

Our previous representations on PLP4 reflect our concerns about the emphasis on large strategic sites, removed from the Green Belt, largely separate from existing settlements and clustered close to motorway junctions. We believe this places disproportionately large infrastructure requirements in relation to the amount of development being delivered. This appears incompatible with the PDLP's intended rapid acceleration in the rate of new development: either the need to fulfil infrastructure requirements will slow down the delivery of development, or the pressure to accelerate the rate of development will lead to planning permissions being granted without adequate infrastructure provision, especially when the viability of developer contributions is being constantly challenged.

This has implications for question (b) insofar as nearby strategic sites in other authorities is inevitably dependent on much of the same infrastructure, and there is insufficient evidence that the plan has considered the cumulative effects of:

- CO2 emissions and air quality problems arising from concentrations of additional road traffic;
- Sustainable travel options that could be delivered at strategic scale through better co-location of land-uses and co-ordinated sustainable travel infrastructure;
- Concentration of development, construction work and risks of market saturation within certain areas, especially close to motorway junctions.

With specific reference to questions (e) and (f), if the focus on strategic sites is to be found sound, we consider that the plan must adopt the Liverpool approach to accommodating backlog housing delivery in the land supply requirements; because the longer lead-times for large developments and their associated infrastructure requirements is incompatible with any other approach.