

Name:

**Part B – Your representation on the Main Modifications and/or supporting documents**

If you wish to make more than one representation, please complete a separate [Part B form](#) for each representation and clearly print your name at the top of this form.

4. Which **Main Modification number and/or supporting document** does your representation relate to? (Each Main Modification within the Schedule has a reference number. This can be found in the first column i.e. MM1, MM2 and each Supporting Document has a reference number beginning with ED).

Any representation on a supporting document should clearly state (in question 6) which paragraphs of the document it relates to and, as far as possible, your comments should be linked to specific Main Modifications. You should avoid lengthy comments on the supporting documents themselves.

MM no.  Supporting document reference

5. Do you consider this **Main Modification and/or supporting document**:  
(Please refer to the Guidance notes for an explanation of terms)

- a) Is Legally compliant      Yes       No
- b) Sound      Yes       No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail

Positively prepared       Effective   
Justified       Consistent with national policy

6. Please give details of why you consider the **Main Modification and/or supporting document** is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the legal compliance, soundness of the Local Plan or compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

We are supportive of the modifications to the Policy P6 supporting text to address inconsistencies and add detail and clarification to policy interpretation. These will aid applicants and decision is makers accordance with the NPPF 2012 paragraph 154.

We support the modification to the supporting text at **paragraph 5.92** which aligns the Strategic Masterplan requirement for North Weald Basset with Policy SP3 and paragraph 2.95.

*(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)*

We note **paragraph 5.93** clarifies that the location and access to site NWB.T1 is to be determined through the Strategic Masterplanning process. We have no objection to this wording, as this was always envisaged to be the case, with the Local Plan evidence base for location and access contained in the Site Selection Report 2018 (EB805 and associated appendices EB805R to EB805 AA) and Traveller Site Selection Methodology (TSSM EB805AI) providing the starting point for location and access.

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the **Main Modification and/or supporting document** legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Positively prepared/Justified/Effective/Consistent with national policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Submission Version of the Local 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.

N/A

*(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)*

***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. 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.***

8. Have you attached any documents with this representation which specifically relate to an MM or supporting document?

Yes

No

Signature:



Date

23-09-21