

## 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, MM40, MM42, MM72, MM79

### 5. Do you support or object the proposed main modification?

Support

Object

X

### 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'

X

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

Positively prepared

X

Justified

X

Effective

X

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).

- Bradford SE is already being asked to provide a wildly disproportionate amount of the total housing target for Bradford. This was one of the main local objections to the original plan because it was seen as unjustified and unfair compared with other areas of the city and the reason wholesale destruction of Green Belt would be required to achieve the target. This is not sustainable in community terms and will not be adequately supported by the proposed infrastructure.
- Now that the overall total has been reduced, why has there been no reduction in the housing target for Bradford SE as in other areas? This was the perfect opportunity to redress this original unfairness and would have reduced the Bradford SE numbers by at least 1800 to be in line with other areas.

3. That would have saved the Tong Valley and it's Green Belt and would have been supported by the majority of local residents!

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.

1. Reduce the target housing by at least 1800 for Bradford SE, this would save the Tong Valley from development, but still allow for up to 1200 homes which would all be sustainable using existing infrastructure and regenerate Holmewood – all realistic and reasonable proposals.
2. Lower the proposed target reduction numbers in each of the other areas (including outside City of Bradford) by modest amounts to accommodate a reduction in the target for Bradford SE.
3. Pat yourselves on the back for at last seeing sense, doing the right thing, being fair to Bradford SE and saving the Tong Valley and Tong Village from destruction so that it can continue to be a unique, valuable and much loved part of Bradford to be enjoyed by future generations, including your own children. It would also help improve the reputation and standing of Bradford Council in this area, which is understandably at an all time low.

11. Signature:

 Greenhough

Date:

19/1/2016

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