

Name:

On behalf of the Landowners of ONG.R1 (Eales-White, Johnson, Kerr, Kerr, and McKinney)

**Part B – Your representation on the further 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 further Main Modification and/or supporting document does your representation relate to? (Representations are only invited on further Main Modifications within the Schedule. These are denoted by red text. The reference number can be found in the first column in red i.e. **MM2**, **MM11** 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 further Main

MM no.

MM84

Supporting document reference

5. Do you consider this further 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 further Main Modification and/or supporting document is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise and concise as possible. If your response exceeds 300 words please also provide an executive summary of no more than 300 words. 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 welcome the amendment to **Part D** to clarify that on and off-site infrastructure and services should be necessary and fairly and reasonably related to the development, having regard to the IDP.

We support the modification **Part I** regarding the Concept Framework requirement, however, we question the need to define it as an “important” material consideration. The Concept Framework will be a non-statutory planning document, which was not subject to the same scrutiny via the Examination process. As such, its status should not be elevated over other material considerations which could be more up-to-date and relevant at the time of determination.

We welcome the amendment to **Part K** to include a requirement to consult with all those with a development interest within the Concept Framework Area.

*(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)*

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the **further 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 and concise as possible. If your response exceeds 300 words please also provide an executive summary of no more than 300 words.

In respect of **Part I**, we suggest the word “important” is deleted.


*(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)*

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

Yes

No

Signature:



Date

08-12-22