

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:

MM91, MM92

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

n/a

No

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

Not justified

Effective

Not 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. We believe that criteria D should specify which large and complex sites are referred to. Other references indicate that Bradford is considering accelerated development in respect of Canal Road and Bradford City Centre, but we would be concerned if this criterion was to be applied to the urban extension at Holme Wood. The figures in the housing trajectory suggest that a very early delivery of substantial numbers of houses on this site is suggested, and the Local Infrastructure Plan update also talks of early commencement of work on the urban extension sites even if infrastructure is not yet in place.
2. We repeat the point we made at the Examination that assured infrastructure, in particular the road improvements to the A 650 at Tong Street, are an essential prerequisite to the urban extension, and that bringing forward development to secure funding for later infrastructure is

a wholly unsatisfactory and unsound way to deal with major and complex sites.

3. The Council may be satisfied that it can accelerate development at Canal Road and in the City Centre, but the criteria D should make it clear that it does not intend to accelerate the urban extension at Holme Wood unless and until infrastructure has been assured.

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.

Make it clear that the large and complex sites which are referred to are the Bradford City Centre sites and the Shipley and Canal Road sites only and that there is no intention to accelerate the Holme Wood urban extension until the Green Belt review has been undertaken and funding and infrastructure assured.

11. Signature:

 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.