



SA/0077

Aek sent 04/06/10

Comment

Consultee	Mr Toby Martin (427674)
Email Address	
Address	
Event Name	Rural Areas Site Allocations DPD
Comment by	Mr Toby Martin
Comment ID	23
Response Date	04/06/10 11:00
Consultation Point	6.83 Paragraph (View)
Status	Submitted
Submission Type	Web
Version	0.1
Legal compliance	
Do you consider the DPD is legally compliant?	Yes
Soundness	
Do you consider the DPD is sound?	No
Unsound	
Do you consider the DPD is unsound because it is not:	(1) Justified

Reasons for compliance and soundness

Please give details of why you consider the DPD is not legally compliant or is unsound, or if you consider the DPD to be legally compliant and sounds, please also use this box to set out your comments (please be as precise as possible).

1. The Regional Spatial Survey has not yet been adopted. The change of government means that there can be no guarantee that it will be adopted in its current broad form. Therefore it is spurious at this time to attempt to identify development requirements to beyond 2016. The DPD is therefore unsound. 2. Additionally, the impending development of the Sherford new town, with thousands of new houses planned to be built in the timescale envisaged (2016 onwards), just a mile or so to the north of Brixton renders invalid any current forecast of the development requirements for Brixton. Who

says that 50 houses will be needed? There is no detailed rationale for this figure in the DPD. It appears to have been plucked from the air. The plan is unsound and there is no need to identify a new development area for Brixton from 2016 onwards.

Changes necessary for legal compliance and soundness

Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the DPD legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified in the question above (Justified/ Effective/ Consistent with National Policy) where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the DPD 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.

1. All development identified as being related to the requirements set out in the Regional Spatial Survey should be removed from the DPD. 2. Remove the development proposal for Brixton from 2016 onwards, as the basis on which an extra 50 houses will be needed is spurious (see my comments in para 2 of the box above.

Participation at oral part of examination

It is important to note that written and oral representations carry exactly the same weight and will be given equal consideration in the examination process.

If your representation is seeking a change, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination? YES, I wish to participate at the oral examination

Reasons for participation at oral part of examination

If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

Because I am not confident that due weight will be given to my comments.