeping with the existing ones. There should be greater parking provision per property than proposed, plus visitor parking. Infrastructure improvements will be required to support new housing, particularly schools and doctor's surgeries. 		
30. Yorkshire and Humber Assembly	No Comment	N/A	No change required.
31. Mrs J.R Pratt (Chairperson, Menston Cares)	<p>I strongly object to the suggestion that vehicles should have direct access into the highway system of the village from Derry Lane, Meadowcroft, and the bend on Moor Lane. These routes are used by both children and elderly people and will consequently become 'rat runs'.</p> <p>Restrict car access into the village. Improve car, pedestrian, and cycle and pushchair access throughout so that everything within walking distance can be fully taken advantage of.</p> <p>I support improvements being made to the bus service as this will greatly benefit elderly people within the village, although the trains will not be able to cope with what you're proposing.</p> <p>I also object to the proposed 3-storey developments on Derry Hill as these will be unsightly and overpowering being at the entrance to the new development. The development is also too close to the Conservation Area and will block the distant view of Ilkley Moor.</p> <p>There is no mention of 'Sheltered Housing'. Menston</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Refer to response number 6 and 16.</p> <p>Housing</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Cares conducted a straw poll survey and obtained 150 signatures from Menston residents who considered there to be a shortage of such accommodation within the Menston area. This survey was proceeded by a questionnaire which found that 76% of those surveyed wanted to buy into sheltered housing, but in increasing the provision within the Menston area, also wanted the option to choose their preferred site, as Bingley Road for example is far closer to the village centre than Derry Hill.</p> <p>Menston cares wishes to ensure that sheltered housing provision is incorporated into the two sites in consultation with the residents of Menston, principally pensioners who would like to stay in the village and want the added protection of sheltered housing.</p>	Housing	
32. Mr C Dewhirst	<p>Bradford council are already failing in providing adequate secondary school places for the area. Given the recent developments in both Guiseley and High Royds the one school within the Leeds area open to Menston children will reach its capacity before these sites are occupied. Bradford Council should build a new secondary school in Burley given the amount of council tax that will be accrued from the occupiers of these developments, with the children in these households therefore attending a school within the Bradford District rather than being apportioned to Leeds.</p> <p>What about the streams and springs, have these been located on the sites and on the ground, not just on maps. At this time all the water runs into one pipe behind 34/36 Dicks Garth Road. A full drainage plan for Derry Hill, Dicks Garth Road and Walker Road should be formulated before construction commences. The drainage system should be of primary concern. The stream mentioned on page 18: paragraph 2.32 runs behind my house, and is already prone to flooding. If the</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 8.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 6.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>'ponding' is rectified the flow of the stream will increase, together with the possibility of flooding. The full capacity and layout of the drainage system in this area is still unknown. In order to alleviate this problem I believe that the stream should be diverted into the drainage system to go down Derry Hill. However as this already overflows in heavy rain and hence the whole drainage system around Dicks Garth, Walker Road and Derry Hill should be upgraded before development commences. There is already ponding behind numbers 21 and 23 Hawksworth Drive, with the gardens of these properties already being waterlogged for most of the year. Terming this as 'rain runoff' fails to convey the severity of the problem and disregards the current state of the land, this being very wet with surface water draining from either Bingley Road or the hill behind the farm. In summary there should be a more comprehensive SUD system of increased capacity incorporated into the Bingley Road site in order to alleviate drainage problems around Hawksworth Drive.</p> <p>Further to this I welcome the proposal that the majority of new properties should be two-storey, however I do believe that the bungalows on Hawksworth drive should be used as reference point. The rise in the land behind these bungalows could cause over domination if two storey buildings were built too close to their existing boundaries. Therefore only one storey properties should be erected along the site boundary adjacent to Hawksworth Drive, with the imposing of the open area proposed on page 30 being crucial in diluting any dominance.</p>	Please refer to response number 6.	
33. Mrs Christelow	I endorse the majority of paragraph 2.49 but believe that the bungalows on Hawksworth Drive should be used as a reference point. Due to the rise in the land there is a danger of over-domination if 2-storey houses are built near the boundaries of the bungalows. Therefore 1	Please refer to response number 6.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	storey houses or an open space should be provided immediately behind the boundary of the bungalows on Hawksworth Drive. This is very wet land with springs and at least one pond on the northern boundary. SUDs are shown (Diagram Page 31) draining to that boundary, but where do they go from there? There is no land drainage until Hawksworth Drive is reached. A system of SUDS is required that has taken into account the slope gradient and can remove water from the site whilst not exacerbating the current drainage problems around Hawksworth Drive.		
34. Mr Gareth Lewis	<p>Page 73 states that the medical centre is overloaded. It is difficult to obtain a medical appointment at short term notice now. This will inevitably get far worse when the proposed 358 houses are occupied.</p> <p>Page 75 of the Sustainability Appraisal states that there are concerns over the impact that the developments will have upon service provision, i.e. water. What is being done to address this concern as local reservoirs are already depleted? As global warming increases water supply problems will inevitably worsen.</p> <p>What exactly is affordable housing? And who will be able to afford it? Strict regulations need to be enforced to prevent agencies/developers/individuals buying such housing to then let it out.</p> <p>The number of houses proposed should be limited as much as is possible so to lessen the amount of cars present within the general Menston area. Moreover the High Royds development itself will bring hundreds of cars to the area.</p> <p>With reference to page 69 I have concern over the loss</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 8.</p> <p>The water and energy efficiency of any housing will be considered in detail against the Sustainable Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document at the time of application. Please refer to response number 26.</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number</p>	<p>No amendment</p> <p>No amendment</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>of green belt and the degree to which the character of the countryside will alter, and the loss of hedgerows, trees, flowers and grasses (page 70). This amounts to a great loss of wildlife habitat and biodiversity, made all the worse by the High Royds development.</p> <p>Less development equals less pollution, noise, congestion, disturbance and demand on what are already stretched resources.</p>	<p>22 and pages 54 and 55 of the sustainability appraisal, paragraphs 3.75/3.76/3.77.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 8.</p>	
35. Mrs Lewis	<p>Page 73 states that the medical centre is overloaded. It is difficult to obtain a doctors appointment at short/medium notice now. This will worsen with the proposed 358 new houses and it is existing Menston residents, particularly parents that will suffer.</p> <p>The 358 houses should be prevented from being built as the increased population will assert too greater pressure on the medical centre given its size.</p> <p>Page 75 states that there is concern over the impact on service provision, particularly water. What is being done to address this concern? Local reservoirs are already low and depleted, global warming is a fact and its effects are increasing; thus the water supply will get worse. Building fewer houses will equal less people, less water required, and subsequently less water used.</p> <p>Parking in and around the train station in Menston is already a problem and will worsen with hundreds of more vehicles from the three new housing developments (Derry Hill/Bingley Road/High Royds). Parking spaces are very limited along Station and Cleasby Road, with parked cars already causing an obstruction to both ambulances and fire engines.</p> <p>Overall the number of houses needs to be limited in</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 8.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 8.</p> <p>The water and energy efficiency of any housing will be considered in detail against the Sustainable Design Guide Supplementary Planning Document at the time of application. Please also refer to representation number 26.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number</p>	No amendment

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>order to reduce the number of vehicles both parked and driven within the area.</p> <p>As regards pages 69 to 70, the loss of green belt will be detrimental to the character of the countryside, as will the loss of hedgerows, trees, plants and grasses to wildlife habitat and biodiversity.</p> <p>A reduction in the number of houses, cars and people will be beneficial to the environment. Green spaces, wider roads, spaces between houses and large gardens should be encouraged so to develop wildlife habitat and further promote the countryside appearance.</p> <p>What exactly is affordable housing? And who will be able to afford it? Strict regulations need to be enforced to prevent agencies/developers/individuals buying such housing to then let it out and exploiting the very purpose of 'affordable housing'.</p>	<p>9 and 16.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 22.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 9, 1, 16 and 22.</p> <p>Housing</p>	
36. Mrs EG. Dewhirst	<p>The three styles of building shown as examples may be okay in Gateshead, but on these sites in Menston the impact would be horrendous (Page 42). Menston needs traditional styles of building in these highly visible sites, not a lego-inspired monstrosity that is visible for miles in Wharfedale.</p> <p>Try walking with shopping and children to Derry Hill in 15 minutes.</p> <p>On a dark afternoon, or morning, the street lighting is abysmal. No one will be prepared to walk in the winter. Also, where are you proposing putting the extra car parking, not to mention the extra passengers on already</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 16.</p> <p>The 15 min assertion is based upon average walking speed, for the average person, under average circumstances.</p> <p>Highways</p>	No amendment

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>crowded trains?</p> <p>I support paragraphs 2.55, 3.06, 3.10, 3.13, 3.16, 3.19, 3.30, 4.24, 4.29 on pages 24, 29, 29, 29, 30, 31, 35, 40, 41 and 42 respectively.</p> <p>The only school in Menston is the Village Primary. What provision is being made for our children at secondary level? All the new developments in Guiseley, such as the addition of a further 200 or so houses at the Crompton Parkinson site, will exert further pressure on the schools within the area as pupils there will no longer be permitted to enrol in schools within the Leeds district. Ilkley Grammar School, which is the nearest Bradford school, is currently bursting at the seams and is considering reducing its intake by five places. Any other school within the Bradford area is only reachable via the two heavily congested roads through Shipley and Greengates, which are not to be considered. Wharfedale needs a new secondary school, and quickly.</p> <p>One parking place per household is plain stupidity. Most people have two cars and sometimes even three or four if their children are over seventeen. Where will these extra cars go?, Derry Hill, Walker Road or Dicks Garth Road perhaps, as Derry Lane and Main Street are all packed in the evenings. There are no spare parking spaces here. Houses should be given a garage and parking for two cars.</p> <p>The problem of drainage needs to be addressed before any work commences as there are springs and a stream running down the two sites, as a result houses in this area have been flooded within the last five years. As any resident of Menston knows, the junction of Derry Hill, Main Street and Burley Lane can flood after exceptional</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 8.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 16.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 6.</p>	<p>No amendment</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>downpours, as can the cellars of the properties around this junction also. A proper survey of the water course from the main watershed needs to be carried out.</p> <p>The proposals for cattle movement from the Derry Hill site state that it should be channelled through housing estates and past the school. This has obvious potential for accidents to occur.</p> <p>Furthermore, adding an additional exit from the Bingley Road site via Meadowcroft will make matters much worse.</p> <p>Where are the proposed parking places for the residents of Derry Lane to be sited if their road becomes a mini highway?</p> <p>The idea of rat-running through Walker Road and Dicks Garth Road is horrendous. Has anyone been around the area in the evening and at weekends when resident's cars are solidly parked there and on Daisy Hill?</p> <p>The most obvious way to keep traffic out of Menston is through the Derry Hill site by diverting it up a short way and left into the new Bingley Road site so it enters/exits into Bingley Road itself. In addition to this the sharp bend by Mount Pleasant is unsuitable and the top of Cleasby Road which links Bingley Road has no clean sight line to the right.</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Meadowcroft will solely be a pedestrian access route.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p>	<p>Amended the Bingley Road Integration diagram on page 34. Removed the vehicular integration arrow.</p>
37. Mr F.C Johnson	<p>I commend Bradford MDC for commissioning the study. However the end product produced by the consultant left much to be desired. I found the SA report difficult to read both in style and content, plain English would have helped improve it. Also, there are significant errors/anomalies which reduce my faith in the report, as</p>	<p>Support noted.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>follows:</p> <p>Page 8: 1.21: The first six bullet points are duplicated onto page 9.</p> <p>Page 11: 1.30: Titled Stage B and C but seems to have omitted Stage C SPS key issues etc.</p> <p>Page 13: 1.37: A reference to App A would have helped.</p> <p>Page 31: 3.2: Summary: Menston population is approximately 5500, which differs from 5658 on page 28, paragraph 5, and 4500 on page 9, paragraph 3.4 of the SPD report.</p> <p>Page 51: There is no recreation space in Victoria Avenue.</p> <p>Page 56: 3.84: Birtley Lane I assume is Burley Lane.</p> <p>Page 59: 3.95/3.97: I assume they mean antiquated and not antique street lighting.</p> <p>Page 62: 3.108: The White Cross roundabout is at Guiseley not Otley.</p> <p>The SPD was easier to understand although it would have been easier to read in large typeface; I no longer have 20/20 vision.</p> <p>I support the general content of the draft SPD, in particular:</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>5500 is an approximate figure, where as 5658 is derived from official census data. Page 9 of the draft SPD should state that Menston has a population of around 5500.</p> <p>This area is allocated as Recreation open space in the RUDP under Policy OS2.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>Amended.</p> <p>No amendment.</p> <p>No amendment.</p> <p>Amended page 9 of the draft SPD accordingly.</p> <p>No amendment.</p> <p>Amended.</p> <p>Amended.</p> <p>Amended.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Page 24: 2.55 Page 29: 3.06 Page 29: 3.10 Page 30: 3.16 Page 31: 3.19 Page 35: 3.30</p> <p>Page 35/37: All- The Provision and encouragement of pedestrian, pushchair and bicycle access, and the use of public transport.</p> <p>Page 40: All Page 41: All Page 42: 4.24 to 4.29</p> <p>I object to:</p> <p>Page 18: 2.32: There is no mention of how to deal with ponding, streams, springs & possible water logging.</p> <p>Page 19: 2.40: Ditto</p> <p>Page 24: 2.51: Meadow Croft should give only pedestrian access not vehicular access to the new site as this will minimise the increase of traffic through the village whilst encouraging integration.</p> <p>Page 34: 3.24: Strongly object to vehicles having direct access to the village system, as above.</p> <p>Page 51/53: All: As above, paragraph 3.24.</p> <p>Page 34: 3.25: The density of Derry Hill should not be more than 28/ha, the inspector's suggestion.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 6.</p> <p>Meadowcroft will solely be for pedestrian access.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number 9.</p>	<p>No amendment.</p> <p>Amended the Bingley Road Integration diagram on page 34. Removed the vehicular integration arrow.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Page 35: 3.27/8: Needs to specify street parking bays and, for safety, eliminate street parking without bays.</p> <p>Page 45: 5.02: For safety, play space for children must be on site.</p> <p>Page 45: 5.03: This should be mandatory (must) not optional (may) to help sustain facilities.</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 16.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 1.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 1.</p>	
38. Eva I. Pinthus			
24: 2.51 34: 3.24 51/53: All	I strongly object to the suggestion that vehicles should have direct access into the highway system of the village. In paragraph 5.64 the report stresses that the High Royds approach to traffic is “exemplary”. This is based on a DfT document of good practice. However, whilst the High Royds approach is to keep cars out of Menston, this document positively encourages cars to drive into Menston via Moor Lane (on a bend), Derry Lane (large numbers of young children), Meadow Croft (other end of Derry Lane), or via the Children’s Home (by demolishing and replacing it). We would urge keeping cars out of the village, by making car access very difficult and time consuming, whilst making pedestrian, cycle and pushchair access very easy. We do welcome the public transport proposals in the report.	Highways	
34: 3.25	Whilst supporting the density proposals for Bingley Road (30/ha compared to Inspector’s 35/ha), I strongly object to the proposal of 35/ha for Derry Hill. The Inspector suggested only 28/ha for that site, which is after all further away from facilities, i.e. the station.	Please refer to response number 9.	
18/19: 2.32/2.40	The issue of ponding is recognised, but we cannot find mention of the need to solve this problem.	Please refer to response number 6.	
20: 2.41	I question the walking time. The distance is measured as the crow flies, not as the commuter walks. The calculation is based on 3mph, which is questionable, especially up hill, with heavy bags, on a wet October	The 15 min assertion is based upon average walking speed, for the average person, under average circumstances. Please	No amendment.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	night!	refer to response 36.	
23: 2.49	I welcome the proposal that most properties should be 2 storey, but question the comment that the bungalows on Hawksworth Drive should not be seen as a reference. There is a danger of over-domination.	Please refer to response number 6.	
31: 3.17	This is too weak, as it mentions rain run-off but ignores springs.	Please refer to response number 6.	
33: 3.23	This misinterprets the VDS, which actually says housing should be provided for pensioners who want to downsize (that would release larger houses back into the market). The VDS also actually says accommodation should be provided for young families who want to stay in the village .	Policy C1 of the Menston Design Statement more specifically states that 'more priority should be given to providing smaller, more manageable housing suitable for pensioners and accommodation for young families who want to stay in the village'...'this may be provided by converting large houses to flats'.	Amended page 33, paragraph 3.23 accordingly so to reflect the finer points of the Menston Village Design Statement, Policy C1.
35: 3.28	Street parking in dedicated bays is fine, but encouraging on street parking is a danger, especially to children. Parking should average 1.5 spaces per dwelling, not 1 space.	Please refer to response number 16.	
42: 4.30	This suggestion could lead to some horrible buildings ... have a look at the pictures! It should stress the "Menston style".	Please refer to response number 16.	
45: 5.02 50: All	Suggests playspace could be off-site. The park is too far away and involves crossing roads, this is inappropriate for small children.	Please refer to response number 8.	
45: 5.03	Suggests improvements to library, a community centre may be needed. Surely they will be needed.	Please refer to response number 8.	
47/48: All	This makes no mention of a "local" affordable housing policy. Recent developments in Menston, Ilkley and Addingham have given first priority to residents in the settlement and second priority to residents in the Wharfe Valley (Bradford part).	Housing	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
24: 2.55	I strongly support that all properties should have a natural stone boundary wall.	Support noted.	No change required.
29: 3.06	I support safe, direct walking and cycling routes from the sites.	Support noted.	No change required.
29: 3.10	I support enhancing the footpaths from Menston through the sites to the countryside.	Support noted.	No change required.
30: 3.16	I strongly support this whole paragraph ... housing must be place specific, avoiding standard house types used elsewhere.	Support noted.	No change required.
31: 3.19	I support the concept that views matter.	Support noted.	No change required.
35: 3.30	I support the use of natural materials.	Support noted.	No change required.
40: All	This is good stuff.	Support noted.	No change required.
41: All	So is this!	Support noted.	No change required.
42: 4.24-4.29	And this!	Support noted.	No change required.
39. Ms Penny Richards	<p>I am objecting to the draft supplementary planning document.</p> <p>I am objecting to the sections below: pages no: 20/24/28, paragraphs: 2.41/2.51/3.06.</p> <p>I am extremely concerned about the potential increase in traffic through the centre of the village, in particular from the Bingley Road site towards East Parade, the Co-op store, and the station. I am not objecting to the development itself, but the traffic increase it will bring.</p> <p>With the route from the developments to the station being rather undulating, and with children or elderly residents in mind, the idea that the station is 15 minutes walk from either development is an underestimate. It seems naive in the extreme to suggest that this will negate the need for car use, particularly in winter when bad weather combined with dark mornings and evenings will make it more likely that people will drive.</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>The 15 min assertion is based upon average walking speed, for the average person, under average circumstances. Please refer to response number 36.</p>	No amendment

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>The Co-op is an excellent village resource and is well-used. However this already leads to congestion at the junction of East Parade and Main Street as people try to park as close to the Co-op as possible. With a large number of extra houses using the Co-op this congestion will become ever more severe when the traffic along Main Street increases, further adding to the danger for children walking to school.</p> <p>I see that one aim of the affordable housing is to provide homes for pensioners – expecting elderly residents to walk to the Co-op and back (uphill) with bags is unacceptable, and cannot be assumed that all residents of the new development will have a car or choose to do all their shopping at a supermarket.</p> <p>I agree that a bus route down Meadow Croft Drive would be an excellent idea – however, I would like to see this route for buses, pedestrians and buses only, with no access for cars.</p> <p>The shuttle bus should be required to run during the day and stop at bus stops on Main Street to enable residents to access local shops. Alternatively existing bus routes that run during the day should be adapted to run through these new developments.</p> <p>Ideally I would like to see speed bumps on East Parade to prevent it from becoming a rat run.</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>Please refer to response number 51.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p>	
40. West Yorkshire Archaeology Advisory Service	Unfortunately the Sustainability Appraisal and Supplementary Planning Document do not include an assessment of the impact of the proposals on either buried remains or the historic built environment. It would appear from the documents that the term 'Cultural Heritage' (i.e. archaeology and the built heritage) has	Agreed	SPD amended accordingly so to state that an archaeological assessment and recording will be required prior to development. Pages 18 and 19.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>not been fully understood – see pages 79 & 84 of the SA which makes no reference to archaeology or the West Yorkshire Historic Environment Record.</p> <p>We are concerned that we appear to have been overlooked during the preparation of these documents as we are retained by Bradford District to provide advice on such matters.</p> <p>Our records show that both the Derry Hill and Bingley Road sites contain evidence of historic agricultural remains. The earthwork remains of ‘ridge and furrow’ cultivation survive within these fields – and are visible on a photograph of the Derry Hill site on page 18 of the SPD. ‘Ridge and furrow’ dates from the medieval and post-medieval periods and is of local and potentially regional significance depending upon preservation.</p> <p>The development of these sites would involve considerable ground disturbance and would lead to the destruction of the archaeological remains.</p> <p>PPG 16 advises that all prospective developers should make appropriate and satisfactory arrangements for the excavation and recording of archaeological remains (PPG 16 paragraph 28).</p> <p>This guidance is reiterated in the Bradford Replacement UDP Policy BH19 (requirement for evaluation, excavation and recording of archaeological remains).</p> <p>We recommend that the remains are not of sufficient significance to warrant preservation in situ and therefore we have no objection to the principle of development at these sites.</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>towards generating at least 10% of the sites energy requirements from on site renewable resources, which would bring the SPD in line with the Draft RSS, Policy ENV5.</p> <p>Yorkshire Forward welcomes the Draft's provision of a single parking space per unit on the two development sites, as this could help to encourage a modal shift towards more sustainable forms of transport. We welcome the Draft's commitment to securing an annual Metro pass for each new residential unit, via the S106 legal agreement between the developers and the council.</p> <p>We welcome the general approach taken in preparing the Sustainability Appraisal Report, particularly the identification of key sustainability issues, potential indicators and sources of baseline data. The clear approach taken in section 2 outlining the links between this document and other strategies, plans and policies and sustainability objectives is welcomed.</p> <p>In addition, we would welcome the amendment of the Regional Spatial Strategy section on page 19 to reflect the latest draft RSS document, which is currently at the examination in public stage.</p> <p>Finally, I hope the above comments are helpful for progressing the SPD on Housing Sites and I look forward to future opportunities for involvement in the Local Development Framework preparation process.</p>	<p>statutory basis than emerging draft RSS policy.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Agreed.</p>	<p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>Amended.</p>
42. Menston in Bloom	We welcome the concept of the SPD and we appreciate that such a document will lead to better development than would otherwise have been produced. We thank Bradford Council for facilitating the production of the document.	Support noted.	No change required.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
6: 1.20	Whilst we appreciate that both sites are 'phase 2' sites, the phase covers a five year period. We consider that these sites should not be developed concurrently, as the disruption to Menston would be too great. They should be sequenced so that the infrastructure can cope with the construction traffic.	There are no RUDP policies that can dictate or rather ensure sequential, rather than concurrent development. When phase two housing sites are brought forward all are considered equally viable in prospective development terms.	No amendment
4: Map	This shows the houses to the west of Meadowcroft as 2 storeys. Some are actually bungalows. The map requires correction.	Please refer to response number 19.	
18: 2.32/ 19:2.40/ 31: 3.17	<p>The issue of ponding is recognised, but we cannot find mention of the need to solve this problem. Even more serious is that there is no mention of the springs. Full surveys and solutions would be required prior to a grant of planning permission. Desk top studies etc would not be sufficient.</p> <p>We do not understand what is meant by paragraph 3.17. Run-off is an issue, but the springs have not been considered. There does not appear to be any consideration given to off-site problems (to the North of the sites), of run-off, springs or drainage or the need for such solutions.</p> <p>There is also no mention of the probable need to expand the existing sewerage and drainage infrastructure to cope with the additional housing.</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 6.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 6.</p> <p>Please refer to page 75 of the sustainability appraisal.</p>	No amendment.
20: 2.41/ 29: 3.09	<p>We do not accept the 'notional walking times' quoted.</p> <p>The distances shown by the circles on the map are as the crow flies, and are not a true reflection of walking</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 39.</p> <p>Agreed the distances are as the crow flies and not in terms of true</p>	No amendment

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>routes. In any event a large part of the Derry Hill site is beyond the 800 metre circle from the railway station. Calculations appear to be based on a walking speed of 3mph. We believe that, with an elderly population, with hills, and using actual walking routes, a 2mph speed is the best that is likely to be achieved by most people, and the real distance is greater than shown. The real distance is between 20% and 25% further than illustrated. Therefore the walking time to the station from the mid-point of the Derry Hill site is at least 20 minutes, so the 'negation of the need for car use' is not a valid conclusion.</p> <p>As walking is not a realistic option, car parking at the railway station is the only other realistic alternative, and as this is already giving rise to on street parking and the blocking of nearby roads it is essential that the car parking capacity of the railway station is increased. We would ask for a S106 obligation to increase car parking at the station by either mezzanine or underground level parking. To ensure that it was actually used there would need to be an undertaking that the parking was to be free for railway users.</p>	<p>walking distance. It is also agreed that a substantial part of the Derry Hill site is beyond 800 metres from the station (as the crow flies). The actual walking time to the far corner of the Derry Hill site is in fact approximately 20 minutes for the average person, walking at average speed, under average circumstances. However the SPD is referring to the walking distance and actual time it would take to walk to/from the station from the principal eastern access point of the site on Derry Hill.</p> <p>Highways</p>	
21:2.45	We find this statement to be too generalised, and cannot find evidence to justify the statement, particularly with regard to connectivity.	Acknowledged, however of the utmost importance is that both these sites are better connected than other identifiable areas of the village, of which they intend to be.	No amendment.
22:2.46/ 34: 3.25	Whether or not existing residential densities meet the guidance in PPG3 is not in itself a justification for higher densities on these sites. PPG3 does say that	Please refer to response number 9 and 6.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>developments should reflect the existing townscape and landscape. We therefore disagree with the proposal that there should be high densities on principal routes, particularly on the part of the Bingley Road site near Hawksworth Drive.</p> <p>We support the density proposals for Bingley Road (30/ha compared to the Inspector's 35/ha), however we strongly object to the proposal of 35/ha for Derry Hill. The inspector suggested only 28/ha for that site, which is further away from facilities, i.e. the station etc. It is the less sustainable of the two sites, and that seems to have been recognised by the Inspector. We urge that density on that site is amended to 28/ha as recommended by the Inspector.</p>	Please refer to response number 9.	
22: 2.47	We do not understand the map. There are no A, B or C trees.	There seems to have been an error with the typeface on a number of diagrams/maps within the draft version however these will be corrected in the final published SPD.	Amended diagram 2.47 on page 22 accordingly.
23: 2.48/ 31:3.19	<p>We agree that views matter. We consider that the sites should be as unobtrusive as possible from the existing settlement and to be screened (in line with the Village Design Statement) so that existing views out of the village are retained.</p> <p>There is no mention of views into the village from the countryside.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 16.</p> <p>As regards building design overall the Menston Village Design Statement states that new development must be attractive in its own right and sympathetic with the design and</p>	<p>No change required.</p> <p>No amendment</p> <p>No amendment</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>materials of nearby properties, whilst also acknowledging the traditional architectural character of the village.</p> <p>In response to this the draft SPD states that...'New development must demonstrate an understanding of context and must respect neighbouring buildings'...</p> <p>The Menston Village Design Statement also states that buildings which mimic other regional styles and materials should not be permitted.</p> <p>In response to this the draft SPD states that...'New development must not resort to pastiche and must not use artificial materials'...</p> <p>The Menston Village Design Statement further states that new buildings should respect property densities of nearby housing.</p> <p>In response to this the draft SPD states that...'New development must respect densities of nearby housing where this is consistent with planning policy and appropriate in terms of wider contextual and socio-economic considerations'...</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>The Menston Village Design Statement states that architectural design should not include extravagant or unnecessary features.</p> <p>In response to this the draft SPD states that... 'Architecture will be free of decorative non-functional elements. It must learn from context but not resort to the application of historical styles'...</p> <p>The Menston Village Design Statement also states that the existence of unsympathetic architectural design or style should not be treated as precedence for further similar properties to be built.</p> <p>In response to this the draft SPD states that... 'Poor quality development should not be treated as a reference for new development regardless of proximity to the sites'...</p> <p>Such guidance should ensure that the view of the development from the surrounding countryside is an aesthetically pleasing one.</p>	
23: 2.49	We welcome the proposal that most properties should be 2 storey, but question the comment that the bungalows on Hawksworth Drive should not be seen as	Please refer to response number 6.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>a reference. There would be a danger of over-domination of the existing bungalows, which would be exacerbated by the rising levels on the new site.</p> <p>In the case of these sites, as they are on rising land, distances between habitable room windows should be increased beyond the normal 21 metres to ensure over dominance is mitigated. A firm basis for this calculation should be stated in the SPD.</p>	<p>Amenity standards will be determined by Bradford Council's Development Control policy at the time of application. The 21 metre standard only applies to housing extensions (Policy 7 of the Revised Housing Extension Policy). Although this may be used in practice for new build developments, no adopted policies exist which dictate such standards for new builds.</p>	<p>No amendment.</p>
<p>24: 2.50/ 24: 2.51/ 24: 2.52/ 29: 3.06/ 29: 3.11/ 34: 3.24/ 36: Map/ 37: Map/ 51/53: All</p>	<p>We consider that out of all of the proposals in the document it is those suggestions for dealing with congestion that are the most flawed. We strongly object to the suggestion that vehicles should have direct access into the highway system of the village.</p> <p>In paragraph 5.64 the report stresses that the High Royds approach to traffic is 'exemplary'. This is based on the DfT document of good practice (Making Residential Travel Plans Work- good practice guidelines, DfT September 2005). However, whilst the High Royds approach, exemplified as good practice, is to keep cars out of Menston, the suggestions made for this site positively encourage cars to drive into Menston via Moor Lane (on a bend), Derry Lane (large numbers of young children), Meadow Croft (other end of Derry Lane), the children's home (by demolishing and replacing). This does not accord with the good practice quoted by the DfT.</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Whilst we appreciate the reasoning is to prevent the new developments being ghettoised, we would urge that cars must be kept out of the village by making vehicular access difficult and time consuming, whilst making bus, pedestrian, cycle and pushchair access very easy. We believe that this is a far more sustainable way forward than that proposed in the draft report. We support the suggestion that safe and direct walking and cycling routes to the village centre will be established.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.24 states... 'Highways integration... must be undertaken in a way that will prevent the generation of large volumes of additional village (traffic) within the village'. We assume the first use of village should read 'traffic'. The suggested traffic flows would not meet the concept in this paragraph.</p> <p>We would suggest that the traffic arrangements would be far more appropriate as follows... For the Derry Hill site there should be two access points. The point at the west either should be amended to be left turn only from the site, up the hill towards Ilkley, or Moor Lane should be rebuilt within the site to straighten the dangerous bend between the proposed roundabout and Mount Pleasant. In either case the top of Moor Lane will require attention as the exit has very poor sightlines.</p> <p>We consider the proposal at the east end of the Derry Hill site to be flawed. We believe that there should be no entry to either Derry Lane or North down Derry Hill. Derry Lane is an area that has a very large number of young people and is already a problem area. Derry Hill to the North is very narrow.</p> <p>Our preferred solutions would be to either direct all traffic up Derry Hill (which would need to be upgraded) to the</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p>	<p>Page 34 on paragraph 3.24 amended accordingly.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Bingley Road junction (which would also require upgrading). Alternatively a link could be created from the South-East corner of Derry Hill site through the intervening field to the North-West corner of the Bingley Road site, and traffic directed through that site to Bingley Road. Cleasby Road should be 'No Entry' from Bingley Road.</p> <p>With regard to the Bingley Road site we strongly object to car access to the village onto Hawksworth Drive either via Meadowcroft or by demolition of the children's home. Access should be limited to Bingley Road. Bingley Road would need significant upgrading, including pedestrian and cycle facilities and lighting.</p> <p>We do welcome the public transport proposals in the report. Either of the solutions above would assist public transport, and we support direct non-car access to the centre of the village. One element missing from the public transport proposals is the provision of raised pavements at all bus stops. This would enable buses to dock, and as by the time these developments happen all buses will have low floors, the docking would enable level access for those with wheelchairs, prams etc.</p> <p>The map legends on pages 36 and 37 are unclear. What sort of integration do the arrows mean?</p> <p>Overall we consider that the costs suggested on page 51 are far too conservative as they are based on a flawed solution.</p>	<p>Meadowcroft will be solely for pedestrian access. The children's home will not be demolished under any circumstances.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Pedestrian integration.</p> <p>These have been removed.</p>	<p>Amended the Bingley Road Integration diagram on page 34. Removed the vehicular integration arrow. Paragraph 5.67 deleted.</p> <p>Amended the legend of the diagram on page 36 so to indicate the arrow as symbolising pedestrian integration.</p> <p>Tables on page 51 deleted.</p>
24: 2.53/ 24: 2.54/ 35: 3.30	These paragraphs lack clarity. We support the use of natural stone and materials, but the alternatives are	Please refer to response number 6 and 16. The final SPD will	Amended accordingly.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	should be provided for young families who want to stay in the village.		
35: 3.27	We support street parking in dedicated bays, but feel that encouraging on street parking is a danger, especially to children. Parking should average 1.5 spaces per dwelling, not 1 space, the allocation to reflect the different sizes of dwellings. In addition there should be an element of visitor parking.	Please refer to response number 16.	
40: All	We support virtually all this page. We do have concerns about paragraph 4.14 as we would not want on street parking to be encouraged if it was outside the sites. Also, we feel that secure cycle storage would not be appropriate for all new housing, especially if houses are designed for the elderly. It seems strange that every house must have space for a cycle, which many residents will neither need nor want, but no mention is made of the need for a bin store for the wheelie bins all houses will need and want.	Please refer to response number 16. Bin stores are alluded to within the Bradford District Council Sustainable Design Guide.	Bin stores are mentioned within the design guidance chapter.
41: All	We support this entire page.	Support noted.	No change required.
42: 4.24-4.29	We support all these paragraphs.	Support noted.	No change required.
42: 4.30	We are very concerned that the very bold statement could lead to inappropriate buildings, as exemplified by the examples shown in the photographs. The 'Menston Style' appropriate to the townscape must be stressed. We do not agree that the development must be contemporary.	Please refer to response number 16 and 6.	
45: 5.02 50: All	This suggests playscape could be off-site. The park is too far away and involves crossing roads, which is in appropriate for small children. We feel that playscape provision must be on-site. Menston is already significantly undersupplied with both recreational open space and playing fields and has only very limited open green space. Of the three main open green spaces, two are in private ownership with no public access. The new developments will exacerbate this, and so space must be provided on site. Paragraph 5.54 backs up this	Please refer to response number 1.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	argument. It may be worth considering creating additional space in the field to the west of the Bingley Road site, in conjunction with the new road that we suggest is needed.		
45: 5.03	This suggests improvements to the library; a community centre may also be needed. Surely they will be needed. Facilities are already stretched. In addition to existing facilities it is likely that new facilities will be required, such as changing facilities and extra meeting rooms and library space.	Please refer to response number 8.	
49: 5.45	We feel that the Leeds calculation is on the low side. It is difficult to scrutinise the totals, as the formula has no numbers attached, but given the vast amount of residential development in the Guiseley/Rawdon areas we are convinced that Guiseley school will have no capacity and St. Mary's is already full. In addition, Bradford Council should be asked for the figures for the expansion of Ilkley Grammar School. The suggestion in the Sustainability Appraisal that Immanuel School in Idle is a local school is laughable. It has no connection with the area, and is a very difficult journey.	Please refer to response number 8.	
43. Mrs Leisa Templeton (Menston Preschool Committee Secretary)	<p>Our concerns relate in particular to Derry Hill. On page 53, paragraph 5.63 of the draft housing sites at Bingley Road and Derry Hill, Menston, Supplementary Planning Document Draft, it states 'A traffic and transport survey was undertaken...this identifies a number of highway safety issues, access and circulation difficulties and a lack of public transport capacity in Menston. It concludes that the development on these sites will slightly worsen the situation'.</p> <p>A further paragraph, 5.68 states 'Traffic generation on these sites will impact on the wider road network and will necessitate off site highway improvements and traffic management proposals to surrounding road network'.</p>	Highways	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>A further paragraph, 5.68 states 'Traffic generation on the sites will impact on the wider road network and will necessitate off highway improvements and traffic management proposals to the surrounding road network'.</p> <p>Some measures have been undertaken to alleviate the problems, i.e., on page 53 the map shows a 'proposed school 20mph zone and traffic calming associated with previously committed development', but this is only on St Peters way in Menston. However, we feel that adequate measures have not been taken regarding traffic speed limits, specifically on Main Street. This is a busy main road through Menston and used as a thoroughfare for traffic in a very popular community with a current speed limit of 30mph, which is not always adhered to.</p> <p>On Main Street the Kirklands Community Centre accommodates Menston Pre-school with children between the ages of 2.5-5 years attending Monday-Friday, as well as providing activities for all age groups throughout the week, including retirement groups for the elderly. There is also a Doctors' Surgery and a library on Main Street, again accommodating all age groups, as well as the side entrance to Menston Primary School. We feel, therefore, that the extra traffic, which will be generated due to these developments, could cause problems for the Menston community if traffic calming measures are not considered along Main Street. We also note that on other roads in and around Menston, 20mph zones and speed bumps have recently been introduced.</p>		
44. Environment Agency	Both the proposed sites are within the area identified by us as Low Flood Risk on the published Flood Zone Maps. We would not raise objections in principle to housing sites in these areas, but would require detailed	Agreed. Please refer to response 6.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>surface water treatment and drainage assessments to be carried out and accompany planning applications. This is to ensure that the developments proposed do not have the potential to increase flood risk elsewhere, and use appropriate Sustainable Urban Drainage Techniques whilst seeking opportunities to reduce the overall level of flood risk in the area through the layout and form of the development.</p> <p>Question 3: Support</p> <p>Question 4: DSPD page 29 Paragraph 3.08</p> <p>Question 5: Using existing features and promoting and providing opportunities for green space are welcomed.</p> <p>Any small streams on the sites should be retained as landscape and biodiversity features. Buffer zones/strips could be established around them to provide green space and opportunities for biodiversity.</p> <p>Question 3: Support</p> <p>Question 4: DSPD page 29 Paragraph 3.12 and 3.13</p> <p>Question 5: We strongly support the use of sustainable design and construction and BREEAM standards. We therefore support the draft SPD which requires adherence to the CBMBC Sustainable Design Guide SPD and the requirements to reduce energy consumption (including use of design and micro generation) and reduce waste and water consumption.</p> <p>Question 3: Support</p> <p>Question 4: DSPD page 31 Paragraph 3.17</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 6 and 22.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Question 5: We strongly support the use of SUDS in the developments proposed and at this early stage. This follows advice given within the current draft PPS25 (Developments and Flood Risk). Further information regarding the use of SUDS on these sites and in further stages of planning development can be obtained from Robert Sanderson on 0113 213 4779.</p> <p>However, we also recommend that the wording also includes reference to the possibility of a Planning (section 106) Obligation could be required (see section below). This may particularly be required for the future maintenance of any agreed SUDS scheme.</p> <p>Question 3: Support with additional comment.</p> <p>Question 4: DSPD page 45 Planning Obligations</p> <p>Question 5: Dependant upon the type of SUDS proposed and ownership, there may be a requirement to secure the future maintenance of the SUDS scheme.</p> <p>Question 3: Support with additional comment</p> <p>Question 4: DSPD page 45 Planning Obligations</p> <p>Question 5: Dependent upon the type of SUDS proposed and ownership, there may be a requirement to secure the future maintenance of the SUDS scheme through the use of a section 106 legal agreement. It would therefore provide clarity to include a short section on this under the Planning Obligation section.</p>	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>Agreed.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>See above.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>See above.</p>	<p>No change required.</p> <p>Amended page 45 paragraph 5.03 so to list SUDS as a planning obligation.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>In section 2, 'Links to Other Strategies, Plans, Policies and Sustainability Objectives'. We consider that this reference should be made to draft PPS25/PPG25, Development and Flood Risk.</p> <p>Additionally, we would also suggest that a review of a document to be produced by us, the Wharfe Flood Risk management Strategy, which will be consulted on in December 2006 should be undertaken, although we recognise this may not be possible at this stage. This considers flood risk implications in the catchments including for example, wetland creation for floodwater storage, new defences etc and the implications of climate change. This document is important due to the implications of the Water Framework Directive. The Planning Section should receive and be consulted on the document in December.</p>	<p>Agreed. Please refer to response number 6.</p>	<p>Inserted a brief description of PPS 25 on page 58.</p>
45. Menston Community Association	<p>Our principal reservation relates to the proposed roads and routings for motor vehicles, which in our opinion encourage much of the traffic into narrow already busy and overcrowded village streets, when alternative and much safer routes can be considered.</p> <p>We have serious reservations as to the lack of clarity with respect to building design and nature of acceptable materials. There are a number of other aspects of the report which we are unhappy with for a variety of reasons, these include drainage, the nature of affordable housing, as well as care provision and housing densities.</p> <p>Ensuring bus, pedestrian, and cycle and pushchair access is very easy, and avoids the risk of turning the new developments into ghettos. Furthermore we believe that this is a far more sustainable way forward than that</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number 16, 6 and 9.</p> <p>Highways</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>proposed in the draft report.</p> <p>We support the suggestion that safe and direct walking routes will be established, as well as direct cycling routes to the village centre.</p>	Highways	
6: 1.20	Whilst we appreciate that both sites are 'phase 2' sites, the phase covers a five year period. We consider that these sites should not be developed concurrently, as the disruption to Menston would be too great. They should be sequenced so that the infrastructure can cope with the construction traffic.	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	
4: Map	This shows the houses to the west of Meadowcroft as 2 storeys. Some are actually bungalows. The map requires correction.	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	
18: 2.32/ 19:2.40/ 31: 3.17	<p>The issue of ponding is recognised, but we cannot find mention of the need to solve this problem. Even more serious is that there is no mention of the springs. Full surveys and solutions would be required prior to a grant of planning permission. Desk top studies etc would not be sufficient.</p> <p>We do not understand what is meant by paragraph 3.17. Run-off is an issue, but the springs have not been considered. There does not appear to be any consideration given to off-site problems (to the North of the sites), of run-off, springs or drainage or the need for such solutions.</p> <p>There is also no mention of the probable need to expand the existing sewerage and drainage infrastructure to cope with the additional housing.</p>	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	
20: 2.41/ 29: 3.09	We do not accept the 'notional walking times' quoted. The distances shown by the circles on the map are as the crow flies, and are not a true reflection of walking	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>routes. In any event a large part of the Derry Hill site is beyond the 800 metre circle from the railway station. Calculations appear to be based on a walking speed of 3mph. We believe that, with an elderly population, with hills, and using actual walking routes, a 2mph speed is the best that is likely to be achieved by most people, and the real distance is greater than shown. The real distance is between 20% and 25% further than illustrated. Therefore the walking time to the station from the mid-point of the Derry Hill site is at least 20 minutes, so the 'negation of the need for car use' is not a valid conclusion.</p> <p>As walking is not a realistic option, car parking at the railway station is the only other realistic alternative, and as this is already giving rise to on street parking and the blocking of nearby roads it is essential that the car parking capacity of the railway station is increased. We would ask for a S106 obligation to increase car parking at the station by either mezzanine or underground level parking. To ensure that it was actually used there would need to be an undertaking that the parking was to be free for railway users.</p>		
21:2.45	We find this statement to be too generalised, and cannot find evidence to justify the statement, particularly with regard to connectivity.	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	
22:2.46/ 34: 3.25	<p>Whether or not existing residential densities meet the guidance in PPG3 is not in itself a justification for higher densities on these sites. PPG3 does say that developments should reflect the existing townscape and landscape. We therefore disagree with the proposal that there should be high densities on principal routes, particularly on the part of the Bingley Road site near Hawksworth Drive.</p> <p>We support the density proposals for Bingley Road</p>	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	(30/ha compared to the Inspector's 35/ha), however we strongly object to the proposal of 35/ha for Derry Hill. The inspector suggested only 28/ha for that site, which is further away from facilities, i.e. the station etc. It is the less sustainable of the two sites, and that seems to have been recognised by the Inspector. We urge that density on that site is amended to 28/ha as recommended by the Inspector.		
22: 2.47	We do not understand the map. There are no A,B or C trees.	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	
23: 2.48/ 31:3.19	We agree that views matter. We consider that the sites should be as unobtrusive as possible from the existing settlement and to be screened (in line with the Village Design Statement) so that existing views out of the village are retained. There is no mention of views into the village from the countryside.	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	
23: 2.49	We welcome the proposal that most properties should be 2 storeys, but question the comment that the bungalows on Hawksworth Drive should not be seen as a reference. There would be a danger of over-domination of the existing bungalows, which would be exacerbated by the rising levels on the new site. In the case of these sites, as they are on rising land, distances between habitable room windows should be increased beyond the normal 21 metres to ensure over dominance is mitigated. A firm basis for this calculation should be stated in the SPD.	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	
24: 2.50/ 24: 2.51/ 24: 2.52/ 29: 3.06/ 29: 3.11/ 34: 3.24/ 36: Map/ 37: Map/ 51/53: All	We consider that out of all of the proposals in the document it is those suggestions for dealing that are the most flawed. We strongly object to the suggestion that vehicles should have direct access into the highway system of the village. In paragraph 5.64 the report stresses that the High Royds approach to traffic is 'exemplary'. This is based	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72. Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>on the DfT document of good practice (Making Residential Travel Plans Work- good practice guidelines, DfT September 2005). However, whilst the High Royds approach, exemplified as good practice, is to keep cars out of Menston, the suggestions made for this site positively encourage cars to drive into Menston via Moor Lane (on a bend), Derry Lane (large numbers of young children), Meadow Croft (other end of Derry Lane), the children's home (by demolishing and replacing). This does not accord with the good practice quoted by the DfT.</p> <p>Whilst we appreciate the reasoning is to prevent the new developments being ghettoised, we would urge that cars must be kept out of the village by making vehicular access difficult and time consuming, whilst making bus, pedestrian, cycle and pushchair access very easy. We believe that this is a far more sustainable way forward than that proposed in the draft report. We support the suggestion that safe and direct walking and cycling routes to the village centre will be established. Paragraph 3.24 states... 'Highways integration... must be undertaken in a way that will prevent the generation of large volumes of additional village (sic) within the village'. We assume the first use of village should read 'traffic'. The suggested traffic flows would not meet the concept in this paragraph.</p> <p>We would suggest that the traffic arrangements would be far more appropriate as follows... For the Derry Hill site there should be two access points. The point at the West either should be amended to be left turn only from the site, up the hill towards Ilkley, or Moor Lane should be rebuilt within the site to straighten the dangerous bend between the proposed roundabout and Mount Pleasant. In either case the top of Moor Lane will require</p>	<p>61 to 72.</p> <p>Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.</p> <p>Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>as the exit has very poor sightlines.</p> <p>We consider the proposal at the East end of the Derry Hill site to be flawed. We believe that there should be no entry to either Derry Lane or North down Derry Hill. Derry Lane is an area that has a very large number of young people and is already a problem area. Derry Hill to the North is very narrow.</p> <p>Our preferred solutions would be to either direct all traffic up Derry Hill (which would need to be upgraded) to the Bingley Road junction (which would also require upgrading). Alternatively a link could be created from the South-East corner of Derry Hill site through the intervening field to the North-West corner of the Bingley Road site, and traffic directed through that site to Bingley Road. Cleasby Road should be 'No Entry' from Bingley Road.</p> <p>With regard to the Bingley Road site we strongly object to car access to the village onto Hawksworth Drive either via Meadowcroft or by demolition of the children's home. Access should be limited to Bingley Road. Bingley Road would need significant upgrading, including pedestrian and cycle facilities and lighting.</p> <p>We do welcome the public transport proposals in the report. Either of the solutions above would assist public transport, and we support direct non-car access to the centre of the village. One element missing from the public transport proposals is the provision of raised pavements at all bus stops. This would enable buses to dock, and as by the time these developments happen all buses will have low floors, the docking would enable level access for those with wheelchairs, prams etc.</p>	<p>Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.</p> <p>Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.</p> <p>Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.</p> <p>Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>The map legends on pages 36 and 37 are unclear. What sort of integration do the arrows mean?</p> <p>Overall we consider that the costs suggested on page 51 are far too conservative as they are based on a flawed solution.</p>		
24: 2.53/ 24: 2.54/ 35: 3.30	<p>These paragraphs lack clarity. We support the use of natural stone and materials, but the alternatives are unclear. Brick can come in many forms, and render can be used sparingly or in vast swathes, the same can apply to timber. No mention is made of roofing materials. A good quality reconstituted stone may be appropriate where it accurately simulates traditional materials and is not in a sensitive location. All this needs clarification especially with reference to buildings visible from outside the sites.</p>	<p>Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.</p>	
24: 2.55	<p>We strongly support the suggestion that all properties should have a natural stone boundary wall.</p>	<p>Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.</p>	
29: 3.05 47/48: All	<p>We support the general principles in paragraph 3.05. However, we have concerns that the detailed suggestions on pages 47 and 48 will not meet local needs.</p> <p>The guidance makes no mention of a 'local' affordable housing policy. Recent developments in Menston, Ilkley and Addingham have given first priority to residents in the Wharfe Valley (Bradford part).</p> <p>We are not persuaded that the proposed mix of affordable housing is correct. The report from the Rural Housing Enablers should carry more weight than district wide policies as it is specific to the village. The report would suggest that the mix of flats should be amended- more 2 bedroom flats and less 1 bedroom flats.</p>	<p>Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.</p>	
29: 3.10	<p>We support enhancing the footpaths from Menston</p>	<p>Please refer to the whole of</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	through the sites to the countryside.	response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	
30: 3.16	We strongly support this whole paragraph...housing must be place specific, avoiding standard house types used elsewhere.	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	
30: 3.17 30: 3.18	This is unclear. The SUDs concept sounds very laudable, but the actual meeting is not explained.	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	
3.23	This misquotes the VDS, which actually says housing should be provided for pensioners who want to downsize. (That would release larger houses back into the market). The VDS also actually says accommodation should be provided for young families who want to stay in the village.	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	
35: 3.27	We support street parking in dedicated bays, but feel that encouraging on street parking is a danger, especially to children. Parking should average 1.5 spaces per dwelling, not 1 space, the allocation to reflect the different sizes of dwellings. In addition there should be an element of visitor parking.	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	
40: All	We support virtually all this page. We do have concerns about paragraph 4.14 as we would not want on street parking to be encouraged if it was outside the sites. Also, we feel that secure cycle storage would not be appropriate for all new housing, especially if houses are designed for the elderly. It seems strange that every house must have space for a cycle, which many residents will neither need nor want, but no mention is made of the need for a bin store for the wheelie bins all houses will need and want.	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	
41: All	We support this entire page.	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	
42: 4.24-4.29	We support all these paragraphs.	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
42: 4.30	We are very concerned that the very bold statement could lead to inappropriate buildings, as exemplified by the examples shown in the photographs. The 'Menston Style' appropriate to the townscape must be stressed. We do not agree that the development must be contemporary.	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	
45: 5.02 50: All	This suggests playscape could be off-site. The park is too far away and involves crossing roads, which is in appropriate for small children. We feel that playscape provision must be on-site. Menston is already significantly undersupplied with both recreational open space and playing fields and has only very limited open green space. Of the three main open green spaces, two are in private ownership with no public access. The new developments will exacerbate this, and so space must be provided on site. Paragraph 5.54 backs up this argument. It may be worth considering creating additional space in the field to the west of the Bingley Road site, in conjunction with the new road that we suggest is needed.	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	
45: 5.03	This suggests improvements to the library; a community centre may also be needed. Surely they will be needed. Facilities are already stretched. In addition to existing facilities it is likely that new facilities will be required, such as changing facilities and extra meeting rooms and library space.	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	
49: 5.45	We feel that the Leeds calculation is on the low side. It is difficult to scrutinise the totals, as the formula has no numbers attached, but given the vast amount of residential development in the Guiseley/Rawdon areas we are convinced that Guiseley school will have no capacity and St. Mary's is already full. In addition, Bradford Council should be asked for the figures for the expansion of Ilkley Grammar School. The suggestion in the Sustainability Appraisal that Immanuel School in Idle is a local school is laughable. It has no connection with	Please refer to the whole of response number 42 from pages 61 to 72.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	the area, and is a very difficult journey.		
46. Natural England	<p>Generally we feel the SPD has covered a good number of issues that Natural England is interested in, including landscape and biodiversity. One area of concern relates to the Public Right of Ways affected by the proposals. These are identified in the context part of the document, pages 18 and 19; however no further mention or identification of public rights is made in the rest of the proposals. We would want to make sure these PROW are not lost and if anything are linked up to local routes to and from the sites.</p> <p>We consider the SA/SEA to have been carried out in a logical manner and although reference should have been made to Planning Policy Statement 9: Biodiversity and Geological Conservation, we welcome the requirement for survey work (s3.75) and the conclusion in S4.4.</p> <p>We conclude that the community option is the most sustainable and will result in a better built and natural environment for the community and people living in the area.</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 22 and 17.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>	<p>Amended page 58 so to make reference to PPS 9.</p> <p>No change required.</p>
47. White Young Green Planning (Representations made on behalf of the JK Smith Trust Fund).	<p>The JK Smith Trust owns a significant proportion of the land being promoted at Bingley Road, and as such has a vested interest in the Draft SPD and Sustainability Appraisal that has been prepared for the site.</p> <p>We have six separate representations to make which comment upon the planning obligations sections of the Draft SPD and specifically address paragraphs 5.02 and 5.03, affordable housing, education, public open space and maintenance, access, traffic management, transport and travel planning, community facilities, and planting maintenance.</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>As you will no doubt be aware, the requirement for planning obligations must comply with the guidance set out in Circular 05/2005 which stipulates that obligations should be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relevant to planning; ▪ Necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms. ▪ Directly related to the proposed development; ▪ Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development; ▪ Reasonable in all other aspects <p>With this in mind, we take this opportunity to make some general observations about the Draft SPD. Firstly, the section on planning obligations in the Draft SPD does not make it clear whether any developer of either of the two sites being promoted would be required to contribute all of the obligations set out in the Draft SPD.</p> <p>It is considered that the planning obligations set out in the Draft SPD are premature in coming forward for consultation. Many of the issues covered in the planning obligations section of the SPD, i.e. affordable housing, public open space and transport and highways, are subject to further work and research by the Council and, or appointed consultants. Therefore, it is unreasonable, at this stage, to set down requirements for the planning obligations without the baseline evidence to justify the basis for this level of contribution.</p>	<p>Developers of both sites will be expected to contribute to all of the areas of obligations set out in the draft SPD. It is agreed that the draft SPD does not currently make this clear. Please also refer to the 'SPD: Planning Obligations Draft for Consultation'.</p> <p>Although the affordable housing SPD is not scheduled for adoption until January 2008 paragraph 5.18 of the draft SPD states that a range of research and survey work has been carried out by the council and its partners, informing both the RUDP and the council's affordable housing strategy. The findings of these assessments are contained within a number of documents including:-</p>	<p>Removed paragraph 5.03 on page 45 and integrated these two points into paragraph 5.02.</p> <p>No amendment</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>Modelling Housing Markets in Bradford 2000.</p> <p>Local Housing Assessment 2000.</p> <p>The Joint Housing Strategy 2000-2010.</p> <p>A Decent Home in a Decent Neighbourhood- Joint Housing Strategy 2003-2010.</p> <p>Rural Housing Enablers Surveys.</p> <p>Local Housing Assessment 2007 (LHA).</p> <p>The findings of such research conclude that there is an imbalance between the need and supply of affordable housing contribution at a district wide level. The LHA concludes that over 55% of district households earn below the amount required to purchase an entry level/lower quartile priced house in the district (£73,000). However this figure is far greater in Menston as average house prices are above the district average. Overall the shortfall of affordable housing in Bradford is considerably high and the LHA suggests that we set a district wide target of 1132 units; 200 in high demand areas, per</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>annum until 2011 in order to try and balance out the housing market and meet demand.</p> <p>The affordability issue needs to be addressed as the LHA identifies the lower quartile house price in Menston as being £175,000. Taking into account this figure and comparing it to the average income within the Menston area the lower quartile house price to average income ratio is 4.6. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation recommends that house prices should be 2.9 times average income.</p> <p>As mentioned the LHA categorises demand for affordable housing as being high, medium, or low. Menston is classed as high and research suggests that 200 units per annum need to be created in these high demand areas in order to meet housing need.</p> <p>It has also been identified through surveys such as this that out of the total residential housing provision within the Menston area only 2% equates to affordable housing.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>Consequently it is research such as this that forms the basis of the planning obligations relating to housing affordability. Although the Affordable Housing SPD will ultimately supplement this research, enough does presently exist to dictate what current affordable housing policy should be regardless. Further to this paragraph 6.36 under Policy H9 of the current Revised Unitary Development Plan states that research, namely that which has been listed above, will be used to provide the basis for assessing the need for affordable housing on a site specific basis, in this case, Menston.</p> <p>The research cited within the draft SPD is therefore the baseline evidence that justifies the level of affordable housing contribution prescribed.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>As regards Public Open Space the draft Planning Obligations Supplementary Planning Document published in April 2007 makes reference to PPG 17 and states that the Council will seek improvements to the quantity or quality of open space if it is deemed inadequate, or where new development will lead to increased demand.</p> <p>The RUDP for the district includes detail on a minimum provision of open space in settlements.</p> <p>Bradford Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance for the provision of children's play space within new developments was approved in December 1994.</p> <p>It outlines what the council expects in terms of providing on</p>	No amendment

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>site open space contributions. The requirements are based on guidance from the national playing field association and worked out at 20 square metres per family dwelling of 2 or more bedrooms.</p> <p>The Planning Obligations SPD together with the formulae takes into account current issues and updates this Supplementary Planning Guidance, having said this the SPG should still be referred to.</p> <p>Developers who submit major planning applications for housing schemes (classed as 10 or more residential units) may be expected to provide £800 per 2-bed unit for off-site improvements to the quality, or additions to the quantity of open space. Where open space is provided onsite by the developer, contributions may be sought for the maintenance of the area for twenty years. Alternatively, the Council may seek contributions towards the provision of indoor recreation facilities.</p> <p>It is for local authorities to undertake robust assessments in order to identify future needs of</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>local communities for sport and recreation.</p> <p>The Bradford Open Space, Sport & Recreation Study Outdoor Facilities Assessment Report (Knight Kavanagh and Page, June 2006) is such an assessment. The purpose of this assessment is to enable Bradford Council to 'plan positively, creatively and effectively to ensure that there is an adequate provision of accessible, high-quality green spaces, civic spaces and sport and recreation facilities to meet the needs of local communities and visitors'.</p> <p>At the time of application this assessment will be utilised in determining the need for housing developers to provide and contribute to open space within the Menston area. Public open space contributions will therefore be somewhat based upon the assessment itself and all that it has identified within the Menston locality as a whole.</p> <p>Policy OS5 of the RUDP states:-</p> <p>'New residential development will be required to make appropriate provision of, or equivalent</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>payment sum payment for:</p> <p>Recreation open space, including childrens playspace and informal open space, to a minimum standard of 20 square metres per dwelling (including a suitably designed and equipped play area in developments of 0.8ha or 50 or more dwellings; and...</p> <p>Playing fields to a minimum standard of 40 square metres per dwelling.</p> <p>Provision will be located within the site, however where this is inappropriate, off site provision or improvements to existing local provision can be suitable alternatives. Developments will be required to make arrangements for adequate maintenance of any new provision.</p> <p>The Council have appointed consultants to develop a detailed strategy for playing pitch provision within Bradford as part of a West Yorkshire initiative supported by Sport England. This work is presently ongoing but when completed will include a comparative profile of outdoor playing pitch sport in the region</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>and an analysis of cross boundary issues, as well as an individual strategy for Bradford. This work will be based upon the methodology developed by Sport England.</p> <p>When complete this will inform future provision of new outdoor playing pitches and the improvement and protection of existing facilities.</p> <p>An Open Space and Built Recreational Facilities SPD is also currently being produced by the council. This will establish the need for open space and built recreational facilities in various parts of the district. Once adopted, this will form a material planning consideration at planning application.</p> <p>The Council's Park's and Landscape Services Department have advised that due to the number of dwellings likely to be developed upon the Derry Hill and Bingley Road sites, it is unlikely that the village will be able to sustain the potential growth in population utilising existing recreation sites in the village.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>The current playing pitch strategy for Shipley & Keighley presently identifies deficiencies in the number of junior and mini football pitches, an area where there appears to be a continued and sustained growth. Bearing in mind the potential number of new properties and the increase in team generation rates, it is expected that additional provision will need to be made to serve these two developments either on site or off site (purchase of additional land) locations. Provision should be made within any new recreation area for a full size winter sports pitch (100 m x 60 m), changing accommodation, parking and an equipped children's play area. A commuted sum would also be required for future maintenance, or alternative means would need to be demonstrated as to how the site would be maintained in the long term.</p> <p>Playing pitch construction and changing accommodation should be in accordance with Sport England recommendations. Children's play equipment should comply with the National Playing Fields Association LEAP standard (local equipped area for</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>play). This includes compliance with the latest European standards BSEN 1176 and BSEN 1177 and information on the range of equipment and proximity to nearby dwellings. An area of not less than .75 hectare should be allocated.</p> <p>A commuted sum will be required for the maintenance of open space provided as part of these developments. This will form part of the Section 106 contribution for each site covering a 20 year period.</p> <p>Within Menston the Kirklands Community Centre is used for a range of uses. The centre is well used by the community, often to capacity, seven days a week, with the church and primary school also being used. At planning application an assessment of the impact that these developments will have on community facilities in the village will need to be made. This approach is supported by RUDP Policy CF7A which states that...</p> <p>'Where major development proposals would result in an increased demand for built recreational facilities which</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>cannot be met by existing facilities a developer may be required to enter into a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 in order to secure the provision of, or contribution towards, new or extended facilities.</p> <p>As stated earlier the council is currently producing an Open Space and Built Recreational facilities SPD. Again, once adopted this will form a material planning consideration at planning application stage.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Furthermore, it is also considered that the Draft SPD and the requirements of the planning obligations place too much emphasis on the recently approved development at High Royds Hospital. Any requirement for planning obligations on either the Derry Hill or Bingley Road sites should be directly related to those developments and as such, it would be unreasonable to expect a developer to enter into a Section 106 Agreement which would link either the Derry Hill or Bingley Road sites to the development at High Royds.</p>	<p>Agreed in relation to page 50 paragraph 5.59.</p> <p>Other references to the High Royds Development (see below) evidently concur with the view that any requirement for planning obligations on either the Derry Hill or Bingley Road site should be solely related to those sites in particular. However as regards the shuttle bus, this should be run on a collaborative basis. This would be the only point at which a developer would be expected to enter a Section 106 agreement linked to the High Royds development, and reasonably so.</p> <p>The draft SPD makes the following references to the High Royds development:</p> <p><u>Under Planning Obligations:</u></p> <p>If the affected school is 'x' places</p>	<p>Amended page 50 paragraph 5.59 and removed ...'It must be noted that this figure is purely indicative at this stage and may need linking in with the development of High Royds Village through discussions with Leeds City Council'.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>short of capacity and the development generates 'y' places, contributions will be sought on the difference between 'x' and 'y'. If 'x' is greater than 'y', then no contributions will be sought. Baseline research has indicated however that existing primary place provision is tight and what little surplus spaces there are for secondary school places will be taken up by pupils resulting from the new high Royds Village development. It is therefore expected that new residential development at both Derry Hill and Bingley Road will be required to contribute monies towards pupil places at both primary and secondary schools.</p> <p><u>Page 3:</u></p> <p>The draft SPD also identifies how the wider impact of new residential development on the local environment, community and physical infrastructure may be managed and mitigated. This is also considered in the context of the cumulative impact such development will have given the development of High Royds Village. This is likely to be achieved through the use of planning obligations. The draft</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>SPD therefore defines the scope and content of the planning obligations the Council expects developers to provide should planning permission be granted.</p> <p><u>Page 51:</u></p> <p>The Section 278 requirements for the development of Derry Hill and Bingley Road have been developed as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic survey and public transport analysis conducted by Faber Maunsell; • Consultation with METRO; • Consultation with Leeds City Council on the High Royds Section 278 agreement; • Liaison with Bradford's Council's Highways Development Control Officers. <p>The High Royds Village development will be fully occupied by the time these sites come forward for development. Therefore the reality of the traffic impact of High Royds Village will be taken in to account as part of the existing traffic conditions.</p> <p>The Section 278 Agreement for High Royds Village seeks to address the impact on traffic and public transport it creates through</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>a raft of measures. This agreement is regarded as exemplary in its approach to "travel planning".</p> <p><u>Page 52:</u></p> <p>Travel Planning Requirements:</p> <p>The following initiatives have been designed to work with those secured in the High Royds Village development as possible additions to improve the local transport service to support the development. Indicative costs have been applied to each. The measure are complimentary to each other but can be implemented independently and flexibly. The Section 278 agreement will require a commuted payment of £138,000 per site or implementation of a measures or measures to that value. If both developments occur in a similar time frame it would be possible to implement all these items.</p> <p>Shuttle Bus:</p> <p>The provision of a free Shuttle Bus Service to carry residents of the new dwellings, occupiers and individuals that work on the site</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>to and from Menston railway station between the hours of 7am and 10am and 3pm and 7pm Monday to Friday. The cost of this is approximated at £80,000 per service, per annum. The developer is urged to collaborate with the Shuttle Bus provider at High Royds Village to investigate cost reductions.</p> <p>Public Transport Capacity:</p> <p>The Baseline study and consultation responses have highlighted the lack of existing capacity at on the Airedale Wharfedale line at peak times. The developments at Derry Hill and Bingley Road will further reduce this capacity. Through the High Royds Section 278 agreement financial resources have been secured to bid to increase train services. On the basis of this precedent the development of the sites will be required to contribute a commuted sum of £300,000, split proportionately between the sites.</p> <p>At the time of application the High Royds development will have been completed for a number of years. The planning</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>obligations relating to the Bingley Road and Derry Hill sites will have to be assessed in light of the circumstances in Menston at this time, circumstances that will have obviously changed since the development of High Royds. The developer of High Royds provided a number of contributions in relation to infrastructural requirements at the time of application, and the developer/developers of these sites will be required to do the same. Inevitably the infrastructural capacity of Menston will be reduced after High Royds is completed, thus possibly requiring the developers of both Bingley Road and Derry Hill to contribute more than what they may have had to have done should the High Royds Development not have commenced. This being the case all planning obligations which developers will be expected to provide will only be linked to the sites themselves and the Menston context at that particular time, regardless of the effect the High Royds development will have had upon that context overall up until that point.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>We would also take this opportunity to note that there are a number of inconsistencies in the information set out in the Sustainability Appraisal and the Draft SPD. Paragraph 5.02 states that 'planning obligations will be expected to include', it is considered that this should be similar to the wording of paragraph 5.03, where 'planning obligations may include'. This would be more in line with tests set out in Circular 05/2005. Planning Obligations area a matter for consideration during application negotiations and the wording of the Draft SPD should reflect that.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.03 states that there may be a requirement for improvements to existing community facilities and a planting management scheme, however there is no further information on either of these obligations in the remainder of the planning obligations section. Furthermore, planting management would usually be dealt with by condition, and for this reason a Section 106 Agreement for such a requirement would be unnecessary.</p>	<p>Please refer to previous response.</p> <p>As regards community facilities please refer to response number 8. Furthermore although planting management may usually be dealt with by condition in this instance it is felt that it should be dealt with rather through planning obligations, thus ensuring the future maintenance of planting schemes through commuted sums. The importance of planting within these prospective developments is illustrated through the excerpts below.</p>	<p>No amendment</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>SPD excerpts relating to planting:</p> <p>Policy guidelines relevant to the Bingley Road and Derry Lane sites contained within the assessment are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevent the spread of development which would destroy the identity of Menston. • Keep settlement edges neat and discreet and utilise a framework of tree planting. • The landscape has the capacity to accommodate small pockets of residential development in a parkland setting. • On-site and off site planting may be required to absorb the development into the landscape. • Associated infrastructure would need to be carefully considered. <p>Landscape – The site forms part of Wharfedale’s southern valley side. It is currently covered by pasture and contains a number of trees that line Moor Lane and help define the historic field boundaries. New tree planting has been established that now</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>form the southern boundary to the site. Prominent groups of trees are located close to the site.</p> <p>Field Boundaries – Most of the historic field boundaries survive. These are defined by hedges and fencing. The boundary to the south that encloses the new tree planting is recent</p> <p>The Edge – The new development provides an opportunity to redefine the southern edge of Menston. New development should be outward facing overlooking the adjacent countryside. The new edge should be softened with tree planting with the objective of breaking down its mass rather than concealing it.</p> <p>The Wharfedale Landscape Assessment:</p> <p>Strengthen planting around dwellings to absorb the built structure. Ornamental style planting is more acceptable in this location, although leylandii style hedging should be avoided.</p> <p>SPD:</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Affordable Housing:</p> <p>Policy H9 of the adopted UDP requires that 40% of new developments over 1ha/25 units should be provided as affordable housing. The UDP states in paragraph 6.38 that consideration is being given to updating the affordable housing SPG (to an SPD) to reflect the approach for identifying need, and provision of, affordable housing in Bradford, particularly that stemming from the work done by Bradford Housing Partnership. Therefore the Menston Draft SPD is based on incomplete information simply because the SPD on affordable housing is yet to be drafted. It would be more reasonable to wait until the affordable housing SPD is drafted before prescribing the level of affordable housing that will be required for the Derry Hill and Bingley Road sites. It is interesting to note that the Affordable Housing SPG for Leeds City Council requires 25% of the development for affordable housing in the locality adjacent to Menston. Furthermore, the High Royds development was only required to provide 18% of units for affordable housing. This would suggest that housing need in this area is not 40%.</p>	<p>Tree planting will be used in blocks and as individual trees to help break down the mass of the new development both when viewed for outside and inside the sites. Native deciduous trees will be used.</p> <p>Please refer to the previous response and response number 9. As regards High Royds that was subject to its own negotiations and planning application and is not within the Bradford District. The baseline evidence for the Bradford district and thus the basis for the planning obligations relating to housing affordability have been alluded to previously. It is this baseline evidence that both prior to and after RUDP adoption justifies a 40% affordability threshold within the Wharfedale area. Furthermore it is important to recognise that despite not being within the Bradford District High Royds if anything will have exacerbated housing affordability need within the Menston area.</p>	No amendment

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Furthermore, paragraph 5.28 of the Menston Draft SPD is far too prescriptive in terms of the percentages it expects for different unit sizes. It would be more appropriate to provide affordable housing that is reflective of the specific requirements of the nominated Housing Agency, as well as with regard to what the developments are offering in terms of housing mixes and types.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.31 provides an indication of the level of income in Menston, with paragraph 5.32 stating that 'market research shows that the open market value of a 1 bed flat in Menston is £130,000'. However, the Draft SPD does not provide any further evidence as regards income or the market values of houses in the Menston area. Both of these figures are fundamental in determining the level of affordable housing required, and hence should be gathered and tested before the percentage of affordable housing figure is confirmed.</p> <p>We also believe that paragraph 5.30 should read... 'the Section 106 Agreement will require the developer to build and then discount these units by 40% of the Open Market Value', if the subsequent paragraphs are the proposed strategy for affordable housing that is.</p>	<p>It is intended that paragraph 5.28 is to be deleted from the final draft SPD regardless.</p> <p>Please refer to previous response. It is intended that paragraph 5.32 is to be deleted from the final draft SPD regardless.</p> <p>It is intended that paragraph 5.28 is to be deleted from the final draft SPD regardless. Having said this in the past developers within the Wharfedale area have been required to discount units by 50% of open market value, not 40%. The inclusion of the 40% figure is an error and unsubstantiated by the council.</p>	<p>Deleted paragraph 5.28.</p> <p>Deleted paragraphs 5.31/ 5.32.</p> <p>Deleted paragraph 5.28.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Education: In the first instance, the Draft SPD does not identify a catchment area for the provision of education contribution. It is understood that the normal practice is to use a 3 mile catchment area for primary school education.</p>	<p>As regards catchment areas the Sustainability Appraisal states the following...'In forecasting future capacity and increasing education provision, it is clearly important to focus on education provision in terms of catchment areas, transcending the local authority boundary'...</p> <p>...'Limitations to the collection of data as part of this baseline assessment include the proximity of Menston to the local authority boundary with both Leeds and Harrogate. The boundary with Leeds creates issues regarding catchment areas for education and health services that straddle these boundaries. It has been important to be aware of this and recognise the associated implications...'</p> <p>Thus the cross boundary issues which relate to catchment areas</p>	<p>No amendment.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Paragraph 3.57 of the Sustainability Assessment for Menston identifies that there is primary school capacity in Leeds and also acknowledges that consideration should be given to sending those children residing at either Derry Hill or Bingley Road to Leeds schools as oppose to Bradford schools. The Sustainability Appraisal clearly states that there is capacity within those schools within the administrative boundary of the Leeds Education Authority, but no indication is given as to what the situation is concerning schools in Menston. The spare capacity in the schools in Leeds is not recognised by the Draft SPD, and thus suggests that the documents are not consistent in their assessments of the education capacity within the Leeds district.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.43 states that existing baseline data indicates primary school place provision is limited and that surplus secondary education places are likely to be taken up by the recently approved High Royds development. Firstly, the Draft SPD does not identify where the evidence is to support the assumption that school capacity will be taken up by the recently approved High Royds development.</p> <p>Secondly, the calculations for education contributions are based on 2009/2010 projections. However, both Derry Hill and Bingley Road are allocated as Phase 2 housing allocations in the Revised UDP (2005) and will therefore not be released until 2009, and thus not fully developed and occupied until the 2009/2010 projections become relevant. The Draft SPD does not take account</p>	<p>have been recognised and will be subject to further clarification at the time of application depending upon local circumstances.</p> <p>As regards school places within Menston itself please refer to response number 8.</p> <p>Although not stated in the draft SPD itself, the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal does quite clearly state the reasons why it can be assumed that school capacity, particularly at secondary level, will be taken up by the High Royds development.</p> <p>Despite the argument presented the calculation in paragraph 5.45 is based upon figures for the year that phase 2 housing allocations were estimated to come forward, i.e. 2009. However this was only an estimation and subject to</p>	<p>No amendment.</p> <p>No amendment.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>of this and as such we would stress that the justification for the education contribution is not robust and does not pass the tests set out in Circular 05/2005. If, once the proposals for the development of either of the sites come forward, a lack of capacity for school places is identified, then a calculation similar to that set out in paragraph 5.45 could be a reasonable basis upon which to justify the requirement for a commuted 'education' sum.</p>	<p>change, as has been the case. Housing figures for the Bradford district now suggest that phase 2 housing allocations may not come forward until later. Nonetheless it is quite evident at this stage that it is extremely difficult to predict exactly when such sites will come forward, and consequently which annual education projections are most relevant. For this reason any figures and projections cited within the SPD can only be looked upon as an indicative estimate of what may be the required contribution at the time, and thus in their very nature are based upon somewhat anecdotal evidence. For this reason the education contributions that will be sought from both these sites will be assessed at the time of application in the context of the educational needs present within Menston at the time.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Public Open Space and Maintenance:</p> <p>Paragraph 5.50 states that the Council has appointed consultants to develop a detailed strategy for playing pitch provision. Given that there is no strategy in place, it is premature to identify that there is a need for a new pitch, as is set out in paragraph 5.57.</p>	<p>Paragraph 5.57 simply states that should the need arise for new recreational facilities given the size of the developments, then these recreational facilities should provide scope for a full sized winter sports pitch.</p> <p>Paragraph 5.57 simply states that those new recreational facilities linked with the developments should make provision for a full size winter sports pitch. However this will be somewhat dependant upon the needs stipulated within those strategies based upon the Bradford Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study Outdoor Sports Facilities Assessment Report and the forthcoming Open Space and Built Recreational facilities SPD accompanying it. Having said this the current playing pitch strategies for Shipley and</p>	<p>No amendment.</p> <p>No amendment.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Paragraph 5.59 states that a commuted sum of £100,000 per housing site is suggested as a typical section 106 contribution. It is not clear whether this sum is just for maintenance only. If this is the case, it is unacceptable to expect a developer to pay for 20 years of maintenance if the public, as a whole, are to benefit from the pitch provision and its maintenance. This principle was accepted by an Inspector at the Leeds UDP Inquiry. Furthermore, there is no indication as to where the money will be spent and for this reason it is also unreasonable to link this contribution to any requirements generated by the High Royds development. This would also not pass the requirements of a Circular 05/2005.</p>	<p>Keighley identified deficiencies in the number of junior and mini football pitches in both constituencies; Menston is encompassed within the Shipley constituency.</p> <p>As regards linking this contribution to the High Royds development please refer to the previous response. Paragraph 5.59 has been revised... 'A commuted sum will be required for the maintenance of open space provided as part of these developments. This will form part of the Section 106 contribution for each site covering a 20 year period'.</p>	<p>Amended paragraph 5.59.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Access, Traffic Management, Transport and Travel Planning:</p> <p>Having reviewed the means of access for both Derry Hill and Bingley Road, the Draft SPD identifies costs of £486,000 in paragraph 5.66 for the location and provision of site accesses. However there is no evidence provided to substantiate this sum of money or to clarify why this is the appropriate point of access. Paragraph 3.100 of the Sustainability Assessment and 5.67 of the Draft SPD are also factually incorrect, as our client already has a right of way across Meadow Croft. Furthermore, there is no justification at this stage as to why access is required at the north west corner of the site, nor whether this is included within the £486,000 contribution identified in paragraph 5.66. Similarly, with regards to off site highways improvements, as set out in paragraph 5.68 of the Draft SPD. It is considered that the Faber Maunsell study should be completed before the requirement to contribute to off site highways improvements. This is due to an increase in traffic generation, and is prescribed in the draft SPD. The draft SPD identifies the £1.5 million would be required for off site highway works; however there is no evidence basis in which to make this financial assumption or define whether these are appropriate off site works.</p>	Highways	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>detail and clarity. It should be made very clear that if, after 2009, the Council's housing requirements are being met, or that Phase 1 housing sites or other more centrally located brownfield sites are still available, the sites should not be brought forward for development. Amendments to the Sustainability Appraisal to reflect the above are also required.</p>	<p>the locality; otherwise these sites wouldn't have been released from the greenbelt. PPS 3 has now superseded PPG 3. There is no reference to sequential testing in PPS 3 and therefore any future application will not have to demonstrate a rigorous approach to the methodology of sequential testing.</p> <p>The procedures for housing monitoring are outlined within the recently published Annual Monitoring Report. One should refer to this for clarification.</p> <p>Given the figures published within the most recent Annual Monitoring Report it is obvious to see that the net annual requirement as it stands of 1390 units per annum is not being met. Given that this is the case and that housing targets are likely to increase, it is highly unlikely that the council will be meeting their housing requirements shortly after 2009.</p> <p>However as stated in Policy H2 of the RUDP the release of Phase 2 housing sites would not be permitted until the total dwellings completed or commenced during Phase 1 is</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>90% of the cumulative Phase 1 dwelling requirement, and thus would not normally have been brought forward until this point.</p> <p>However should allocated Phase 1 sites, and infill conversions and windfalls together, provide consistently and significantly fewer dwellings than called for by the housing requirement, or would fail to produce a five year supply of dwellings then Phase 2 sites may be brought forward.</p> <p>Therefore if the housing requirement and hence the level of the deliverable 5 year supply required increases the Phase 2 sites in Menston may be released earlier than expected. Having said this an application could be refused on the grounds that more sustainable Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites still existed within the district at the time of application.</p> <p>As stated under Policy H2 of the RUDP changing the timing of the release of Phase 2 housing sites will normally be done by promoting a Local Development Document as part of the Local Development Framework.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Paragraph No. 5.60-5.73</p> <p>The location of the proposed Derry Hill site access and the associated traffic management proposals are unacceptable. The proposals fail to recognise existing serious highway safety issues, access and circulation difficulties, and a lack of car parking provision in this part of the village. The lack of public transport capacity in Menston (particularly trains) is also understated.</p> <p>More detailed consideration is needed on the issue of access and circulation, particularly around the Dicks Garth Road/Walker Road/Derry Hill area, which is predominately high density, back-to-back housing with no off-street parking provision and very narrow carriageways. The need for further consultation with local residents on these issues should be clearly stated. Greater detail and transparency on the costs of the site access arrangements, off-site highway improvements and travel planning initiatives is also required.</p>	Highways	
49. Mrs H Lee	<p>I am objecting to the whole of the traffic structure. The idea to make Moor Lane into a race track for cars is stupid.</p> <p>Has anyone considered the wildlife? On this site there are Badgers, Bats, Foxes, Deer etc. Squirrels and the most beautiful birds, i.e. Jays, Sparrow Hawks, Grouse Pheasants, even a Red Kite have been seen. Moor Lane is the gateway to Ilkley moor-which is world renown, please do not spoil the area, as it is enjoyed by walkers, joggers, visitors, residents and lots of wildlife. It is important to leave something for the next generation and not just another built up area. It is almost impossible for heavy goods vehicles, which will be required to make the sites, to drive down Moor Lane, a lane which already</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number 22.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>has a notice saying 'Unsuitable for Heavy Goods', without doing a lot of damage to the trees (which have a preservation order on them).</p> <p>(N.B. This representation is accompanied with a copy of the GOYH letter Mr and Mrs Lee referred to when Bradford Council originally displayed the plans for Menston).</p>		
50. Mr C J Renard	I do not support the density proposal of 35/ha for Derry Hill. I would suggest nearer to 28/ha for this site, as was originally proposed by the Inspector.	Please refer to response number 6 and 9.	
51. Mr Cooper	<p>I object strongly to the proposed developments and know that this will be disastrous for the village and its community, however I do realise this may be fait a complet!.</p> <p>I think that any development should impact as little as possible on the village, and that my concerns and ideas should be put forward for serious consideration. These are as follows:</p> <p>Building with empathy, in keeping with existing buildings, Bingley Road site in particular, no buildings above two storeys as the majority of nearby existing buildings are single storey bungalows.</p> <p>Impact of traffic kept to a minimum in the village. Traffic calming is not a solution. Keep traffic out of the village as much as possible and make it go around the village. Do not link a road from the Derry Hill site and Moor lane through to Hawksworth Drive.</p> <p>Improve pedestrian access as an alternative, in particular pedestrian and wheelchair access only via Meadowcroft. The use of Meadowcroft for vehicular access would result in vehicles passing dangerously</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 6, 19 and 16.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Meadowcroft will solely be for pedestrian access.</p>	Amended the Bingley Road Integration diagram on page 34. Removed the vehicular integration arrow.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>close to the bungalow at No1.</p> <p>The infrastructure is at over capacity already. The A65 is currently unable to cope, schools are full, trains are full, and there is already insufficient parking for rail users at Menston. Consequently people park in every adjacent road thus making it difficult for buses travelling along the existing bus route. Put a new infrastructure in place before, not after the event, and be proactive, more trains and parking spaces are required at present, never mind after the additional housing developments, including High Royds, are developed.</p> <p>Ecological impact and pollution of our environment.</p> <p>In conclusion, above all, be realistic, this is not a perfect world, people will choose the easiest and most convenient option for themselves with complete disregard for others. Make it difficult to clog up our village with cars.</p> <p>There should be a pedestrian only way from Meadowcroft to Hawksworth Drive, and the routing of vehicles around the village to avoid Hawksworth Drive.</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number 22.</p> <p>Highways</p>	
52. Mrs G Cliffe	<p>I am concerned about public transport. Already there is traffic congestion, owed to bus cuts and road works. There are always road works. Will we get these buses back? The train station cannot cope with the cars, not only from Menston but from Otley and Guiseley, with the early trains being already overcrowded. There is a lot of street parking in Menston, not just surrounding the station but surrounding Derry Hill for example as well.</p> <p>There are buses running along Bradford Road, but that is too far away for many new people to walk to.</p>	Highways	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	We have no sheltered housing in Menston.	Paragraphs 5.28 to 5.33 on page 48 will be deleted and amended so to highlight that there is a greater need for tenure diversification and new developments to meet the housing need of old age pensioners. Furthermore surveys have identified that there is a need for sheltered housing in the form of two bedroom bungalows to enable elderly people to stay within the vicinity of the village.	Amended page 48 accordingly.
53. Olga Chapham	<p>I wish to object most strongly to the above proposed development.</p> <p>The village of the Menston is already bursting at the seams, the present infrastructure will be put under further duress when the High Royds development is finalised. The proposed housing in the above area needs to be treated in both a morally and an ecological way so to ensure that present services aren't compromised.</p> <p>I do not agree with the proposal to link a through road from the Derry Hill site and Moor lane to Hawksworth Drive, making this a busy main thoroughfare. It is a busy road now, and is not wide enough to make this the main artery of the 'village'. Traffic humps would not be the answer.</p> <p>To make Meadowcroft a vehicular access route would cause great distress to the residents. Loss of security, inability to reverse safely out of driveways, an increased noise level, with bungalows 29 and 1 suffering noise on</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 22 and 8.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number 51.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>two sides. There would be a loss of value on properties also. The properties on this cul-de sac are all open plan, therefore entrance doors are not very far from the road. Access to the proposed site would be bad enough were it only a walkway, but to even consider this as a vehicular access point is not acceptable.</p> <p>Does Menston really need more housing? Or is this just a money making exercise for unscrupulous developers. It is ecologically and morally unsound. Stop it now.</p>	Please refer to response number 48.	
54. Mr Brownlow	<p>The current situation with Bingley Road is this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It is a narrow, low classification, country road. ▪ It carries an unacceptable amount of large goods vehicles, coaches and 'convoys' of tripper trucks. N.B. Current signs limit road to 'light goods' vehicles only. ▪ The vast majority of all types of vehicles travel at excessive speeds; up to 60/70 mph at times (limit 30 mph). Motorcycles often in excess of this. ▪ Infrastructure in this area, particularly the A65, is wholly inadequate to meet the current levels of traffic. The development of the High Royds Village complex and the future development of phase (ii) at the Silver Cross site in Guiseley will considerably worsen the situation. If the proposed developments at Bingley Road and Derry Hill are added to this, the effect will be that Bingley Road, irrespective of the so-called proposed 'improvements', will be itself gridlocked throughout its length, for most of the day and evening. ▪ Current volumes of traffic between 07.00 and 09.00 and 16.00 and 19.00 are such that getting on and off our property is extremely hazardous, 	Highways	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>with the queue at the Hare and Hounds traffic lights in the mornings taking up to 15 minutes to negotiate. The return journey, through Guiseley, and onto Bingley Road at busy times, is 'nose to tail'. Nowadays, the situation at weekends is no better.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The police have shown themselves to be uninterested in enforcing current traffic regulations. <p>Bingley Road: Proposed Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Our property is one of three that will be effectively trapped between two traffic roundabouts, allowing access to, and egress from the proposed Bingley Road development. ▪ The effect of the traffic generated by both of the proposed developments, on top of the appalling current problems, will render the road all but unusable. Much of the traffic will seek an alternative route and the results for the village overall, and for these properties in particular, will be calamitous. ▪ The short distance between the two proposed traffic roundabouts in the vicinity of these three properties will have the effect of 'bunching up' vehicles to the point of a continuous queue, as was previously stated. 		
55. Mr Dracup	<p>The development in the area of Menston although not in Bradford will have serious implications. The infrastructure and local amenities will be stretched to breaking point. Roads, schools, shops, doctors, are but a few.</p> <p>The whole scheme should be dropped for reasons pertaining to it being an over development of the area.</p>	Please refer to response number 48 and 8.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
56. Mr Calverley		Please refer to response number 42.	
6: 1.20	Whilst we appreciate that both sites are 'phase 2' sites, the phase covers a five year period. We consider that these sites should not be developed concurrently, as the disruption to Menston would be too great. They should be sequenced so that the infrastructure can cope with the construction traffic.	Please refer to response number 42.	
4: Map	This shows the houses to the west of Meadowcroft as 2 storey. Some are actually bungalows. The map requires correction.	Please refer to response number 42.	
18: 2.32/ 19:2.40/ 31: 3.17	<p>The issue of ponding is recognised, but we cannot find mention of the need to solve this problem. Even more serious is that there is no mention of the springs. Full surveys and solutions would be required prior to a grant of planning permission. Desk top studies etc would not be sufficient.</p> <p>We do not understand what is meant by paragraph 3.17. Run-off is an issue, but the springs have not been considered. There does not appear to be any consideration given to off-site problems (to the North of the sites), of run-off, springs or drainage or the need for such solutions.</p> <p>There is also no mention of the probable need to expand the existing sewerage and drainage infrastructure to cope with the additional housing.</p>	Please refer to response number 42.	
20: 2.41/ 29: 3.09	We do not accept the 'notional walking times' quoted. The distances shown by the circles on the map are as the crow flies, and are not a true reflection of walking routes. In any event a large part of the Derry Hill site is beyond the 800 metre circle from the railway station. Calculations appear to be based on a walking speed of	Please refer to response number 42.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>3mph. We believe that, with an elderly population, with hills, and using actual walking routes, a 2mph speed is the best that is likely to be achieved by most people, and the real distance is greater than shown. The real distance is between 20% and 25% further than illustrated. Therefore the walking time to the station from the mid-point of the Derry Hill site is at least 20 minutes, so the 'negation of the need for car use' is not a valid conclusion.</p> <p>As walking is not a realistic option, car parking at the railway station is the only other realistic alternative, and as this is already giving rise to on street parking and the blocking of nearby roads it is essential that the car parking capacity of the railway station is increased. We would ask for a S106 obligation to increase car parking at the station by either mezzanine or underground level parking. To ensure that it was actually used there would need to be an undertaking that the parking was to be free for railway users.</p>		
21:2.45	<p>We find this statement to be too generalised, and cannot find evidence to justify the statement, particularly with regard to connectivity.</p> <p><u>Housing Densities:</u></p> <p>The statement that connectivity in post war developments is poor, in relation to that in the Conservation Area and the junction of Main Street and Cleasby Road, does not appear to be justified. Also the statement does not seem to take into account Guideline E4 of the VDS; 'New building should respect property densities of nearby housing'.</p>	Please refer to response number 42.	
22:2.46/ 34: 3.25	Whether or not existing residential densities meet the guidance in PPG3 is not in itself a justification for higher	Please refer to response number 42.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>densities on these sites. PPG3 does say that developments should reflect the existing townscape and landscape. We therefore disagree with the proposal that there should be high densities on principal routes, particularly on the part of the Bingley Road site near Hawksworth Drive.</p> <p>We support the density proposals for Bingley Road (30/ha compared to the Inspector's 35/ha), however we strongly object to the proposal of 35/ha for Derry Hill. The inspector suggested only 28/ha for that site, which is further away from facilities, i.e. the station etc. It is the less sustainable of the two sites, and that seems to have been recognised by the Inspector. We urge that density on that site is amended to 28/ha as recommended by the Inspector.</p>		
22: 2.47	We do not understand the map. There are no A, B or C trees. The map is not accurate and does not depict the landscape characteristics as intended.	Please refer to response number 42.	
23: 2.48/ 31:3.19	<p>Views are important but this paragraph considers only the views out of the sites in question, it does not appear to take into account views out of the village that will be affected by these two developments.</p> <p>We agree that views matter. We consider that the sites should be as unobtrusive as possible from the existing settlement and to be screened (in line with the Village Design Statement: Guidelines- Open Spaces and Village Edges) so that existing views out of the village are retained. There is no mention of views into the village from the countryside and how these will be affected by the developments.</p>	Please refer to response number 42.	
23: 2.49	<p><u>Heights:</u></p> <p>The proposal that most properties should be 2 storey is agreed but the comment that the bungalows on</p>	Please refer to response number 42.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Hawksworth Drive should not be seen as a reference is not agreed.</p> <p>There would be a danger of over-domination of the existing bungalows, which would be exacerbated by the rising levels on the new site. In the case of these sites, as they are on rising land, distances between habitable room windows should be increased beyond the normal 21 metres to ensure over dominance is mitigated. A firm basis for this calculation should be stated in the SPD.</p> <p>The paragraph refers to the possibility of three storey buildings adjacent to those on Dicks Garth Road. It should be noted that these late Victorian buildings are relatively low three storey and adjacent building should not be of greater height. Paragraph 4.29 (p42) refers to local concern that new development should not resemble in any way St Peter's Court. Whilst the principal concern was that design, the height of this development was also objectionable.</p>		
<p>24: 2.50/ 24: 2.51/ 24: 2.52/ 29: 3.06/ 29: 3.11/ 34: 3.24/ 36: Map/ 37: Map/ 51/53: All</p>	<p><u>Traffic Movement:</u></p> <p>Of all the proposals in the document, those for dealing with traffic are the most contentious. There is strong objection to the proposal that vehicles should have direct access onto the highway system of the village.</p> <p>In paragraph 5.64 the report stresses that the High Royds approach to traffic is 'exemplary'. This is based on the DfT document of good practice (Making Residential Travel Plans Work- good practice guidelines, DfT September 2005). However, whilst the High Royds approach, exemplified as good practice, is to keep cars out of Menston, the suggestions made for this site positively encourage cars to drive into Menston via Moor Lane (on a bend), Derry Lane (large numbers of young</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 42.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>children), Meadow Croft (other end of Derry Lane), the children's home (by demolishing and replacing). This does not accord with the good practice quoted by the DfT.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.24 states...'Highways integration...must be undertaken in a way that will prevent the generation of large volumes of additional village (traffic) within the village'. The suggested traffic flows would not meet the concept in this paragraph.</p> <p>Whilst it is important to prevent the new developments being isolated (ghettoised), cars must be kept out of the village by making vehicular access into the village from these sites difficult and time consuming. This is a far more sustainable way forward than the vehicular movements proposed in the draft report. The suggestion that safe and direct walking and cycling routes to the village centre will be established is strongly endorsed.</p> <p>The following traffic are considered more appropriate:</p> <p><u>Derry Hill Site</u></p> <p>There should be two access points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ That at the 'west' either should be amended to be 'left turn only' up the hill towards Ilkley, or Moor Lane should be rebuilt within the site to straighten the dangerous bend between the proposed roundabout and Mount Pleasant. In either case the junction of Moor Lane and Hillings Lane will require upgrading as the exit has very poor sightlines. It might be considered that entry into the site at this west end side should be prohibited. 		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal for the east end exit is thought to be unsatisfactory because Derry Lane is an area that has a very large number of young children and is already a problem area. Derry Hill to the north is very narrow and congested. There should be 'No Entry' to either Derry Lane or to the north down Derry Hill. The alternatives are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To direct all traffic up Derry Hill (which would require upgrading) to the Bingley Road junction (which would also need upgrading). 2. Create a link from the South-East corner of the Derry Hill site through the intervening field to the North-West corner of the Bingley Road site, and traffic directed through that site to Bingley Road. Cleasby Road should be 'No Entry' from Bingley Road. <p>Bingley Road Site:</p> <p>There is strong objection to car access to the village onto Hawksworth Drive either via Meadowcroft or by demolition of the Children's Home.</p> <p>Access should be limited to Bingley Road, which would need significant upgrading, including pedestrian and cycle facilities and lighting.</p> <p>The alternative proposal of the link road in 2b above will require access in to this site in the northwest corner. The map paragraph 3.38 (p37) is not altogether clear but it suggests that an estate road runs parallel to Hawksworth Drive. This should be upgraded as necessary to take the eastward traffic from the Derry Hill</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>site. It will also be safer for this road to run behind the dwellings on Hawksworth Drive rather than between.</p> <p>The public transport proposals in the report are welcome. Any of the proffered solutions above that would assist public transport and direct cars away from the centre of the village is strongly supported. One element missing from the public transport proposals is the provision of raised pavements at all bus stops. This would enable buses to dock and thus allowing access for those with wheelchairs/prams etc, since by the time these developments have happened it is expected all local buses will have low floors.</p> <p>The suggested costs are considered too low as they are based on unsound premises.</p>		
24: 2.53/ 24: 2.54/ 35: 3.30	<p>These paragraphs lack clarity. We support the use of natural stone and materials, but the alternatives are unclear. The VDA states 'The use of artificial stone is unacceptable unless it accurately simulated traditional materials'. Even so it should not be used in a sensitive location. Guidance is needed on the type and colour of bricks that would be acceptable for each site and on the extent to which render would be acceptable, (it is considered that large swathes of white or coloured render would be inappropriate). Likewise timber cladding or exposed timbers are unlikely to be considered appropriate, certainly within the Derry Hill site.</p> <p>There is no reference to roof materials which should be appropriate to the design of the housing unit and location.</p> <p>These important design parameters should be spelt out more clearly and precisely.</p>	Please refer to response number 42.	
24: 2.55	<u>Boundaries:</u>	Please refer to response number	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	Subject to the block design it may be appropriate not to include physical units between boundaries. However, where properties are to have a physical boundary this should be of natural stone. Hedges, railings (timber or steel) are not acceptable.	42.	
29: 3.05 47/48: All	<p>We support the general principles in paragraph 3.05.</p> <p>The paragraphs are agreed that outline the recent development whereby first priority for affordable housing in Menston, Ilkley and Addingham is given to local residents. However, the proposals for the provision of affordable housing do not appear compatible with the Rural Housing Enablers report of housing need in Menston. The report indicated a preference for more 2 & 3 bedroom flats and fewer one bedroom flats.</p> <p>The submission from the group 'Menston Cares' expressed a need in the village for some form of assisted living for the elderly that had greater than basic affordable housing for the elderly.</p>	Please refer to response number 42.	
29: 3.6/3.10	<p>Access to Amenities and Countryside</p> <p>The establishment of safe walking and cycling routes between sites and the centres of village activities, and the enhancement of footpaths and the retention of existing rights of way is strongly supported.</p>	Please refer to response number 42.	
30: 3.16	Strongly support this whole paragraph.	Please refer to response number 42.	
30: 3.18	Route hierarchy is not understood.	Please refer to response number 42.	
3.23	This misquotes the VDS, which actually says housing should be provided for pensioners who want to downsize. The VDS also actually says accommodation should be provided for young families who want to stay	Please refer to response number 42.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	in the village.		
35: 3.27	<p>Street parking is to be avoided unless in dedicated bays. Children should be encouraged to play outside and parked cars on traffic lanes constitute an unwanted danger.</p> <p>With increasing affluence an allowance of one parking space per dwelling is likely to prove inadequate.</p>	Please refer to response number 42.	
36/37	The framework drawings are difficult to comprehend.	Please refer to response number 42.	
40: 4.00-4.16	<p><u>Design Guidance:</u></p> <p>These paragraphs are fully supported with the exception of 4.16. Dwellings for the older generation are unlikely to need cycle storage. What is required is storage for at least three wheelie bins (off site and away from the house frontage) and level or sloping access to the road so that they can be emptied easily.</p>	Please refer to response number 42.	
41: 4.17-4.23	We support this entire page relating to conservation area assessments.	Please refer to response number 42.	
42: 4.30	<p><u>CBMDC Views:</u></p> <p>The significance of the paragraph is that the 'New development will be contemporary and contextual. Contextual to Menston it should be, but contemporary it need not be if the illustration of Gateshead and Harlow are an indication of contemporary styles. The 'Menston Style' appropriate to the townscape and landscape must be adopted as far as possible.</p>	Please refer to response number 42.	
43: All	Design Guidance is fully supported.	Please refer to response number 42.	
45: 5.02 50: All	<p><u>Planning Obligations/Children Play Space:</u></p> <p>Menston presently does not meet the UDP criteria for playing fields per head of population and the new developments will exacerbate this shortage. Of the three</p>	Please refer to response number 42.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	main open green spaces, two are in private ownership with no public access. The park, bounded by Bingley road, Leathley road and Low Hall road is too far away for the development sites and involves crossing roads, which is inappropriate for small children. Essential playspace for these developments must be provided on site. Paragraph 5.54 refers.		
45: 5.03	<u>Planning Obligations/Local Facilities:</u> The paragraph understates the need for local facilities, library, community centre, sports facilities. These are presently more than fully utilised.	Please refer to response number 42.	
49: 5.45	<u>Education:</u> The major problem will be the provision of secondary education. Given the enormous residential development in the Guiseley/Rawdon areas, including the development of High Royds Village, it is unlikely that Guiseley school will have any capacity, St. Mary's, Menston has restricted entry and is already full. Prince Henry's Grammar School, Otley is reported as being near to capacity, entry to Ilkley Grammar is also becoming very difficult for Menston residents. In addition, Bradford Council should be asked for the figures required for expansion of Ilkley grammar School. This is an area that requires very careful consideration by both Bradford and Leeds authorities.	Please refer to response number 42.	
57. Mrs M H Emmerson	In relation to page 29: 3.06 I support safe and direct walking and cycling routes from the sites into the village. In relation to page 24:2.51 I object to the suggestion that vehicles from the new building sites should have direct access into the highway system of the village.	Support noted. Please refer to response number 51.	No change required.
58. Professor & Mrs D.B Ingham	I strongly object to all the proposals because the necessary infrastructure is not in place, even for the High Royds development, let alone the two extra	Please refer to response number 8.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>developments proposed in Menston. The proposed increase in the infrastructure is far from being adequate.</p> <p>Do not build, or if the building is to go ahead, completely and substantially upgrade the entire infrastructure.</p> <p>I am not against progress and the building of new houses anywhere. In fact I am supportive of the recent building of houses next to my property-housing starting next door but one to me.</p> <p>This was the first time I have seen and proposals for these sites. However, I found the maps incomprehensible. The whole presentation and documentation was a disgrace. The consultants who were commissioned to prepare this information should not be paid-a school child could have done better.</p> <p>I think that it is essential that new housing is built. However, I do think that Menston, with the development of the High Royds hospital site, has been over developed in such a short period of time and that the vast development on this site should be allowed to be completed and equilibrium reached before any further development of the village is embarked upon.</p> <p>If further development of the village is to be rushed into then I would have no objection provided that there is adequate infrastructure in place. I am not competent to comment in detail on many aspects of this, e.g. schools, shops, medical facilities etc, and thus I will leave others to do so. I accept that this document does try to address these issues but the proposals are far too limited in all respects.</p> <p>However I am competent to comment on traffic and</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 48.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 8.</p> <p>Highways</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>transport. This is in a critical situation with respect to public transport, as the trains are already at over capacity and the development of the High Royds site will push this over the critical mark, especially for passengers wishing to get on the train in Guiseley. Any further development of the village will only make the problem that much more impossible. Further to this, the parking for the station is already at a critical level. See comments below.</p> <p>The rapid increase in the number of cars in and around the village has caused major problems for people driving within the area. The parking problems in the village are causing major problems for the progress of buses, refuse collections, deliveries by large lorries, and ambulances, with it only being a matter of time before a major incident occurs and emergency vehicles find themselves unable to access it. Only then will the real folly of building too many houses in a village without due infrastructural planning be realised by personnel who clearly do not know the area (as is evident from the consultants who drew up the document for the public display).</p> <p>With regard to page 53 I support the introduction of the traffic regulations/parking area associated with the High Royds Development. However I think the proposals for the area should be substantially increased. With the extra proposed houses it is essential to increase the size of the restricted parking zone even further.</p> <p>Substantially increase the size of the restricted parking zone which should include, at least, Fairfax Avenue (more of Fairfax Road and Fairfax Gardens).</p> <p>I welcome the restrictive parking area around the station</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>as it will improve safety within the vicinity. However it does not solve the problem. It merely moves the problem elsewhere. This is a 'trick' that is common and deceitful within our society today. Thus my request is that this area of parking restriction is furthered to include Fairfax Avenue. This is a small cul-de-sac with no facility for vehicles to turn around in. Thus larger vehicles have to reverse one way up and down the avenue. At present this is done with relative ease as most residents use their driveways for themselves and visitors. However, if the avenue is used as a car park for the railway station then this will cause a major problem to essential services and emergency vehicles.</p> <p>Further, there is a safety problem with traffic in Fairfax Avenue, one end of the avenue terminates in a footpath which is heavily used by primary school children going to school from properties across the railway line. Thus as we have throughout the village, we will have cars parked on pavements and large vehicles backing down a curved road. Without any parking restrictions on the avenue it will only be a matter of time before a serious accident occurs to a small child.</p> <p>Accidents at the corner of Fairfax Avenue and Fairfax Road are also a frequent event. There is also the added problem of dogs not on leads in the avenue, as the presence of the footpath at the end of the avenue encourages dog owners to frequently use the avenue as means to access the footpath.</p> <p>With dogs running between parked cars and children being distracted by them an accident will surely happen sooner or later.</p> <p>I would support all the planning applications if the people who make the decisions will take personal responsibility</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	for the safety of people, and in particular very young children on the roads.		
59. G D Whitaker	<p>In the eyes of the Council and the Planning Inspector, what were the exceptional circumstances that existed for favouring changes to the Green belt? I doubt there were any; rather that the force of developer and landowner persuasion won the day.</p> <p>The inspector's claim that development in Menston was sustainable as Phase 2 because shopping and other services were to be found in Guiseley or further afield was crass. Surely a better reason for not developing in Menston at all.</p> <p>Good features:</p> <p>Page 24-2.53 and 2.55- natural stone only.</p> <p>Page 29- 3.01, 3.05 and 3.08.</p> <p>Page 35- 3.30 although would prefer maximum two storey buildings even in high density areas.</p> <p>Page 40- 4.08, 4.09 and 4.14 are all good.</p> <p>Page 41- 4.18, 4.19 and 4.22 all good.</p> <p>Page 42- 4.25, 4.26 and 4.29 all good.</p> <p>Questionable features:</p> <p>Page 34- 3.25. Density levels at 28 per hectare for Derry Hill and 46 for Bingley Road still ridiculously high</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 48. Further to this the principal reason that these sites were reallocated as Phase 2 housing sites was that they were considered by the Inspector as being sustainable housing locations due to their proximity to a transport node and having good quality links to both Leeds and Bradford centres.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 9.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>although perhaps below the national average. Country districts should be treated differently to urban locations in order to retain the ambience of a gentler lifestyle.</p> <p>Page 42- 4.30. New developments to be 'contemporary and contextual' could mean anything, and monstrosities could come within these definitions. The style of housing should be in direct sympathy with recent Menston developments with the exception of St Peter's Court.</p> <p>Page 47/48. Affordable Housing- preference should be given to local residents who would have to prove conclusively that their income justifies this concession. Strict monitoring will be required as and when those people decide to sell so to ensure that new owners also qualify.</p> <p>Page 29- 3.06. Access to education and amenities by introducing safe and direct walking and cycling facilities sounds good but will be impractical. Already the village has too many cars, too few garages and at times becomes gridlocked.</p> <p>Page 29- 3.06. Public Transport. Claims that the railway station is within ten to fifteen minutes walk from the new developments is a joke.</p> <p>The railway will be a non-event. There is already discussion surrounding whether to reduce the number of carriages and services. Add this to the fact that the railway car park is stuffed to capacity at all times, and that Station Road has cars parked on both sides of the road all the way to the A65, and it becomes obvious that selling Menston on the basis of a rail link is deceitful.</p> <p>Page 35- 3.27/3.28. On street parking makes little sense</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 16.</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number 36.</p> <p>Highways</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>if there is a possibility of garaging or rear courtyard parking. The roads are already cluttered because so few homes have garages, so please don't encourage more of it. Safely sadly cannot be protected where impractical. Off road parking should provide an average of 1.5 spaces per home not 1 space.</p> <p>In conclusion, the whole idea of creating more homes in an over capacity village is beyond the comprehension of those of us who live here but if it has to be, many of the demands you require of developers is to be applauded.</p>		
60. B Brownnutt	<p>The village is already suffering traffic congestion, to be exacerbated by the High Royds village.</p> <p>It is vital that all traffic from this new development be directed away from the village towards Leeds or Bradford.</p> <p>I strongly agree with the comments made on this issue by Messrs Greaves and Ward and I know my neighbours share my concerns.</p>	Highways	
61. Mr Peter Wilkinson	<p>My main concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Road infrastructures - the A65 was already bad enough before the High Royds development, but I fear that once this housing becomes occupied the road will become gridlocked. What are the council doing to alleviate this problem? How will the village road infrastructure, let alone the main roads, possibly cope with this additional proposed housing, are you proposing new roads into the village to cope? The additional traffic will also potentially put pedestrians/ children at risk and serious consideration would therefore need to be given to road calming measures! Rail services - we have not yet seen the impact 	Highways	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	am sure other residents have similar and additional concerns, which they will raise with you yourselves, and I would appreciate feedback on how you intend to resolve these and any other issues.		
62. Mr John Madeley	<p>I wish to object most strongly to the above proposed development.</p> <p>The village of the Menston is already bursting at the seams, the present infrastructure will be put under further duress when the High Royds development is finalised. The proposed housing in the above area needs to be treated in both a morally and an ecological way so to ensure that present services aren't compromised.</p> <p>I do not agree with the proposal to link a through road from the Derry Hill site and Moor lane to Hawksworth Drive, making this a busy main thoroughfare. It is a busy road now, and is not wide enough to make this the main artery of the 'village'. Traffic humps would not be the answer.</p> <p>To make Meadowcroft a vehicular access route would cause great distress to the residents. Loss of security, inability to reverse safely out of driveways, an increased noise level, with bungalows 29 and 1 suffering noise on two sides. There would be a loss of value on properties also. The properties on this cul-de sac are all open plan, therefore entrance doors are not very far from the road. Access to the proposed site would be bad enough were it only a walkway, but to even consider this as a vehicular access point is not acceptable.</p> <p>Does Menston really need more housing? Or is this just a money making exercise for unscrupulous developers. It is ecologically and morally unsound. Stop it now.</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 28 and 8.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number 51.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 48.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
63. Gareth Lewis	<p>Parking in all areas at and around the train station is already a major problem, which will only become far worse given the hundreds more cars that the three housing developments will bring. We already suffer from people parking in the street as parking at the train station is limited.</p> <p>The numbers of houses needs to be limited to lessen the number of cars on the roads.</p> <p>Buses already find it very difficult to navigate the cars parked on Cleasby Road. Speeding is also a problem, and traffic calming measures need to be introduced to parts of the village where they do not exist at present (and to be more effective than those in Leathley Avenue).</p> <p>Measures designed to encourage people to walk to shops/train station are naive. People simply do not walk any more. If you doubt this fact please visit the village at any time of day to witness the number of cars outside the co-op, local shops, and schools.</p> <p>Page 29 Paragraph 3.7 states that 'car-ownership' in Menston is high. With 172 houses proposed for Derry Hill and 176 proposed for Bingley Road nearly 700 more cars will arrive in the village. This of course does not include the hundreds of cars High Royds will bring. Fewer houses will mean fewer cars. Enforcement measures around shops/schools need to be in place so to prevent congestion becoming even worse.</p> <p>An effective way to improve traffic flow in the village now and even more so in the future, would be to ban sport utility vehicles from the village centre.</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number 9.</p> <p>Highways</p>	
64. Miss R Cavanagh	The traffic management proposals have looked carefully	Highways	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>at traffic immediately around the sites, but do not appear to have looked at the knock-on effect on some of the primary routes through and around the village. The number of houses on the Derry Hill site is likely to generate between 200 & 300 additional cars, which will use the existing roads through the village. Having read both documents I cannot find reference to traffic considerations outside the immediate area, other than those on the A65 which the High Royds site is already addressing.</p> <p>As regards the Derry Hill site, traffic will leave the site onto Moor Lane at a newly proposed mini roundabout opposite west winds. All traffic wishing to travel west to Burly in Wharfedale, Ilkley, Skipton and beyond (Lake District, M6 etc) will either turn left and travel up Moor Lane to Hillings Lane or turn right down to Main Street and via Burley lane. Neither route is currently capable of carrying such additional traffic.</p> <p>Moor Lane is currently subject to an 'unsuitable for HGV' signage order and consideration needs to be given regarding access to the site not only with building/construction traffic but also for removals and delivery on an on-going basis.</p> <p>Traffic travelling to Otley and beyond via the Hillings Lane route must pass through Burley Woodhead and on to Moor Road and Hangingstone Lane. Burley Woodhead is extremely narrow; in places too narrow for two vehicles to pass, although the 20mph speed limit does appear to have alleviated some of the dangers. Moor Road and Hangingstone Lane are restricted to the national speed limit despite being still very narrow in places and often has the additional hazard of sheep in the road. Drivers who aren't used to narrow country</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>roads, or sheep, are extremely dangerous.</p> <p>Consideration ought to be given as to how this route can cope with an increase in traffic volume (not only from Derry Hill but also from Bingley Road and High Royds). Personal thoughts include: a reduction in speed limit on the national speed limit section, improved signage of the hazards and the provision of a cattle grid around the Stead Crag/Cragg House area to stop sheep straying east into the very narrow, walled section of Moor Road.</p> <p>Traffic leaving the Derry Hill site at the west winds roundabout and turning right will travel past the cottages at Mount Pleasant. It is here that on-road parking makes the road extremely narrow and un-sighted. Whilst I note you are considering re-alignment of the road, this will not address the on-road parking. Perhaps a residents parking permit area in the corner of the site would alleviate this problem and improve the sight-line along the road.</p> <p>Traffic will continue onto and along Main Street. Currently cars accelerate here, although the road is not wide enough to allow two vehicles to pass if there are cars parked. There are always parked vehicles along this stretch of road, especially between Fairfax Hall and the Menston Arms/Derry Hill junction. Consideration ought to be given to traffic calming measures along this stretch to ensure that vehicle speed does not increase, especially considering that the volume of traffic will increase substantially.</p> <p>Burley lane is also extremely narrow. It is, in several places, unsighted and in two places too narrow for two vehicles to pass by one another. There is also no pavement provision for the majority of its length. This</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>road is used daily by many walkers and residents (including school-children) to walk into the centre of the village. The certain increase in the volume of traffic using this road will increase the serious risk of pedestrian injury. Consideration of how to address pedestrian safety on this road must be given.</p> <p>In summary, the volume of housing proposed on the Derry Hill site will, I believe, generate an increase in traffic that is unsustainable on the current road network. I do not believe that sufficient improvements can be made to what are essentially narrow country lanes that will ensure the safety of existing residents, new residents, pedestrians and other road users.</p> <p>I believe there should be a reduction in the number of houses proposed for Derry Hill so to reduce the number of cars.</p> <p>Improvements to Hillings Lane, Moor Rd and Haningstone Lane as stated earlier. A parking permit scheme for Mount Pleasant so to reduce on-street parking on this dangerous corner. Traffic calming measures for main street between Moor Lane and Burley Road/Derry Hill junction and beyond. Vast improvements to Burley lane, especially for pedestrians.</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 9.</p> <p>Highways</p>	
65. Mrs J Madeley	<p>I wish to object most strongly to the above proposed development.</p> <p>The village of the Menston is already bursting at the seams, the present infrastructure will be put under further duress when the High Royds development is finalised. The proposed housing in the above area needs to be treated in both a morally and an ecological way so to ensure that present services aren't compromised.</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 62.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>I do not agree with the proposal to link a through road from the Derry Hill site and Moor lane to Hawksworth Drive, making this a busy main thoroughfare. It is a busy road now, and is not wide enough to make this the main artery of the 'village'. Traffic humps would not be the answer.</p> <p>To make Meadowcroft a vehicular access route would cause great distress to the residents. Loss of security, inability to reverse safely out of driveways, an increased noise level, with bungalows 29 and 1 suffering noise on two sides. There would be a loss of value on properties also. The properties on this cul-de sac are all open plan, therefore entrance doors are not very far from the road. Access to the proposed site would be bad enough were it only a walkway, but to even consider this as a vehicular access point is not acceptable.</p> <p>Does Menston really need more housing? Or is this just a money making exercise for unscrupulous developers. It is ecologically and morally unsound. Stop it now.</p>		
66. Julia Bateson	<p>My particular additional concerns are fourfold</p> <p>1. Water and Drainage Issues - my understanding from the documentation is that this issue is one that will have to be addressed by any eventual developer. However, as with many matters of this type it is people who are not directly involved who are likely to be most affected. I live adjacent to the railway line immediately below (or down in altitude terms) from Derry Hill. In the last 10 years, building 'above/higher' than us at 'Whiddon Croft' has led to severe drainage issues for us and adjoining homes with run-off causing water ingress (into our homes) in heavy rain (and foul water in the cellars of our neighbours). The issue of increased pressure on surface drains should, in my opinion, be addressed before the</p>	Please refer to response number 6.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>planning stage as further hard-surface cover of what is currently absorbent land will potentially exacerbate what is barely controlled at the moment.</p> <p>2.Educational and Recreational Facilities and Other Facilities for 'Living' - I appreciate that at present Menston Primary School is not full, but my understanding is that Tranmere Park Primary & Burley Oaks Primary (the two closest) are or are close to full. The development at the old High Royds site includes numerous family homes and children from these may well fill up the Menston Primary School. It occurs to me that any 'affordable housing' on the new site is likely to attract younger families with primary aged children - the lack of local schooling could be a serious issue. Turning to secondary schooling Menston is not in the first or second priority areas for Ilkley Grammar School. Guiseley School is in Leeds Education Authority and on a closest priority basis places at Guiseley will be awarded to 'High Royds' families above Menston residents from either current housing or new houses that are now being proposed bearing in mind the costs of housing elsewhere in the immediate area. St Mary's is Catholic and in the absence of any 'quota' Menston students do not get places unless practicing Catholics. In the proposal it is suggested that Menston students might go to Immanuel College in Idle - this is not practical - there is no direct route and personally I would not commend sending children of any age to a school more than a couple of miles away - (Immanuel is 7.5 miles from my house and takes an hour to get to during the normal 'school run' time of day).</p> <p>Other facilities that will require consideration include recreational facilities - is the modestly sized park on the edge of Menston to be expected to accommodate not</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 8.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 8 and 47.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>only current Menston residents but also high Royds residents?, and now residents from the proposed new development - money in lieu (section 106) is hardly the point - recreation is recreation and space is required. Also if there is to be housing for the more mature, what provision for shopping/doctors etc is proposed? The doctors surgery is always busy now, and the co-op is shortly to earn the privilege of yellow 'no parking' lines so how are these people to get their shopping? We are all being encouraged to walk rather than use polluting cars so where are we all expected to go for the necessities of life?</p> <p>3. Which brings me onto the third point I wish to make and that is access and impact of increased traffic on the development and village as a whole. I understand what is proposed but personally cannot believe that this will work. Village life and traffic is not the same as that seen on suburban areas so I query the modelling strategies employed by the 'experts'. In addition to narrow roads with on-street parking (due to lack a garages for older properties) there are situations where village events lead to dropping off and picking up at Derry Hill/Main Street junction where currently it is a nightmare, additional vehicles passing through or dropping off from the new properties will inevitably lead to more trouble and danger.</p> <p>4. Finally, I just wish to say that along with many other people who moved to Menston; I came here to be part of a village and not a small town. This development will make it hard to see where our village finishes and another starts. Although a personal and possibly greedy point of view, how will villages sustain their character if they grow to such a great extent? I do understand that the land was identified with the Council, but a smaller</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number 9 and 48.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	number of properties with possibly green space and sympathetic development with a view to maintaining a village character would really be appreciated, rather than the current proposals which appear to ride roughshod over the concept of a community and all that this would normally mean.		
67. Mr Michael Reynolds	Traffic management plans with regard to Bingley Road and Derry Hill (and High Royds) will have significant impact upon traffic on Leathley Road.	Highways	
68. Mr P Littlewood	Traffic management plans for Derry Hill (and High Royds) will have significant impact upon West Chevin Road and plans should be taken to remedy this impact.	Highways	
69. Menston Parish Council	<p>The overall view of the Parish Council (PC) regarding the developments in general, is that the village has been presented with a fait accompli albeit that there are possibly other sites more suitable for this type of development within the village boundary. Therefore the production of the Supplementary Planning document by Bradford MDC and the consultants GV Grimley, Lathams and Faber Mauncell is recognised by the Parish Council as being a vital guide to ensuring the detrimental impact the two developments will have on the village is lessened. We therefore thank Bradford MDC and the Consultants for the production of the document.</p> <p>The PC considered documentation of "Comments resulting from a meeting held on 16th. October" attended by Chris Greaves, Gordon Metcalfe, Peter Ward (Menston Community Association Chairman), David Pickles (Hawkesworth Drive resident), David Smith (Derry Hill resident). It is assumed that this has been forwarded to you. The Parish Council agreed that it</p>	Support noted.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>should endorse the content of this document in its entirety and support the suggestions made within it.</p> <p>With regard to the design criteria suggested in the SPD the PC expressed reservations relating to density, quality, materials, layout and parking. Density figures in the document should be reduced if possible and certainly not exceeded. The photographs purporting to show similar styles of housing on page 42 caused concern. If this style is contemporary as promoted in the document then the PC cannot agree with it being the style the developments should adopt. The PC recommends that the final document should not promote large areas of render or over use of brickwork. The PC welcomes the use of natural materials on the buildings and stone walls as boundaries. Whilst the PC welcomes 2 storey houses it does not wish to see 3 storeys being used especially on the higher areas of the Bingley Rd. development. The PC cannot agree with the SPD parking criteria or the preference expressed for on street parking. Parking standards would be preferred at min 1.5 per unit and street parking minimized.</p> <p>It is appreciated that affordable housing is necessary and the percentage amounts obligatory however the PC express concern that the figures show an excess of single bed apartments to the detriment of 2 bed and apartments suitable for the elderly. The opinion of the PC is that 2 bed apartments are more suitable for the elderly and will encourage elderly Menston residents to downsize and thus release existing larger properties in the village for family use. The PC would wish to see priority being given to existing Menston residents for the affordable housing</p> <p>It is very clear that the developments will only</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 9, 16 and 6.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 47 and 52.</p> <p>Please refer to response 8 and</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>exacerbate the education needs of the village and especially secondary school education. The majority of secondary school children attend Guiseley School with a small minority going to Ilkley. It is likely that in the not too distant future there will be no provision for Menston children at Guiseley as the availability will be taken up because of major developments within Guiseley itself leaving Menston outside its catchments area and in another local authority area. This is also true with regards to Ilkley which is the only accessible school within the Bradford district. The Parish Council therefore urges Bradford MDC to utilise the revenue gained from the Developments to address this problem.</p> <p>The document shows proposals with regard to traffic routes, pedestrian routes, and public transport provision within the village and alterations required to accommodate the new developments. The proposals are simply inadequate and the problems must be addressed in more detail. It is a fact that the lower section of Derry Lane cannot be altered to cope with the increased traffic generated by the developments. It is a fact that the station parking provision is currently inadequate and that the developments can only worsen the current situation. It is a fact that the trains are running above capacity at peak periods and additional passengers generated from the developments will again add to the problem. However, it is still a fact that these two developments are going to happen. The PC again urges Bradford MDC to re-appraise their proposals expressed in the SPD and ask that they consider the proposals put forward by Cllr Greaves and Co. suggesting solutions for the long term benefit of the village.</p> <p>Public open space and recreation provision is noted in</p>	<p>47.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response 1 and</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome						
	<p>the document as being unable to sustain the potential growth in population utilizing existing facilities. Again, it is good that the problem is recognised but a solution via a commuted sum is not the answer unless the sum can provide for the make up of the provision within the village. The PC notes the sums mentioned but asks that further consultation takes place to ensure that these facilities are provided within the boundaries of the village.</p> <p>The Parish Council appreciates the production of the SPD and asks that the opinion of the Parish Council is taken into consideration when concluding the final version.</p> <p>In view of the number of comments it did not seem appropriate to complete large numbers of individual forms. The comments and suggestions have been cross referenced to the documents. We would be happy to discuss these with Officers or to provide any additional information.</p> <p>We welcome the concept of the SPD. We appreciate that such a document will lead to a better development than would otherwise be the case. We thank Bradford Council for facilitating the production of the document.</p> <p>Supplementary Planning Document Draft</p> <p>Substantive Comments</p> <table><tr><th>Page</th><th>Para</th><th>Issue</th></tr><tr><td>6</td><td>1.20</td><td>Whilst we appreciate that both sites are “phase 2” sites, the phase covers a 5 year period. We consider that the sites should not be developed concurrently, as the disruption to Menston would be too great. They should be sequenced so that the</td></tr></table>	Page	Para	Issue	6	1.20	Whilst we appreciate that both sites are “phase 2” sites, the phase covers a 5 year period. We consider that the sites should not be developed concurrently, as the disruption to Menston would be too great. They should be sequenced so that the	<p>47.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 42.</p>	
Page	Para	Issue							
6	1.20	Whilst we appreciate that both sites are “phase 2” sites, the phase covers a 5 year period. We consider that the sites should not be developed concurrently, as the disruption to Menston would be too great. They should be sequenced so that the							

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD			Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
			infrastructure can cope with the construction traffic, etc.	Please refer to response number 42.	
	14	Map	This shows the houses to the west of Meadowcroft as 2 storeys. Some are actually bungalows. The map requires correction.		
	18 19 31	2.32 2.40 3.17	<p>The issue of ponding is recognised, but we cannot find mention of the need to solve this problem. Even more serious is that there is no mention of the springs. Full surveys and solutions would be required prior to a grant of planning permission. Desk top studies, etc., would not be sufficient.</p> <p>We do not understand what is meant by para 3.17. Run-off is an issue, but the springs have not been considered. There does not appear to be any consideration given to off-site problems (to the North of the sites) of run-off, springs or drainage or for the need for such solutions.</p> <p>There is also no mention of the probable need to expand the existing sewerage and drainage infrastructure to cope with the additional housing.</p>		
	20 29	2.41 3.09	<p>We do not accept the “notional walking times” quoted. distances shown by the circles on the map are as the crow flies, and are not a true reflection of walking routes. In any event a large part of the Derry Hill site is beyond the 800 metre circle from the railway station.</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD			Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
			<p>Calculations appear to be based on a walking speed of 3mph. We believe that, with an elderly population, with hills, and using actual walking routes, a 2mph speed is the best that is likely to be achieved by most people, and the real distance is greater than shown. The real distance is between 20% and 25% further than illustrated. Therefore the walking time to the station from the mid-point of the Bingley Road site is at least 15 minutes and the walking time to the station from the mid-point of the Derry Hill site is at least 20 minutes, so the “negation of the need for car use” is not a valid conclusion.</p> <p>As walking is not a realistic option car parking at the railway station, which already is inadequate and gives rise to on street parking and the blocking of nearby roads needs to be increased. We would ask for a S106 obligation to increase car parking at the station by underground or mezzanine level parking. To ensure that it was actually used there would need to be an undertaking that the parking was to be free for railway users.</p>	Please refer to response number 42.	
	21	2.45	We find this statement to be too generalised, and cannot find evidence to justify the statement, particularly with regard to connectivity.		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD			Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	22 34	2.46 3.25	<p>Whether or not existing residential densities meet the guidance in PPG3 is not in itself a justification for high densities on these sites. PPG3 Does say that developments should reflect the existing townscape and landscape. We disagree with the proposal that there should be high densities on principal routes, particularly on the part of the Bingley Road site near to Hawksworth Drive.</p> <p>We support the density proposals for Bingley Road (30/ha compared to Inspector's 35/ha), however we strongly object to the proposal of 35/ha for Derry Hill. The Inspector suggested only 28/ha for that site, which is further away from facilities, the station etc. It is the less sustainable of the sites, and that seems to have been recognised by the Inspector. We urge that density on that site is amended to 28/ha as recommended by the Inspector.</p>	Please refer to response number 42.	
	22	2.47	We do not understand the map. There are no A, B or C trees.		
	23 31	2.48 3.19	<p>We agree that views matter. We consider that the sites should be as unobtrusive as possible from the existing settlement and to be screened (in line with the Village Design Statement) so that existing views out of the village are retained. There is no mention of views into the village from the countryside.</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD			Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	23	2.49	We welcome the proposal that most properties should be 2 storeys, but question the comment that the bungalows on Hawksworth Drive should not be seen as a reference. There would be a danger of over-domination of the existing bungalows, which would be exacerbated by the rising levels on the new site. In the case of these sites, as they are on rising land, distances between habitable room windows should be increased beyond the normal 21 metres to ensure over dominance is mitigated. A firm basis for this calculation should be stated in the SPD.	Please refer to response number 42.	
	24 24 24 29 29 34 36 37 51/53	2.50 2.51 2.52 3.06 3.11 3.24 Map Map All	We consider that of all the proposals in the document that the suggestions for dealing with traffic are the most flawed. We strongly object to the suggestion that vehicles should have direct access into the highway system of the village. In para 5.64 the report stresses that the High Royds approach to traffic is “exemplary”. This is based on a DfT document of good practice (Making Residential Travel Plans Work – good practice guidelines, DfT September 2005). However, whilst the High Royds approach exemplified as good practice is to keep cars out of Menston, the suggestions made for this site positively encourage		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD			Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
			<p>cars to drive into Menston via Moor Lane (on a bend), Derry Lane (large numbers of young children), Meadow Croft (other end of Derry Lane), the Children's Home (by demolishing and replacing). This does not accord with the good practice quoted by the DfT.</p> <p>Whilst we appreciate the reasoning is to prevent the new developments being ghettoised, we would urge that cars must be kept out of the village by making vehicular access difficult and time consuming, whilst making bus, pedestrian, cycle and pushchair access very easy. We believe that this is a far more sustainable way forward than that proposed in the draft report. We support the suggestion that a safe and direct walking and cycling routes to the village centre will be established. Para 3.24 states "... Highways integration ... must be undertaken in a way that will prevent the generation of large volumes of additional village (sic) within the village ..." We assume the first use of village should read "traffic". The suggested traffic flows would not meet the concept in this paragraph.</p> <p>We would suggest that the traffic arrangements would be far more appropriate as follows ...</p> <p>For the Derry Hill site there should be two access points. The point at the</p>	Please refer to response number 42.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD			Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
			<p>West either should be amended to be left turn only from the site, up the hill towards Ilkley, or Moor Lane should be rebuilt within the site to straighten the dangerous bend between the proposed roundabout and Mount Pleasant. In either case the top of Moor Lane will require upgrading as the exit has very poor sightlines.</p> <p>We consider the proposal at the East end of the Derry Hill site to be flawed. We believe that there should be no entry to either Derry Lane or North down Derry Hill. Derry Lane is an area that has a very large number of young children and is already a problem area. Derry Hill to the North is very narrow.</p> <p>Our preferred solutions would be to either direct all traffic up Derry Hill (which would need to be upgraded) to the Bingley Road junction (which would also require upgrading). Alternatively a link could be created from the South-East corner of the Derry Hill site through the intervening field to the North-West corner of the Bingley Road site, and traffic directed through that site to Bingley Road. Cleasby Road should be “No Entry” from Bingley Road.</p> <p>With regard to the Bingley Road site we strongly object to car access to the village onto Hawksworth Drive</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 42.</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD			Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
			<p>either via Meadowcroft or by demolition of the Children's Home. Access should be limited to Bingley Road. Bingley Road would need significant upgrading, including pedestrian and cycle facilities and lighting.</p> <p>We do welcome the public transport proposals in the report. Either of the solutions above would assist public transport, and we support direct non-car access to the centre of the village. One element missing from the public transport proposals is the provision of raised pavements at all bus stops. This would enable buses to dock, and, as by the time these developments happen all buses will have low floors, the docking would enable level access for those with wheelchairs, prams etc.</p> <p>The map legends on pages 36 and 37 are unclear. What sort of integration do the arrows mean?</p> <p>Overall we consider that the costs suggested on page 51 are far too conservative as they are based on a flawed solution.</p>	Please refer to response number 42.	
	24 24 35	2.53 2.54 3.30	These paragraphs lack clarity. We support the use of natural stone and materials, but the alternatives are unclear. Brick can come in many forms, and render can be used sparingly or in vast swathes, the		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD			Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
			same can apply to timber. No mention is made of roofing materials. A good quality reconstituted stone may be appropriate where it accurately simulates traditional materials and is not in a sensitive location. All this needs clarification, especially with reference to buildings visible from outside the sites.	Please refer to response number 42.	
	24	2.55	We strongly support the suggestion that all properties should have a natural stone boundary wall.		
	29 47/48	3.05 All	<p>We support the general principles in para 3.05. However, we have concerns that the detailed suggestions on pages 47 and 48 will not meet local needs.</p> <p>The guidance makes no mention of a "local" affordable housing policy. Recent developments in Menston, Ilkley and Addingham have given first priority to residents in that settlement and second priority to residents in the Wharfe Valley (Bradford part).</p> <p>We are not persuaded that the proposed mix of affordable housing is correct. The report from the Rural Housing Enablers should carry more weight than district wide policies as it is specific to the village. That report would suggest that the mix of flats should be amended – more 2 bedroom flats and less 1 bedroom flats.</p>		
	29	3.10	We support enhancing the footpaths		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD			Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
			from Menston through the sites to the countryside.	Please refer to response number 42.	
	30	3.16	We strongly support this whole paragraph ... housing must be place specific, avoiding standard house types used elsewhere.		
	30 30	3.17 3.18	This is unclear. The SUDs concept sounds very laudable, but the actual meaning is not explained.		
	33	3.23	This misquotes the VDS, which actually says housing should be provided for pensioners who want to downsize. (That would release larger houses back into the market). The VDS also actually says accommodation should be provided for young families who want to stay in the village.		
	35	3.27	We support street parking in dedicated bays, but feel that encouraging on street parking is a danger, especially to children. Parking should average 1.5 spaces per dwelling, not 1 space, the allocation to reflect the different sizes of dwellings. In addition there should be an element of visitor parking.		
	40	All	We support virtually all this page. We do have concerns about para 4.14, as we would not want on street parking to be encouraged if it was outside the sites. Also, we feel that secure cycle storage would not be appropriate for all new housing, especially if houses are designed for the elderly. It seems strange that		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD			Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
			every house must have space for a cycle, which many residents will neither need nor want, but no mention is made of the need for a bin store for the 3 wheelie bins all houses will need and want.	Please refer to response number 42.	
	41	All	We support this entire page.		
	42	4.24 - 4.29	We support all these paragraphs.		
	42	4.30	We are very concerned that the very bald statement could lead to inappropriate buildings, as exemplified by the examples shown in the photographs. The "Menston Style" appropriate to the townscape and landscape must be stressed. We do not agree that the development must be contemporary.		
	45 50	5.02 All	This suggests playspace could be off-site. The park is too far away and involves crossing roads, this is inappropriate for small children. We feel that playspace provision must be on-site. Menston is already significantly undersupplied with both recreational open space and playing fields and has only very limited open green space. Of the three main open green spaces, two are in private ownership with no public access. The new developments will exacerbate this, and so space must be provided on site. Para 5.54 backs up this argument. It may be worth considering creating additional space		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD			Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
			in the field to the West of the Bingley Road site, in conjunction with the new road we suggest is needed.	Please refer to response number 42.	
	45	5.03	This suggests improvements to library, community centre may be needed. Surely they will be needed. Facilities are already stretched. In addition to existing facilities it is likely that new facilities will be required, such as changing facilities and extra meeting rooms and library space.		
	49	5.45	We feel that the Leeds calculation is on the low side. It is difficult to scrutinise the totals, as the formula has no numbers attached, but given the vast amount of residential development in the Guiseley / Rawdon areas we are convinced that Guiseley School will have no capacity and St. Mary's is already full. In addition, Bradford Council should be asked for the figures required for expansion of Ilkley Grammar School. The suggestion in the Sustainability Appraisal that Immanuel School in Idle is a local school is laughable. It has no connection with the area, and is a very difficult journey.		
70. English Heritage	As you will be aware, this site lies opposite the Grade II Registered Historic Park and Garden at High Royds Hospital. Although some limited reference is made to the presence of the designated landscape within the SPD, the document concentrates, primarily, on the relationship of the site to the adjacent built-up area with little mention			Agreed, paragraph 2.13 on page 11 will be amended accordingly.	Amended paragraph 2.13 so that it mentions the important relationship the Bingley Road site has with the Grade II Registered Historic Park and Garden at High Royds Hospital,

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>made of the equally-important relationship which the site also has to the open land to the south. In preparing the detailed proposals for this site, it is important that full account is taken of the need to safeguard the setting and views out of the designated landscape.</p> <p>It is noted that a mini-roundabout access is proposed for the eastern end of the site immediately opposite the Registered Park. Within Section 2 of the document, the importance of the existing tree belt alongside Bingley Road (both within the allocated site and within the grounds of High Royds Hospital) is noted. Whilst we have no objections to the principle of an access to the site at this point, in order to lessen the potential impact of the widening of the road (and, no doubt, the loss of some of the existing woodland at this point), the reinforcement of the existing tree belt at this point should be a firm commitment of the Supplementary Planning Document. This would not only help to lessen the impact of the development on the adjacent registered landscape but would also help to unify the two sides of Bingley Road.</p> <p>From Paragraph 1.22, the Council has concluded that a Sustainability Appraisal is required for this SPD and, in addition, that Sustainability Appraisal is also required to comply with the requirements of the SEA Directive. If this is the case, as the ODPM guidance "<i>Sustainability Appraisal of Regional Spatial Strategies and Local Development Documents</i>" makes clear, the Council should have previously consulted the four statutory environmental bodies (which includes English Heritage) on the "scope" of this Sustainability Appraisal. However, from our records, we can find no trace of having been consulted in the past about this Appraisal. Indeed, from Paragraph 3.135, it appears that the only previous</p>	<p>Highways</p> <p>Admittedly English Heritage should have been consulted along with the other three statutory bodies on the scope of the sustainability appraisal beforehand. However, all the statutory bodies have been consulted at the draft stage.</p>	<p>especially in terms of safeguarding the setting and views out of the designated landscape.</p> <p>No amendment.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>consultation has been with the local community. Useful as this exercise may have been, the requirements of the Regulations are explicit about which organisations need to be consulted during the production of an Appraisal and failure to satisfy this requirement may render the Appraisal (and the accompanying plan) open to challenge.</p> <p>The document which is currently out for consultation appears to be a non-technical summary of the final Sustainability Appraisal Report. This would imply that, somewhere, there is a full Sustainability Appraisal which includes a full assessment of the likely effects of the development of these sites. However, we have been unable to find any details of such a Report on the Council's web site and no further details are provided within the document which you have sent out for comment. Once again, we would remind the Council that it is a requirement to consult on the content of the full SA Report not just its non-technical summary.</p> <p>Figure 9 of the ODPM guidance sets out a number of stages for incorporating SA within the SPD process. Many of these stages do not appear to have been undertaken within the Appraisal of this particular SPD or, if they have, it is not clear where they are in this document.</p>	<p>The document released for consultation along with the draft SPD was the full sustainability appraisal. These documents have been available on the BMDC website since consultation began on 25 September 2006. Unfortunately there are references in the introductory part of the document which imply that this is a non-technical summary, however it is not.</p> <p>Acknowledged. The majority of the stages set out in the guidance have been carried out and have influenced the development of the SPD. We accept that the stages are not as clearly identified as what they should be and that those for testing the SPD objectives and identifying monitoring measures have not been included within the document.</p>	<p>Delete first sentence in paragraph 1.1, page 3.</p> <p>No amendment.</p>
10: Paragraph 1.28	These are not SA Objectives - they are simply a list of topics.	The topics listed in paragraph 1.28 are used as a checklist and are linked to the SA of the UDP.	No amendment.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>The Objectives which are detailed on page 79 do not adequately reflect the range of environmental issues required under the Directive.</p> <p>Where is the assessment of the SPD Objectives against the SA Objectives (Stage B1)?</p>	<p>We consider that the objectives set out on page 79 do adequately reflect the range of environmental issues required under the Directive.</p> <p>Admittedly the assessment of the SPD objectives has not been presented in the document.</p>	<p>No amendment.</p> <p>No amendment.</p>
10: Paragraph 1.28	Under the SEA Directive, the purpose of the Baseline Data is to provide a baseline against which to assess the likely significant effects of the plan upon the environment. However, this document does not provide a robust evidence base against which to predict and monitor the effects of the SPD's proposals. In the absence of any Indicators, we are not sure how the Council intends to monitor the likely significant effects upon the environment.	We would argue that the document does provide a robust evidence base but that indicators to monitor the effects of the SPD have not been identified. Certain effects of the plan could be monitored through existing systems.	No amendment.
12: Paragraph 1.31 et seq	It would be helpful to outline what the differences are between the two Options. Without this explanation it is impossible to ascertain whether the assessments in Appendix 1 are correct. Which, if any, of the Options has been chosen? There is also a requirement to assess the likely affects of the chosen Option including not just direct effects but also secondary, cumulative and synergistic effects. Where appropriate, there is also a need to put forward mitigation measures.	It is apparent that the options identified represent the opposite ends of the spectrum in terms of how the sites could be developed, and that the community option took account of community views. This takes account of the fact that a decision has already been taken to develop the sites and that options will need to fulfil the requirements of UDP policies. These are the parameters which influenced the development of the planning framework set out in the SPD, with elements from both the options having influenced this.	No amendment.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		The tables presented in Appendix 1 provide a reasonably detailed assessment of the implications of applying the sustainability objectives, including mitigation measures. We would accept that a more robust assessment of the chosen option could have been carried out.	
15: Paragraph 2.1	The Bingley Road site adjoins the boundary of a Registered Historic Park and Garden. The SPD Objectives seek to safeguard the character and appearance of the Menston Conservation Area. Why, therefore, is there no reference made to PPG15?	This was an omission.	No amendment.
15: Paragraph 2.1	Given the SPD Objectives relating to design and context, it is unbelievable that no reference is made to PPS1 within the list of relevant Plans or Programmes.	Again, this was an omission.	No amendment.
15: Paragraph 2.1	This list should also have included the Policies of the emerging RSS.	It is impractical to suggest that RSS policies should be set out at length, given the need to produce a reasonably succinct document. The summary provided is adequate.	No amendment.
54: Paragraph 3.75	In the light of the SPD Objectives and the fact that the development of these areas could impact upon historic assets in the area (including a nationally-designated site opposite the allocation at Bingley Road), it is somewhat surprising that no reference at all is made to the built and historic environment. It is also unclear why there are no identified sustainability issues relating to the environment.	We accept this and that a reference should have been made to the assessment of the built environment of the village that appears in the SPD. Part of the issue is one of cross-referencing. Issues are identified relating to the environment in paragraphs 3.75-3.77. A summary was not included, perhaps because this is a relatively short section.	No amendment No amendment.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>In conclusion, as an SA Report, this document falls a long way short of the requirements outlined in current ODPM guidance which must raise question about its conformity to the requirements of the SEA Directive.</p>	<p>The SA was prepared by consultants in February and March 2006. The final ODPM Guidance had only been in existence for 3 months and the SA Scoping Report for the Core Strategy, setting out SA objectives in line with this guidance, had not yet been produced. The decision was therefore taken to use the UDP SA headings as a checklist to develop objectives tailored to the SPD. We accept that this has produced a document that is a hybrid and could undoubtedly be more polished. Accordingly we have learnt from this and amended our approach for the future appraisal of SPDs.</p>	<p>No amendment.</p>
<p>71. Mrs P Monaghan</p>	<p>As regards page 20 paragraph 2.41 people will not walk to the station and village amenities. The distance is measured as the crow flies, and it is at least 15-20 min walk to the station from the furthest developments.</p> <p>The plan for Main Street includes nothing to make it safer for pedestrians. There will be substantially increased traffic through the village and as pavements are very narrow the current 30mph speed limit will pose a much greater danger.</p> <p>There needs to be enhanced provision for cyclists in Menston village, with cars being kept out and a 20mph speed limit imposed on Main Street.</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 36.</p> <p>Highways</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Page 20: 2.41. Currently no pedestrian crossing on Main Street. The pavement is so narrow in places that two buggies cannot pass and someone often has to stand in the road, particularly on the stretch from the Co-op to Menston Old Lane.</p> <p>Walking and Cycling should be made a priority in a village location and not just the sites themselves. There is currently no cycle path in Menston at all.</p> <p>With regard to page 45: 5.03, improvements to the library and the community centre should include a safe entrance and crossing for pedestrians.</p> <p>Getting two and from the library, Kirklands centre, and doctor's surgery, entails crossing a car park with no pavements.</p> <p>Page 31: 3.17, ignores the springs. The water table is very high in Menston as Station Road and Main Street already flood when there's a sudden and prolonged downpour.</p> <p>Page 45: 5.02. The main children's play area is very shabby and in great need of refurbishment. The fence is always knocked down and the equipment is also often vandalised.</p> <p>We are very short of green spaces in Menston.</p> <p>Page 24: 2.51/3.24. I strongly object to cars having direct access into the village. I believe cars should be kept out through making it difficult and time consuming to make short car journeys around the village. Make pedestrian, pushchair, and cycle access much easier</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 6.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 8 and 47.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 47.</p> <p>Highways</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>instead.</p> <p>Menston Old Lane. This is extremely difficult to cross for pedestrians at present.</p>		
72. Mr Ruddy			
Page 24: 2.51	<p>Vehicular routes through the developments are important. This paragraph is unclear as to whether through routes are being suggested.</p> <p>Make it clear that the developments will have vehicular access through them.</p>	Highways	
Page 50	<p>The diagram is a study on the proposals for vehicles. The brief for the study is too narrow.</p> <p>The study and the proposals need to be integrated so that they fully consider pedestrians and all other modes of transport, not just the car.</p> <p>A footpath is needed along the Burley Lane access route into the village. It is very busy and has very poor provision for pedestrians (in places no footpath at all). This must be addressed and I'm surprised that it was noted in the study as requiring improvement.</p> <p>The addition of a footpath along this road (at the expense of vehicular carriageway width is necessary). This can be achieved with vehicular passing places being on a shared/coloured surface.</p>	Highways	
73. Mrs P Hall	<p>I object to the play area being off site because the park is too far away and the crossing of roads is not safe for small children.</p> <p>Vehicles should not have direct access into the highway system of the village via Meadow Croft or Derry Lane where the children's home is now. This is due to a great rush of children in both places, as well as other parking</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 1 and 47.</p> <p>Highways</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>difficulties. Cars should be kept out of the village by making pedestrian and cycle access easy, especially when we are trying to cut down on climate change by reducing unnecessary car use.</p> <p>I support the density proposals for Bingley Road (30/ha). However I object to the Derry Hill proposal of 35/ha. The inspector suggested 28/ha. Seek to keep a lower housing density on Bingley Road.</p> <p>I welcome the proposal that properties should be two storey and object to any being 3 storeys. There should only be two storey properties on each site or else there will be an over domination of the village.</p> <p>I support housing for pensioners and young families, but they must be near the village, where they will have their friends and interests.</p> <p>I object to the fact that older people have been portrayed as just wanting to look at children playing, they need to be included in 'their' village.</p> <p>On street parking in bays is good, but street parking is dangerous. Parking should average 1.5 parking spaces per dwelling.</p> <p>The buildings shown in some pictures wouldn't fit in with the area.</p> <p>Make sure it's in the 'Menston Style'.</p> <p>Improvements to the library and community centre are most welcome.</p> <p>I support the following: Page 24: 2.55, Page 29: 3.06,</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 9.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 6.</p> <p>Housing</p> <p>Please refer to response number 52.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number 16.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>	<p>No change required.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	29: 3.10, 30: 3.16, 31: 3.19, 35: 3.30, 40: All, 41: All.		
74. Mr D M Pickles	<p>The release of both sites will choke the village with noise, dust and construction traffic. The release of the sites should be staggered.</p> <p>The housing is low density (including bungalows) and this should be reflected in the development. High density should be located adjacent to existing high density development, and not adjacent to low density. The single storey development along Hawksworth Drive should be seen as a reference for new development. Elderly residents require single storey for ease of living and access.</p> <p>Omit the word 'not' from paragraph 2.49 on page 23.</p> <p>Meadowcroft Access. All cars from the site will use this for village access. Together with the Derry Hill site, traffic will all flow onto Hawksworth Drive.</p> <p>Meadowcroft access to be for pedestrian only/bus access.</p> <p>The proposed link between the two sites should be supported.</p> <p>Higher Density noted on principal route for Bingley Road Site, but this road passes many existing bungalows. Low density should be provided adjacent to existing bungalows.</p> <p>I agree that the prevention of the generation of large volumes of traffic within the existing village is paramount, but with two access points as shown. This will have the opposite effect.</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 48.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 9 and 6.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 6.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number 9 and 6.</p> <p>Highways</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Vehicular access should be omitted from paragraph 3.24 on page 34.</p> <p>The proposed high density development behind the existing bungalows on Hawksworth Drive will lead to loss of amenity and severe overlooking. Low density development should be implemented here.</p> <p>I agree with paragraph 3.40 on page 37 as it is paramount that consideration be given for existing residential areas. Pedestrian integration noted and agreed.</p> <p>The architectural styles shown on page 42 are appalling and would not be acceptable in Menston. The Menston design statement should be followed.</p> <p>I agree that 10% of affordable housing should be provided for older people, with a mix of 1 & 2 bed bungalows and apartments.</p> <p>New development should be well related to the existing character of the locality in terms of design, scale, massing, height and materials.</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 51.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 6, 9 and 42.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 6 and 16.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 47 and 52.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 16.</p>	No change required.
75. Mr J H Drake	<p>Traffic levels: Living as I do at the opposite end of Menston to the intended developments, but near to the A65 and A6038 feeder roads I am very aware of the problems that exist now, relating to access into the village. It may be that the promised but not yet delivered improvements to the A65 adjacent to High Royds will help to compensate for the related increased traffic levels, but with the Silver Cross and other impending Guiseley developments adding to traffic levels from the south, only time will tell. Hopefully this will be in time for</p>	Highways	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>section 106 and 278 provisions relating to Derry Hill and Bingley Road to relate to the then present, and future, projected traffic levels.</p> <p>SPD references to traffic (page 24:2.51 and page 34:3.24) leave me in no doubt that all traffic generated from both sides will be directly connected/physically integrated with the existing village system. It may well be the case that the aforementioned High Royds related traffic movement improvements will help Leeds/Bradford A65 traffic but something must surely be done to improve access from the west/north, i.e. from Otley (A6038) and Ilkley (A65) towards and into Menston.</p> <p>Inevitably Menston Old Lane and Station Road gateways to Menston which are already heavily congested at busy times, will become even busier, and thus improvements must be associated with the Derry Hill and Bingley Road schemes making them types of exemplary traffic planning as referred to on page 51: 5.64 in the SPD in relation to High Royds. It must surely be Bradford's turn to gain something, as Leeds has done pretty well by way of planning gain from High Royds.</p> <p>For example, the provision of traffic lights/mini roundabout at the A65/Station Road junction. The provision of a pedestrian footbridge over the railway would release land for any necessary road widening. This would surely ease the current situation (which will inevitably increase) regarding hold-ups on the A65 in a westerly direction caused by vehicles trying to turn right into Menston at the eastern end of Station Road.</p> <p>Currently the problems caused by giving way to the right at the roundabout mean that the A6038 traffic from Otley often queues back considerable distances (with</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>associated air pollution etc).</p> <p>Perhaps less likely and more expensive, consideration of a 'western gateway' linking Menston Old Lane with Moor lane or even Bingley Road by bringing a new road under the railway. What an advantage to Menston this would be and if it could be put in before the developments started it would be a very useful access road for construction traffic on both sites.</p> <p>I sincerely hope that any finalised plans will comply with all low cost provision, be it to encourage local youngsters to continue to be able to live in Menston and for the elderly to occupy unite appropriate for their needs. Identification with the terms of the Menston Design Statement is crucial. Density levels should also at least identify with the RUDP inspectors recommendations.</p> <p><u>Leisure:</u></p> <p>If not implemented by the time the schemes receive planning approval consideration must be given to the conversion of the old Menston/Otley railway line to a cycle/pedestrian way with possibly a footbridge/cycle over the A65 (and later the A6038).</p> <p><u>Public Transport:</u></p> <p>Local health, schooling, library facilities must be increased to service the demand the proposed developments will generate.</p> <p><u>Parking:</u></p> <p>Whilst where I live is not a problem it is obvious that</p>	<p>Please refer to response number 52, 16, 9 and 16.</p> <p>Highways</p> <p>Please refer to response number 8.</p> <p>Highways</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	Menston has a problem which will only increase. Near the school there are difficulties at going to school and going home times. Could a permit scheme on Main Street be considered? More importantly however are the difficulties rail travellers cause. Clearly the station car park is already inadequate. Could a facility be created between say between Menston and Burley (subject of course to increased rail movements/new rolling stock etc) with a linked bus service which could encompass the promised High Royds/bus station link.		
76. Councillor C Greaves	I welcome the concept of the SPD and we appreciate that such a document will lead to better development than would otherwise have been produced. I thank Bradford Council for facilitating the production of the document.	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
6: 1.20	Whilst we appreciate that both sites are 'phase 2' sites, the phase covers a five year period. We consider that these sites should not be developed concurrently, as the disruption to Menston would be too great. They should be sequenced so that the infrastructure can cope with the construction traffic.	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
4: Map	This shows the houses to the west of Meadowcroft as 2 storeys. Some are actually bungalows. The map requires correction.	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
18: 2.32/ 19:2.40/ 31: 3.17	<p>The issue of ponding is recognised, but we cannot find mention of the need to solve this problem. Even more serious is that there is no mention of the springs. Full surveys and solutions would be required prior to a grant of planning permission. Desk top studies etc would not be sufficient.</p> <p>We do not understand what is meant by paragraph 3.17. Run-off is an issue, but the springs have not been considered. There does not appear to be any consideration given to off-site problems (to the North of</p>	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>the sites), of run-off, springs or drainage or the need for such solutions.</p> <p>There is also no mention of the probable need to expand the existing sewerage and drainage infrastructure to cope with the additional housing.</p>		
20: 2.41/ 29: 3.09	<p>We do not accept the 'notional walking times' quoted. The distances shown by the circles on the map are as the crow flies, and are not a true reflection of walking routes. In any event a large part of the Derry Hill site is beyond the 800 metre circle from the railway station. Calculations appear to be based on a walking speed of 3mph. We believe that, with an elderly population, with hills, and using actual walking routes, a 2mph speed is the best that is likely to be achieved by most people, and the real distance is greater than shown. The real distance is between 20% and 25% further than illustrated. Therefore the walking time to the station from the mid-point of the Derry Hill site is at least 20 minutes, so the 'negation of the need for car use' is not a valid conclusion.</p> <p>As walking is not a realistic option, car parking at the railway station is the only other realistic alternative, and as this is already giving rise to on street parking and the blocking of nearby roads it is essential that the car parking capacity of the railway station is increased. We would ask for a S106 obligation to increase car parking at the station by either mezzanine or underground level parking. To ensure that it was actually used there would need to be an undertaking that the parking was to be free for railway users.</p>	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
21:2.45	We find this statement to be too generalised, and cannot find evidence to justify the statement, particularly with	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	regard to connectivity.		
22:2.46/ 34: 3.25	<p>Whether or not existing residential densities meet the guidance in PPG3 is not in itself a justification for higher densities on these sites. PPG3 does say that developments should reflect the existing townscape and landscape. We therefore disagree with the proposal that there should be high densities on principal routes, particularly on the part of the Bingley Road site near Hawksworth Drive.</p> <p>We support the density proposals for Bingley Road (30/ha compared to the Inspector's 35/ha), however we strongly object to the proposal of 35/ha for Derry Hill. The inspector suggested only 28/ha for that site, which is further away from facilities, i.e. the station etc. It is the less sustainable of the two sites, and that seems to have been recognised by the Inspector. We urge that density on that site is amended to 28/ha as recommended by the Inspector.</p>	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
22: 2.47	We do not understand the map. There are no A,B or C trees.	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
23: 2.48/ 31:3.19	We agree that views matter. We consider that the sites should be as unobtrusive as possible from the existing settlement and to be screened (in line with the Village Design Statement) so that existing views out of the village are retained. There is no mention of views into the village from the countryside.	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
23: 2.49	We welcome the proposal that most properties should be 2 storeys, but question the comment that the bungalows on Hawksworth Drive should not be seen as a reference. There would be a danger of over-domination of the existing bungalows, which would be exacerbated by the rising levels on the new site. In the case of these sites, as they are on rising land, distances between habitable room windows should be increased beyond the normal 21 metres to ensure over dominance	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	is mitigated. A firm basis for this calculation should be stated in the SPD.		
24: 2.50/ 24: 2.51/ 24: 2.52/ 29: 3.06/ 29: 3.11/ 34: 3.24/ 36: Map/ 37: Map/ 51/53: All	<p>We consider that out of all of the proposals in the document it is those suggestions for dealing that are the most flawed. We strongly object to the suggestion that vehicles should have direct access into the highway system of the village.</p> <p>In paragraph 5.64 the report stresses that the High Royds approach to traffic is 'exemplary'. This is based on the DfT document of good practice (Making Residential Travel Plans Work- good practice guidelines, DfT September 2005). However, whilst the High Royds approach, exemplified as good practice, is to keep cars out of Menston, the suggestions made for this site positively encourage cars to drive into Menston via Moor Lane (on a bend), Derry Lane (large numbers of young children), Meadow Croft (other end of Derry Lane), the children's home (by demolishing and replacing). This does not accord with the good practice quoted by the DfT.</p> <p>Whilst we appreciate the reasoning is to prevent the new developments being ghettoised, we would urge that cars must be kept out of the village by making vehicular access difficult and time consuming, whilst making bus, pedestrian, cycle and pushchair access very easy. We believe that this is a far more sustainable way forward than that proposed in the draft report. We support the suggestion that safe and direct walking and cycling routes to the village centre will be established. Paragraph 3.24 states...'Highways integration...must be undertaken in a way that will prevent the generation of large volumes of additional village (sic) within the village'. We assume the first use of village should read 'traffic'. The suggested traffic flows would not meet the</p>	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>concept in this paragraph.</p> <p>We would suggest that the traffic arrangements would be far more appropriate as follows...For the Derry Hill site there should be two access points. The point at the West either should be amended to be left turn only from the site, up the hill towards Ilkley, or Moor Lane should be rebuilt within the site to straighten the dangerous bend between the proposed roundabout and Mount Pleasant. In either case the top of Moor Lane will require as the exit has very poor sightlines.</p> <p>We consider the proposal at the East end of the Derry Hill site to be flawed. We believe that there should be no entry to either Derry Lane or North down Derry Hill. Derry Lane is an area that has a very large number of young people and is already a problem area. Derry Hill to the North is very narrow.</p> <p>Our preferred solutions would be to either direct all traffic up Derry Hill (which would need to be upgraded) to the Bingley Road junction (which would also require upgrading). Alternatively a link could be created from the South-East corner of Derry Hill site through the intervening field to the North-West corner of the Bingley Road site, and traffic directed through that site to Bingley Road. Cleasby Road should be 'No Entry' from Bingley Road.</p> <p>With regard to the Bingley Road site we strongly object to car access to the village onto Hawksworth Drive either via Meadowcroft or by demolition of the children's home. Access should be limited to Bingley Road. Bingley Road would need significant upgrading, including pedestrian and cycle facilities and lighting.</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>We do welcome the public transport proposals in the report. Either of the solutions above would assist public transport, and we support direct non-car access to the centre of the village. One element missing from the public transport proposals is the provision of raised pavements at all bus stops. This would enable buses to dock, and as by the time these developments happen all buses will have low floors, the docking would enable level access for those with wheelchairs, prams etc.</p> <p>The map legends on pages 36 and 37 are unclear. What sort of integration do the arrows mean?</p> <p>Overall we consider that the costs suggested on page 51 are far too conservative as they are based on a flawed solution.</p>		
24: 2.53/ 24: 2.54/ 35: 3.30	<p>These paragraphs lack clarity. We support the use of natural stone and materials, but the alternatives are unclear. Brick can come in many forms, and render can be used sparingly or in vast swathes, the same can apply to timber. No mention is made of roofing materials. A good quality reconstituted stone may be appropriate where it accurately simulates traditional materials and is not in a sensitive location. All this needs clarification especially with reference to buildings visible from outside the sites.</p>	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
24: 2.55	<p>We strongly support the suggestion that all properties should have a natural stone boundary wall.</p>	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
29: 3.05 47/48: All	<p>We support the general principles in paragraph 3.05. However, we have concerns that the detailed suggestions on pages 47 and 48 will not meet local needs.</p> <p>The guidance makes no mention of a 'local' affordable housing policy. Recent developments in Menston, Ilkley and Addingham have given first priority to residents in</p>	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>the Wharfe Valley (Bradford part).</p> <p>We are not persuaded that the proposed mix of affordable housing is correct. The report from the Rural Housing Enablers should carry more weight than district wide policies as it is specific to the village. The report would suggest that the mix of flats should be amended- more 2 bedroom flats and less 1 bedroom flats.</p>		
29: 3.10	We support enhancing the footpaths from Menston through the sites to the countryside.	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
30: 3.16	We strongly support this whole paragraph...housing must be place specific, avoiding standard house types used elsewhere.	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
30: 3.17 30: 3.18	This is unclear. The SUDs concept sounds very laudable, but the actual meeting is not explained.	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
3.23	This misquotes the VDS, which actually says housing should be provided for pensioners who want to downsize. (That would release larger houses back into the market). The VDS also actually says accommodation should be provided for young families who want to stay in the village.	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
35: 3.27	We support street parking in dedicated bays, but feel that encouraging on street parking is a danger, especially to children. Parking should average 1.5 spaces per dwelling, not 1 space, the allocation to reflect the different sizes of dwellings. In addition there should be an element of visitor parking.	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
40: All	We support virtually all this page. We do have concerns about paragraph 4.14 as we would not want on street parking to be encouraged if it was outside the sites. Also, we feel that secure cycle storage would not be appropriate for all new housing, especially if houses are designed for the elderly. It seems strange that every house must have space for a cycle, which many residents will neither need nor want, but no mention is made of the need for a bin store for the wheelie bins all	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	houses will need and want.		
41: All	We support this entire page.	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
42: 4.24-4.29	We support all these paragraphs.	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
42: 4.30	We are very concerned that the very bold statement could lead to inappropriate buildings, as exemplified by the examples shown in the photographs. The 'Menston Style' appropriate to the townscape must be stressed. We do not agree that the development must be contemporary.	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
45: 5.02 50: All	This suggests playscape could be off-site. The park is too far away and involves crossing roads, which is in appropriate for small children. We feel that playscape provision must be on-site. Menston is already significantly undersupplied with both recreational open space and playing fields and has only very limited open green space. Of the three main open green spaces, two are in private ownership with no public access. The new developments will exacerbate this, and so space must be provided on site. Paragraph 5.54 backs up this argument. It may be worth considering creating additional space in the field to the west of the Bingley Road site, in conjunction with the new road that we suggest is needed.	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
45: 5.03	This suggests improvements to the library; a community centre may also be needed. Surely they will be needed. Facilities are already stretched. In addition to existing facilities it is likely that new facilities will be required, such as changing facilities and extra meeting rooms and library space.	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	
49: 5.45	We feel that the Leeds calculation is on the low side. It is difficult to scrutinise the totals, as the formula has no numbers attached, but given the vast amount of residential development in the Guiseley/Rawdon areas we are convinced that Guiseley school will have no	Please refer to response number 42 and 38.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD			Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	capacity and St. Mary’s is already full. In addition, Bradford Council should be asked for the figures for the expansion of Ilkley Grammar School. The suggestion in the Sustainability Appraisal that Immanuel School in Idle is a local school is laughable. It has no connection with the area, and is a very difficult journey.				
	Page	Para	Issue	Highways	
	24 34 51/53	2.51 3.24 All	Strongly object to the suggestion that vehicles should have direct access into the highway system of the village. In para 5.64 the report stresses that the High Royds approach to traffic is “exemplary”. This is based on a DfT document of good practice. However, whilst the High Royds approach is to keep cars out of Menston, this document positively encourages cars to drive into Menston via Moor Lane (on a bend), Derry Lane (large numbers of young children), Meadow Croft (other end of Derry Lane), the Children’s Home (by demolishing and replacing). We would urge keeping cars out of the village, by making car access very difficult and time consuming, whilst making pedestrian, cycle and pushchair access very easy. We do welcome the public transport proposals in the report.		
	34	3.25	Whilst supporting the density proposals for Bingley Road (30/ha compared to Inspector’s 35/ha), strongly object to the proposal of 35/ha for Derry Hill. The Inspector		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD			Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
			suggested only 28/ha for that site, which is further away from facilities, the station etc.	<p>Please refer to response number 6.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 42.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 6.</p> <p>Please refer to response number 6. Please refer to response number 38.</p> <p>Highways</p>	
	Page	Para	Issue		
	18/19	2.32 2.40	The issue of ponding is recognised, but we cannot find mention of the need to solve this problem.		
	20	2.41	Question the walking time. The distance is measured as the crow flies, not as the commuter walks. The calculation is based on 3mph, which is questionable, especially up hill, with heavy bags, on a wet October night!		
	23	2.49	Welcome the proposal that most properties should be 2 storey, but question the comment that the bungalows on Hawksworth Drive should not be seen as a reference. Danger of over-domination.		
	31	3.17	This is too weak, as it mentions rain run-off but ignores springs.		
	33	3.23	This misinterprets the VDS, which actually says housing should be provided for pensioners who want to downsize . (That would release larger houses back into the market). The VDS also actually says accommodation should be provided for young families who want to stay in the village .		
	35	3.28	Street parking in dedicated bays is fine, encouraging on street parking is a danger, especially to children.		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD			Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
			Parking should average 1.5 spaces per dwelling, not 1 space.	Please refer to response number 6. Please refer to response number 1 and 47. Please refer to response number 8 and 47. Please refer to response number 47.	
	42	4.30	This suggestion could lead to some horrible buildings ... have a look at the pictures! It should stress the "Menston style".		
	45 50	5.02 All	Suggests playspace could be off-site. The park is too far away and involves crossing roads, this is inappropriate for small children.		
	45	5.03	Suggests improvements to library, community centre may be needed. Surely they will be needed.		
	47/48	All	This makes no mention of a "local" affordable housing policy. Recent developments in Menston, Ilkley and Addingham have given first priority to residents in the settlement and second priority to residents in the Wharfe Valley (Bradford part).		
	Page	Para	Issue	Support noted.	
	24	2.55	Strongly support that all properties should have a natural stone boundary wall.		
	29	3.06	Support safe and direct walking and cycling routes from the sites.		
	29	3.10	Support enhancing the footpaths from Menston through the sites to the countryside.		
	30	3.16	Strongly support this whole paragraph ... housing must be place specific, avoiding standard house types used elsewhere.		
	31	3.19	Support the concept that views		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD			Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
			matter.		
	35	3.30	Support the use of natural materials.		
	40	All	This is good stuff.		
	41	All	So is this!		
	42	4.24	And this!		
		-			
		4.29			
77. Mr Michael W Harding Reynolds	The implementation of No Lorry Access on Leathley Road. I am of the opinion that the Traffic Management plans with regard to Bingley Road and Derry Hill (and High Royds) will have significant impact upon traffic on Leathley Road.			Highways	
78. Mr P Littlewood	I am of the opinion that the traffic management plans for Derry Hill and Bingley Road (and High Royds) will have significant impact upon West Chevin Road and plans should be taken to remedy this impact.			Highways	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
79. George Wright	The SPD and its process are so fundamentally flawed it should be withdrawn. It is not appropriate	The SPD has been produced in accordance with the process set out in	No change to SPD

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	to address the shortcomings of the SPD by amendment, as any such amendments would be so far reaching to amount to a re-writing of the document.	<p>Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.</p> <p>The document has been amended as necessary, in response to comments received, but the development principles for each site will largely remain the same. On this basis the document has been produced in accordance with the regulations and has taken representations received into account but it will not be withdrawn.</p>	
	<p>The ten principal concerns about and objections to the SPD can be summarised as follows: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no sound and lawful framework for the SPD. • The SPD is not in conformity with the legal and policy framework for making supplementary planning documents, including conformity with guidance set out in PPS 12: Development Plans. • The design guidance is unnecessarily prescriptive and attempts to impose an architectural style and particular tastes. The design guidance is not in conformity with the guidance set out in PPS 1: Delivering Sustainable Development, and PPG 15: Planning and the Historic Environment. • A supplementary planning document should not blatantly attempt to introduce a level of prescription that would not have survived the Local Plan process or attempt to introduce new policies that have no basis in planning policy but which rather reflect the desire of the 	These points are picked up in relation to other comments made throughout the document.	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>local planning authority to micro manage the development process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The SPD attempts to introduce new policies in a manner that would not have survived the robust consideration of a local plan inquiry. Furthermore, the SPD attempts to introduce new and prescriptive policies which would not have survived the Local Plan inquiry process and it is therefore unlikely to be given any significant weight in a S.78 procedure. • The SPD fails to demonstrate a robust evidence base for many of its assertions, policy proposals and development requirements. • The SPD attempts to dictate matters of detail, which will consequently deter development from taking place. • The SPD attempts to incorporate references or relate to as yet unformed policy that is predicted to arise in the future LDF process. Such attempts are both premature and inappropriate. • The SPD fails to reflect the emphasis of national policy and guidance on flexibility and negotiation. <p>Substantial elements of the text are composed in incomprehensible language which difficulty is exacerbated by spelling mistakes, ungrammatical phrasing, omitted and truncated wording.</p>		
	<p><u>Preface Para 3</u> There is no evidence or reasons set out to support the assertions in this paragraph. In particular: -</p> <p>1.1 The ‘<i>sensitive nature</i>’ which also is not identified or characterised.</p>	<p>The Council agrees to add the following words in the middle of the first sentence to add clarity to the text, “(<i>located at the edge of the village and on rising topography</i>)”</p>	<p>Amend Preface Para 3 to include the following in the first sentence. “Due to the sensitive nature of these two housing allocations (<i>located at the edge of the village and on rising topography</i>) an SPD....”</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>1.2 As to why the SPD is necessary prior to any pre-application discussions.</p> <p>1.3 As to the necessity for a '<i>comprehensive</i>' approach.</p>	<p>The Council does not intend to allow housing to take place on these sites until phase 2 housing of the RUDP comes into effect. The intention of this text is to therefore inform the public that an SPD will be in place prior to any pre-application discussions for housing under Phase 2</p> <p>Agree delete the final sentence from the text</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>Amend Preface Para 3 by deleting the last sentence from the text</p>
	<p><u>Preface Para 4</u> The statement of this paragraph is without validity. The current policy framework derives under the RUDP and LDS. The LDS makes no provision for an SPD. The 2004 Regulations would relate to a document being produced within the ambit of the LDS but presumably under LDF policy as yet unpublished.</p>	<p>The LDS approved by the 1st Secretary of State in September 2005 made no reference to the Menston SPD, however a revised version of the LDS was submitted to the Government at the end of March 2007. The Menston SPD is clearly listed as part of the Council's SPD work programme and within the ambit of the LDF.</p> <p>The Preface Para 4 however will need to be deleted to take account of recent events concerning the SPD's production</p>	<p>Delete Para 4 and add new text to Preface to take account of recent events concerning the SPD's production.</p>
	<p><u>Preface Para 5</u> The SCI applies to the forthcoming LDF not the adopted RUDP.</p>	<p>The SCI once adopted will apply to the production of all Local Development Documents, of which the Menston SPD is one. However, until the SCI is adopted the Council will adhere to guidelines set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England)</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		Regulations 2004.	
	<p><u>Preface Para 6</u> This paragraph indicates the consultation is with the 'community'. This approach appears, by cross reference to para 3 of the Preface, to exclude the landowners and the (potential) developers. The intention as to the extent or limitation on consultation is unclear or inappropriately constrained.</p>	Noted. However, this para needs to be updated to take account of more recent events.	Delete para 6 and add new text to take account of the status that an adopted SPD will have.
	<p><u>Preface Generally</u> In summary the Preface indicates that there is currently no lawful framework for the process of an SPD and the process itself is not compliant with the 2004 regulations, should they be applicable. It is further observed that if the legal deficiency of the absence of a reference to a SPD in the LDS was corrected the SPD would still be legally flawed due to its intended reliance on future policy proposals of the LDF and not thereby predicated upon adopted development plan policy.</p>	The Council disagrees with this statement for the reasons given in the preceding paragraphs	No change to SPD
	<p><u>Introduction Para 1.01</u> The overarching aim to achieve 'sensitive control' is not an aim to address a perceived pre-existing sensitivity as referred to in Para 3 of the Preface. The aim appears to be to establish a basis for new (policy) objectives which are beyond those set out in the RUDP. The issue of 'constraints' is not one identified either in the Preface or the RUDP.</p>	The Council disagrees with this statement, as the aim of the SPD is to sensitively plan for and control development of these sites using saved policies within the adopted RUDP. The role of the SPD is not to create "new" policy but to "supplement" policies and proposals within the RUDP. The site is identified for housing in the RUDP; the SPD in supplementing the RUDP has to identify opportunities and constraints in planning for the development of the site.	No change to SPD
	<p><u>Introduction Para 1.02</u> The Sites are allocated in RUDP but the RUDP does not identify issues of cumulative impact or</p>	The issue of cumulative impact in relation to the reference in this paragraph to the	Amend Para 1.02 by deleting the sentence "This is also considered in the

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>constraints which would prevent or restrict development of the Sites in accordance with national policy.</p> <p>The scope of planning obligations is related to issues intended to make acceptable development which would otherwise be unacceptable in planning terms. Such issues as may be necessary to make the development acceptable are identified in the RUDP, which is the up-to-date context within which the allocation of the Sites took place. The Council's expectations are overstated and beyond those requirements of adopted policy. To that extent the requirements for planning obligations are not compliant with Circular 05/2005 Planning Obligations.</p>	<p>High Royds development is noted.</p> <p>Planning obligations contained within the SPD are in accordance with those identified in the RUDP. The level of contribution required as a result of the developments will be assessed at planning application. The level of contribution will be assessed in response needs arising from the development at that time.</p>	<p><i>context of the cumulative impact such development will have given the development of High Royds Village"</i></p> <p>No change to SPD</p>
	<p><u>Introduction Para 1.03</u></p> <p>The assertion of this paragraph is misconceived as the expectations are not in all cases related to adopted planning policy relevant to the Sites.</p>	The Council disagrees with this comment	No change to SPD
	<p>Introduction Para 1.04</p> <p>The issue of an extension to the Conservation Area is an immaterial consideration. This relates to potential but as yet uncertain future policy.</p>	Agreed reference should only be made to the "Conservation Area" and not any proposed amendments to it.	Amend para 1.04, bullet point 2 by deleting the words " <i>and the setting of a future Conservation Area extension.</i> "
	<p><u>Para. 1.10 & 1.11</u></p> <p>These paragraphs do not relate to the topic headed '<i>Background to the Allocation of the Sites</i>' and should be separately headed.</p>	Agreed paragraph 1.10 is repeated in Appendix B paragraph 6.08	Delete paragraph 1.10 as this is referred to in Appendix B
	<p>Para 1.12</p> <p>This statement is unclear and ambiguously phrased. The SPD must relate to policies in a development plan and be in conformity with the development plan.</p>	For clarity this paragraph should be amended.	Delete paragraph 1.12 and replace with the following, " <i>The purpose of SPDs is to expand upon policy or provide greater detail to policies contained within a development plan. SPDs may also take</i>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
			<i>the form of design guides, master plan or issue based documents which supplement policies in a development plan. This SPD is a development brief.</i>
	<u>Para. 1.13</u> Whilst the statement reflects the terms of PPS 12, the SPD fails to state clearly and categorically which purpose it seeks to undertake and should do so.	Delete paragraph 1.13 for reasons stated above in paragraph 1.12	Delete paragraph 1.13 for reasons stated above in paragraph 1.12
	<u>Para. 1.14</u> Whilst the statement correctly sets out the limitation of the SPD in relation to development plan policy, the content of the SPD fails to conform to this limitation.	The Council disagrees with this statement the SPD has been drafted in accordance with development plan policy.	No change to SPD
	<u>Para. 1.15</u> This statement reflects the approach of material policy to an SPD. The SPD itself has to comply with national policy and, as drafted, it does not. Not only is the SPD not derived solely under the Development Plan but it also is not produced as a document to provide guidance but instead sets out new and prescriptive policies which are inappropriate to the circumstances. Accordingly the SPD would not be appropriate to the consideration of the determination of a planning application in respect of the Sites as a material consideration.	The Council disagrees with this statement as the SPD has been produced to supplement development plan policies and in accordance with national planning policy	No change to SPD
	<u>Para 1.16</u> The SPD is, according to para 1.14, to be promoted under the RUDP not the LDF.	The SPD will be produced to supplement policies contained within the adopted RUDP, but once the SPD is adopted it will form one of the portfolio of documents that make up the emerging LDF.	No change to SPD
	<i>Para 1.18 and Sustainability Appraisal (SA)</i>	It is a requirement of PPS12 and the	No change to SPD or Sustainability

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>The SA does not justify proposals to address pre-existing problems in the locality or problems not generated by this development. The requirements of the planning system are that the development proposals have to be acceptable when measured against Development Plan policy and other relevant material considerations, not that the proposals have to be <i>the most acceptable proposal that can be derived in the circumstances</i>. The SA involves subjective judgements and might have produced vastly different conclusions without invalidating the process. The SA merely provides an assessment of what might be sustainable. In those circumstances, the SA does not require its conclusions to be complied with if other material considerations outweigh them or justify a different conclusion.</p> <p><u>SA Para. 3.103 onwards</u> To emphasise the inappropriateness of making reference within the SPD to required commuted sums within the Section 278 Agreement, the Sustainability Appraisal sets out the scope of the Transport Assessment required by the SPD, identifying the four major junctions on the A65 at which a material traffic impact arising from the development can be expected. This general scope and approach is accepted as being reasonable. In addition, the Sustainability Appraisal highlights that the scope of any offsite works that may prove necessary should ensure that the junction or link operates '<i>no worse off</i>' as a result of the development. Again, this approach is agreed and accepted as appropriate but it is at odds with the prescriptive requirements of the draft SPD.</p> <p>At paragraph 3.118, it is stated that '<i>Metro is giving</i></p>	<p>Planning Regulations that a SA is undertaken of an SPD. The purpose of SA is to promote sustainable development through the integration of social, economic and environmental considerations into the preparation and content of an SPD.</p> <p>While support is given to the content of the SA, the objector's comments relating to the offsite highway aspects of the SPD are noted. It is considered that it is more appropriate to establish the exact nature of the offsite highway improvements required as a result of the development at planning application.</p> <p>Para 5.73 refers to resources being</p>	<p>Appraisal</p> <p>Amendments have been made to the Planning Obligations section of the SPD as they relate to off site highways works and are referred to below</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p><i>consideration to an increase in service provision</i>, which it is previously <u>suggested</u> should take the form of additional services as opposed to increases in the numbers of carriages. Two issues arise from this. First, Metro are clearly still to advise on the practicalities of service improvements. Second if Metro is still giving '<i>consideration</i>' to an increase in service provision, the SPD cannot require financial contributions which, in effect, pre-empt the outcome of their considerations.</p> <p>The SA refers to the Rural Housing Enabler but it is not manifest in the SPD why this reference is made and the nature of its implications.</p> <p>There is a second paragraph numbered 1.18 in respect of which no further comment is made other than to identify the error.</p>	<p>secured in the adjacent High Royds development to secure an increase in train services. This sets a precedent for seeking such a contribution as a result in the increased passenger demand for rail services arising from these sites.</p> <p>Reference is made to the Rural Housing Enabler in Chapter 5, sub sections on Affordable Housing and The Council's Expectations in Terms of Unit Size and Tenure Mix</p> <p>This is an error that needs to be corrected</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>Amend SPD by renumbering the second paragraph that is numbered 1.18 to 1.19</p>
	<p>Para. 1.19 This is a factual statement of policy but the application of the phasing policy will have to be reviewed in light of the emerging policies of the Submission RSS with regard to housing provision delivery</p>	<p>Until the phasing policy is reviewed the policy statement referred to still applies</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>
	<p>Para 1.21 The words following 1.22 appear to be part of this paragraph. Para 1.23 the SPD offers no guidance on the timing of the release for housing but rather flags up a number of contradictory considerations in this regard. As such the statement fails to achieve the objective of an SPD to give a more detailed statement of the underlying policy of the Development Plan or guidance as to its application</p>	<p>This is an error that needs to be corrected. The para should be merged with para 1.22. However, para 1.23 is not superfluous and has even more meaning once the housing requirement is set in the emerging adopted Regional Spatial Strategy</p>	<p>Amend SPD by merging paras 1.21 and 1.22</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>or interpretation.</p> <p>Para 1.21 indicates that a review might take place where completions <i>are consistently and significantly below the housing requirement</i>. This does not represent the appropriate approach under Plan, Monitor and Manage where action should be taken much earlier than that which would arise in the case of consistent and significant shortfalls.</p>	<p>The Council disagrees with this statement. Para 1.21 reiterates Policy H2 of the <u>adopted</u> RUDP. The Policy is based on monitoring and subsequently managing the housing supply.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>
	<p><i>Highway matters in general</i></p> <p>In relation to highway and transport matters, both the SPD and the SA have relied on input provided by Faber Maunsell. Background documents in the form of a transport assessment or other reports analysing the local highway network and the impact of development traffic have been requested so that a comprehensive response in relation to these matters could be provided. At the time of preparing these submissions however, the background documents relied upon within the draft SPD have not been received. It is not possible therefore to achieve a comprehensive response as is the expressed aim of the SPD in a proper process of public consultation ensuring a comprehensive engagement with the landowners.</p>	<p>Faber Maunsell were commissioned by the Council to assess highway and transport matters. The outcome of their work is well documented within the SPD and SA, and these are the documents that are available for consultation</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>
	<p><i>Paras 2.10 – 2.40 & 2.42 – 2.52</i></p> <p><i>Whilst the factual matters set out in these paragraphs are relevant to any development proposals, such proposals will also need to reflect development plan policy and other material policy considerations. These aspects are responded to where they arise in Chapter 4 but in broad terms the SPD fails to provide</i></p>	<p>Policy considerations are addressed in later section of the document and specifically refer to Menston.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<i>guidance on the way the 'Menston Context' should be balanced against policy.</i>		
	<p>Para. 2.02</p> <p><i>The Community's wishes for the new development are only relevant in so far as they relate to proper planning considerations. What comments have been made and which are accepted by the Council?</i></p>	Paras 3.135 – 4.13 of the SA broadly summarised comments made to the consultation and how some of the issues raised will be addressed in the draft SPD	No change to SPD
	<p>Para. 2.04</p> <p>This paragraph contains two important elements which are not carried through into the proposals for the sites. First, the "Menston style architecture" as defined is not specific or special to Menston but is typical of many of the settlements in the eastern Pennine valleys (and also to the west in Lancashire) which saw their first period of significant growth occur in the mid/late 19th Century. Second, it is noted that: "Each period of development activity is represented by a distinctive architecture that represents the economic, policy and design drivers of the day". If that is typical of Menston, then the development of the 2 sites should also reflect current circumstances.</p>	While it is inevitable that Menston will share some of the architectural design characteristics of neighbouring villages, as a place it has a character and style of its own that is respected in the SPD.	No change to SPD
	<p>Para 2.06</p> <p>It would be appropriate to identify as one of the characteristics of Menston the juxtaposition of substantial (predominantly mill) buildings with smaller scale domestic architecture. This variety and juxtaposition could usefully be carried through into the 2 sites, where larger scale buildings could be used to provide the large number of very small</p>	Building scales have been adequately addressed within the document without the need to replicate a mill style development	No change to SPD

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	flats which are identified elsewhere in the document as necessary to meet housing requirements.		
	<p>Para 2.08</p> <p>Field boundaries are identified as dry stonewalls, hedges and fences. Elsewhere it is proposed that existing hedgerows within the sites should be retained where possible, but that otherwise all new boundaries to the public highway should be constructed in natural stone. This is an unreasonable requirement and would lead to sameness throughout the sites, in contrast to the variety of built form, boundaries etc. which is identified as important to the character of Menston.</p>	<p>The Council disagrees with this view. The construction of boundary walls adjoining the highway in natural stone is not unreasonable and is an important feature that characterizes Menston that should be reflected in the development of these sites.</p>	No change to SPD
	<p>Para 2.10</p> <p>The relevance of the third bullet point to the development of the 2 sites is not understood. Is it suggested that the 2 sites represent <i>small pockets of residential development</i> and that the off-site planting referred to in the fourth bullet point is intended to provide the <i>parkland setting</i>? The ability of a developer to provide off-site landscaping and the amount of on-site landscaping required will significantly affect the viability and delivery of the two sites. If there are absolute requirements in respect of the extent of the planting required to absorb the development into the landscape, these need to be clearly stated at this stage.</p>	<p>Para 2.10 highlights the relevant points from the Council's Wharfedale Landscape Character Assessment that could be incorporated into this development. Bullet points 3 and 4 of this para. aim to have a significant amount of landscaping so that the development is incorporated sympathetically into the landscape without destroying the character of the area. The viability of landscaping each site is a matter that will be discussed at planning application.</p>	No change to SPD
	<p>Paras 2.10, 2.22 & 2.48</p> <p>Similarly, the extent to which views into and out of the site from the built up area of Menston and</p>	<p>The Planning Frameworks for each site (diagrams accompanying para 3.19) show the form that each development should take. These have been drawn up</p>	No change to SPD

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<i>the surrounding countryside need to be protected must be made clear. Potentially, the graphic above paragraph 2.48, if interpreted literally, would render significant parts of both sites undevelopable.</i>	assessing views into and out of the site. They clearly show blocks of development within each site, with no part rendered undevelopable.	
	Para 2.14 <i>A conflict as to the purpose of the document runs through the Draft. It purports to offer guidance to prospective developers yet in very many aspects is prescriptive, without any adequate justification.</i>	The Council disagrees with this statement as the whole of Chapter 2 'Menston Context' studies/assesses various aspects of the settlement and the relationship of these sites to the settlement. Chapter 3 'Planning Framework' then develops these concepts further in devising a scheme for each site.	No change to SPD
	Para 2.15 & 2.16 <i>The 'Historic Core' of Menston is now but a small part of the settlement. The 2 sites are separated from the Historic Core by development of a significantly different age and character. What proper planning purpose will be achieved by requiring the sites to be developed in a manner which replicates the mid/late 19th Century development?</i>	The Council disagrees with this statement particularly as the historic core largely abuts part of the Derry Hill site. Also it is clearly stated in para 4.30 that "new development will be contemporary and contextual".	No change to SPD
	Para 2.17 <i>What precisely is meant by: 'Where brick has been used has not always understood context'. This phrase is entirely without meaning and is an unsubstantiated statement. If the author of the document understands the context of the use of brick in this locality and if it is thought to</i>	The Council agrees this section of the SPD defines the materials that make up the settlement. This sentence does not add to this and should therefore be deleted	Amend SPD by deleting the sentence 'Where brick has been used has not always understood context' from para 2.17

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<i>have any significance for the development of the 2 sites, then please state it explicitly.</i>		
	<p>Para 2.18</p> <p><i>Does this paragraph refer to the heights of dwellings? The mills, which are an integral part of Menston, are not 2 storey buildings. There is frequently little difference in overall height between Victorian 2 storey dwellings and modern 2½/3 storey dwellings. What precisely is the objection to 3 storey development or higher on the Sites?</i></p>	This para and accompanying diagram illustrates existing building heights.	No change to SPD
	<p>Para 2.20 & 2.21</p> <p>These paragraphs emphasise the variety of uses and variety of buildings within Menston and particularly within the central core. What opportunities will be available for non-residential uses within the Sites?</p>	These sites are identified for residential use and the Council will not support non-residential uses on this site.	No change to SPD
	<p><u>Para 2.23</u></p> <p><i>This paragraph identifies the Victorian residential development as comprising terraces, grand villas and large semi-detached properties. Presumably, development of similar mix scale and massing will be appropriate on the Sites.</i></p>	The diagrams accompanying para 3.25 illustrates how density of development should take place within each site. The diagrams accompanying paras 3.35 and 3.38 show massing to be in a simple block configuration.	No change to SPD
	<p>Para 2.24</p> <p><i>See earlier comments re boundary treatments</i></p>	See comments in para 2.08 above	No change to SPD
	Para 2.30 & 2.38	Highway comments are addressed below	No change to SPD

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<i>The requirements of the Highway Authority in respect of any improved and/or additional accesses into both sites should be made clear – see below</i>		
	<p>Para 2.32 & 2.40</p> <p>Ponding is referred to as a characteristic of both sites. If there is any suggestion that these wet areas and/or the stream affecting the Derry Hill site have any amenity, wildlife or biodiversity value, this needs to be made clear as it would potentially represent a significant constraint to the development of the sites.</p>	These paras describe existing features that characterize each site and are dealt with and addressed in later sections of the document, namely para 3.17 and diagrams accompanying which relate to Sustainable Urban Drainage techniques.	No change to SPD
	<p>Para 2.34</p> <p><i>What is the significance of the number of freestanding trees within the Bingley Road site? Is it intended that some or all of them should be retained within the development. Again, this could represent a significant constraint.</i></p>	This para describes the existing “landscape” features that characterise the Bingley Road site.	No change to SPD
	<p><u>Para 2.41</u></p> <p>Walk distances of 400 metres are shown from the centre of the two allocated Sites and a 400 and 800 walk distance is shown from Menston railway station. Both of these distances are however, measured as the ‘crow flies’ rather than representing actual walking distances. Measured in this way the draft SPD indicates that about two-thirds of the Derry Hill site is within an 800 metre walk distance of the railway station, the recommended distance between rail stations and dwellings as quoted in Institution of Highways and Transportation guidance. The actual walk distance</p>	Agreed this para needs amending to provide some clarity that differentiates between the distance as the crow flies and actual walking times to the station and bus services.	Amends para 2.41 of SPD to indicate that the 400m and 800m distances are shown as the “crow flies” and that actual walking time and distances are longer.

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	from the railway station to the proposed point of access on the Derry Hill frontage is however 1.0 kilometres and the walk distance to the point of access on the Moor Lane frontage is some 1.2 kilometres. The SPD needs to clarify whether regard should be had to 'crow fly' or actual walking distances when considering the accessibility of the site by walking and public transport.		
	<p>Para 2.43</p> <p><i>This paragraph purports to provide the link between the descriptive material preceding it and the policies and guidance which follows. It is inadequate for this purpose, it is too short, badly expressed and lost within the body of the document. If the policies and guidance which follow are to be robust, credible and evidence based, they must self-evidently derive from this paragraph.</i></p>	Agreed this section should be highlighted as a separate chapter entitled "Analysis" and each para that follows renumbered accordingly	Amend SPD by including this section as a new Chapter
	<p>Para 2.46 Density</p> <p><i>One element of the 'variety' of the built form of Menston referred to elsewhere in the document derives from the juxtaposition of buildings and areas of differing density. There are no grounds whatsoever for requiring higher density development within the 2 development sites to be either located along principal routes or adjacent to existing high density development or at the focal point of each site, although some high density development in these three types of location may well be acceptable.</i></p>	The location of the higher density development is a matter of judgement based on general development principles contained within the document. As no alternative locations are identified for high density development within the site, by the commenter, this para will remain unchanged	No change to SPD

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Para 2.49 Heights</p> <p><i>What basis is there for requiring three storey development to be located only adjacent to existing three storey properties when in the same paragraph it is made clear that single storey development will not be acceptable adjacent to existing single storey development.</i></p>	Agreed. The single storey development along Hawksworth Drive 'should' rather than 'should not' be seen as a reference for development on Hawksworth Drive	Amend para 2.49 by stating that Hawksworth Drive "should" rather than "should not" be seen as a reference for development on Hawksworth Drive
	<p>Paras 2.53 & 2.55</p> <p><i>These paragraphs move from survey and analysis to prescribing specific design requirements. Such an approach is rejected as not being compliant with national policy and is not required under RUDP policy</i></p>	The role of SPD such as this, are to provide guidance on how each site should be developed and that this should be undertaken in light of national policy and the RUDP. Paras 2.53 and 2.55 supplement policies in the Design Chapter of the RUDP in particular policies D1 and D5.	No change to SPD
	<p>General</p> <p><i>Whilst the approach is recognised as being legitimate, it is not accepted that this represents the only acceptable framework for the Sites and it is not accepted that planning policy should seek to prescribe a single solution to the design challenge or characterise it as the best solution or framework. The detail outcomes are specifically addressed at Chapter 4.</i></p>	This document once adopted will provide a guide to developers on the principles of how the site should be developed. As no alternative design solution is provided for the Council to consider no major changes are proposed to the planning frameworks provided for each site.	No change to the SPD
	<p>Para 3.14</p> <p><i>It is stated in relation to 'structure' that the internal road network will be based on a grid</i></p>	The internal grid structure of the site has been drafted in liaison with our highways section who support this as a general design principle. Detailed design and	No change to the SPD

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<i>but that ‘the streets and lanes will be straight to facilitate good views in and out and to increase legibility’. Such a design principle would conflict with good road safety design principles where long straight sections of streets and lanes are to be avoided in order to restrain vehicle speeds.</i>	layout would be agreed at planning application	
	<p>Para 3.18</p> <p>The route hierarchy indicated on the inset diagrams should either be highlighted as ‘illustrative’. As shown, the road hierarchy may not achieve the best use of land as for economy; streets with development on a single side should be avoided. Whilst paragraph 3.35 states that the site specific development principles adopted when developing the framework for Derry Hill could be reinterpreted to achieve a different but equally valid layout, there is a danger that the internal movement system illustrated could be seen as ‘the preferred solution’. Consideration ought to be given to simplifying the framework diagrams to allow greater flexibility in the design of the future road layout.</p> <p>Rather than depicting what could be interpreted as a prescriptive road hierarchy, the proposed street hierarchy and street types should be described within the text, moving from village streets through to residential lanes and mews. The roles of these streets within the hierarchy should be as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Villages streets/primary routes – these will be the most heavily trafficked routes and will form the spine road through the development. Pedestrian connectivity is important in these routes. 	<p>The internal route hierarchy identified in para 3.18 is the preferred route for each site. While these have been defined in as simplistic terms as possible, there is scope to amend this layout at planning application.</p> <p>Having an illustrated route hierarchy is fundamental to the overall layout of each site for housing.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential lanes/secondary routes – these will provide a local distributor function linking from the spine roads to connect through the site. These connecting streets will be less busy than the spine and can be designed in favour of pedestrian movement. ○ Mews/tertiary streets – the least trafficked routes; these will have no strategic function and should be used principally by residents only. Where possible, these routes should form connecting routes rather than culs-de-sac. 		
	<p>Para 3.27</p> <p>The parking principles promoted within the draft SPD have been developed having regard to the English Partnership document ‘Design for Homes, Car Parking, What Works Where’. This is not appropriate and is inconsistent with Central Government guidance. Paragraph 3.27 also suggests that parking should be either on-street, where road widths or dedicated bays will make parking on pavements unnecessary, or off-road and that where off-road spaces are provided only one space per residential unit will be permitted. See also objection to para 4.14.</p> <p>Experience shows that the principle of car parking restraint within residential developments has not been successful. The overall Government policy set out in PPG3 is not to restrain car ownership but to limit the use of the private car, particularly for trips to work, and journey lengths. The consequences of limiting private parking within curtilage has lead to considerable problems within developments relating to on-street, verge and</p>	<p>The Council agrees that one space per unit may not be adequate, and for consistency the 1.5 car parking spaces per dwelling advocated in Appendix C of the RUDP will be used as the standard.</p>	<p>Amend SPD para 3.27 by deleting the reference to “one” parking space per unit and replacing with 1.5 spaces per unit.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>footway parking with consequential difficulties for pedestrian movement and safety, as well as other environmental considerations.</p> <p>PPS3 advises with specific reference to parking at paragraph 20 that authorities should develop parking policies having regard to expected car ownership for planned housing in different locations, the efficient use of land and the importance of promoting good design.</p> <p>The draft Regional Spatial Strategy for Yorkshire and Humberside maintains the 1.5 spaces per unit average provision set out in the current PPG3. Government statements post PPG 3 have made it clear that parking should be applied not at individual site level but for a wider area. The Sustainability Appraisal recognises that Menston has a high overall car ownership and limiting parking provision to one space per unit will not in itself result in restricting car ownership but will simply result in the second family car being parked on-street. Extensive on-street parking prejudices the PPS3 objectives of providing good residential environments and high quality design.</p> <p>It is also unclear as to whether the suggested standard of one space per unit set out in the draft SPD includes garages. If it does, then the necessary private drive to the front of all garages required by the Local Highway Authority, will result in those plots having 200% and therefore at least half of the proposed dwellings not having any off-street parking provision, again exacerbating the problems of on-street parking, prejudicing the accessibility to homes by pedestrians and cyclists.</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Para 4.01</p> <p><i>It is assumed in the responses that follow in this chapter that the statements set out in italics preceded by the letter SPD represent policy statements flowing from the justification of the text and the responses are made on that basis. The opening paragraph indicates that the SPD sets out guidance whereas in fact the policy statements are prescriptive requirements rather than guidance.</i></p> <p><i>This paragraph indicates that the two sites are unlikely to be developed for some time, though no indication is given as to what that time span might be.</i></p>	<p>The wording following “SPD” forms the design guidance that will be used to guide each site. The design guidance has been formulated with regard to a number of sources e.g. the Village Design Statement etc.</p> <p>The sites are identified as Phase 2 housing sites in the RUDP and are therefore not to come forward for development until 2009. For clarity this para should be changed to highlight this point</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>Amend the penultimate sentence of para 4.01 by deleting the words “are unlikely to be developed for some time” and replace with, “are identified as phase 2 housing sites in the RUDP they will not be available for development until 2009, therefore”</p>
	<p>Para 4.06</p> <p><i>If any helpful guidance was to be given to developers and their advisors in a tangible and specific way, this would be achieved by way of recognised contemporary exemplars. However the document singularly fails to identify any. Subsequently six sites are identified as being in the appropriate category but which of these six might be regarded as exemplars is not stated.</i></p>	<p>Para 4.32 steers the reader to the relevant document that highlights contemporary exemplars. The heading of this para should change to reflect the heading in para 4.06</p>	<p>Amend para 4.32 by deleting the sub heading “Housing Audit” and replacing with “Recognised Contemporary Exemplars”</p>
	<p>Para 4.08</p> <p><i>This guidance is potentially acceptable and probably could be elaborated upon in a very</i></p>	<p>The guidance in this para is succinct and to the point.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<i>minor way to thereby dispense with many of the other negative and prescriptive policy statements that then follow.</i>		
	<p>Para 4.09</p> <p><i>This policy proposal is not appropriate and not necessary. It is entirely negative in its approach.</i></p>	The guidance in this para is succinct and to the point.	No change to SPD
	<p>Para 4.10</p> <p><i>The policy statement is meaningless. It provides no guidance as to indicate what is required.</i></p>	The guidance in this para is succinct and to the point.	No change to SPD
	<p>Para 4.11</p> <p><i>The justification to the policy refers to ‘regional in character’, whereas in the earlier part of the SPD, it is indicated that the intention is to create a ‘Menston character’ to the proposed development. The justification indicates that garden walls should be designed to allow the planting of hedging and shrubs. The purpose for this is not understood. The statement appears to be in conflict with paragraph 2.55.</i></p> <p>The requirement for gritstone walls appears to be the requirement to mimic selected elements of historic styles and as such appears to be in conflict with the requirements set out under paragraph 4.09. The requirement is onerous and the justification for this requirement is not substantiated in the SPD.</p>	<p>The wording in italics following the word “SPD” provides the guidance for boundary walls treatments for each of the sites. This statement does not conflict with para 2.55, as para 2.55 describes existing boundary treatments around the village.</p> <p>Gritstone walls, as a requirement is not onerous. As a feature they will be in keeping with much of the character of the area.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Para 4.12</p> <p><i>The layout of development should reflect the organic growth of the village which means that some idiosyncratic buildings do randomly occur with inconsistent heights and materials and including extravagant gestures. A policy requirement not to incorporate what is an established pattern within the village context is at odds with the policy requirement of this paragraph.</i></p>	<p>Organic growth can take place without idiosyncratic buildings. This para clearly seeks to avoid extravagant architectural features that are not functional to any proposed buildings.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>
	<p>Para 4.13</p> <p><i>The justification and the policy are meaningless and in any event subjective in its assessment.</i></p>	<p>This para refers to the quality of design. While “design” is a subjective issue, it is clear in the SPD that the development should not be of poor quality.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>
	<p>Para 4.14</p> <p><i>The justification and the policy are self-contradictory. The justification requires that development should not increase on street parking and the policy indicates that on-street parking should be encouraged. Further comment about car parking is made at paragraph 4.34.</i></p>	<p>See previous comments to para 3.27 that relate to parking</p>	<p>See previous comments to para 3.27 that relate to parking</p>
	<p>Para 4.15 & 4.16</p> <p>The proposals are too prescriptive and unreasonably restrictive. The issues raised could more simply be addressed by the requirement that the development schemes should address the issues of lighting and street furniture comprehensively and as a positive element of urban design.</p>	<p>The Council disagrees; these paras provide design guidance on lighting and street furniture and are not unreasonable.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Para 4.17</p> <p><i>The sentiment of the paragraph is supported in its general intention but it would appear that the following paragraphs 4.18-4.20 are in fact intended to be sub-paragraphs to this general introduction, particularly as the paragraph ends with a colon.</i></p> <p><i>The subsequent paragraphs however do not follow by necessity and are not supported by any evidence, reason or justification.</i></p>	<p>For clarity the final sentence of para 4.17 should be deleted and para 4.17 merged with para 4.18.</p> <p>The Council disagrees with this statement, as the role of SPDs such as this is to provide a design brief. These paras do just that in specifying that any development on the site is of a high quality contemporary design, which avoids high points within the site and historic field boundaries</p>	<p>Amend SPD by a) deleting the following words from para 4.17 “<i>There are however a number of useful suggestions that would help to introduce a Menston flavour to the new development</i>”. And b) merging para 4.17 with 4.18</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>
	<p>Para 4.18</p> <p><i>This requirement is contradicted to other requirements of the SPD and is not supported by example or justification.</i></p>	<p>The Council disagrees with this statement as throughout the document specific reference has been made to seeking high quality contemporary architecture on these sites.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>
	<p>Para 4.19</p> <p><i>The guidance for development on the ‘high points’ is not reflected in the Framework set out in Section 3.</i></p>	<p>Partly agree. The wording in this para is incorrect with reference to the avoidance of high points. This para needs to be amended so that it reflects the guidance in the Planning Frameworks in section 3.</p>	<p>Amend para 4.19 as follows, “<i>SPD: New development will respect historic field boundaries. Development along high points of the sites should be low density and landscaped to minimise impact.</i>”</p>
	<p>Para 4.20</p> <p><i>The justification sentence is incoherent. The policy does not flow from the references in the justification, which are to ‘the surrounding</i></p>	<p>Agreed. This sentence has been taken from the Conservation Area Assessment and needs to be amended to include the word “<i>the surrounding (conservation) area</i>” for clarity</p>	<p>Amend the first sentence of para 4.20 as follows “<i>the surrounding (conservation) area</i>” for clarity</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	area'.		
	<p>Para 4.21</p> <p><i>Again the justification sentence is incoherent. How can a view be kept 'visible'? Again the policy proposal is in conflict with the Framework. It is unclear how these contradictions should be interpreted. The policy objective is unclear and unclearly stated.</i></p>	<p>Partly agree. The wording in the first sentence of this para needs to correctly reflect the words in the Conservation Area Assessment. However, the importance of preserving vistas is not in conflict with the document and is reflected throughout the document, most notably by the proposed block layout of any new development.</p>	<p>Delete the first sentence of para 4.21 and replace as follows <i>"Important views and vista should be preserved. Key buildings should be kept visible and spaces between buildings maintained where they allow important visual linkages across the settlement"</i></p> <p>Amend second sentence as follows, <i>"New development will allow views in and out of the site, extending..."</i></p>
	<p>Para 4.22</p> <p><i>The justification sentence is incoherent and meaningless. The policy fails to give clear guidance.</i></p>	<p>Partly agree. This para seeks to respect the scale and proportions of existing surrounding buildings within the new development where appropriate. The diagram accompanying para 2.19 shows the architectural quality of buildings within the settlement and some adjoining these sites are not of the highest quality. However, it is noted that some of the wording in this para is not appropriate.</p>	<p>Amend para 4.22 by deleting the final sentence.</p>
	<p>Para 4.23</p> <p>This does not amount to either guidance or policy. The Council's stance within the SPD on materials is entirely unclear due to the use of inappropriate or imprecise language. The use of the term 'artificial materials' is unclear and ambiguous. It would appear the guidance wishes to avoid the use of artificial stone as a facing material. It may or may not be the case that the Council do not wish to permit the use of replica or re-production materials</p>	<p>Partly agree. The wording within this para needs to provide more detailed guidance on the use of materials in the new development. This is defined in paras 2.53, 2.54 and the diagrams accompanying para 3.16.</p>	<p>Amend para 4.23 by deleting the words after the first sentence and replacing with <i>"SPD: The use of natural stone should be used in certain key locations, in particular land mark buildings and development visible from the entry routes into both the village and the sites. Reconstituted stone should not be used. Brick or render, both found in buildings close to both sites, should be used in preference to the use of artificial material"</i></p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	in external cladding. However on a strict interpretation of 'artificial' there could be a bar on manufactured material which would include brick. That clearly is not the intention but what overall constraint is being advocated in the guidance remains unclear.		
	<p>Para 4.24</p> <p><i>This paragraph does not explain its purpose in terms of design guidance. The statement requires some clarity.</i></p>	Agreed. Delete para 4.24 and replace with a general introduction to the Landscape Character Assessment.	Delete para 4.24 and replace with the following text. <i>"The Landscape Character Assessment assesses the distinct character of the landscape that surrounds settlements within the Bradford district. The district is divided into ten character areas, one of which is Wharfedale. Both these sites fall within an area of "Enclosed Pasture" as defined by the Wharfedale Landscape Character Assessment. This recommends that the landscape in this area should be conserved and restored."</i>
	<p>Para 4.25</p> <p>These requirements are over prescriptive. It is assumed the policy is intended to state: -</p> <p>'SPD: Field boundaries and their alignment'.</p>	The Council disagrees, as these requirements will help to retain the character of the area. However, the spelling mistakes are noted	Minor amendment to para 4.25 to read <i>"SPD: Field boundaries and their alignment"</i>
	<p>Para 4.26</p> <p><i>An appropriate policy would be to require tree planting to be of species appropriate to the domestic environment of the Sites. The guidance is unclear particularly as most native species in and around the site are forest scale trees rather than ornamental in form and habit. Parts of the guidance are meaningless, such as</i></p>	The Council disagrees, as these requirements will help to absorb the mass of development into the landscape.	No change to SPD

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<i>the expression 'leylandii style' and the overall impression is of a lack of appreciation of the issues.</i>		
	<p>Para 4.27</p> <p><i>The inadequate language of the paragraph gives rise to a lack of clarity in the guidance. Is it intended a buffer is required and if so how is a buffer to be distinguished from a screen? If the underlying intention (though not expressed in the language) is assumed to be for the transition from the development to the open countryside to be filtered by trees and other planting? That is not what the paragraph states.</i></p>	<p>The language in this para needs to be rephrased to provide clarity. Delete the final sentence of para 4.27 and replace with "Tree planting will be used to create a buffer between the development and the adjacent countryside so that the mass of development can be better absorbed into the landscape."</p>	<p>Delete the final sentence of para 4.27 and replace with, "Tree planting will be used to create a buffer between the development and the adjacent countryside so that the mass of development can be better absorbed into the landscape."</p>
	<p>Para 4.28</p> <p><i>The purpose of this paragraph is unclear and the context of the photographs on the page next to this paragraph and those following is unexplained and not self-evident.</i></p>	<p>Agreed. Delete para 4.28, as it does not add any value to understanding what the SPD is seeking to achieve.</p>	<p>Delete para 4.28</p>
	<p>Para 4.29</p> <p><i>The reference to 'Tall, high density development' is not necessarily excluded from conclusions which flow from the survey and analysis.</i></p>	<p>Delete this para, not for the reasons given by the representee, but because views of interested parties have been taken into account in producing the SPD and are expressed in a separate document entitled 'Statement of Consultation'</p>	<p>Delete para 4.29</p>
	<p>Para 4.30</p> <p><i>The approach/test adopted for this guidance is not that which arises in the planning system</i></p>	<p>Delete this para, not for the reasons given by the representee, but because the SPD represents the Council's approach on how these two sites should</p>	<p>Delete para 4.30</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<i>(i.e. the best suited form) and in consequence the policy is inappropriately prescriptive.</i>	be developed.	
	<p>Para 4.31</p> <p><i>The conclusions of this paragraph do not fully follow from the text of the SPD. The paragraph is characterised as rhetoric rather than guidance and does not assist its understanding.</i></p>	Agreed paras 4.31 – 4.36 reiterates best practice guidance and should be placed in a separate Chapter following Chapter 1 and entitled 'National Design Guidance.'	Amend SPD by moving paras 4.31 – 4.36 on national design best practice into a separate Chapter following Chapter 1 and entitled 'National Design Guidance'.
	<p>Para 4.32</p> <p>Guidance is not provided by this paragraph but could be if the Council identified specific examples of best practice which could be related to this site.</p>		
	<p>Para 4.33</p> <p>It is unclear as to which report is being referred to. Even if the report was identified it would remain unclear as to how its recommendations help interpret the guidance of the SPD.</p>	See response in para 4.31 above. However, by adding the word "CABE" to follow the words in the first sentence "Recommendations of the CABE..." will give clarity to para 4.33	See response in para 4.31 above. Amend para 4.33 by adding the word "CABE" to follow the words in the first sentence "Recommendations of the CABE..." this will give clarity to para 4.33
	<p>Para 4.34</p> <p>The policy in relation to car parking within the development is unclear. Whilst it is agreed that not all parking should be accommodated in rear courts, there are concerns in relation to the principles set out in paragraph 4.35, where it is suggested that the layout should '...rediscover the street as an efficient and safe place to park...' and '... don't park at the back of the block until on-street and frontage options have been exhausted.'</p> <p>The overriding guiding design principles should be</p>	<p>See response in para 4.31 above.</p> <p>The parking principles to be applied to each site are clearly stated in para 3.27.</p>	<p>See response in para 4.31 above.</p> <p>Otherwise no further changes to this para.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	for the impact and intrusion of traffic to be minimised at every opportunity and that streets for people should be designed and not roads for cars. Car parking should be integrated in a manner so as not to visually dominate the street scene, open spaces or communal areas.		
	<p>Para 4.35</p> <p>There will be various options for the location and design of car parking to the front, side and rear of properties. Parking areas should be designed as an integral part of the property and should not reduce the attractiveness of the street, architecture or landscape of the development. The type of parking solution should be related not just to the type of property, but also the function and design of the street within which the properties are designed.</p> <p>It is considered that the design guidance to be developed for the Sites should have regard to advice set out in the DTLR/CABE document 'By Design – Better Places to Live' and the DETR document 'By Design – Urban Design in the Planning System'. These documents suggest that best practice in relation to car parking should include the following principles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parked cars should not be the dominant feature along the street and careful design should minimise visual intrusion on the street scene. • Design in variety to ensure that not one form of parking solution dominates the street or the development. This can avoid the problem of a large number of cars parked to the front of properties. 	<p>See response in para 4.31 above.</p> <p>The parking principles to be applied to each site are clearly stated in para 3.27.</p>	<p>See response in para 4.31 above.</p> <p>Otherwise no further changes to this para.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Where parking is provided in curtilage, it should ideally be located to the side or back of the property. Where rear residential parking courts/areas are provided, these should be limited to not more than ten parking bays and designed as attractive spaces. <p>The above Government/CABE best practice design principles should be adopted to minimise the impact and intrusion of traffic. These principles cannot be achieved within the guidelines set out at paragraph 4.35 of the draft SPD. The suggested design principles in relation to parking would reduce the attractiveness of the street, architecture and landscape of the development and should be reviewed.</p>		
	<p>Para 4.36</p> <p>This paragraph has no relevance to an SPD arising under the RUDP. It provides no design guidance for the Sites.</p>	See response in para 4.31 above.	See response in para 4.31 above.
	<p>Para 4.37</p> <p>This proposition is not based on or arising under any policy in the adopted development plans. It is unsupported by national or regional policy.</p>	Agreed. While the use of a chartered architect is something that the Council would wish to see in drawing up plans and a design for the site, it is not something that the Council can impose upon an applicant.	Delete para 4.37 from the SPD
	<p>Chapter 5 Generally</p> <p>It is understood that the Council are in the process of preparing a Planning Obligations SPD, although it is not known how this will relate to the existing</p>	The reference to developer contributions is made via various policies within the adopted RUDP and is not reliant upon the publication of a Planning Obligations	No change to SPD

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>RUDP and emerging LDF. It would seem appropriate to wait for this SPD to be published in order to ensure that the requirements in this SPD are compatible with the emerging supplementary guidance.</p> <p>There is missing background information regarding some of the detailed financial requirements within this chapter, i.e. Without this background information the consultation process fails to comply with the public participation requirements as set out in the Town and Country Planning Regulations, or indeed the Council's SCI which ensures that <i>"the local community, stakeholders and other interested parties will be consulted on the portfolio of documents that make up the Local Development Framework."</i> – see SPD Preface.</p>	<p>SPD. Although, once adopted the Planning Obligations SPD will be a consideration in the assessment of any subsequent planning application.</p> <p>This SPD has been produced in accordance with the consultation requirements set out in the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 and the still to be adopted SCI.</p> <p>Background documents (that are agreed Council policy) in general are available for the public to view but are not the subject of this consultation exercise.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>
	<p>Paras 5.02 & 5.03</p> <p>The fact that there are separate lists of planning obligations which developers will be expected and may be expected to provide provides uncertainty for the landowners and future developers. The policy context on which the lists of provision are based is not clear and will be questioned further in this section. Indeed not all the requirements relate to existing adopted policies.</p> <p>This paragraph provides a list of planning obligations which the developers <u>will</u> be expected to provide. Included within the list are the provision of a commuted sum for additional train services, Metrocard provision for all households, the provision of a shuttle bus and real-time public</p>	<p>To provide greater certainty the SPD will be amended to include one list.</p> <p>The policy context of this list is clearly covered by adopted RUDP policies UR6, H9, CF2, OS5, TM1, TM2, CF7A and NE4 these policies are referred to later in the main body of text accompanying this chapter.</p> <p>Planning Obligations will be negotiated at planning application. This list is not exhaustive however, for clarity this para should be amended by deleting: <i>"- Commuted sum payment for additional train services - Metrocard provision for all households;</i></p>	<p>Amend SPD by merging paras 5.02 and 5.03 and by deleting the words <i>"Other planning obligations may include:-"</i></p> <p>No change to SPD</p> <p>Amend para 5.02 by deleting: <i>"- Commuted sum payment for additional train services - Metrocard provision for all households; - Shuttle bus provision; - Real time tables"</i> As these are referred to in greater detail</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>transport timetable information. It is considered that this is far too prescriptive as, on detailed assessment of the accessibility of each site and the package of measures that it proves viable to bring forward may not necessarily include all of the above</p> <p>First, the rolling stock operated on the Menston to Leeds railway line is outdated and no longer in production. Additional carriages would not therefore be able to be provided without detriment to other services on other lines. Second, a new 'train set' (i.e. a tractor unit with up to four coaches) costs in the order of £1.5 million and Metro advise that at least two 'train sets' would be required to achieve a level of service that would not prejudice existing frequencies or therefore existing users. Such a level of investment would not be viable for a combined development of some 348 dwellings. Finally, Metro have advised that even if additional 'train sets' could be provided this would introduce significant signalling problems on the approach to and within Leeds City railway station to the extent that significant peak hour improvements could not be achieved. To include a commitment for a commuted sum towards 'additional train services' would therefore fail one of the tests of Circular 05/2005 which requires obligations to be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development proposed. It is also considered that contributions to new rail services would not be necessary to make the development of 348 new dwellings within Menston acceptable in planning terms.</p>	<p>- <i>Shuttle bus provision;</i> - <i>Real time tables</i>" As these are referred to in greater detail in this chapter and replace with: <i>"Improvements to public transport provision and incentives to encourage the use of public transport"</i></p> <p>A commuted sum towards the cost of increasing train services is not an unreasonable request and would be one assessed in scale and kind to the level of demand generated by each of these developments. In any event, such a precedent has already been set locally in relation to the High Royds development and this is referred to in para 5.73</p>	<p>in elsewhere in chapter 5 and replace with: <i>"Improvements to public transport provision and incentives to encourage the use of public transport"</i></p> <p>No change to SPD</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Para 5.03</p> <p>There is no further reference within this chapter to obligations that may be required, therefore their inclusion within the SPD is concerning, and provides uncertainty. The inclusion of such possible requirements leads us to believe there may be further requirements added to this list.</p>	To provide greater certainty the SPD will be amended to include one list.	Amend SPD by merging paras 5.02 and 5.03 and by deleting the words <i>"Other planning obligations may include:-"</i>
	<p>Para 5.04</p> <p>Whilst the requirement for such obligations must arise from a clear need, they must also be in accordance with the tests in Circular 05/2005. The lists of requirements in paragraphs 5.02 and 5.03 should be justified and tested against Circular 05/2005.</p>	<p>Noted. This para should be amended to make reference to the requirements in Circular 05/2005.</p> <p>A consequential change is also required to update this para in light of the work currently being undertaken by the Council in producing a Draft Planning Obligations SPD</p>	<p>Amend para 5.04 at the end of the first sentence to state, <i>"in accordance with Circular 05/2005"</i></p> <p>Add the following to the end of para 5.04. <i>"At the time of writing a draft Planning Obligations SPD has been produced by the Council, once adopted, this will form a material planning consideration at planning application."</i></p>
	<p>Para 5.06</p> <p>There are no policy requirements of the RUDP requiring a cumulative impact of development to be considered in terms of the potential release of the Sites contemporaneously.</p>	Noted. It is agreed that that paras 5.06 – 5.08 be deleted from the SPD	Amend SPD by deleting paras 5.06 – 5.08 from the SPD
	<p>Para 5.08</p> <p>This statement provides no clarity of its purpose but rather indicates that the Council are not approaching the issue of planning obligations within the terms of Circular 5/2005 of issues relevant to the development but are seeking to achieve obligations based on the outcome of different development in a neighbouring authority.</p>	See response to para 5.06 above	See response to para 5.06 above

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Para 5.10</p> <p>The Circular 05/2005 tests should be used to test the reasonableness of the requirements listed in paragraph 5.02 and 5.03.</p>	<p>Noted. It is agreed that paras 5.09 – 5.11 be moved to the beginning of this chapter so that Circular 05/2005 sets out the national policy context for which planning obligations for each of these sites will be assessed.</p>	<p>Amend SPD by moving paras 5.09 – 5.11 to the beginning of the Planning Obligations chapter.</p>
	<p>Para 5.12</p> <p>Whilst it may be useful to list the Regional policy justification, the policies referred to do not specify specific financial sums, therefore only justify the principle of the requirement rather than the actual amount as suggested later in this chapter. Furthermore, the emerging policies in the RSS will become relevant once it is adopted but the SPD needs to reflect currently adopted policy.</p>	<p>Noted. The requirements for planning obligations are clearly set out in national and RUDP policies. Regional support of the principle of planning obligations, does not add any value in this context. Paras 5.12 and 5.13 to be deleted from the SPD</p>	<p>Amend SPD by deleting paras 5.12 – 5.13 from the SPD.</p>
	<p>Para 5.14</p> <p>The identified RUDP policies do relate to the listed requirements in para's 5.02 & 5.03, (some rather loosely) although the RUDP policies in some instances do not provide specific figures/formulas, and do not have adopted supplementary guidance. Therefore some of the listed requirements, particularly as to the detailed financial requirements, have no adopted policy context.</p>	<p>The adopted RUDP is the policy framework that we are working to. To date the Council has not adopted a Planning Obligation SPD. However, once the Planning Obligations SPD is adopted, and if each site has not gained planning permission, this will form a material planning consideration at planning application stage. The level of planning obligation is one that is negotiated at planning application stage. This is the procedure that is used across the Council where a planning obligation is required. However, para 5.14 is best placed within the SPD to follow on from para 5.02.</p>	<p>Amend SPD by moving para 5.14 to follow on from para 5.02</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Paras 5.15 – 5.21</p> <p>National planning policy guidance on affordable housing is set out in ‘Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing (PPG3) and in Circular 6/98 ‘Planning and Affordable Housing’ PPG3 requires Local Planning Authorities to plan to meet the housing requirements of the whole community, including those in need of affordable housing: -</p> <p><i>“A community’s need for a mix of housing types, including affordable housing, is a material consideration which should be taken into account when formulating development plan policies and in determining planning applications involving housing. Where there is a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs – <u>as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information – local plans should include a policy for seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments</u>”.</i> (Our emphasis) (Paragraph 14 PPG3)</p> <p>The importance of accurate survey data was stressed within Circular 6/98: -</p> <p><i>“Assessments will need to be rigorous, <u>making clear the assumptions and definitions used</u>, so that they can withstand detailed scrutiny. Double counting of those in need must not occur and full account must be taken of affordable housing already available”.</i> (Our emphasis) (Paragraph 6, Circular 6/98)</p> <p>The research evidence upon which policy H9 of the RUDP is based is stated to comprise the following documents: -</p>	<p>Since the Draft SPD was published and subject of public consultation the guidance relating to affordable housing (namely PPG3 and Circular 6/98) has been superseded and is now replaced by Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) Housing. The new guidance came into force on 1st April 2007. The SPD will need to be updated accordingly.</p> <p>Update para 5.18 to take account of more recent research and survey work relating to affordable housing</p>	<p>Amend paras 5.15 and 5.16 by deleting all references to PPG3 and Circular 6/98 and replacing with PPS3 to take account of recent changes to the guidance relating to affordable housing.</p> <p>Amend para 5.18 by adding an * at the end of the 2nd bullet point as follows,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>“Local Housing Assessment**”</i>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Modelling Housing Markets in Bradford 2000'(MHMB) • 'Local Housing Assessment 2000' (LHA) • 'The Joint Housing Strategy 2000 – 2010' (JHS 2000) • 'A Decent Home in a Decent neighbourhood – Joint Housing Strategy 2003 -2010' (JHS 2003) <p>The Strategy documents outline the policies the Council intends to pursue to address the findings of the LHA and MHMB research documents. They do not represent research evidence in their own right.</p> <p>In July 2000 the DETR published 'Local Housing Needs Assessment; A Guide to Good Practice'. The guide set out the recommended methodology that local authorities follow when undertaking an assessment of local housing need.</p> <p>The objective of the methodology set out in table 2.1 of the guide is to establish whether there is a need for <u>additional</u> affordable housing in the area beyond that already predicted.</p> <p>The methodology set out in Table 2.1 of the DETR Guide involves adding the annualised 'backlog needs' figure to an annual 'newly arising' needs figure before deducting an annualised figure for 'supply of affordable units' to establish if there is a surplus/deficit. The objective is to establish if there is a need for</p>		<p>Add a further bullet point at the end of the para and some extra text as follows,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>"Rural Housing Enablers Surveys</i> <p><i>*The Local Housing Assessment is due to be replaced in 2007 and will form a material planning consideration at planning application."</i></p> <p>The following consequential changes are being made to this section to give clarity to the document: -</p> <p>Delete para 5.17, as the Regional Spatial Strategy does not add any value to the document.</p> <p>Delete para 5.19 as this refers to the district and not Menston, the information in this para may become quickly out of date with regard to the imminent publication of the 2007 Local Housing Assessment.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p><u>additional</u> affordable housing in the area beyond that already predicted and thus inform the Council's preparation of planning and housing policies.</p> <p>The DETR guide confirms that:- <i>'..the table presents a basic needs assessment model which all local authorities should try to follow..'</i> (DETR Guide, para 2.3 page 21). And the model is summarised as: -</p> <p><i>B : Backlog of existing need (times a quota) plus N : Newly arising need (minus) S : Supply of affordable units = Net shortfall (Surplus) affordable units per year.</i> (DETR Guide Table 2a, page 22)</p> <p>Neither the MHMB nor LHA research document is in accordance with the methodology adopted in the guide. They are neither rigorous, nor up-to-date. The DETR Guide states: <i>'Is it to be practicable, or indeed good value for money, to undertake a major review of the housing needs assessment, including the collection of new data through surveys every year. A more likely pattern is for these major reviews and surveys to be carried out at 3 – 5 year intervals'</i> (DETR Guide para 8.1, page 101)</p> <p>Consequently, owing to the passage of time since the research was undertaken, these documents can be considered to be of little relevance. They do not form a sound basis for the determination of an affordable housing policy.</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Guidance is given to Councils in both Circular 6/98 and PPG3 as to how they should interpret affordability; they are instructed that policies for affordable housing should:-</p> <p><i>“define what the authority considers to be affordable in the local plan area in terms of the relationship between local income levels and house prices or rents for different types of households;”</i> (Paragraph 15, page 9, PPG3 2000)</p> <p>No such definition has ever been provided by the Council in order to justify the 40% affordable housing ‘quota’ for development sites in the Wharfedale area. In connection with the MHMB study only 47% of respondents to the survey would provide information on their net household income. In the Wharfedale area this figure increased to almost 73%. It is difficult to accept that such a result represents a ‘rigorous’ assessment of the type envisaged by guidance.</p> <p>In seeking to identify areas where there may be a shortfall of affordable accommodation the LHA used the valuation of properties within Council tax ‘band A’ (up to £40,000) as a ‘proxy’ for affordable housing. It then derived a household income requirement to purchase a property at this cost of £15,200 per annum, assuming a 95% mortgage and a 2.5 times income multiplier. Using local incomes data it concluded that 31.8% of households in the Wharfedale area could not afford to purchase at this price.</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Such a simplistic approach fails to distinguish between the incomes of those already adequately housed within the area, and those households that are newly forming or may have already formed (and are concealed) that are seeking to access the housing market. Neither does it give any consideration to the ability of households to access suitable accommodation in the private rented sector. An assessment undertaken in accordance with the DETR guidance would have addressed this issue and would therefore be considered more robust.</p> <p>It can be seen therefore that the Council have failed to undertake a robust assessment of local housing need, therefore it is inappropriate to impose a requirement for affordable housing through a site specific SPD.</p> <p>The DETR guidance also emphasises the need for account to be taken of any existing or planned supply of affordable housing when determining the requirement for new provision. The research undertaken suggests that throughout Bradford, the provision of affordable housing would appear to be evenly balanced, although mismatches of supply and demand may exist in certain areas.</p> <p>Whilst Menston, as an element of the Wharfedale area is presented as requiring new affordable provision, it forms part of a wider housing market area incorporating North West Leeds. Therefore any consideration of the supply of affordable housing in the area should have regard to the fact</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	that 109 new affordable dwellings are being provided by way of planning obligation as part of the 'High Royds Village' development on the site of the former hospital. These dwellings are to be provided through a Registered Social Landlord, and will be allocated according to local needs, irrespective of administrative boundaries. Therefore the requirement for any new affordable housing provision in Menston should have regard to current and planned supply at High Royds.		
	<p>Paras 5.22 – 5.26</p> <p>The draft SPD seeks to impose a requirement for 40% affordable housing to be provided on both Sites. Policy H9 of the RUDP states that: -</p> <p><i>“On planning applications for substantial residential development The Council will negotiate for a proportion of affordable housing based on the extent and type of need, the suitability of the site or building in the case of conversions, and the economics of provision.”</i> (our emphasis)</p> <p>It is wholly inappropriate therefore for this draft SPD to fetter the development potential of these Sites through the prescription of a fixed level of affordable housing provision.</p> <p>This matter was considered at the inquiry into the RUDP when the inspector commented in respect of the 40% 'Quota' for Wharfedale:-</p> <p><i>“...Paragraph 6.36 indicates that whilst the Joint Housing Strategy points to a 40% quota for Wharfedale, the overall situation in the housing market area would only be one of the relevant</i></p>	<p>It is clear from policy H9 that the level of affordable housing will be <u>negotiated</u> on each site. It is also clear in para 6.27 of the adopted RUDP that 40% of the total development is the percentage that the Council will seek to achieve for affordable housing. This figure is based on the latest research and survey work listed in para 5.18. (See response no. 47 to comments made by White, Young and Green)</p> <p>Since the Draft SPD was published and subject of public consultation the guidance relating to affordable housing (namely PPG3 and Circular 6/98) has been superseded and is now replaced by Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) Housing. The new guidance came into force on 1st April 2007. Para 5.23 of the SPD therefore needs to be amended to reflect the new national thresholds identified for affordable housing in PPS3.</p>	<p>No change to para 5.22</p> <p>Amend the first sentence in para 5.23 to reflect new minimum site size thresholds for affordable housing in PPS3 as follows, <i>“For the purposes of the policy, substantial means sites of 1 hectare and above or developments yielding 25 15 dwellings or more, this reflects the national policy advice on affordable housing in PPS3.”</i></p> <p>Delete para 5.25 as the Supplementary</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p><i>considerations. The basis for assessing need for, and quantity of, affordable housing will be done on a site specific basis. A developer would not therefore automatically be asked to provide 40% affordable housing within a development..” (our emphasis) (Paragraph 6.125 – Bradford RUDP: Inspector’s Report)</i></p> <p>Furthermore national guidance is clear that site size, suitability and the economics of provision should be taken into account in preparing plan policies for the provision of affordable housing. Local Planning Authorities should consider:-</p> <p><i>‘whether the provision of affordable housing would prejudice the realisation of other planning objectives that need to be given priority in the development of the site.’ (Paragraph 10 i), Circular 6/98)</i></p> <p>In addition to the provision of affordable housing, the draft SPD outlines the following planning obligations which developers will be expected to provide: - commuted sum education contributions, on site provision and maintenance of children’s play areas, commuted sum playing pitch contributions, Metrocard provision for all households, shuttle bus provision and real time tables. Significant improvements to the local highway network are also sought. It is further suggested that contributions toward improvements to existing community facilities and a planting management scheme may also be required.</p> <p>In establishing the level of affordable housing</p>	<p>As a consequence of changes to national guidance and updated affordable housing studies, the Supplementary Planning Guidance referred to in para 5.25 has largely been superseded and it is therefore proposed that this para is deleted</p>	<p>Planning Guidance on Affordable Housing 1999 referred to has been superseded by advice in PPS3.</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>provision required, the Council do not appear to have considered the priority that needs to be given to other planning objectives in order to make development of these Sites acceptable. The level of affordable housing sought will deter development and prevent these objectives being attained. In the absence of an evidence base and detailed site viability there can be no case for a 40% affordable housing requirement.</p> <p>The prematurity of the SPD is evident with regards to the specific affordable housing requirements. Given that the Sites are Phase 2, and therefore not expected for release until 2009, it is uncertain what the actual affordable housing requirement will be at this time, particularly since the emerging RSS Policy H3 is uncertain, but in draft stage sets a provision of between 0 – 29% in Bradford.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Council are about to publish a Housing Needs Survey, which may include further market need intelligence that differs from the current 40% 'requirement' for the Wharfedale area. Indeed paragraph 6.37 of the RUDP refers to the regular review and revision of data to ensure the most relevant and up-to-date information is used – <i>'this application of up-to-date local data is considered to be a flexible, reasonable and realistic approach to the delivery of affordable housing.'</i></p> <p>Additionally, national housing policy (PPS3) will have replaced the existing PPG3 by the time the Sites are released. PPS 3 may include an alternative approach to the delivery of affordable housing provision. The specific 40% requirement is</p>	<p>In response to these comments para 5.18 has been updated to take account of more recent and imminent studies relating to affordable housing (see previous response to paras 5.15 – 5.21)</p>	

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>too prescriptive and is premature in light of the various emerging local, regional and national information.</p> <p>While taking advice from the Council's Housing Strategy Section and Rural Housing Enablers may provide useful information if it is outside the remit of the information in adopted policy.</p>		
	<p>Para 5.27 – 5.34</p> <p>It is important to allow for flexibility and negotiation when an application comes forward. Therefore paragraph 5.28 which seeks to define a tenure mix by reference to a range of house types is particularly unhelpful, is in contradiction to Circular 6/98 and should be removed from the SPD.</p> <p>The defined tenure mix also appears to run contrary to paragraph 5.26 of the SPD which states:-</p> <p><i>“Advice will be taken from the Council’s Housing Strategy Section as well as the Rural Housing Enablers to ensure the correct mix of affordable housing...”</i></p> <p>It is clearly inappropriate to suggest a tenure mix so prescribed in advance of a planning application being submitted.</p> <p>The SPD attempts to define affordable housing by imposing prescriptive tenure mixes, a matter that was not debated during examination of RUDP policy H9 at inquiry. The Council can therefore be seen to be attempting to</p>	<p>As stated above new guidance on affordable housing in PPS3 now replaces PPS3 and Circular 6/98. However, comments made by Mr Wright relating to paras 5.27 – 5.33 being too prescriptive allowing little flexibility for negotiation at planning application is noted. However, this change will not jeopardize the Council negotiating for affordable housing on the site at planning application stage. Any such negotiations can now take place using advice and information available at that time relating to local needs for affordable housing.</p> <p>In addition the discounts referred to in paras 5.30 – 5.32 will become out of date if house prices increase at current rates. It is therefore proposed that these paras are deleted from the document and this issue assessed at planning application.</p> <p>As a means to ensure to correct that all tenure mix is covered a minor amendment is proposed to para 5.26 to include <i>“sheltered housing for the elderly”</i></p>	<p>Amend SPD by deleting paras 5.27 – 5.33 in their entirety.</p> <p>Amend para 5.26 to include the words in the last part of the para, <i>“...of the right type (bungalows, houses, sheltered housing for the elderly and</i></p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>circumvent the tenure neutrality that is imposed by the Circular.</p> <p>It is apparent that this draft SPD attempts to change policy. The Council can therefore be criticised for attempting to prescribe a definition of affordable housing that does not conform to Circular 6/98 nor the adopted plan.</p> <p>This attempt to prescribe tenure is indicative of the thrust of this SPD to fetter development with restrictions that would not have survived a Local Plan Inquiry process.</p> <p>PPG3 published in 2000 confirms that Circular 06/98 Planning and Affordable Housing continues to apply within the framework of the revised PPG. This states;</p> <p><i>'Planning policy should not be expressed in favour of any particular form of tenure. Therefore, the terms "affordable housing" or "affordable homes" are used in this Circular to encompass both low-cost market and subsidised housing (irrespective of tenure, ownership – whether exclusive or shared – or financial arrangements) that will be available to people who cannot afford to rent or buy houses generally available on the open market.'</i></p> <p>(paragraph 4, Circular 6/98)</p> <p>Whilst the information relating to size, mix and tenure of affordable housing may be up to date, it is not based on any adopted policy. Since the Sites are phase 2 sites they should await the updated Affordable Housing SPD. It is not clear what this</p>		flats)..."

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>'advice' is based on in terms of the most up-to-date information, or indeed the status of this information – has it had the benefit of public consultation?</p> <p>Paragraph 5.28 includes a rather general statement relating to first time buyers' average income in the area being likely to fall well short of the average income. Why is this, and what is it based on? There is no justification as to why a purchasing power of £77,000 is more realistic (making a joint average income of £25,666) Is there any evidence as to where this figure comes from or why it is just under £12,000 less than the joint average income in Wharfedale. It is convenient that this 'realistic' figure of £77,000 is 40% less than the average open market value of a 1 bed flat, therefore justifying the requirement of 40% discount for discounted units for sale.</p> <p>Again, it is unclear as to how the 50% discount figure is derived in terms of dwellings to be made available to an RSL.</p> <p><i>There is no basis in planning guidance for a local planning authority to determine the transfer cost of land or dwellings to a 3rd party. This matter was considered at the Tewkesbury Borough Council Local Plan Inquiry and the inspector concluded:-</i></p> <p>'...it goes beyond the remit of the Plan to seek to influence the value at which land will be transferred. The inclusion of the references to free land in the Plan is in conflict with the advice in Circular 1/97 and</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>6/98 and should be deleted.’ <i>(Inspector’s Report, paragraph 1.3.21.12)</i></p> <p>Circular 5/05: Planning Obligations has now replaced and updated Circular 1/97. It advises that:-</p> <p><i>‘Planning obligations should not be used solely to resolve existing deficiencies in infrastructure provision....’ (B9)</i></p> <p>and furthermore that:-</p> <p><i>‘...planning obligations should never be used purely as a means of securing for the local community a share in the profits of development i.e. as a means of securing a ‘betterment levy’ ‘ (B7)</i></p> <p>In this regard it is of particular concern that in paragraphs 5.33 and 5.34 the Council are stipulating the transfer price mechanism through which a developer of the Sites must provide RSL accommodation but make no reference to the likely availability of Social Housing Grant. Circular 6/98 confirms at paragraph 9 and 33(A)(c) that public subsidy should be taken into consideration during negotiations and that if it is agreed to sell dwellings to an RSL the number i.e. the proportion will be dictated by the funding available or a different method of provision agreed.</p> <p>Affordable housing provision of the magnitude</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>sought by the Council without recourse to public subsidy will deter these Sites being brought forward for development.</p> <p>SPD referred to for development control purposes must conform with the guidance in PPS12: Development Plans which instructs:-</p> <p><i>Supplementary planning documents may contain policies which expands or supplements the policies in the development plan documents. However, <u>policies which should be included in a development plan document and subjected to proper independent scrutiny in accordance with the statutory procedures should not be set out in supplementary planning documents</u></i>"(our emphasis)</p> <p>Paragraph 2.44, PPS12: Development Plans)</p> <p>Furthermore, when local planning authorities are drawing up planning obligations to secure affordable housing Circular 6/98 specifically advises:-</p> <p><i>'..local planning authorities should ensure that they [planning obligations] are consistent with the general guidance on the use of obligations set out in Circular 1/97..' (paragraph 17, Circular 6/98).</i></p> <p>The DTLR examined the practice of local planning authorities seeking to secure funding from developers and, in their publication of February 2002 "Delivering Affordable Housing Through Planning Policy" commented:-</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p><i>'It is our understanding that the planning process has no locus to provide such detailed guidance on financial matters' (para 8.3.12)</i></p> <p><i>'There was some evidence that concerns about lack of SHG [Social Housing Grant] underlay the approach taken by many [local planning authorities], but nowhere did we find any clear explanation as to why the developer/landowner should be expected to bridge the funding gap thus created...the fact that such policies were normally contained in SPG and not in the Local Plan or UDP also gave grounds for concern.'</i> (para 8.3.21)</p> <p>The local planning authority should enter into negotiations regarding the type of provision and, if it is agreed by both parties that it is preferable to sell dwellings to an RSL, the number of dwellings provided should be adjusted to match the funding available. This pragmatic approach is confirmed at paragraph 33(A)(c) in Circular 6/98.</p> <p>This approach is reiterated in the Consultation Paper of PPS 3 which advises that:</p> <p><i>'Local Planning authorities should balance the need for affordable housing against the viability of Sites in their area. This will involve having regard to the implications of competing land uses and making informed assumptions about the levels of finance available for affordable housing. Local planning authorities should aim to manage the risks in terms of delivery to</i></p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p><i>ensure they achieve their affordable housing targets. The companion guide sets out an approach that local authorities may use if the assumed level of finance available for affordable housing is not forthcoming and provides examples of innovative ways of delivering affordable housing where this is the case or to supplement the delivery of affordable housing.</i>" (Paragraph 27, Page 15, Draft PPS3)</p> <p>There is nothing in existing or emerging national guidance that states that a local planning authority can insist that a specific tenure of affordable housing should be provided irrespective of the availability of public subsidy. Rather, the guidance is that the type and proportion sought should be flexible in response to the availability of public subsidy.</p> <p>It is evident that the Council is attempting to secure funding rather than adopt land use policies and references to provision irrespective of grant availability should be deleted. In particular it is evident that no consideration, other than the assumption that a Council may impose prescriptive requirements irrespective of the availability of the necessary public subsidy, has been given to the availability of sufficient public subsidy to support the tenure split being proposed.</p> <p>It is explicit in paragraphs 5.33 and 5.34 of the SPD that the Council are predisposed towards the involvement of RSLs in the provision of affordable housing whereas Circular 6/98 advises that:-</p>		

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p><i>'Local planning authorities should not prescribe which partners developers should use to deliver the affordable housing, but rather should aim to ensure that arrangements will deliver the objectives of the policy as set out in the local plan.'</i> (para. 17, Circular 6/98)</p> <p>SPD should confirm it is not necessary to involve an RSL in the provision of affordable housing as is made explicitly clear in paragraph 34 of Circular 6/98.</p> <p>This general position is re-affirmed in the Housing Act 2004 (S27a) which allows Social Housing Grant to be paid to non-RSL organisations and makes provision for any such dwellings funded in this manner to be managed by non-RSL organisations. The SPD does not contemplate this degree of flexibility. Furthermore, the recently produced Golden Triangle 'best practice' report, which was prepared in partnership with LA's, Housing Associations and the private sector within the North Leeds, Harrogate and York housing market area makes recommendations for the delivery of affordable housing in this high value market area. Menston is revealed to be just outside the Golden Triangle area; however the Golden Triangle recommendations are thought to be relevant. Of particular relevance, the document states – 'delivering 25% on site affordable housing provision, without the use of SHG, is an established benchmark within the Golden Triangle.'</p>		
	<p><i>Education Contributions – General</i></p> <p>Policy CF2 is the relevant RUDP policy, however</p>	<p>Policy CF2 establishes that planning obligations will be sought where a development is likely to result for an</p>	<p>Amend SPD by adding a further para following para 5.45 that refers to the Planning Obligations SPD that is currently</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>there is no adopted supplementary guidance relating to financial contributions and formulae to be used to calculate contributions. There is no publicly available information or guidance to allow private developers to calculate or aide negotiations in terms of education contributions. The RUDP specifically refers to the process of negotiations; therefore it is surprising that the SPD includes actual S106 requirements. This suggested fixed fee (based on 2006 figures) is too prescriptive, is contrary to the RUDP and should not be included in the SPD, given the number of assumptions that have been made in calculating and including the financial requirements, e.g. it is not even certain how many dwellings in total will be developed on each site.</p>	<p>increased demand for educational facilities. The SPD on Planning Obligations has yet to be adopted, this will include a subsection on education contributions, once adopted the SPD will form a material planning consideration.</p> <p>However, the comment in relation to establishing a fixed fee is noted, particularly as the number of family units is not yet established on each site.</p> <p>The following consequential changes are proposed to the document: -</p> <p>As a consequence of changes to para 5.45, para 5.44 needs to be amended for clarity</p> <p>Delete reference to PPG3 in para 5.35 as this has been superseded</p> <p>Delete para 5.36 as reference to the Regional Spatial Strategy here does not add any value to the document.</p>	<p>being produced by the Council. Amend as follows, <i>"It is important to note that a Planning Obligations SPD is being produced by the Council. Once adopted, this will form a material planning consideration in the assessment of any contributions to education provision that are likely to arise as a result of these developments."</i></p> <p>Amend SPD by deleting the table in para 5.45</p> <p>Delete para 5.44 and section subheading and replace with the following, <i>"The Section 106 education contribution will be based on advice from Bradford Education, for primary school provision and Education Leeds for secondary school provision."</i></p> <p>Amend SPD by deleting the second sentence of para 5.35 relating to PPG3.</p> <p>Amend SPD by deleting para 5.36</p>
	<p>Para 5.43 It seems premature to state that it is expected that</p>	<p>An assessment of education provision and the needs for education arising from</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>new residential development at both Sites will be required to contribute monies towards primary and secondary school places, due to any previous surplus being taken up by the High Royds Village development, given that it is still not totally clear when the Sites will be released for development. That said, information in the Sustainability Appraisal provides further detail regarding surplus space (or lack of) in nearby schools.</p> <p>Interestingly, paragraph 3.61 of the Sustainability Appraisal reveals that the High Royds development made no contribution towards education provision. It therefore seems that the requested financial contribution from the Sites appears to compensate for the lack of contribution made from the High Royds development.</p>	<p>these developments will be assessed and negotiated at planning application stage.</p>	
	<p><u>Para 5.45</u> The Bradford and Leeds LEAs' advice regarding contributions for Primary and Secondary provision has not been the subject of public consultation. We consider it is unnecessary to include within the SPD the 2006 figures because they will be outdated by the time the Sites are brought forward for development. If DfES Primary and Secondary School Cost Multipliers, and Location Factors are to be referred to, the details of them should be included in the SPD for consideration. The background information is not available and therefore the 'proper process of public consultation' is not being adhered to.</p>	<p>See amendments to para 5.45 above under Education Contributions – General</p>	<p>See amendments to para 5.45 above</p>
	<p><u>Public Open Space Provision and Maintenance – Generally</u> The calculation of provision is reliant on knowledge of the type of dwellings to be built, which is as yet</p>	<p>Noted. The figure referred to in para 5.59 is to be deleted; however a commuted</p>	<p>Amend SPD by deleting the last sentence of para 5.59</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>unknown. Therefore the suggested £100,000 commuted sum for each site is rightly identified as <i>purely indicative</i>. This does beg the question of the relevance of including it as the actual figure could be considerably different.</p> <p>While we welcome the preparation of a detailed strategy for playing pitch provision it is questionable how this relates to the adopted RUDP. The current SPG is arguably out of date ('Provision of Children's Play Space Within New Residential Development' December 1994); therefore it would be preferable to replace the current SPG with an updated SPD that relates specifically to RUDP policy. This should be made clear within this SPD and any forthcoming LDS.</p>	<p>sum for maintenance works will be required as part of the section 106 agreement.</p> <p>The SPG on 'Provision of Children's Play Space Within New Residential Development' is not referred to in this document; however your point is noted, as this document is largely out of date. The Council now proposes in the current LDS to produce an SPD on Open Space and Built Recreational Facilities. A further para is required in the SPD to reflect this change.</p> <p>The following consequential changes are proposed to this section of the document to make it more up to date: -</p> <p>Para 5.47 1st sentence, add the following italics to "legal agreements <i>under section 106</i>". Delete last sentence of this para.</p> <p>Para 5.48 Policy OS5 is inaccurately described. This needs amending to reflect policy OS5 in its entirety.</p>	<p>Amend SPD by adding a further para to follow on from para 5.51 as follows, <i>"An Open Space and Built Recreational Facilities SPD is currently being produced by the Council. This will establish the needs for open space and built recreational facilities in the various parts of the district. Once adopted, this will form a material planning consideration at planning application."</i></p> <p>The following consequential changes are proposed to this section of the document.</p> <p>Para 5.47 1st sentence, add the following italics to "legal agreements <i>under section 106</i>". Delete last sentence of this para.</p> <p>Para 5.48 delete policy wording in italics and replace with,</p> <p><i>"New residential development will be required to make appropriate provision of or equivalent commuted payment for:</i></p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>(1) Recreation open space, including children's play space and informal open space, to a minimum standard of 20 square metres per dwelling (including a suitably</i></p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>Para 5.49 Delete</p> <p>Para 5.50 Delete following words that form part of the last sentence, <i>“which provides a more detailed assessment than that provide by the NPFA standard.”</i></p> <p>Para 5.51 Delete last sentence of this para</p> <p>Para 5.52 Delete</p> <p>Amend para 5.59 so that it reads as follows, <i>A commuted sum will be required for the maintenance of open space provided as part of these developments, this will form part of the section 106 contribution for each site and cover a period of 20 years.</i></p> <p>The following subsection has been</p>	<p><i>designed and equipped play area in developments of 0.8ha or 50 or more dwellings); and</i></p> <p><i>(2) Playing fields, to a minimum standard of 40 square metres per dwelling</i></p> <p><i>Provision will be located within the site, however where this is inappropriate, off site provision or improvements to existing local provision can be suitable alternatives. Developers will be required to make arrangements for adequate maintenance of any new provision”</i></p> <p>Delete para 5.49</p> <p>Para 5.50 Delete following words that form part of the last sentence, <i>“which provides a more detailed assessment than that provide by the NPFA standard.”</i></p> <p>Para 5.51 Delete last sentence of this para</p> <p>Para 5.52 Delete</p> <p>Amend para 5.59 so that it reads as follows, <i>A commuted sum will be required for the maintenance of open space provided as part of these developments, this will form part of the section 106 contribution for each site and cover a period of 20 years.</i></p> <p>Add a further sub section and associated text to follow para 5.59 entitled “Built</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>omitted from the draft SPD and needs to be included so that planning obligations are clearly stated. Add a further sub section and associated text as follows, “Built Facilities For Community Sport and Recreation</p> <p><i>Within Menston, Kirklands Community Centre is used for a range of uses. The centre is well used by the community, often to capacity, 7 days a week. There are churches and the primary school that are also used. At planning application an assessment of the impact that these new developments will have on community facilities in the village will need to be made. This approach is supported by RUDP Policy CF7A which states that,</i></p> <p><i>Where major development proposals would result in an increased demand for built recreational facilities which cannot be met by existing facilities a developer may be required to enter into a planning obligation under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, in order to secure the provision of, or contribution towards, new or extended facilities.</i></p> <p><i>As stated earlier the Council is currently producing an Open Space and Built Recreational Facilities SPD. Once adopted this will form a material planning consideration at planning application stage.”</i></p>	<p>Facilities For Community Sport and Recreation”</p> <p><i>Within Menston, Kirklands Community Centre is used for a range of uses. The centre is well used by the community, often to capacity, 7 days a week. There are churches and the primary school that are also used. At planning application an assessment of the impact that these new developments will have on community facilities in the village will need to be made. This approach is supported by RUDP Policy CF7A which states that,</i></p> <p><i>Where major development proposals would result in an increased demand for built recreational facilities which cannot be met by existing facilities a developer may be required to enter into a planning obligation under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, in order to secure the provision of, or contribution towards, new or extended facilities.</i></p> <p><i>As stated earlier the Council is currently producing an Open Space and Built Recreational Facilities SPD. Once adopted this will form a material planning consideration at planning application stage.”</i></p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>Transport Requirements – Generally</p> <p>The cumulative affect of the transport requirements appears unreasonable, and they are not all based on adopted RUDP policies.</p>		
	<p>Para 5.63</p> <p>This identifies a number of highway safety issues, access and circulation difficulties and lack of public transport capacity in Menston. The paragraph subsequently requires a ‘Traffic Impact Assessment’ (Transport Assessment) to be submitted with each planning application. It is recommended that this should be reworded to require a ‘Transport Assessment’ which will consider sustainable transport policies and objectives as well as pure traffic impact and road network capacity.</p>	<p>Noted. This para should be amended by deleting all references to “<i>Traffic Impact Assessments</i>” and replacing with “<i>full detailed Transport Assessment</i>”</p> <p>Reference to a Scoping Study is missing from this section and needs to be included. As a consequence of this change add the following words after the 3rd sentence, “<i>A Scoping Study will be required prior to the submission of a Transport Assessment; the terms of which will need to be agreed with the Council</i>”</p> <p>Reference to a Travel Plan Framework is also missing from para 5.64. It is therefore proposed that reference is made to this at the beginning of the para as follows, “<i>A Travel Plan Framework will need to be submitted with the Transport Assessment, this will look in more detail at the modal split.</i>”</p>	<p>Amend para 5.63 by deleting all references to “Traffic Impact Assessment” and replacing with “<i>full detailed Transport Assessment</i>”</p> <p>Reference to a Scoping Study is missing from this section and needs to be included. As a consequence of this change add the following words after the 3rd sentence, “<i>A Scoping Study will be required prior to the submission of a Transport Assessment; the terms of which will need to be agreed with the Council</i>”</p> <p>Reference to a Travel Plan Framework is missing from para 5.64. Amend para 5.64 so that the 1st sentences is as follows “<i>A Travel Plan Framework will need to be submitted with the Transport Assessment this will look in more detail at the modal split.</i>”</p>
	<p>Para 5.66</p> <p>This sets out site access issues shown on the Faber Maunsell plan number 48665/P/001 included within the draft SPD. This is presented as ‘an illustrative plan’ and yet appears to form the basis</p>	<p>Partly agree. Until a Transport Assessment is undertaken it is premature to include figures on the likely cost of section 278 improvements. On this basis figures should be deleted from this section of the document and will be the</p>	<p>Amend SPD by deleting the costing tables following paras 5.66 and 5.68, as well as any reference to costings in paras 5.66 and 5.68</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>of the calculated financial Section 278 contributions required for site access purposes. It is considered inappropriate to include such calculations within a supplementary planning document without full and detailed assessment carried out by the highway consultants to also be included or available for consideration. This paragraph and the illustrative plan appear to pre-empt the production of any Traffic Impact Assessment/Transport Assessment required within paragraph 5.63 of the draft SPD. Whilst it may be considered appropriate to include the illustrative plan within the SPD as part of a scoping exercise, subsequent discussion in relation to Section 278 contributions for the Sites is not appropriate and should be deleted. Such contributions cannot be determined in the absence of a formal Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Furthermore, it would appear from the illustrative plan that the cost of the site access arrangements to the Derry Hill and Bingley Road Sites are included within the suggested contributions. However, the scope of the roundabout access arrangements required to provide access to Bingley Road, and the creation of a traditional estate road link to the north of that site is significantly greater than that required to access the Derry Hill site. The apportionment of the specific site access arrangement costs for the Bingley Road site to the Derry Hill site is inappropriate and unreasonable.</p>	<p>subject of negotiations at planning application.</p> <p>The Fauber Maunsell Plan on page 53 of the document is to be retained, but updated to reflect schemes that have already been implemented in the settlement. This Plan will also be given a new title <i>"Indicative Plan Of Highway Proposals For The Menston Settlement"</i></p> <p>A further change is proposed to para 5.67 of the document. The proposal to relocate the Children's home and use this area as another access into the site will be too costly and on this basis is to be removed from the document.</p>	<p>Amend SPD Highway plan on page 53 in light of updated proposals. Entitle plan <i>"Indicative Plan Of Highway Proposals For The Menston Settlement"</i></p> <p>Amend SPD by deleting para 5.67</p>
	<p>Para 5.68</p> <p>This considers possible offsite highway improvements and states that 'Faber Maunsell advise that the increased traffic from these</p>	<p>See previous response to para 5.66</p>	<p>See previous response to para 5.66</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>developments will require detailed analysis and a raft of measures at a cost of £1,500,000'. Again, this statement appears to pre-empt the outcome of the required Traffic Impact Assessment/Transport Assessment. Either the detailed requirements are need or detailed investigation is needed. In the latter use the costs cannot be known. All that is necessary is for the requirement for a TA to be flagged up and a regulation the developers' of the Sites will need to meet the cost of any mitigation. The access point to Derry Lane from Bingley Road site is unnecessary and appears to require the acquisition of third party land. In those circumstances the provision of the access is unlikely to be financially viable.</p>		
	<p>Para 5.69</p> <p>The requirement for a £138,000 contribution per site within the Section 278 Agreement towards 'travel planning requirements' is unclear and undefined and does not appear to bear any relationship to the subsequent suggested contributions relating to the shuttle bus, Metrocards and public transport improvements. Whilst a list of suggested measures to encourage the use of public transport could be included within the SPD, reference to a specific commuted sum should be deleted.</p>	<p>It is agreed that a financial sum should not be included in the document at this time. For this reason reference to costs are to be removed from the document. Delete wording following the 1st sentence. Add the following words after the 1st sentence, <i>"The following proposals are put forward as travel planning requirements arising from developing each site. These will be subject of negotiation as part of the section 278 agreement at planning application."</i></p>	<p>Amend para 5.69 of the SPD by deleting the words following the 1st sentence. Add the following words after the 1st sentence, <i>"The following proposals are put forward as travel planning requirements arising from developing each site. These will be subject of negotiation as part of the section 278 agreement at planning application."</i></p>
	<p>Para 5.70</p> <p>The walk distances illustrated within paragraph 2.41 of the draft SPD indicate that all of the Bingley Road site and about two thirds of the Derry Hill site fall within the recommended 800 metre walking distance of a rail station. On this basis, it could be</p>	<p>Agreed. Amendments to the para on walking are proposed to the document. The provision, or the tapping into the shuttle bus provided at High Royds is one of the options to be retained and negotiated at planning application stage.</p>	<p>Amend para 5.70 by deleting a) the 2nd sentence and b) the following words at the end of the last sentence <i>"to investigate cost reductions."</i></p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	<p>argued that the provision of a bus service to link the new developments to the railway station is not required under the terms of guidance set out by the Institution of Highways and Transportation. The position on walking accessibility needs further clarification. After such clarification the necessary consequences can be evaluated.</p> <p>RUDP Policy UR6 forms the context for the requirement of shuttle bus provision, Metrocards and real time bus information, however this is a generic policy with reference only to 'physical infrastructure'. RUDP paragraph 4.23a refers to highway improvements including the provision of traffic calming and public transport movements, however does not go into detail regarding specifics, like shuttle bus provision for example.</p> <p>It is not clear how long the free shuttle bus provision will extend. This level of detail is not specified within the RUDP.</p>	<p>Reference to a bus service through the site has been omitted from the document. Yet such provision would be more permanent, but will require negotiations with Metro. It is therefore proposed that the following text and subheading is added to the document to follow on from para 5.70,</p> <p><i>“Bus Service Through Each Site</i> <i>Bus stops are some distance from each site. As a means to encourage the use of public transport the developer will be expected to negotiate with Metro in seeking bus penetration through each site. In terms of duration of provision, this is more “permanent” and therefore preferred to the provision of a Shuttle Bus”</i></p>	<p>Add the following subsection to the SPD to follow on from para 5.70,</p> <p><i>“Bus Service Through Each Site</i> <i>Bus stops are some distance from each site. As a means to encourage the use of public transport the developer will be expected to negotiate with Metro in seeking bus penetration through each site. In terms of duration of provision, this is more “permanent” and therefore preferred to the provision of a Shuttle Bus”</i></p>
	<p>Para 5.71 Again, as above, this requirement is not set out in adopted policy. It is ambiguous as to how long a period the Metrocard would be expected to be provided, or indeed whether it is one per household, or one per adult in each household.</p>	<p>It is clearly stated in the document that every dwelling will receive a Metrocard valid for one year.</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>
	<p>Para 5.72 The requirement of real time bus information display units cannot be a justified requirement as a result of the Derry Hill and Bingley Road developments alone. How far would these display units extend to? The cost of the installation cannot</p>	<p>The extent of such provision is a matter for negotiation at planning application. However, it is proposed to delete reference to the costings of such provision. Therefore it is proposed that the 2nd sentence of para 5.72 is deleted from the document</p>	<p>Delete the 3rd sentence from para 5.72. Add a new subheading to the section entitled <i>“Real Time Tables”</i></p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	be attributed solely to these development Sites.		
	<p>Para 5.73</p> <p>The principle of seeking improvement to rail services is discussed above. It is evident that a commuted sum of £300,000 would be wholly insufficient to make any substantive improvement to the existing rail services and that even if this level of provision was added to the contribution of £300,000 made by the developers of High Royds, this would still not secure the rolling stock necessary to achieve increased capacity on the line or the necessary improvements to the signalling regimes. Reference to such a commuted sum is therefore irrelevant and should be deleted.</p>	<p>Partly agreed. Reference to a specific financial sum is to be deleted from the document, as this is subject of negotiation and an assessment of the capacity of the rail service at the time of the submission of a planning application. However, a contribution to rail service will be the subject of negotiation at planning application stage. The following changes are proposed to para 5.73, a) delete table at end of para 5.73, b) delete following words at the end of the para “of £300,000, split proportionately between the sites” and replace with “to increase train services.”</p> <p>Parking in and around Menston Station is currently a problem and is likely to exacerbate as demand for parking increases as a result of these developments. Add an additional para following 5.73 stating, “A need for car parking around the station is likely arise from each of these developments. A developer will therefore be expected to assess and provide measures to increase parking provision in and around the station”</p> <p>As the sites are some distance from the station, it is likely that people living in the new housing will cycle to the station. It is therefore proposed that the provision of secure cycle lockers at the station is</p>	<p>The following changes are proposed to para 5.73, a) delete table at end of para 5.73, b) delete following words at the end of the para “of £300,000, split proportionately between the sites” and replace with “to increase train services.”</p> <p>Add a new para to follow on from para 5.73 as follows, “A need for car parking around the station is likely to arise from each of these developments. A developer will therefore be expected to assess and provide measures to increase parking provision in and around the station”</p> <p>Amend SPD by adding a new para as follows, “As the sites are some distance from the station, it is likely that some people living in the new housing will cycle to the station. A developer will be</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
		<p>assessed at planning application. It is therefore proposed that a further para relating to the provision of cycle lockers at the station is added to the SPD as follows, <i>“As the sites are some distance from the station, it is likely that some people living in the new housing will cycle to the station. A developer will be required to assess cycle locker provision at the station in discussion with Metro and make further provision where a need arises from the development”</i></p> <p>Reference to street lighting has been largely omitted from this section and needs to be included an additional para should be added to the end of this section as follows, “Street Lighting <i>The provision of street lighting in and immediately adjoining the surrounding area will be the subject of the section 278 agreement at planning application”</i></p>	<p><i>required to assess cycle locker provision at the station in discussion with Metro and make further provision where a need arises from the development”</i></p> <p>Add a further para at the end of this section relating to street lighting as follows, “Street Lighting <i>The provision of street lighting in and immediately adjoining the surrounding area will be the subject of the section 278 agreement at planning application”</i></p>
	<p>Appendix C – Generally Should the development Sites not come forward until 2009, some of the planning considerations stated in this appendix will have been superseded. PPS3 for example is due to be published shortly, as will the RSS.</p>	<p>Noted amend this section of the document in light of new guidance such as PPS3</p>	<p>Amend para 6.15 to take account of advice in PPS3.</p>
	<p>Para 6.38 Although this paragraph indicates a reasonable approach, it is not derived from RUDP policy. The absence of RUDP policy conflicts with Circular 5/05</p>	<p>This issue has been discussed elsewhere in the document and is not at odds with the requirements of circular 5/05</p>	<p>No change to SPD</p>

Consultee (Name/Organisation)	Representation(s) to Draft Menston SPD	Bradford MDC Response	Outcome
	requirements in this respect.		
Highways	See all relevant representations.	<p>The highways within Menston and the effect that development may have upon them is understandably a contentious issue. Without doubt the development of the sites at Bingley Road and Derry Hill will have an inexorable degree of impact upon volumes of traffic within the village. Each representation made has equal validity and standing and as a result each should be referred to nearer application stage at the time when both the terms of the Traffic Impact Assessment Report and the annually monitored Travel Plan are formulated. Residents within Menston will have the opportunity to comment upon the highways improvements proposed by any application submitted upon either site. Therefore specific comments and views regarding the diagrammatic representation of highways improvements are somewhat premature as the plan itself is not a rigidly defined representation of what will transpire, only an indicative proposal of the possible improvements that will need to be implemented in order to lessen the effects of increased volumes of traffic to the greatest possible extent. Bradford Council acknowledges that this should have been made clear in the draft SPD and as result has clearly stated this in the final version. To formulate prescriptive plans now as regards highways prevent</p>	SPD amended accordingly.

		<p>the Council from obtaining more improvement through negotiation as the effects of High Royds cannot yet be fully taken into account.</p> <p>The SPD has reinforced the fact that on street parking although present will need to be within dedicated demarcated bays.</p> <p>Meadowcroft has been categorically stated as a pedestrian only access point.</p> <p>These sites will also be required to contribute a commuted sum to increase train services. A need for further car parking provision around the station is likely to arise from each of these developments also. A developer will therefore be expected to assess and provide measures to increase parking provision in and around the station. As the sites are some distance from the station it is likely that some people living in the new housing will cycle to the station. A developer will thus be required to assess cycle locker provision at the station in discussion with Metro and make further provision where a need arises from the development.</p> <p>The developer is also urged to collaborate with the Shuttle Bus provider at High Royds Village in terms of both funding and the provision of the services themselves. As a means to encourage the use of public transport the developer will be expected to negotiate with Metro in seeking bus penetration through each site. In terms of duration of provision this would be more</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>permanent and therefore preferred to the provision of a Shuttle Bus.</p> <p>The children's home is no longer to be considered for demolition in order to provide a possible future access route. The SPD now reflects this.</p> <p>Cycling to and from the station will be promoted but the specifics of this will again be dealt with through the Green Travel Plan submitted at application stage.</p> <p>All references to financial requirements have been removed as this again is dependant upon the results of traffic assessments and the cost of such improvements at the time of application.</p>	
Housing	See all relevant representations.	<p>Housing Affordability:</p> <p>Although the affordable housing SPD is not scheduled for adoption until January 2008 paragraph 5.18 of the draft SPD states that a range of research and survey work has been carried out by the council and its partners, informing both the RUDP and the council's affordable housing strategy. The findings of these assessments are contained within a number of documents including:-</p> <p>Modelling Housing Markets in Bradford 2000.</p> <p>Local Housing Assessment 2000.</p> <p>The Joint Housing Strategy 2000-2010.</p> <p>A Decent Home in a Decent</p>	SPD amended accordingly.

		<p>Neighbourhood- Joint Housing Strategy 2003-2010.</p> <p>Rural Housing Enablers Surveys.</p> <p>Local Housing Assessment 2007 (LHA).</p> <p>The findings of such research conclude that there is an imbalance between the need and supply of affordable housing contribution at a district wide level. The LHA concludes that over 55% of district households earn below the amount required to purchase an entry level/lower quartile priced house in the district (£73,000). However this figure is far greater in Menston as average house prices are above the district average. Overall the shortfall of affordable housing in Bradford is considerably high and the LHA suggests that we set a district wide target of 1132 units; 200 in high demand areas, per annum until 2011 in order to try and balance out the housing market and meet demand.</p> <p>The affordability issue needs to be addressed as the LHA identifies the lower quartile house price in Menston as being £175,000. Taking into account this figure and comparing it to the average income within the Menston area the lower quartile house price to average income ratio is 4.6. The Joseph Rowntree Foundation recommends that house prices should be 2.9 times average income.</p> <p>As mentioned the LHA categorises demand for affordable housing as being</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>high, medium, or low. Menston is classed as high and research suggests that 200 units per annum need to be created in these high demand areas in order to meet housing need.</p> <p>It has also been identified through surveys such as this that out of the total residential housing provision within the Menston area only 2% equates to affordable housing.</p> <p>Consequently it is research such as this that forms the basis of the planning obligations relating to housing affordability. Although the Affordable Housing SPD will ultimately supplement this research, enough does presently exist to dictate what current affordable housing policy should be regardless. Further to this paragraph 6.36 under Policy H9 of the current Revised Unitary Development Plan states that research, namely that which has been listed above, will be used to provide the basis for assessing the need for affordable housing on a site specific basis, in this case, Menston.</p> <p>The research cited within the draft SPD is therefore the baseline evidence that justifies the level of affordable housing contribution prescribed.</p> <p>Phasing:</p> <p>The inspector at enquiry deemed the growth that would ensue from the development of these sites to be both suitable and sustainable for the locality;</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>otherwise these sites wouldn't have been released from the greenbelt. PPS 3 has now superseded PPG 3. There is no reference to sequential testing in PPS 3 and therefore any future application will not have to demonstrate a rigorous approach to the methodology of sequential testing.</p> <p>The procedures for housing monitoring are outlined within the recently published Annual Monitoring Report. One should refer to this for clarification.</p> <p>Given the figures published within the most recent Annual Monitoring Report it is obvious to see that the net annual requirement as it stands of 1390 units per annum is not being met. Given that this is the case and that housing targets are likely to increase, it is highly unlikely that the council will be meeting their housing requirements shortly after 2009.</p> <p>However as stated in Policy H2 of the RUDP the release of Phase 2 housing sites would not be permitted until the total dwellings completed or commenced during Phase 1 is 90% of the cumulative Phase 1 dwelling requirement, and thus would not normally have been brought forward until this point.</p> <p>However should allocated Phase 1 sites, and infill conversions and windfalls together, provide consistently and significantly fewer dwellings than called for by the housing requirement, or would fail to produce a five year supply of dwellings then Phase 2 sites may be</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>brought forward.</p> <p>Therefore if the housing requirement and hence the level of the deliverable 5 year supply required increases the Phase 2 sites in Menston may be released earlier than expected. Having said this application could be refused on the grounds that more sustainable Phase 1 and Phase 2 sites still existed within the district at the time of application.</p> <p>As stated under Policy H2 of the RUDP changing the timing of the release of Phase 2 housing sites will normally be done by promoting a Local Development Document as part of the Local Development Framework.</p> <p>Density:</p> <p>The Planning Inspector suggested that the Derry Hill site should have a density of 28 housing units per hectare and that the Bingley Road site should have a density of 46 housing units per hectare.</p> <p>However the draft SPD states that the Derry Hill site should have an average density of 35 units per hectare and the Bingley Road site should have an average density of 30 units per hectare. There should also be density gradients within both sites. High density development on these sites would be inappropriate.</p> <p>The density stipulated within the SPD is different from that recommended by the inspector as a density of 28 units per</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>hectare on Derry Hill wouldn't be in conformity with Policy H7 of the RUDP. Policy H7 of the RUDP states that residential development planning permission will only be granted if a density of 30 to 50 units per hectare net is proposed.</p> <p>Furthermore the average density of both sites has been determined by layout and hence altered for this reason also. Despite these alterations good design principles will still be adhered to within both sites.</p> <p>Since the draft SPD has been published new national housing guidance has been released in the form of PPS 3. This now supersedes PPG 3 and will be the national guidance by which all future housing applications are assessed. PPS 3 also indicates 30 dwellings per hectare as a minimum.</p> <p>If an average density of 28 units per hectare was to be permitted for the Derry Hill site then it would set a precedent for future development and possibly result in further portions of greenbelt within the district needing to be utilised for housing development.</p> <p>There is no policy in the RUDP to ensure the sequential release of Phase 2 housing sites.</p> <p>Sheltered Housing:</p> <p>The SPD now highlights that there is a greater need for tenure diversification</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>and new developments to meet the housing need of old age pensioners. Furthermore surveys have identified that there is a need for sheltered housing in the form of two bedroom bungalows to enable elderly people to stay within the vicinity of the village.</p>	
--	--	--	--