Dated: January 2016

Representations to City of Bradford MDC Core Strategy DPD - Proposed Main Modifications – November 2015 with Specific Reference to Land at Hag Farm Road, Burley in Wharfedale SHLAA Reference BU/004



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 Rothery, 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 Hag Farm Road, Burley in Wharfedale, SHLAA Reference BU/004.
- 1.3 It should be noted that Rothery 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. Rothery <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. Rothery 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. Rothery <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. Rothery 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. Rothery <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. Rothery 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. Rothery <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 Ilkley, Burley in Wharfedale and Menston.
- 2.23 Mr. Rothery 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. Rothery <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. Rothery considers that the inclusion of Burley in Wharfedale and Menston in the Local Growth Centres is <u>sound</u> 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. Rothery <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. Rothery <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. Rothery 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. Rothery 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.

								O			

Core Strategy Development Plan Document
Proposed Main Modifications – November 2015
Representation Form

For	Office Use only:
Date	
Ref	

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 a	pplicable)
Title	MR		MR		
First Name					
Last Name	ROTHERY		IRVI	NG	
Job Title (where relevant to this representation)			DIREC	TOR	
Organisation (where relevant to this representation)			ID PL	ANNING	
Address Line 1	c/. AGENT				
Line 2					
Line 3			LEEDS		
Line 4					CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR
Post Code			LSI		
Telephone Number					
Email Address					
Signature:			Date:		18th JANUARY 2016
3. Please let us kno	w if you wish to be notified o	f the follov	ving:	· .	
The publication o	Yes	/	No		
The adoption of t	Yes	/	No		
Are you attaching any additional sheets /		Yes	/	No	
documents that re representation?	No of she documen	eets / ts submitted :			

Core Strategy Develo	pment Plan	Document	For Office Use only:
Proposed Main Modi	ovember 2015	Date	
Representation Form			Ref
•		ana una a canarata cha	ot for each representation
PART B - YOUR REPRESE Additional Part B forms can be downlo	aded from the web page	ase use a separate site	et for each representation.
I. To which proposed main n	odification does	this representation relat	9?
Proposed Main Modification nu	mber:	MM 2	
5. Do support or object the p	roposed main mo	dification?	
Support	1	Object	
t de la companya de			The second secon
6. Do you consider the propo	sed main modific	cation to be 'legally comp	pliant'?
Yes	1	No	
en de la companya del companya de la	and a government of the contract of the		and the second of the second o
7. Do you consider the prop	osed main modific	cation to be 'sound'?	
Yes	/	No — 'unsound'	
soundness your comme Positively prepared	nts relate to r	Justified Consistent with Na	itional Planning
Effective		Policy (the NPPF)	Alonai Planising
unsound in light of the I	main modification ne proposed main esentation should o support / justify the	s proposed. Please be a modification please use cover succinctly all the information and the su	ication is not legally compliant or is precise as possible. this box to set out your comment mation, evidence and supporting aggested change. It is important that
SEE ATTACHED ST	ATEMENT		
Out Mindenes 3			

Core Strategy Develop	For Office Use only:		
Proposed Main Modific	cations – N	November 2015	Date
Representation Form			Ref
PART B - YOUR REPRESEN	TATION - Ple	ease use a separate sheet	t for each representation.
(Additional Part B forms can be downloade	ed from the web pa	age)	
4. To which proposed main mod	dification does	this representation relate?	
Proposed Main Modification numb	per: ^	1M 7	
5. Do support or object the prop	posed main m	odification?	
Support		Object	
C. Da very bounder the propose		inction to be flegally compli	ant??
6. Do you consider the propose	M maur moun		(A))
Yes		No	
7. Do you consider the propose	ed main modif	ication to be 'sound'?	and the second s
	200 0 1 100 m o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o o		
Yes	<u> </u>	No – 'unsound'	
8. If you consider the proposed soundness your comments		cation to be 'unsound', plea	se identify which test of
Positively prepared		Justified	
Effective		Consistent with Natio Policy (the NPPF)	onal Planning
L	<u> </u>	. Tolloy (the table)	
9. Please give details of why	you consider	the proposed main modificans proposed. Please be as p	ation is <u>not legally compliant or is</u>
	F. 7 2 4 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7		nis box to set out your comments.
(Please note: Your represe	ntation should o	cover succinctly all the informa	ation, evidence and supporting
information necessary to sup your representation relates to	port / justify the	e representation and the sugg	jested change. It is important that
		Total Trooms	
SEE ATTACHED ST	ATEMENT		
j			

ore Strategy Develop	ment Plan D	ocument	For Office Use only:
roposed Main Modific	vember 2015	Date	
epresentation Form			Ref
ART B – YOUR REPRESEN	TATION - <i>Pl</i> eas	e use a separate she	et for each representation.
Additional Part B forms can be downloade	d from the web page)	maje (%) - (%) - (15 - 11 - 11 - 15 - 19 - 8 0 0 7 (10 - 11 - 12) (15 - 15 - 15 - 15)	
. To which proposed main mod	lification does th	ils representation relat	e?
roposed Main Modification numb	er: MM	18	
. Do support or object the prop	osed main mod	ification?	
Support	1	Object	
		and the second s	
. Do you consider the propose	d main modifica	tion to be 'legally comp	oliant 7
Yes	<u> </u>	No	
			en e
. Do you consider the propose	d main modifica	tion to be 'sounday L	
Yes	✓	No – 'unsound'	
soundness your comments Positively prepared	relate to?	Justified	
Effective	***************************************	Consistent with Na Policy (the NPPF)	tional Planning
		i Nina Buoy Myy ya <u>ya </u>	
 Please give details of why unsound in light of the mai 	you consider the n modifications	e proposed main modifi proposed. Please be a	cation is <u>not legally compliant or</u> s precise as possible.
		the control of the co	this box to set out your commen
(Please note: Your represe information necessary to sup your representation relates to	port / justify the re	epresentation and the su	mation, evidence and supporting ggested change. It is important that
SEE ATTACHED STATE	EMENT		<u>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </u>
	-		

	医生态的 地名美国西 克勒	W.W.S	TD B 7 Clev	oragov.uk
Core Strategy Developr	nent Pla	an Document	For O	ffice Use only:
Proposed Main Modific	- November 2015	Date		
Representation Form			Ref	
PART B – YOUR REPRESENT (Additional Part B forms can be downloaded	ATION - F	Please use a separate sheet	for each re	oresentation.
4. To which proposed main mod	ification do	pes this representation relate?		
Proposed Main Modification number	ər:	MM 9		
5. Do support or object the prop	osed main	modification?	-	
Support	<u> </u>	Object		
		The second section is a second of the second		
6. Do you consider the proposed	d main mod	dification to be 'legally complia	int'?	
Yes	1	No		
		And American the Control of the Cont		
7. Do you consider the propose	d main mod	dification to be 'sound'?		
Yes	1	No – 'unsound'		(,)
Positively prepared	relate to?	Justified Consistent with Natio	nal Planning	
Effective		Policy (the NPPF)		
If you wish to support the r	n modificatoroposed matation shout port / justify	ler the proposed main modifications proposed. Please be as plain modification please use the lower succinctly all the information and the sugged main modification).	recise as po is box to set ation, evidenc	ssible. out your comments. e and supporting
SEE ATTACHED STA	rement			

Core Strategy Develop	ment Plan Docume	nt	For Office Use only:
Proposed Main Modific	2015	Date	
Representation Form		ı .	Ref
•	FATION Place use a si	nnarato choot fo	or each representation
PART B – YOUR REPRESEN' (Additional Part B forms can be downloade	d from the web page)	eparate sneet it	n each representation.
4. To which proposed main mod	lification does this represe	ntation relate?	
Proposed Main Modification numb	er: Mm 11		adayanatik da shiya analahagi kupi kupi ayyid sanyiqishirid kabanasiin samariyyadadiin — pilkidi in 1974 fi Ta bi Addid radi
5. Do support or object the prop	osed main modification?		
Support	/ Objec		
Support .			
6. Do you consider the propose	d main modification to be '	legally compliant	ť?
Yes	/ No	The state of the s	
L			<u></u>
7. Do you consider the propose	d main modification to be	sound'?	The second se
Yes	/ No - 5	unsound'	
165	V	anodana	
8. If you consider the proposed	t main modification to be 'ւ	ınsound'. please	identify which test of
soundness your comments			
Positively prepared	Justif	ied	
Effective	1	stent with Nationa	l Planning
LITOGUYO	Policy	(the NPPF)	Property and the second sec
9. Please give details of why	you consider the proposed	main modification	on is <u>not legally compliant or is</u>
unsound in light of the mai	n modifications proposed.	Please be as pre	cise as possible.
			box to set out your comments.
(Please note: Your represer	itation should cover succinct	y all the information	on, evidence and supporting ted change. It is important that
your representation relates to	a proposed main modification	on).	ou onango. Te lo associate trate
SEE ATTACHED ST	ATF M G N T		
SEE ATTACHED ST	-11 31-1674 1		

Core Strategy Develop	ment Plan	Document	For Office Use only:
Proposed Main Modific	lovember 2015	Date	
Representation Form			Ref
•	TATION DIA	anno uno o congreto choc	of for each representation
PART B - YOUR REPRESEN (Additional Part B forms can be download	ed from the web pa	ase use a separate snee	Lior each representation.
4. To which proposed main mo	dification does	this representation relate	?
Proposed Main Modification numb	per:	MM 12	
5. Do support or object the pro	posed main m	odification?	
Support	<u> </u>	Object	
6. Do you consider the propose	ed main modifi	cation to be 'legally compl	iant'?
Yes	/	No	
7. Do you consider the propose	ed main modif	ication to be 'sound'?	
Yes	/	No – 'unsound'	
8. If you consider the propose soundness your comments	d main modific s relate to?		ase identify which test of
Positively prepared		Justified	
Effective		Consistent with Nation Policy (the NPPF)	onal Planning
unsound in light of the ma If you wish to support the (Please note: Your represe	in modification proposed mail entation should poort / justify the	ns proposed. Please be as n modification please use the cover succinctly all the informerepresentation and the suggestions.	cation is not legally compliant or is precise as possible. his box to set out your comments. nation, evidence and supporting gested change. It is important that
SEE ATTACHED ST	TATEMENT		
DOD THE THE	, , , , , , ,		

Core Strategy Developr	ment Plan D	ocument	For Office Use only:
Proposed Main Modific	Date		
Representation Form			Ref
PART B - YOUR REPRESENT	`ATION - <i>Pl</i> ease	e use a separate shee	et for each representation.
(Additional Part B forms can be downloaded	d from the web page)	ego poro la compansa de la compansa	e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e
4. To which proposed main mod	ification does thi	is representation relate	
Proposed Main Modification number	er: Mi	M 18	
5. Do support or object the prop	acad main madi	iontian?	
Participation of the control of the	Osed main modifi		
Support		Object	
6. Do you consider the proposed	d main modificati	ion to be 'legally compl	liant'?
Yes	<i></i>	No	
			
7. Do you consider the proposed	d main modificat	ion to be 'sound'?	
Yes	/	No – 'unsound'	
8. If you consider the proposed soundness your comments		on to be 'unsound', ple	ase identify which test of
Positively prepared		Justified	
Effective	and the second	Consistent with Nati Policy (the NPPF)	onal Planning
9. Please give details of why y unsound in light of the mair	ou consider the modifications p	proposed main modific roposed. Please be as	sation is <u>not legally compliant or is</u> precise as possible.
			his box to set out your comments.
(Please note: Your represent information necessary to support your representation relates to	ort / justify the rep	presentation and the sug	nation, evidence and supporting gested change. It is important that
SEE ATTACHED STATE	EMENT		
a production of the control of the c			

www.pradford.gov.uk

	_				
Core Strategy Develo	opment Plan D	ocument	For Office Use only:		
Proposed Main Modifications – November 2015					
Representation Forn	٦	-			
PART B - YOUR REPRES (Additional Part B forms can be down!		e use a separate sheet f	or each representation.		
4. To which proposed main r	nodification does th	is representation relate?			
Proposed Main Modification no	umber: M	M 51			
5. Do support or object the p	proposed main modi	fication?			
Support	<i>J</i>	Object			
6. Do you consider the prop	osed main modificat	ion to be 'legally compliar	ıt'?		
Yes		No			
7. Do you consider the prop	osed main modificat	tion to be 'sound'?			
Yes	/	No – 'unsound'			
8. If you consider the proposoundness your comme	osed main modificati ents relate to?	on to be 'unsound', please	e identify which test of		
Positively prepared		Justified			
Effective		Consistent with Nation Policy (the NPPF)	al Planning		
Please give details of w unsound in light of the	hy you consider the	proposed main modificati proposed. Please be as pr	ion is <u>not legally compliant or is</u> ecise as possible.		
If you wish to <u>support</u> t	he proposed main m	odification please use this	box to set out your comments.		
(Please note: Your reprint information necessary to your representation related	support / justify the re	presentation and the sugge:	ion, evidence and supporting sted change. It is important that		
SEE ATTACHED ST	ATEMENT		Marine Jeron vergen vije vijek je skole je vije minerjelom v minimer projekt og 95 de Artikala v Marine i med vilenske ver		

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			W.Oradi	ora, gov.uk										
Core Strategy Develop	For Office Use only:													
Proposed Main Modific	Oate													
Representation Form		Ref												
PART B - YOUR REPRESEN			t for each re	presentation.										
(Additional Part B forms can be download			5											
4. To which proposed main mod	Inication doe	es this representation retate												
Proposed Main Modification numb	per;	MM 88												
5. Do support or object the prop	oosed main n	nodification?												
Support		Object												
														
6. Do you consider the propose	d main modi	fication to be 'legally compli	iant"?											
Yes	<u> </u>	No												
7. Do you consider the propose	ed main modi													
Yes		No – 'unsound'												
8. If you consider the propose soundness your comments		ication to be 'unsound', plea	se identify w	hich test of										
Positively prepared		Justified												
Effective	1	Consistent with Nation	onal Planning											
9. Please give details of why	you consider	r the proposed main modific	ation is <u>not le</u>	gally compliant or is										
		ons proposed. Please be as in modification please use the												
(Please note: Your represe	ntation should oport / justify th	l cover succinctly all the inform ne representation and the sugg	ation, evidenc	e and supporting										
SEE ATTACHED STAT	EMENT													
A CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACTOR														
Reference of the Control of the Cont														

www.bradford.gev.uk

Core Strategy Devel	For Office Use only:		
Proposed Main Mod	Jate		
Representation For	Ref		
•	SENTATION -	Please use a separate shee	et for each representation.
1. To which proposed main	modification o	loes this representation relate	?
Proposed Main Modification r	number:	MM 92	
5. Do support or object the	proposed mai	n modification?	
Support		Object	J
garanta de la casa de l	,		
). Do you consider the prop	oosed main mo	odification to be 'legally compl	liant'?
Yes		No	
7. Do you consider the pro	assed main m	odification to be 'sound'?	
	posed main in		
Yes		No 'unsound'	·
soundness your comm	ents relate to?	dification to be 'unsound', ple Justified	ase identity without test of
Effective		Consistent with Nati Policy (the NPPF)	ional Planning
unsound in light of the If you wish to support (Please note: Your rep	main modificathe proposed in resentation shows a support / justification main main main main main main main mai	ations proposed. Please be as main modification please use t uid cover succinctly all the inform by the representation and the sug	this box to set out your comment
SEE ATTACHED ST	TATEMENT		

THE RESIDENCE AND ASSOCIATE AND ASSOCIATE AND ASSOCIATE ASSOCIATION ASSOCIATIO		WW	AWPOFACTOROSGOVEUK							
Core Strategy Develop	For Office Use only:									
Proposed Main Modific	Date									
Representation Form		Ref								
PART B – YOUR REPRESEN' (Additional Part B forms can be downloade			t for each representation.							
4. To which proposed main mod		with the second	?							
Proposed Main Modification numb		MM 96								
5. Do support or object the prop	oosed main	modification?								
Support	/	Object								
6. Do you consider the propose	d main mod	lification to be 'legally compli	iant'?							
Yes	/	No	,							
7. Do you consider the propose	od main mor	diffication to be 'sound'?								
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	/	No – 'unsound'								
Yes	<u> </u>	NO - unsound								
8. If you consider the proposed soundness your comments		ification to be 'unsound', plea	ase identify which test of							
Positively prepared		Justified								
Effective		Consistent with Nation Policy (the NPPF)	Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)							
unsound in light of the mai If you wish to support the r (Please note: Your represen	n modification proposed manual ntation shoul port / justify	ions proposed. Please be as pain modification please use the decover succinctly all the informathe representation and the sugg	his box to set out your comments							
SEE ATTACHED STATE	EMENT									
1										

Н	æε	œ	38 .	732	17.1	98	SW.	ы.		201	- 5	45	 т.			100				-	- 7			75.0	950	4		÷
	ВΠ.	ĸ	ж.	84	.41		1.40	85/15	3.71	100		1.3	100	A	2.00			 Artis.				: 10	٧	- 30	75.1	→ 4 1:		ė
	re.		35.1		X 1.1		2.5	200	 200	1.55		55.	w	28.	2.00		200	 15.7	2.0	•	2.3	-0.0	ar ar	10		-		

18H JANUARY 2016

Date:

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

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

11. Signature: