

## 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 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).

It seems apparent that housing numbers for S.E Bradford have been increased where of course they should be decreased so as not to encroach onto greenbelt land (bearing in mind there is no exceptional circumstance to be realistically regarded). In some areas Housing allocations within Bradford council's jurisdiction have been decreased and other areas allocations have increased!

The housing allocation for SE Bradford, specifically in the Tong valley is disproportionate to other areas, and relies solely on releasing greenbelt land in the valley. The plan describes it misleadingly as the 'Holme wood extension' the 2700 homes planned is not an 'extension' it is a whole new area.

This is not sustainable in terms of community nor in terms of infrastructure. The need for schools, NHS services and the access proposed/ envisaged is inadequate.

Finally as mentioned in my first document, the volume of houses proposed creates a huge flooding risk. New Lane, which runs through part of the green belt you are proposing to release, regularly floods, this weekend 15/16<sup>th</sup> Jan 2016 it has been closed due to the build-up of water, fields around it have been flooded, some appear contaminated, due to rust coloured water which also need investigating.

Building in this area, allowing no run off for water will end up flooding the valley, endangering land, livestock, existing houses as well as the proposed new houses. This needs urgent address and response, a specific enquiry of its own given recent event in Dec 2015 and Jan 2016 in many parts of Northern England.

To stress again that the Environment Minister has a responsibility to investigate this and take into account before allowing this plan to go any further.

**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.**

**11. Signature:**



**Date:**

19/1/2016

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