

Stakeholder Reference:
Document Reference:

Part A

Making representation as Resident or Member of the General Public

Personal Details		Agent's Details (if applicable)	
Title	Mr		
First Name	David		
Last Name	Rogers		
Job Title (where relevant)			
Organisation (where relevant)			
Address			
Post Code			
Telephone Number			
E-mail Address			

Part B

REPRESENTATION

To which Main Modification number and/or supporting document of the Local Plan does your representation relate to?

MM no: 78

Supporting document reference: A. Council's response to Actions outlined in Inspector's post examination hearing advice (Examination document reference number ED98), July 2021 (ED133)

Do you consider this Main Modification and/or supporting document of the Local Plan to be:

Legally compliant: No

Sound: No

If no, then which of the soundness test(s) does it fail? Justified, Consistent with national policy

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.

Within the document EB1421, which was prepared in response to the initial comments from the inspectorate and with particular reference to site EPP.R1, the single point of access to the proposed site layout appears to have not been included in the original call for sites and would be wholly dependent upon one or more properties in Bridge Road/Ivy Chimney's Road being bought or CP'd. We do not believe that this location falls within the original remit of the call for sites strategy.

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.

With the removal of the bridge over the railway and the proposed single access, we do not believe that the use of EPP.R1 is viable at all. A single point entry, would be difficult to justify, we note the EPP.R2 has two points of entry. The identified 'Emergency Access' is frustrated by a ransom strip. The impact on the traffic in Ivy Chimneys Road/Bridge Road and Centre Drive will be a nightmare, in particular in front of the school during peak times. It is bad enough already.

The removal of the bridge is clear evidence that the development of both sites in the SEMP is not financially viable. The various constraints of access, infrastructure, noise, air quality, HV pylons and utility exclusions zones and a requirement for a high proportion of the properties to be affordable, make the delivery of homes in the whole of the proposed SEMP very challenging. The purpose of the local plan is to be able to deliver much needed housing, pursuing the SEMP does not do this.

I would very much welcome an opportunity to discuss this further.

Signature: David Rogers Date:
16/08/2021