



Core Strategy Partial Review

Preferred Options - July 2019

Representation Form – Part B

For Office Use only:	
Date	
Ref	

PART B – YOUR REPRESENTATION - Please use a separate sheet for each representation.

(Additional Part B forms can be downloaded from the web page)

1. Please state which document you wish to comment on:-

Core Strategy PR Preferred Options	<input type="checkbox" value="Y"/>	Sustainability Appraisal	<input type="checkbox"/>
Habitats Regulations Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	Equality Impact Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>
Health Impact Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/>	Evidence Base <i>(please state which document below)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="text"/>			

2. Please state which part of the document your comments relates to:-

Policy	<input type="text" value="HO4"/>	Page Number	<input type="text" value="157"/>	Paragraph	<input type="text" value="Q29"/>
--------	----------------------------------	-------------	----------------------------------	-----------	----------------------------------

3. Do you wish to:-

Support	<input type="checkbox"/>	Object	<input type="checkbox" value="Yes"/>	Comment	<input type="checkbox" value="Yes"/>
---------	--------------------------	--------	--------------------------------------	---------	--------------------------------------

4. Please provide your comments and/or any suggested changes in the box below.

If you would support an alternative to the preferred option, please provide further details and evidence to support this.

(Please note: Your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support / justify the representation and the suggested change. It is important that your representation relates to the consultation document).

The Society agrees with the abandonment of a universal 2 tier phasing of development. However Paragraphs 5.34.2 (Page 154) and 5.35.3 (Page 155) point to clear differences between the larger urban conurbations and the smaller rural centres. The Society proposes that the former should not be subject to phasing to allow large sites to be brought forward early in the Plan period, whilst the latter should be subject to phasing. This would fulfil the requirement set out in Point B Paragraph 5.34.4 (Page 155) “to ensure a delivery path within smaller and rural areas of sites which meet local and affordable housing need over the whole period of the Local Plan.”

Please continue your comments on the next page.



[Large empty rectangular box for representation details]

Signature:	<input type="text"/>	Date:	<input type="text"/>
-------------------	----------------------	--------------	----------------------

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