



For Office Use only:		
Date		
Ref		

Core Strategy Development Plan Document

Regulation 20 of the Town & Country (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012.

Publication Draft - Representation Form

PART A: PERSONAL DETAILS

* If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation in box 1 below but complete the full contact details of the agent in box 2.

	1. YOUR DETAILS*	2. AGENT DETAILS (if applicable)
Title	Cllr	
First Name	[REDACTED]	
Last Name	Heseltine	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)	Bingley Ward Councillor	
Address Line 1	[REDACTED]	
Line 2		
Line 3		
Line 4	SHIPLEY	
Post Code	BD18 [REDACTED]	
Telephone Number	[REDACTED]	
Email Address	[REDACTED]	
Signature:	[REDACTED]	Date: 26-03-14

Personal Details & Data Protection Act 1998

Regulation 22 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012 requires all representations received to be submitted to the Secretary of State. By completing this form you are giving your consent to the processing of personal data by the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council and that any information received by the Council, including personal data may be put into the public domain, including on the Council's website. From the details above for you and your agent (if applicable) the Council will only publish your title, last name, organisation (if relevant) and town name or post code district.

Please note that the Council cannot accept any anonymous comments.

For Office Use only:			
Date			
Ref			

PART B – YOUR REPRESENTATION - Please use a separate sheet for each representation.

3. To which part of the Plan does this representation relate?

Section	<input type="text"/>	Paragraph	<input type="text"/>	Policy	<input type="text"/>
---------	----------------------	-----------	----------------------	--------	----------------------

4. Do you consider the Plan is:

4 (1). Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>
4 (2). Sound	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	no
4 (3). Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input type="text"/>

5. Please give details of why you consider the Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please refer to the guidance note and be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

Please see attached submission

6. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to the soundness. (N.B Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination).

You will need to say why this modification will make the Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Please see attached submission

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. Please be as precise as possible.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

7. If your representation is seeking a modification to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

<input type="checkbox"/>	No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

8. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

To fully articulate the concerns highlighted in the attached submission

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt when considering to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

9. Signature:

Date:

26-03-14

Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD) : Publication Draft

PART C: EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY MONITORING FORM

Bradford Council would like to find out the views of groups in the local community. Please help us to do this by filling in the form below. It will be separated from your representation above and will not be used for any purpose other than monitoring.

Please place an 'X' in the appropriate boxes.

Submission from Councillor [REDACTED] Heseltine, Bingley Ward

I object to the Bradford LDF proposals as set out below.

Deliverability, robustness of evidence

The 10 year historic building completion from boom to current levels falls significantly below the requirement as stated in the proposals, there is no evidence or mechanism within the proposals as to how this deficit in build numbers will be addressed, there is no evidence that the increases on current yield proposed are actual needed, wanted or deliverable.

If the supposed demand was there then developers would have exercised their current planning permissions of which there are a significant number granted but not developed or sites that are available from the RUDP which have yet to have planning permissions granted.

Another factor in the consideration is the number of long term empty homes, over the last 10 years Bradford has run with a significant level of empty homes, if there was a demand for housing then this already built property would have been mostly occupied, this in my view highlights yet again that actual demand is significantly lower than estimates.

The failure to develop current sites and turn round empty homes suggests low demand. If large tracts of new land are brought forward then it is unlikely still that the demand will be there and sites we need to develop in and close to the city and town centres will be left while the developers cherry pick the easy green sites to develop, this will do nothing to improve the city or regenerate swathes of derelict land and buildings. There is no mechanism in the policy to ensure regeneration is the first and foremost goal of the strategy.

This additional burden on our current infrastructure contained within these proposals will in my view be actually detrimental to the district. Already in Airedale we have poor road connections to the motorway network, we have many overcapacity junctions and roads with little or no opportunity to increase capacity. This congestion is bad enough without adding thousands of properties. Business struggle with this additional burden of bringing goods in and exporting them out of the district, if we continue to exacerbate the situation business will relocate to better connected locations taking the jobs they provide with them. If we don't provide opportunity for jobs for the population then they will be forced to go to where the jobs are. Already we have had a number of large manufacturers leave the city

The rail network particularly in the Aire valley is at capacity on the commuter run to Leeds and close to Bradford, adding thousands of journeys on a maxed out system will only add to the congestions woes on our highways, very detrimental to the economic prosperity of the district. Crossflatts and Bingley stations are already filling trains additional building will only increase the demand on the car, both in the ward and further down the line as trains operate at capacity the idea that development in the ward is sustainable is actually not correct.

The proposals do not indicate how the district will significantly grow its jobs numbers to meet the potential growth in residents; if we can't grow the jobs the population will move to areas where employment opportunities exist, reducing demand for housing in the city.

Bradford historically fails to get significant investment in our roads, rail, education, recreation and affordable homes etc, time after time developers plead the poor tale and "prove" the scheme is not viable with the needed contributions, This has lead to under investment in essential infrastructure which is detrimental to the current situation, any future development will seriously overwhelm current provision and as history shows Bradford is unlikely to lever the much need contributions.

Much of the recent building has not been for Bradford's housing need, we actually require affordable affordable housing, the proposals would lead to major construction on high value sites and this will not meet our housing needs.

The proposals in the main for Bingley and area provide commuter hosing for residents who currently live in Leeds not houses to meet our needs, Bradford should not be forced be these proposals into providing homes we do not require. Let Leeds deal with its own housing demand and Bradford with its. The only people to benefit from these proposals are developers and landowners, not the inhabitants or Bradford district.

The suggestion that Bingley should be moved up the hierarchy of towns is at best poor, the local roads, rail and facilities struggle to cope with current demand, and additional significant building here will be detrimental to existing and future residents of the ward and communities already struggling particularly with their own transport infrastructure further down the Aire valley.

I would like the opportunity to address my concerns to the public inspection when that occurs.

Cllr [REDACTED] Heseltine

26-03-14