

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 30 November 2015 15:52
To: Planning Policy
Subject: CSDP Comment

Thank you for your letter advising me of the update to the CSDP.

I find it difficult to understand how you think that you have fulfilled your obligation to consult, bearing in mind that the documents exceed 9,500 pages, excluding any previous versions to which you refer. The CSDP is impenetrable due to its volume, which is unnecessary. The cost of producing this document must be astronomical, yet volume does not equal quality. Does the Council produce verbose reports to stop people providing quality feedback or just to keep people employed? Either way, it is an unacceptable and bureaucratic approach, and a waste of tax payers money.

A few specific comments on the housing study:

· If unemployment continues at a high level, then migration out of the city/region will follow. This appears to have been overlooked, in the belief/desire that it can be fixed - it might not be.

· The conclusion to 3.41 is illogical in my opinion. The figures deteriorate from 2005 generally, yet the blame for unemployment is put on the economic climate from 2008. The high and growing level of unemployment was present before the crash. What was happening then?

· Housing should, wherever possible, be close to demand, not scattered through the wider Bradford area. If more 'affordable' housing is genuinely needed, then it should be in areas near employment and where people do not have to commute to get to work. Commuting has a substantial cost attached to it for any resident.

· The conclusion regarding income verses mortgage repayments is not drawn from the data. Yes I agree that the deposit required and the lack of lending have no doubt affected the sale of houses. However, another possible reason is that people's behaviour may have changed. So they may consciously be spending less of their income on mortgage repayments due to future uncertainty. This would have the effect of reducing buyers and their spending power and thus reducing the sale of houses and the mortgage repayments required.

· Over crowding of houses is shown to be higher in certain areas of the city. This may not be an issue caused by the lack of houses/mortgages/deposits. It may simply be a cultural phenomenon, due to the ethnic diversity of Bradford and the concentration of different groups in certain areas of the city. It may therefore be a choice that these residents make, which we should not assume is wrong. Yet the report does just that.

A few specifics on Menston:

· The report asserts that Menston children can access Ilkley Grammar School, which they cannot, due to its catchment area. Nor do they have general access to St Mary's as this is a Catholic school.

· There is only one pharmacy in the village. The table states that there is two.

· The flood risk in the village is skirted in the report. Yet it is a very real issue, as the Council knows. It may be very convenient not to mention this.

I will try to read some more of the documents and make comments, however I do find the Council's approach to this issue cynical and its approach is not designed to seek real input from the community which it serves. In fact it appears to be designed to do quite the opposite.

[REDACTED] Cordingley
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]
Menston
Ilkley
LS29 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]