

Core Strategy Development Plan Document Proposed Main Modifications – November 2015 Representation Form

For Office Use only:	
Date	
Ref	

PART B – YOUR REPRESENTATION - *Please use a separate sheet for each representation.* (Additional Part B forms can be downloaded from the web page)

4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?

Proposed Main Modification number:

MM38,MM 40,MM 42, MM72, MM79

5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?

Support

Object

6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?

Yes

No

7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?

Yes

No – 'unsound'

8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)

9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.

(Please note: Your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support / justify the representation and the suggested change. It is important that your representation relates to a proposed main modification).

The number of 6000 houses shown for SE Bradford should be reduced substantially, and redistributed more equitably across the whole of Bradford and Leeds. An unfair and disproportionately high number of houses are being distributed to SE Bradford, and in particularly the Tong Valley, which is not sustainable in community terms and will not be adequately supported by the infrastructure envisaged.

10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.

You need to say why this change will make the proposed main modification 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.

There needs to be evidence of the thorough investigation of all available alternative brown field sites as Bradford is full of such areas, open spaces, derelict and abandoned buildings that can easily be rezoned / redeveloped for housing purposes. This should be the first focus rather than putting additional pressure on the existing creaking infrastructure (roads, drainage, etc), and destroying the natural beauty of the Tong and surrounding valleys, thus precluding the future development of tourist orientated attractions, and employment.

The impact on the health and well-being of residents of the Tong valley, surrounding areas, tourists and visitors drawn to the natural beauty and attractions as a result of the destruction of the outdoor recreational facilities (footpaths, walkways, farm visits etc) in the greenbelt, has not been robustly investigated.

The impact on the natural becks in the area has been largely ignored and in light of the current flooding issues in areas such as this (across many parts of the country), the existing drainage problems in the valley with the concomitant increased risk of flooding, is self-evident.

Looking through the proposals, the test of sustainability has not been adequately proven beyond reasonable doubt. The Tong and surrounding valleys are totally unsuitable for the proposed development.

11. Signature:

Towns

Date:

17/1/2016

Thank you for taking the time to complete this Representation Form.