

**Email per Andrew Wood 180315**

**From:** andrewthewood@googlemail.com [mailto:andrewthewood@googlemail.com] **On Behalf Of** Andrew Wood  
**Sent:** 18 March 2015 12:35  
**To:** Tony Blackburn  
**Cc:** Chris Darley; Andrew Marshall; sphillipson@nlplanning.com  
**Subject:** Re: Letter in respect of Bradford Core Strategy Examination in Public [NLP-DMS.FID267392]

Dear Tony,

I'm sure the Inspector doesn't wish us to keep pressing this issue, so I will be as brief as possible and would be grateful if you could convey this message to the Inspector.

I'd like to thank NLP for copying me into this communication, and I will of course forward it to the other signatories of the letter. For clarity I would just like to make three points, which I am making myself without referring back to the other signatories.

1. The phrase 'hostile takeover' is used to characterise how community representatives feel about what happened in the Examination on the first day. It is not a criticism of NLP or any other party, but reflects the wider problem that community representatives had no practical choice but to take baseline evidence in good faith, and were wholly unprepared for this eventuality in terms of their own submissions and statements.
2. We fully accept that there is a due process for consultation on proposed main modifications, and it is useful to have this clarified for the community representatives. The difficulty is that, since the Council's 'suggested change' was tabled, presumably without prejudice to everyone's representations on the Publication Draft, it has been treated for practical purposes in the hearings as a formally proposed main modification. This has direct implications for my point 3 below.
3. The fact that suggested changes to the settlement hierarchy may substantially impact on the whole strategy, the uncertain status of those changes in the ongoing hearings of the discussions not only make it difficult to distinguish exactly which version of the hierarchy we are using to inform our contributions to the discussions, but also raise the possibility that we would wish to object to policies that we had previously considered sound. Given that further consultations on main modifications are normally limited to comment on the modifications, not on other aspects of the plan, there is a need to voice this concern now to highlight the range of policies that we might wish to comment on at this further consultation stage.

Many thanks,

Andrew.