

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:

MM63

5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?

Support

Object

object

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

Yes

No

Duty to co-operate must be demonstrated in respect of planned economic growth area at the interface of adjoining authorities.

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

Yes

No – 'unsound'

unsound

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

Positively prepared

Not 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).

1. Clarification is needed for the term “South East Bradford – Leeds Interface”. The Council has been unclear about what its employment land use in or around the proposed Holme Wood urban extension will be. We believe that it is essential to alleviate local concerns and for consistency with the Tong and Holme Wood Neighbourhood Development Plan that it makes it clear that it has no intention of locating employment or commercial land within the Tong Valley.
2. We have already pointed out the very vague references within the Core Strategy to the “South East Bradford Access Route” and evidence was presented to the Examination in paper PS/DO18i that the Council has advanced plans for a strategic highway along the edge of its proposed urban extension. Such a road was never envisaged in the Tong and Holme Wood Neighbourhood Plan and would be a highly contentious proposal, which may be why the Core Strategy says little about it.
3. If however it is also part of the Council’s as yet unpublished plans that this road should form a secondary arterial access for new industrial and commercial development we would strongly oppose this as a further desecration of highly functional Green Belt land.
4. The Council should therefore make it clear that the South-East Bradford – Leeds Interface is not the interface which runs through the Tong Valley, and state in exact terms where this proposed economic growth area is.

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.

Define "South-East Bradford – Leeds Interface" and include express confirmation that this does not include the area around the Holme Wood urban extension

11. Signature:	[Redacted] Finnigan For and on behalf of the Tong and Fulneck Valley Association	Date:	17 January 2016
----------------	---	-------	-----------------

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