

Planning Policy

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 January 2016 20:57
To: Planning Policy
Subject: Bradford Council Core Strategy Proposed Main modifications Consultation

SIR /MADAM

I trust I am replying in the preferred manner
I will be brief in my objections to ease your load
I DO OBJECT MOST STRONGLY

I INTEND TO BE DIRECT AND CONCISE SO MY MESSAGE TO YOURSELVES IS QUITE CLEAR

MY objections concern Menston although my nearest neighbours suffer equal consideration and inequality in your modified consultations outcome ideas!

MM2 MM7 MM11----Menston cannot be upgraded to Local growth Centre ---there is nothing to say this is sound in any manner---there is no positive preparation --no accurate consideration has been given to the existing situation --geographically, demographically or any "...graphically" -----What this would cause is poor health, both physical and mental as no employment, no health facility access, no education facilities and no transport to get 50% more population where they need to be in the centres of cities namely LEEDS -Bradford where on an average of 10 miles distance these exist. Build in these nearer places----clear the sites at Council[Community Charge payers] expense and build near the facilities

There is no Justification as the evidence you use is not accurate and therefore an appropriate strategy is impossible to construct ---I am 40plus years in menston -I can help you

Neither is it Sustainable therefore I object for that reason as well as it is not in alignment with NPPF

MM127 MM128 refer to climate change --Menston reflects this BUT it is much more exaggerated because out geology is very unhelpful----our village reservoir is now a partially underground house residence--our ground water has never been more abundantwe all have spring water....you can see our evidence on a very regular basis If we look together at the NPPF definition of Flooding --you must not recommend Menston as a Local growth centre! Menston grows every year to the extent that each September there are too few school places
With respect **MM51 MM52** ---Please remove your idea of yet another 50% increase in housing numbers ---the tests of Soundness are not sound

I sat in the Core strategy meeting for hours and days and I am in disbelief at the document I now read and try to make sense of and comment upon

---there appears a mis-match

[REDACTED] Rix