

## Consultation Response A13 DPD

5.22, 5.34, 5.46      Generally Yes

The context for this and most questions assumes that the reduced number of 800 homes is the correct number. We do not believe it is.

With the new government and the return of fixed housing targets the resulting increase in requirement District wide of circa 59% added to the announcement of a 6 year land supply and not the current 5 would suggest that numbers are likely to need to increase.

With such an increase the West Scenario (as for the East Scenario) is likely to increase the likelihood of a requirement for a multi model bridge once beyond the circa 800 homes that look to be achievable north of the railway without a road bridge, is reached (Para 5.8). The uncertainties of safeguarding the land required for a new road crossing of the railway under both West and East Scenarios are clearly an ongoing risk to delivery beyond 800 homes. Arguably therefore **both** East and West options should be preserved. Whilst Scenario 3 Mixed would appear to be taking this view the Map/Sketch for Scenario 3 would appear not to include in the distribution of development shaded red (and hence land value) to the necessary landowners required south of the railway. This seems likely to lead to substantive delays in overall scheme delivery beyond 800 homes whilst the co-ordination of land interests and objectives is reconciled.

The commissioned viability work also suggests strongly that more units will be required in any event to ensure viability without compromising on levels of affordable housing and other infrastructure requirements. Combining West and East with an acknowledgement of an increased number of homes say at least to the original target of 1,250 does appear to be the way forward. The required distribution of development, in combination with the permitted schemes and extant applications are in effect redrawing the future settlement boundaries.

Landowners in proximity to the existing and proposed railway crossings where safety improvements/bridges may be deliverable and/or land safeguarded (both pedestrian and road intersections) need to see development gain if they are to embrace the opportunity in a timely fashion.

Given the parish preference previously for East over West, the permitted schemes and extant applications demonstrate good progress has been secured and the outlook for up to 800 homes is encouraging. It seems pragmatic to support Scenario 2 East in the short term and scenario 3 Mixed for a longer-term view. Scenario 1 West should be deleted as it seems likely to concentrate traffic pressures on Stein Road railway crossing if selected in isolation.

