Dated: January 2016

Representations to City of Bradford
MDC Core Strategy DPD - Proposed
Main Modifications – November 2015
with Specific Reference to
Land at Banner Grange, Burley in Wharfedale –
SHLAA Reference BU/005 and Land off
Bradford Road, Burley in Wharfedale –
SHLAA Reference BU/014



CONTENTS

		PAGE NO
1.0	Introduction	1
2.0	Representations to the Main Modifications	2
3.0	Conclusions	8

APPENDICES

1 – Site Plan

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Following instructions from Bannister, ID Planning are commissioned to make representations to the emerging Bradford Core Strategy DPD and the proposed modifications issued for consultation in November 2015.
- 1.2 These representations are made in the specific context of the development potential of land at Banner Grange, Burley in Wharfedale SHLAA Reference BU/005 and Land off Bradford Road, Burley in Wharfedale SHLAA Reference U/014
- 1.3 It should be noted that Bannister holds the freehold interest in the sites in question and the areas of land that are being promoted for development are shown on the attached plan at Appendix 1.
- 1.4 A robust assessment of the main modifications to the Core Strategy DPD have been undertaken and these representations seek to make comment on the main modifications in order to promote the site for a proposed housing allocation during the preparation of the subsequent Allocations DPD.

2.0 Representations to the Core Strategy DPD Proposed Main Modifications

2.1 These representations have been prepared in relation to the City of Bradford MDC Core Strategy DPD proposed modifications of November 2015. We seek to examine the relevant proposed main modifications pertinent to the subject site and to comment in line with the requirements of National Guidance as set out below.

National Planning Policy

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- 2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework was published on the 27th March 2012. As the Core Strategy DPD main modifications were issued for consultation in November 2015, the document should wholly reflect the National Planning Policy Guidance set out within the NPPF.
- 2.3 Paragraphs 150-185 of the NPPF relate to plan making. Paragraph 151 advises that Local Plans must be prepared with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development and therefore should be consistent with the principles and policies set out in the framework, including the presumption in favour of sustainable development.
- 2.4 Paragraph 154 requires plans to be aspirational but realistic. Paragraph 178 advises that public bodies have a duty to cooperate on planning issues that cross boundaries, particularly those which relate to strategic policies.

NPPF Tests of Soundness/European SEA Directive and Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulation 2004

- 2.5 The Core Strategy inspector will consider the proposed main modifications on the basis of whether they have been prepared in accordance with the duty to cooperate, the legal and procedural requirements and whether they are sound.
- 2.6 Paragraph 182 of the NPPF advises: -

"The Local Planning Authority should submit a plan for examination which it considers is 'sound' – namely that it is: -

- Positively prepared the plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements for neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;
- Justified the plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives based on proportionate evidence:
- Effective the plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross boundary strategic priorities; and

- Consistent with National Policy the plan should enable the delivery
 of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the
 framework."
- 2.7 In addition, the representations will consider the legal duty to comply with the European SEA Directive 2001/42/PC and the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes regulations 2004. The directive and regulations require the need for: -
 - 1. Environmental reports to be of sufficient quality and provide proper information to allow consideration of all potential effects.
 - 2. Sufficient detail to allow the public to understand why the plan is said to be sound
 - 3. An appropriate and equal assessment of the alternatives to the chosen strategy/policy an explanation as to why they were not considered to be the best option

Representations on Main Modifications

Main Modification 2

Summary of Main Modification

- 2.8 Main Modification 2 seeks to add Burley in Wharfedale and Menston to the list of Local Growth Centres in Policy SC1 Part B5 where the policy offers to support, protect and enhance the roles of the Local Growth Centres as hubs for the local economy and housing etc.
- 2.9 These modifications reflect the revised settlement hierarchy and changes within Policy SC4 which, in turn, reflects the revised Habitat Regulations Assessment and the increased housing targets proposed for Burley and for Menston.

Soundness of Main Modification 2

- 2.10 Mr. Bannister <u>supports</u> the Council's inclusion of Burley in Wharfedale and Menston within the list of Local Growth Centres in Policy SC1 Part B5.
- 2.11 Mr. Bannister considers that the inclusion of Burley in Wharfedale and Menston within the Local Growth Centres that act as hubs for the local economy is **sound** and that it meets the four tests of soundness in that this main modification has been positively prepared, is justified, is effective and consistent with National Policy based on the adjustments to the settlement hierarchy derived from the amendments to the Habitat Regulations Assessment.

Main Modifications 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12

Summary of Main Modifications

- 2.12 Main Modification 7 seeks to add Burley in Wharfedale and Menston to the list of Local Growth Centres in Policy SC4. Parallel Main Modification 8 seeks to remove Burley in Wharfedale and Menston from the list of Local Service Centres and Rural Areas from Policy SC4.
- 2.13 Main Modification 9 seeks to identify that Burley in Wharfedale and Menston when assessed against the outcomes table for Policy SC4 will have made a significant contribution to meeting the districts needs for housing, employment and associated community facilities.
- 2.14 Main Modification 11 seeks to identify that Burley in Wharfedale and Menston are Local Growth Centres on the key strategy diagram and also identifies that they are "the most sustainable local centres which provide an important focal point for affordable housing and market housing needs as well as employment. Parallel Main Modification 12 seeks to remove Burley in Wharfedale and Menston from the list of settlements where there will be a slower pace and scale of growth.
- 2.15 All of these modifications result from the revised status within the settlement hierarchy of Burley in Wharfedale and Menston as explained earlier as a direct result of the revisions to the Habitat Regulations Assessment.

Soundness of Main Modifications 7, 8, 9, 11 and 12

- 2.16 Mr. Bannister <u>supports</u> the Council's inclusion of Burley in Wharfedale and Menston within the list of Local Growth Centres subsequent main modifications to the policies and paragraphs of the Core Strategy as set out above.
- 2.17 Mr. Bannister considers the main modifications resulting from the revised status within the settlement hierarchy of Burley in Wharfedale and Menston are sound and that they meet the four tests of soundness in that the main modifications have been positively prepared, are justified, are effective an consistent with National Policy based on the adjustments to the settlement hierarchy derived from the amendments to the Habitat Regulations Assessment.

Main Modification 18

Summary of Main Modification

2.18 Main Modification MM18 seeks to amend paragraph 3.102 under Policy SC7 relating to Green Belt and the requirement for its release to meet the housing needs for the area. The modification states that the Council considers, having reviewed the evidence and all reasonable alternatives, that exceptional circumstances exist which justify and require a change to the Green Belt in order to meet its development needs for housing in full and in order to support long term economic success to the district.

Soundness of Main Modification MM18

- 2.19 Mr. Bannister <u>supports</u> the inclusion of clarity on the exceptional circumstances which support the need to review the Green Belt as proposed within Main Modification MM18.
- 2.20 Mr. Bannister considers that the inclusion of clarity in relation to the exceptional circumstances relating to the release of Green Belt is **sound** and that it meets the four tests of soundness in that the main modification has been positively prepared, is justified, and is effective and consistent with National Policy.

Main Modification MM51

Summary of Main Modification

- 2.21 This Main Modification seeks, in accordance with Policy HO3 and EC3 to increase the housing requirement in Wharfedale from 1,600 to 2,500 dwellings. In addition, it seeks the following broad distribution: -
 - Ilkley increase of dwellings from 800 to 1,000
 - Burley in Wharfedale increase of dwellings from 200 to 700
 - Menston increase of dwellings from 400 to 600
 - Addingham maintained at 200

Soundness of Main Modification MM51

- 2.22 Mr. Bannister <u>supports</u> the Council's increase of the housing requirement for Wharfedale from 1,600 to 2,500 and the subsequent increase in the housing targets for likley, Burley in Wharfedale and Menston.
- 2.23 Mr. Bannister considers that the increase in the housing requirement for Wharfedale and the increase of the number of residential units for three of the four settlements is <u>sound</u> and that it meets the four tests of soundness and that this main modification has been positively prepared, is justified, is effective and consistent with National Policy based on the adjustments to the settlement hierarchy derived from the amendments to the Habitat Regulations Assessment.

Main Modification MM88

Summary of Main Modification

2.24 This Main Modification seeks to adjust Policy HO3 and the apportionments between the different settlements of the district for housing. It seeks to increase the housing delivery in Local Growth Centres from 3,400 to 4,900 and identifies that Burley in Wharfedale will deliver 700 units and Menston 600 units. It also identifies that Burley in Wharfedale and Menston are to be deleted from the Local Service Centre list. In essence, Burley in Wharfedale and Menston are reinstated as Local Growth Centres (and thus removed as

Local Service Centres), with higher housing targets largely as a result of the revised Habitat Regulations Assessment.

Soundness of Main Modification MM88

- 2.25 Mr. Bannister <u>supports</u> the Councils inclusion of Burley in Wharfedale and Menston in the list of Local Growth Centres and the increase in housing distribution to said centres.
- 2.26 Mr. Bannister considers that the inclusion of Burley in Wharfedale and Menston in the Local Growth Centres is **sound** and it meets the four tests of soundness in that this Main Modification has been positively prepared, is justified, is effective and consistent with National Policy based on the adjustments to the settlement hierarchy derived from the amendments to the Habitat Regulations Assessment.

Main Modification MM92

Summary of Main Modification

2.27 This Main Modification seeks to adjust the approach to phasing of housing allocations as set out within Policy HO4. The modification goes on to identify that the housing implementation framework will set out how the Council will monitor delivery and this includes the implications of underachievement on housing completions and brownfield development targets for the phasing approach. The modifications go on to identify that the Council will consider the early release of Phase 2 sites in the unlikely event of a persistent shortfall (defined as being over two successive monitoring year periods) in five-year land supply. The text goes on to identify the Council's approach to maintaining a five-year land supply which includes allowing for a 20% buffer in additional supply brought forward from the latter part of the plan period and resolving the backlog in undersupply over the plan period which is termed as "the Liverpool" approach.

Soundness of Policy MM92

- 2.28 Mr. Bannister <u>objects</u> to the inclusion of a phasing policy within the Core Strategy as it is unjustified. At other Core Strategy examinations, for example, Rotherham, phasing policies have been removed.
- 2.29 If the phasing policy is to be retained, the appropriate approach for dealing with any undersupply within the five-year requirement calculation is to resolve shortfall within the five years (the Sedgefield approach) as advocated by the NPPF and the Planning Practice Guidance.
- 2.30 The inclusion of a phasing policy and one which is reliant on release of later phases based on the Liverpool approach to dealing with undersupply is unsound as the approach has not been justified, will be ineffective in terms of releasing later phases of land for housing and is also inconsistent with National Policy.

Proposed Changes to the Main Modification to address Soundness Issues

2.31 The phasing policy should be deleted from the Core Strategy. Should the phasing strategy be retained, the reference to the application of the Liverpool approach should be deleted and be replaced with the application of the Sedgefield approach, i.e. dealing with the backlog over a five year period, not the period of the plan.

Main Modification MM96

Summary of Main Modification

2.32 This Main Modification seeks to amend Policy HO6 by removing the reference to the delivery of 50% of housing on previously developed land as a minimum over the Local Plan period and also removes the reference to the PDL targets being a minimum for the Regional City of Bradford, Principal Towns, Local Growth Centres and Local Service Centres.

Soundness of Main Modification MM96

- 2.33 Mr. Bannister <u>supports</u> the Council's Main Modification at MM96 wherein it removes the reference to the PDL targets being a minimum.
- 2.34 Mr. Bannister considers the removal of the reference to the PDL targets being a minimum is **sound** and that it meets the four tests of soundness in that this Main Modification has been positively prepared, is justified, is effective and consistent with National Policy.

3.0 Conclusions

3.1 Mr. Bannister is supportive of the majority of the Main Modifications proposed and in particular, those which reinstate Burley in Wharfedale and Menston as Local Growth Centres and the respective increase in proposed housing delivery. Where issues on soundness with proposed modifications have been raised, amendments have been proposed to address any soundness issues.

Core Strategy Development Plan Document	For Office Use only:	
Proposed Main Modifications – November 2015	Date	
1 Toposed Main Modifications - November 2013	Ref	
Representation Form	·	

www.bradford.gov.uk

PART A: PERSONAL DETAILS

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

	1. YOUR DETAILS*		2. AGENT DE	TAILS (if app	licable)
Title	MR	1 4 4 4 4	MR		
First Name					
Last Name	BANNISTER		IRVI	7G	
Job Title (where relevant to this representation)			DIRECT	oR.	
Organisation (where relevant to this representation)			ID PL	ANNING	
Address Line 1	% AGENT				
Line 2					
Line 3			LEEDS		
Line 4					
Post Code			LS1		
Telephone Number					
Email Address			3		
Signature:			Date:	18	M JANUARY 2016
3. Please let us kno	w if you wish to be notified o	f the follow	ring:		
The publication o	Yes	/	No		
The adoption of t	Yes	/	No		
Are you attaching any additional sheets / documents that relate to this representation?		Yes	/	No	
		No of she document	ets / ts submitted :	AND PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF PARTY SALES	

CANALAN MORE MANAGER OF CONTRACT OF CONTRA	Company of the compan	W AW	yvy lo nako pokod ogovy tik
Core Strategy Devel	lopment F	'lan Document	For Office Use only:
Proposed Main Mod	– November 2015	Date	
Representation Form			Ref
PART B – YOUR REPRES	SENTATION -	- Please use a separate sheet	et for each representation.
(Additional Part B forms can be down	The second secon	web page) does this representation relate?	
ninggaran an san not yanni - modan stassan anga ana sassannos so sas			Marie Carlos Car
Proposed Main Modification n	rumber:	MM 2	
5. Do support or object the	proposed ma	in modification?	
Support		Object	The state of the s
6. Do you consider the pror	osed main m	nodification to be 'legally compli	iant'?
Yes	/	No	
7. Do you consider the prop	osed main m	odification to be 'sound'?	
Yes		No – 'unsound'	
8. If you consider the proposition soundness your common		odification to be 'unsound', plea ?	ase identify which test of
Positively prepared		Justified	
Effective		Consistent with Natio Policy (the NPPF)	onal Planning
unsound in light of the If you wish to support t (Please note: Your reprint information necessary to	main modificathe proposed in the proposed in t	cations proposed. Please be as p	his box to set out your comments. nation, evidence and supporting

wy www.losioakilijorkilagiowycilik

f ach representation.
ich representation.
nch representation.
itify which test of
7 S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S
nning
not legally compliant or is as possible.
to set out your comments.
vidence and supporting hange. It is important that

Of the Davidson		1 . D = =====	
Core Strategy Develor	For Office Use only:		
Proposed Main Modifi	cations -	- November 2015	Date
Representation Form			Ref
•		Please use a separate sheet	et for each representation.
the control of the co	* 1 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	does this representation relate?	
Proposed Main Modification num		MM 8	
FTOPOSOU WIGHT WOULDERS	L	ММ В	
5. Do support or object the pro	posed mair	n modification?	
Support		Object	<u> </u>
Supplemental Committee of the Committee	****	The state of the s	en e
6. Do you consider the propos	ed main mo	odification to be flegally compli	lant'?
Yes		No	
7. Do you consider the propos	ed main mc	odification to be 'sound'?	
Yes		No – 'unsound'	
L_	*		
8. If you consider the propose soundness your comment		dification to be 'unsound', plea	ase identify which test of
Positively prepared		Justified	
Effective		Consistent with Natio Policy (the NPPF)	onal Planning
			the state of the s
9. Please give details of why unsound in light of the ma	you consid	der the proposed main modifica ations proposed. Please be as p	ation is <u>not legally compliant or is</u> precise as possible.
			his box to set out your comments.
(Please note: Your represe	entation shou pport / justify	uld cover succinctly all the informa y the representation and the sugg	공통하다 하다는 사람들은 사람들이 되는 것들이 되는데 없다.
your representation relates t	o a propose	d main modification).	
SEE ATTACHED STAT	EMENT		
		,	

Core Strategy Devel	lanment F	Plan Document	For Offi	ce Use only:
	Date	CC CSG Office		
Proposed Main Mod	Ref			
Representation Form	m			
PART B – YOUR REPRES (Additional Part B forms can be down		- Please use a separate shee	et for each repr	esentation.
4. To which proposed main	modification	does this representation relate	17	
Proposed Main Modification n	ıumber:	MM 9		
5. Do support or object the	proposed ma	ain modification?		
Support		Object	,	
6. Do you consider the prop	osed main m	nodification to be 'legally compl	liant'?	
Yes		No		
7. Do you consider the prop	oosed main n	nodification to be 'sound'?		
Yes	/	No – 'unsound'		
8. If you consider the proposition soundness your comme		odification to be 'unsound', plea	ase identify whic	h test of
Positively prepared		Justified		
Effective		Consistent with Nation Policy (the NPPF)	onal Planning	
9. Please give details of w unsound in light of the	vhy you cons main modific	ider the proposed main modific ations proposed. Please be as	ation is <u>not lega</u> precise as poss	lly compliant or is ible.
if you wish to support t	he proposed	main modification please use t	his box to set ou	it your comments.
(Please note: Your representation related your representation related	support / justi	ould cover succinctly all the inform ify the representation and the sugged sed main modification).	nation, evidence a gested change. It	nd supporting is important that
SEE ATTACHED S	TATEMENI			

	<u>w</u>	W.W., Byraid Forgovgovauk
Core Strategy Development P	lan Document	For Office Use only:
Proposed Main Modifications	– November 2015	Date
Representation Form		Ref
PART B – YOUR REPRESENTATION (Additional Part B forms can be downloaded from the w		et for each representation.
4. To which proposed main modification	does this representation relat	e?
Proposed Main Modification number:	MM 11	
5. Do support or object the proposed ma	in modification?	
Support /	Object	
6. Do you consider the proposed main m	odification to be 'legally comp	oliant'?
Yes	No	
7. Do you consider the proposed main m	odification to be 'sound'?	
Yes 🗸	No – 'unsound'	
8. If you consider the proposed main mo soundness your comments relate to		ease identify which test of
Positively prepared	Justified	
Effective	Consistent with Nat Policy (the NPPF)	tional Planning
9. Please give details of why you consi unsound in light of the main modifical If you wish to support the proposed (Please note: Your representation sho information necessary to support / justif your representation relates to a propose	ations proposed. Please be as main modification please use to build cover succinctly all the information and the suggestion and the suggestion and the suggestion.	s precise as possible. this box to set out your comments. mation, evidence and supporting
SEE ATTACHED STATEMEN	T	

	(ww	/www.formarchitomorphopoveuk
Core Strategy Development	Plan Document	For Office Use only:
Proposed Main Modification	ıs – November 2015	Date
Representation Form		Ref
PART B – YOUR REPRESENTATION (Additional Part B forms can be downloaded from the	e web page)	
4. To which proposed main modification	on does this representation relate?	
Proposed Main Modification number:	MM 12	in the second se
5. Do support or object the proposed n	nain modification?	
Support	/ Object	
6. Do you consider the proposed main	modification to be 'legally compli	ant'?
Yes	/ No	
7. Do you consider the proposed main	modification to be 'sound'?	
Yes 🗸	No – 'unsound'	
If you consider the proposed main resoundness your comments relate to		se identify which test of
Positively prepared	Justified	
Effective	Consistent with Natio Policy (the NPPF)	nal Planning
9. Please give details of why you con unsound in light of the main modified if you wish to support the propose (Please note: Your representation support / just your representation relates to a propose.	ications proposed. Please be as ped main modification please use the hould cover succinctly all the informatify the representation and the suggestion and the suggestify the representation and the suggestify the suggestification and the sugg	orecise as possible. ils box to set out your comments. ation, evidence and supporting
SEE ATTACHED STATEM	E~ T	

			, Maria de Cara de Car
Core Strategy Develop	ın Document	For Office Use only:	
Proposed Main Modifications – November 2015			Date
Representation Form			Ref
PART B – YOUR REPRESENT Additional Part B forms can be downloade			et for each representation.
4. To which proposed main mod			
Proposed Main Modification numb	er:	MM 18	
5. Do support or object the prop	osed main i	modification?	
Support		Object	
6. Do you consider the propose	l main mod	ification to be 'legally compl	liant'?
Yes	J	No	
7. Do you consider the propose	l main mod	ification to be 'sound'?	en e
Yes	✓	No – 'unsound'	
8. If you consider the proposed soundness your comments		fication to be 'unsound', plea	ase identify which test of
Positively prepared		Justified	
Effective		Consistent with Nation	onal Planning
		r the proposed main modific ons proposed. Please be as	ation is <u>not legally compliant or is</u> precise as possible.
(Please note: Your represen	tation should	cover succinctly all the inform	his box to set out your comments. nation, evidence and supporting gested change. It is important that
your representation relates to			gested change. This important that
SEE ATTACHED STATE			

		T VAV	w bradford gov uk
Core Strategy Develo	pment Pla	n Document	For Office Use only:
Proposed Main Modi	Date		
Representation Form	1		Ref
PART B – YOUR REPRESE (Additional Part B forms can be downlo			for each representation.
4. To which proposed main n	odification do	es this representation relate?	
Proposed Main Modification nu	mber:	MM 51	
5. Do support or object the p	roposed main n	nodification?	
Support		Object	
6. Do you consider the propo	sed main modi	fication to be 'legally complia	
Yes		No	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
.		······································	
7. Do you consider the propo	sed main modi	fication to be 'sound'?	The second secon
Yes	√	No 'unsound'	
8. If you consider the proposition soundness your commen		ication to be 'unsound', pleas	se identify which test of
Positively prepared		Justified	
Effective		Consistent with Natior Policy (the NPPF)	nal Planning
unsound in light of the m If you wish to support th (Please note: Your repre-	nain modification e proposed main sentation should upport / justify the	ons proposed. Please be as p in modification please use thit cover succinctly all the informative representation and the sugge	s box to set out your comments.
SEE ATTACHED STA	TEMENT		

PARTIES AND	ALTERNATION CONTRACTOR	WW	wsbradtord govuk
Core Strategy Develop	ment Pla	an Document	For Office Use only:
Proposed Main Modific	ations –	November 2015	Date
Representation Form			Ref
PART B - YOUR REPRESEN			t for each representation.
(Additional Part B forms can be downloaded) 4. To which proposed main models.	. 40 0	m Touris of the service of the servi	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Proposed Main Modification numb		MM 88	
5. Do support or object the prop	osed main	modification?	
Support	/	Object	
Зирроп		Object	
6. Do you consider the propose	d main mod	lification to be 'legally compli	ant'?
Yes	/	No	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
,			<u> </u>
7. Do you consider the propose	d main mod	lification to be 'sound'?	
Yes	✓	No – 'unsound'	
8. If you consider the proposed soundness your comments	I main modi relate to?	fication to be 'unsound', plea	se identify which test of
Positively prepared	**************************************	Justified	-
Effective		Consistent with Natio	nal Planning
unsound in light of the main If you wish to support the part (Please note: Your represer	n modification proposed man intation should port / justify the	ons proposed. Please be as pain modification please use the document of the information and the suggestion and the suggestion.	is box to set out your comments.
SEE ATTACHED STATE	-MENT		

		www.rorororororororororororororororororo		
ore Strategy Developmer	For Office Use only:			
oposed Main Modificatio	Date			
epresentation Form	Ref			
ART B – YOUR REPRESENTATION dditional Part B forms can be downloaded from		et for each representation.		
. To which proposed main modificat	tion does this representation relate	a?		
roposed Main Modification number:	MM 92			
. Do support or object the proposed	main modification?			
Support	Object			
Do you consider the proposed ma	in modification to be 'legally comp	 liant'?		
Yes	No			
. Do you consider the proposed ma	in modification to be 'sound'?			
Yes	No – 'unsound'			
. If you consider the proposed main soundness your comments relat		ase identify which test of		
Positively prepared	Justified	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Effective	Consistent with Nati Policy (the NPPF)	ional Planning		
unsound in light of the main model of you wish to support the propose (Please note: Your representation	onsider the proposed main modific difications proposed. Please be as sed main modification please use to a should cover succinctly all the information justify the representation and the sugposed main modification).	s precise as possible. this box to set out your comment: nation, evidence and supporting		
SEE ATTACHED STATEMEN	т			
	•			

Core Strategy Develop	For Office Use only:			
Proposed Main Modific	Date			
Representation Form		Ref		
•	I O N		4-45	
PART B – YOUR REPRESENT (Additional Part B forms can be downloade			et for each representation.	
4. To which proposed main mod	lification d	loes this representation relate		
Proposed Main Modification numb	nr.	MM 96		
гторозестиант июсиюсяюн нать	L	MM 16		
5. Do support or object the prop	osed mair	n modification?	and the second of the second o	
		the state of the s		
Support		Object		
6. Do you consider the propose	d main mo	odification to be flegally compl	liant?	
and a second control of the second control of the second control of the second control of the second control of		and the second s	Section 1	
Yes		No		
7. Do you consider the propose	d main mc	adification to be 'sound'?		
and the second second of the			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Yes		No – 'unsound'		
8. If you consider the proposed soundness your comments			ase identify which test of	
Positively prepared		Justified		
Effective	_	Consistent with Nation Policy (the NPPF)	onal Planning	
		der the proposed main modifications proposed. Please be as	ration is <u>not legally compliant or is</u> precise as possible.	
			his box to set out your comments.	
(Please note: Your represen	itation shou	uld cover succinctly all the inform	nation, evidence and supporting	
information necessary to supp your representation relates to			gested change. It is important that	
		W. Ollow Comments of the Comment of		
SEE ATTACHED STATE	T N3M.			
l .				

		100	52.1			100,000	100	200			B165(4.5)	GEOLOGICAL CONTRACT	1,325,51	X12 X 11 X 15
	43.50		3.3	4-19-K	600	100	30 TO	ترزاو ۲	1000	er and	THE STATE	3 w	13.5	ιk
	218	a a a n	JEU	455	5.0	-35-24	iš la lak	E Los E	1 24 50	$\alpha = \lambda \alpha$	and the same	12.12	40.	365-040-010
	100	1,000	200	3.83	85 - SSR	E45.43	50 × 10		7 P. 1994			Acres 6	3 223	200
			200	37777	-3.00	1000	100			75 M M		77	KY-SSY:	337 75
3				1000				0.000	2005	1000 130	10.83500	RED LAK	March 1	200211-160

10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modification 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.

SEE ATTACHED STATEMENT

11. Signature:

Date:

18th JANUARY 2016

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