

Core Strategy - Proposed Main Modifications  
 Development Plans  
 2nd Floor (South) Jacob's Well  
 Nelson Street  
 Bradford  
 BD1 5RW  
[planning.policy@bradford.gov.uk](mailto:planning.policy@bradford.gov.uk)  
**Sent by Email only**

20/01/2016

Dear Sir / Madam,

## Core Strategy DPD Proposed Main Modifications

Thank you for consulting with the Home Builders Federation (HBF) on the Core Strategy Main Modifications consultation.

The HBF is the principal representative body of the house building industry in England and Wales and our representations reflect the views of our membership of multinational PLCs, through regional developers to small, local builders. Our members account for over 80% of all new housing built in England and Wales in any one year including a large proportion of the new affordable housing stock.

The HBF was a participant in a number of the examination hearing sessions, providing both oral and written submissions. We have not sought to duplicate our written submissions as part of this consultation, however we do make reference to a number of our previous comments. The HBF would like to submit the following additional comments upon the main modifications which have been structured to accord with the consultation document and the representation form. **If required the HBF would also wish to attend any further hearing sessions.**

3. Please let us know if you wish to be notified of the following:				
The publication of the Inspector's Report?	Yes	✓	No	
The adoption of the Core Strategy?	Yes	✓	No	

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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:	MM1
------------------------------------	-----

**5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support	<input type="checkbox"/>	Object	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---------	--------------------------	--------	-------------------------------------

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
-----	-------------------------------------	----	--------------------------

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No – 'unsound'	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----------------	-------------------------------------

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared	<input type="checkbox"/>	Justified	<input type="checkbox"/>
Effective	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

The HBF supports the inclusion of the words *'in full'* which accord with an element of our previous comments upon this policy and are more consistent with the NPPF. The objective does, however, retain the prioritisation of previously developed land. As discussed within our comments upon the submission version of the plan and within our hearing statements this is considered contrary to paragraph 111 of the NPPF which seeks to encourage, not prioritise, the effective use of previously developed land.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

The HBF suggest that the objective be amended to read;

*'To ensure that the district's needs for housing, business and commerce are met **in full** in sustainable locations that reduce the need to travel and are well served by public and services, whilst ~~prioritising~~ **encouraging**, the use of deliverable and developable previously developed land. In so doing overcrowding within the existing housing stock should be reduced.'*

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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:

MM3

**5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support

✓

Object

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes

✓

No

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes

✓

No – 'unsound'

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

The proposed modification provides greater clarity and removes uncertainty. The support for this main modification also relates to all related modifications including MM46, MM61, MM62, etc.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

Not applicable.

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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:

MM5

**5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support

✓

Object

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes

✓

No

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes

✓

No – 'unsound'

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

The modification provides greater inclusivity and clarity with regards to the policy.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

Not applicable.

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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:

MM10

**5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support

✓

Object

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes

✓

No

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes

✓

No – 'unsound'

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

The proposed amendment provides greater clarity and is more positively worded.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

Not applicable.

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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:

MM18

**5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support

✓

Object

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes

✓

No

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes

✓

No – 'unsound'

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

The explicit reference to the need to review the Green Belt is welcomed and supported. This provides greater clarity to the Core Strategy and Allocations DPD.

In common with our comments upon objectively assessed housing needs (see our Matter 4a hearing statement and comments upon the publication version of the plan) the HBF consider that the Council may need to consider whether the proposed Green Belt releases are sufficient.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

Not applicable.

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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:

MM73

**5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support

Object

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes

No

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes

No – 'unsound'

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

The modification is considered unsound as the housing requirement remains the same as that proposed within the submission version of the plan. The HBF made comments upon this issue both at submission and within our written and oral comments upon Matter 4a of the examination hearing sessions. Both of these documents are already before the Council and the Inspector and as such our arguments are not repeated here. It is, however, notable that since the examination hearing sessions the ONS have recently announced that net migration to the UK is substantially higher than previously estimated. This is particularly important within Bradford where Unattributable Population Change (UPC), often attributed to international migration, has consistently been an issue for Bradford and has led to constant annual uplifts to the population (paragraph 2.6, EB033). Furthermore international migration has also constantly been assumed to be positive within Bradford (figure 3, EB033). Therefore any under-assumption of international migration nationally could have a significant effect upon the population and housing needs of Bradford.

Furthermore to make this modification compatible with the NPPF requirement for positive planning and to boost significantly housing supply, as well as main modification MM86, it is recommended that the housing requirement be expressed as a minimum.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

The HBF recommends that a higher housing requirement is needed.



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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:

MM86

**5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support

✓

Object

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes

✓

No

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes

✓

No – 'unsound'

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

The HBF supports the inclusion of the words 'at least' prior to the housing requirement. This is considered a positive statement and is more consistent with the NPPF. Our support for this main modification does is provided without prejudice to our continued objection to the overall housing requirement which is considered too low.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

Not applicable.

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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:

MM89

**5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support

Object

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes

No

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes

No – 'unsound'

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

The HBF raised objection to the phasing of sites within our comments upon the submission version of the Core Strategy as well as our written and oral comments to the examination hearing sessions (matter 7b). This main modification does not seek to address this issue but rather adds clarity to the existing position. Given that the Council and Inspector are already in receipt of our comments upon this issue they are not repeated in detail here. However, in summary we consider that the proposed phasing of sites will not assist the Council in achieving a five year supply, therefore upon adoption of the Core Strategy the housing policies are likely to be out of date (paragraph 48 NPPF). Furthermore because the Council are seeking the phasing requirement to promote sites in regeneration areas and on previously developed land which are likely to have significant economic viability issues, this may further hamper the achievement of a five year supply.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

The phasing policy be deleted.

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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:

MM91 & MM92

**5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support

✓

Object

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes

✓

No

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes

✓

No – 'unsound'

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

The HBF support the inclusion of criteria D and E (MM91) and the additional supporting text (MM92) which will provide a more responsive mechanism for bringing forward sites from later phases. This will assist in addressing issues such as under-delivery and ensuring that larger more complex sites, with longer lead-in times prior to development commencing, can assist in delivering the overall plan requirements.

Our support of these criteria (MM91) and the supporting text (MM92) should not, however, be considered to over-ride our fundamental objection to the phasing policy, set out within our comments upon the submission version of the plan and examination hearing statements, as well as against MM89 above.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

See our response to MM89 above.

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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:

MM93

**5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support

Object

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes

No

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes

No – 'unsound'

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

The proposed main modification to paragraph 5.3.77 indicates that the minimum density requirement of 30dph can be varied, although it does not provide any further information regarding the circumstances where variations may be required.

Whilst the proposed modification is welcomed it does not go far enough on terms of overcoming our initial concerns with policy HO5 and the explanatory text. Our objections are clearly set out without our comments upon the publication version of the plan and examination hearing statement upon matter 7b. In summary these relate to a need to consider site characteristics, local needs, demand and viability.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

To ensure that Policy HO5 is consistent with other Core Strategy policies and takes account of site specific issues it is recommended that reference to the fact a lower density may be acceptable having regard to site layout and characteristics, infrastructure provision, local needs and demands as well as viability. This reference could either be included as part of the policy or within the supporting text. It is also considered that this reference would balance the text which currently refers to higher densities only.

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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:

MM96, MM97 & MM98

**5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support

Object

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes

No

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes

No – 'unsound'

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

The proposed modifications are considered an improvement upon Policy HO6 (MM96) and the supporting text (MM97 and MM98) as they are clear that the percentages are targets rather than requirements. These proposed modifications do not, however, overcome our fundamental concerns with the policy and supporting text. These concerns are clearly set out within our comments upon the publication version of the plan and within our matter 7b examination hearing statement.

In summary our concerns relate to the fact that the Council's own evidence does not indicate that the targets are achievable and as such the policy is not justified. The plan wide 50% requirement would need a previously developed land supply of at least 21,044 units, approximately 3,000 more than identified, within the Council's evidence base, even if all such sites are viable. Furthermore the prioritisation of previously developed land is contrary to the NPPF which seeks to encourage its re-use.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

The policy and supporting text which refers to prioritisation should be amended to read encourage and the targets re-drafted to conform to the evidence base.

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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:

MM99

**5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support

✓

Object

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes

✓

No

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes

✓

No – 'unsound'

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

The insertion of a reference to viability within supporting paragraph 5.3.116 is supported. These will ensure that the plan is more flexible and responsive to local market conditions at the time of the application. It is, however, considered that it would also be beneficial to include the viability clause into Policy HO8 to provide consistency and certainty within the decision making process.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

Include the proposed modification within Policy HO8.

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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:	MM100
------------------------------------	-------

**5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support	<input type="checkbox"/>	Object	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---------	--------------------------	--------	-------------------------------------

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----	-------------------------------------

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No – 'unsound'	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
-----	--------------------------	----------------	-------------------------------------

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared	<input type="checkbox"/>	Justified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Effective	<input type="checkbox"/>	Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

The HBF supports the amendments to Part B of the policy which refers to sustainable design and construction. The proposed amendments remove the reference to the Code for Sustainable Homes, which is now defunct, and indicate that the relevant energy efficiency standards are those set out within the Building Regulations. This is considered consistent with the Ministerial Statement upon Housing Standards.

The HBF continues to object to Part C of the policy which refers to the need for larger sites to include a proportion of housing which are designed to be accessible and easily adaptable to support the changing needs of families and individuals over their lifetime, including older people and people with disabilities. This requirement is interpreted within the supporting text, proposed main modification MM105, as requiring sites of 10 dwellings or more to provide a proportion of dwellings which surpass the minimum standards for access. The proposed new paragraph identified within MM105 further notes that work will be undertaken in this regard and a percentage requirement introduced through the Housing Design Guide in advance of a local plan policy.

The HBF supports the need for accessible homes but consider the Council's position contrary to the ministerial statement and the PPG, both of which are clear that such requirements must be set within a local plan and the evidence appropriately examined. The Council cannot introduce a policy requirement through a 'Design Guide' which will

not be subject to independent examination. This would not only be contrary to the PPG, but would also go beyond the remit of a 'Design Guide' as it would essentially be introducing new policy requirement which will inevitably impact upon viability.

The PPG (ID 56-007) identifies which criteria must be considered through the examination process. The PPG also advises plans should provide targets (ID 56-008). The Council (MM105) clearly indicate that additional work is required to justify the optional standard and as such cannot currently justify the introduction of such a requirement.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

The HBF recommends that the policy and supporting text be further modified to simply indicate the Council will encourage and support the provision of dwellings which exceed the national minimum accessibility standards. If the Council can supply suitable evidence to justify the introduction of the optional accessibility standards at a later date such a requirement could form part of the examination of the forthcoming Allocations document.



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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:

MM105

**5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support

Object

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes

No

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes

No – 'unsound'

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

See our response to MM100 (Policy HO9, part C) above.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

See our response to MM100 (Policy HO9, part C) above.

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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:

MM106

**5. Do you support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support

Object

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes

No

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes

No – 'unsound'

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

Whilst the HBF supports the deletion of the Council's proposed space standards the new and amended paragraphs infer the use of the new optional national space standard. The Council currently does not have the evidence to justify the introduction of this standard. Further detail is provided in our response to MM107 below.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

Refer to our comments upon MM107 below.

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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:

MM107

**5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support

Object

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes

No

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes

No – 'unsound'

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

Part E of Policy HO9 refers to internal space standards. The proposed main modification suggests the inclusion of an additional paragraph after 5.3.143 which seeks to apply the national space standard. The amendments to existing paragraph 5.3.144 indicate that if developments are below the national space standard the onus will be upon the developer to identify why the standard cannot be achieved, as discussed at the hearing sessions and within our statements this could have a significant impact upon viability within Bradford. Therefore the proposed paragraph is effectively seeking to introduce the national space standard.

The PPG (ID 56-020) clearly indicates the introduction of the internal space should be justified by appropriate evidence and examined through a local plan. The evidence includes the impact upon viability and affordability. The final paragraph of MM107 clearly identifies that the Council currently does not have the evidence to justify the introduction of the standard. It therefore should not be placing the onus upon developers to identify why the standard cannot be met.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

Given additional work is required to justify the introduction of the national internal space standard it is recommended that reference to the standard be removed from the supporting text. Furthermore Part E of the policy should either be deleted or amended to remove reference to internal space standards to ensure that unjustified requirements are not placed upon developments.

If the Council can provide adequate justifiable evidence to introduce the national minimum space standards in the future this could be examined within the forthcoming Allocations document.

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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:

MM108 & MM109

**5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support

Object

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes

No

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes

No – 'unsound'

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

The modifications do not seek to overcome our objections to the policy targets and thresholds which are not considered to be consistent with the Council's own evidence. Our reasoning for these conclusions are set out within our comments upon the submission version of the plan and our written and oral comments upon Matter 4F of the examination hearing sessions. All of these are before the Council and the Inspector and as such are not repeated here.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

I refer to our previous comments upon the submission version of the plan and matter 4F.

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

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

**4. To which proposed main modification does this representation relate?**

Proposed Main Modification number:

MM152

**5. Do support or object the proposed main modification?**

Support

Object

**6. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'legally compliant'?**

Yes

No

**7. Do you consider the proposed main modification to be 'sound'?**

Yes

No – 'unsound'

**8. If you consider the proposed main modification to be 'unsound', please identify which test of soundness your comments relate to?**

Positively prepared

Justified

Effective

Consistent with National Planning Policy (the NPPF)

**9. Please give details of why you consider the proposed main modification is not legally compliant or is unsound in light of the main modifications proposed. Please be as precise as possible. If you wish to support the proposed main modification please use this box to set out your comments.**

The plan seeks to meet the backlog in housing delivery over the full plan period, utilising the 'Liverpool' method of delivery. This is contrary to the PPG (ID 3-35) which states that;

'Local planning authorities should aim to deal with any undersupply within the first 5 years of the plan period where possible. Where this cannot be met in the first 5 years, local planning authorities will need to work with neighbouring authorities under the 'Duty to Cooperate'.

**10. Please set out what changes you consider necessary to make the proposed main modifications legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Q7 above.**

The undersupply be dealt with during the first 5 years of the plan period.

I trust that the foregoing comments upon the main modifications will be given due consideration. I confirm that the HBF would like to be informed of the following;

- Publication of the inspectors' recommendations; and
- Adoption of the Local Plan

Yours sincerely,

MJ Good

**Matthew Good**  
**Planning Manager – Local Plans**  
Email: [matthew.good@hbf.co.uk](mailto:matthew.good@hbf.co.uk)  
Tel: 07972774229