

Email 210416 to Programme Officer from Ross McGibbon

I have cut and pasted below from the Bradford response document. Frankly, Bradford's response is technical gobbledegook and as a fairly well-educated ex-university lecturer, I cannot begin to understand it well enough to know if there is a housing legislation basis underpinning it. The original comment was very straight forward: Menston and Burley are unsuitable to be made into local growth centres (the detailed reasons I presented eg recent building by Leeds next to the village) have been removed by Bradford). The response cannot be counter-argued by someone not trained in planning law. How can that be fair? Bradford present no arguments to justify their modification to consider the villages as growth centres.

Regards,

Ross McGibbon

MM1

Objective 2 1.

My comments were approximately these: Burley In Wharfedale and Menston are not sustainable locations for new development in terms of transport accessibility, lack of services and focus of meeting the needs should be on brownfield land within the City of Bradford and conflicts with Objective.

Commenters: 20 , 103

Bradford's response: The comments do not relate to the proposed modification, but rather the applications of the objective in context of other parts of the plan and other main modifications. In this context there is an implied support for the objective. The Objective is appropriate and reasonable in order to set out the key elements against which the spatial vision can be measured and has informed the core approach of the plan. The plan needs to be read as a whole when applying the policies.