



For Office Use only:		
Date		
Ref		

Core Strategy Development Plan Document

Regulation 20 of the Town & Country (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012.

Publication Draft - Representation Form

PART A: PERSONAL DETAILS

* If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation in box 1 below but complete the full contact details of the agent in box 2.

	1. YOUR DETAILS*	2. AGENT DETAILS (if applicable)
Title	Mrs	
First Name	[REDACTED]	
Last Name	Cooper	
Job Title (where relevant)	PCC member	
Organisation (where relevant)	St John the Evangelist Church Bierley	
Address Line 1	[REDACTED]	
Line 2	[REDACTED]	
Line 3	Bradford	
Line 4		
Post Code	BD12 [REDACTED]	
Telephone Number	[REDACTED]	
Email Address	[REDACTED]	
Signature:	[REDACTED]	Date: 31 March 2014

Personal Details & Data Protection Act 1998

Regulation 22 of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012 requires all representations received to be submitted to the Secretary of State. By completing this form you are giving your consent to the processing of personal data by the City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council and that any information received by the Council, including personal data may be put into the public domain, including on the Council's website. From the details above for you and your agent (if applicable) the Council will only publish your title, last name, organisation (if relevant) and town name or post code district. Please note that the Council cannot accept any anonymous comments.

1. For Office Use only:			
2. Date	3.	4.	5.
6. Ref	7.		

PART B – YOUR REPRESENTATION - Please use a separate sheet for each representation.

3. To which part of the Plan does this representation relate?

Section	4	Paragraph	1	Policy	C1
---------	---	-----------	---	--------	----

4. Do you consider the Plan is:

4 (1). Legally compliant	Yes		No	
4 (2). Sound	Yes		No	✓ not compliant
4 (3). Complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes		No	

5. Please give details of why you consider the Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please refer to the guidance note and be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

C: SOUNDNESS

4th TFVA REPRESENTATION

Not positively prepared – *the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements.*

Infrastructure Requirements: There is no attempt in either the NDP or the Core Strategy to show how any of the infrastructure requirements of such a large new community for it to be sustainable would be met. The development would have significant impact upon both Leeds and Kirklees, but there is no sign of this being recognised or planned for.

Effect on Holme Wood: To describe the new development as a ‘Holme Wood Urban Extension’ is misleading. Holme Wood does not have the infrastructure capacity to ‘own’ or provide for a development of this scale. We believe that the main bulk of this new development will not assist Holme Wood to become a more socially and economically mixed community, and may well further damage its potential. In contrast TFVA would be in favour of plans to build 900 new homes within the current natural boundary of the estate.

Transport and Traffic Concerns:

- **Congestion** Bradford has been assessed as the third most congested city in the UK with regard to , and traffic surveys have shown that Tong Street (A650) is the most congested road in Bradford. To build such a vast new housing development that will inevitably lead to further congestion on Tong Street is foolhardy.
- **Road Provision.** There is confusion about Bradford’s intentions regarding road provision for the Urban Extension. There is conflicting evidence regarding a proposal to build a new highway link road from Westgate Hill to Thornbury, or to only provide the

new community with an access road. If it were only an access road, the effect of traffic growth through Holme Wood would be unacceptable. If a link road were to be built there would be even further devastating major green belt loss, and serious ecological threat to the important ancient woodland of Black Carr Woods. Such a road would require agreement and support from neighbouring authorities

- **Rural Roads** The rural farm roads that lead to Tong or Tyersal are entirely unsuited to carrying the increases in traffic that would result from the Urban Extension, and further substantial traffic increases in Tong Lane through the Tong Conservation Area would be highly undesirable.

5th TFVA REPRESENTATION

Not Justified – *the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.*

Green Belt Priority The loss of green belt protected land should not take place unless there is no alternative, yet we do not see any sign of this having been a priority with those who are making these proposals. Indeed the prior inclusion of this in the NDP indicates a lack of genuine commitment to green belt protection by Bradford Council.

No Greenbelt Policy We are not aware of Bradford Council having produced a Green Belt policy that has a cogent strategy for the redefining of greenbelt – nor are we aware of any negotiation taking place with neighbouring authorities to reach common agreement on this.

6th TFVA REPRESENTATION

Not Effective – *the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.*

Cross Boundary There is no sign of any cross boundary agreement for the Urban Extension despite the substantial social and economic implications that such a development would have for Leeds and Kirklees.

Time Scale There is no clear time frame given for the Urban Extension, and there are conflicting statements made in Council documents that indicate confusion as to how and when land for the Urban Extension would be released.

7th TFVA REPRESENTATION

Not consistent with national policy – *the plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.*

Green Belt Protection All of the land that we are concerned about currently enjoys Green belt Protection. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires the same high level of protection to the Green Belt as in the previous Unitary Development Plan (UDP), and identifies five purposes served by the Green Belt. The Core Strategy does not reflect the importance of these – indeed they are not mentioned in the document; nor does it reflect any clear commitment for minimising green belt release.

Each of the Five Purposes will be compromised by the proposed Urban Extension to Holme Wood:

1. Prevent Spread of Urban Sprawl

The Green Belt currently controls effectively the growth of urban sprawl both between Tong and Holme Wood, and between the Metropolitan Districts of Bradford, Leeds and Kirklees. In particular the boundary to the green belt provided by Westgate Hill Street, Holme Lane and Ned Lane is adequate and defensible. The proposed sites and boundaries identified on the SHLAA plan for the Urban Extension are arbitrary and largely indefensible.

2. Prevent merger of Neighbouring Towns

Vital Lung: The green belt provides a vital countryside lung between the neighbouring authorities. The threat of coalescence between Bradford and Leeds was a key reason for the objection to the NDP and FED by Leeds Council. The threat of such coalescence has increased in the current plan with the inclusion of site SE101.

3. Safeguard the countryside from encroachment

Vital Countryside: The current boundaries enable the preservation of important countryside opportunities in the Tong Valley for residents of Bradford, Leeds and Kirklees. TFVA is committed to working with others to see this enhanced in for future generations. Bradford's concept of a major new highway to be constructed between Westgate Hill and Thornbury would further destroy important countryside, and threaten the ancient woodland at Black Carr Woods.

4. Preserve the setting of Historic Towns

Tong and Fulneck: The ancient and historic communities of Tong and Fulneck and the recreational benefit that they offer to the substantial number of visitors who benefit from them require strong maintenance of the protection currently secured by the green belt land that surrounds them. Both are rightly identified as Conservation Areas, and both offer unique historical and cultural attraction within the largely urban life of West Yorkshire. Fulneck became the key settlement of the Moravian Community in the 18th century, and has retained much of its unique character. Tong is included in the Domesday Book; Tong Hall is a Grade One listed Queen Anne building; Tong Church is also Grade One, has Saxon and Norman origins, and has original 18th century fittings and furnishings from its rebuild in 1727 by leading Methodist preacher, John Nelson. Tong Village has a wide range of other listed buildings and features.

5. Recycling of derelict and other urban land.

The need to give priority to brown field and other derelict sites has been a consistent and universal message from a wide range of politicians and campaigners in Bradford. However the challenges that exist in tackling this can motivate housing developers to seek access to alternative countryside sites that are more attractive and profitable to develop. The need therefore to maintain protection for the Tong Valley is vital to ensure that the substantial areas of Bradford land that needs regeneration is given priority.

8th TFVA REPRESENTATION

Not positively prepared/justified/effective – detail of these as above

This representation relates specifically to the failure of the Plan to recognise the special landscape character of the Tong Valley in SE Bradford, the historical significance of that area and of the conservation area comprising Tong Village and the place of the Tong Valley and Tong

Village in relation to the historic Moravian settlement and village of Fulneck (part of Leeds MDC).

We ask for revision of the Plan to recognise those features as well as the cultural, recreational and leisure potential of the area and to make it clear that Tong Valley will be included in proposals for a Leeds/Bradford Country Park.

We also ask for the correction of an apparent error in Policy EN4.

We believe that the Tong Valley is an immensely valuable recreational and leisure asset for Bradford with important historical associations. Bradford has in the past paid little attention to the important area, first by selling Tong Hall, then by pulling out of the Tong Cockersdale Partnership and now by proposing that the area should be the site of an urban extension. We feel that this position should be rectified by the positive statements in the Core Strategy that we are suggesting should be introduced and that real vision should be displayed now for its future.

6. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at question 5 above where this relates to the soundness. (N.B Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination).

You will need to say why this modification will make the Plan 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.

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage.

Please be as precise as possible.

After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

7. If your representation is seeking a modification to the Plan, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

8. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Please note the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt when considering to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

9. Signature:

Date:

31.March 2014