#### 1. Which Main Modification are you responding on?

- 1. Local Plan Main Modification (MMxx) ref.: 5
- 2. Local Plan Paragraph ref.:
- 3. Local Plan Figure/ Table No.: Table: Local Plan Housing Trajectory 2021 2040

## 2. To which Test of Soundness does your representation relate?

None selected.

#### 3. Summary of Comments:

The windfall sites associated with this trajectory is concerning. It would appear that there will be presumption in favour.

## 1. Which Main Modification are you responding on?

- 1. Local Plan Main Modification (MMxx) ref.: 5
- 2. Local Plan Paragraph ref.:
- 3. Local Plan Figure/ Table No.: Table Housing Supply during the Plan period

# 2. To which Test of Soundness does your representation relate?

None selected.

#### 3. Summary of Comments:

The original Local Plan had 2% of dwellings or 117 in total allocated to Key Rural Service Areas. Now MM5 says that figure is 2,383 across the centres. A huge increase and still no mention of Brownfield site redevelopment.

## 1. Which Main Modification are you responding on?

- 1. Local Plan Main Modification (MMxx) ref.: 5
- 2. Local Plan Paragraph ref.:
- 3. Local Plan Figure/ Table No.: Table Identified Housing Land Supply Picture

## 2. To which Test of Soundness does your representation relate?

None selected.

#### 3. Summary of Comments:

MM5 offers a sudden influx of windfall development which the main towns can't cope with so around 3,000 dwellings will be built on these 'windfall' sites which may be outside the previously approved area of development. Still no mention of redeveloping brownfield sites, as mentioned at length in the original local plan. Growth of 14% for Tier 4 settlements is deemed appropriate when there is still a massive gap in infrastructure to cope with the developments. Using Sec 106 or CIL money to 'pay for a new Dr or teacher at the local school' doesn't work as recruitment is the issue. Our village still has a school administered by a different county so no developer contribution is directed to it anyway and the MM doesn't address any of this.

- 1. Which Main Modification are you responding on?
- 1. Local Plan Main Modification (MMxx) ref.: 5
- 2. Local Plan Paragraph ref.:
- 3. Local Plan Figure/ Table No. Table- Key Rural Service Centres
- 2. To which Test of Soundness does your representation relate? None selected.

#### 3. Summary of Comments:

The amount of new homes allocated to Outwell, Upwell and Emneth - all neighbouring villages, is much greater at nearly 500 than anywhere else. The villages also border Cambridgeshire so development within a mile or so appears not to be included, presenting an untrue picture.

- 1. Which Main Modification are you responding on?
- 1. Local Plan Main Modification (MMxx) ref.: 12 MM34
- 2. Local Plan Paragraph ref.:
- 3. Local Plan Figure/ Table No.
- 2. To which Test of Soundness does your representation relate? None selected.

### 3. Summary of Comments:

Why is it that Key Rural Service Centres have been removed from the paragraph relating to transport 'connectivity' as an element of development. "To ensure people have access to the services they need," now only applies to towns.

- 1. Which Main Modification are you responding on?
- 1. Local Plan Main Modification (MMxx) ref.: 6 MM7
- 2. Local Plan Paragraph ref.:
- 3. Local Plan Figure/ Table No.
- 2. To which Test of Soundness does your representation relate?

None selected.

#### 3. Summary of Comments:

M7 Parishes yet to have a Neighbourhood plan in place look to be penalised with a higher 'minimum' allocation of housing. Everything is geared towards new national planning policy which is far from clear at this point.

4. This consultation forms the final stage of the plan-making process for the Local Plan 2021 - 2040. Do you wish to be notified further about the Local Plan, at either of the following stages?

No

	Yes	NO
1. Publication of Inspector`s Report (anticipated January 2025)	Selected	Not Selected
2. Adoption of Local Plan (anticipated February 2025)	Not Selected	Not Selected