

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.

MM79 p110 Supporting test to Policy P 2 Page 121-122; MM133 p195 Appendix 6 LOU.R7 Page 43

Site LOU R7

There is a serious inconsistency in that sites near the Forest (within 400m and we argue elsewhere in our submissions on the MMs that this should be 1km or further based on survey work) remain allocated despite the MM arguing for a *cordon sanitaire* in which development intensification is strongly discouraged. Site LOU R7 (within 5 min walk of the SAC) is perhaps the worst of these, given that its owners have stated their intention to build a 5-storey block with 38 dwellings, more than double the allocated capacity.

The site should be deleted, or at the least its capacity should be kept strictly to 18 in view of Policy DM 2.

7. Please set out what change(s) (Continue on a separate sheet if necessary) **Main Modification and/or supporting document** legally compliant, 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.

MM79 p110 Supporting test to Policy P 2 Page 121-122; MM133 p195 Appendix 6 LOU.R7 Page 43

Site LOU R7

Delete site or at the least keep its capacity strictly to 18 in view of Policy DM 2 see Page 76-77 above

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.

(Continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

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

☐

Yes

☒

No

Signature:

....Redacted....

Date

20/09/21