

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Barlow
<b>Given Name</b>	Jennifer
<b>Person ID</b>	1286908
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Barlow
<b>Given Name</b>	Jennifer
<b>Person ID</b>	1286908
<b>Title</b>	JPA 22: Land North of Smithy Bridge
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	This site is greenbelt land and should not be built on ,there are brownfield sites that can be used but the developers find it easier and more profitable to build their luxury houses on greenbelt. This area has not got the infrastructure to provide education, all schools are over subscribed in this area. The roads are already congested causing air pollution, more housing creates more traffic, more pollution. Our children deserve better air quality not worse. We need open green spaces for our health and sanity. Once built on these open spaces are gone forever and bring the risk of further flooding
<b>Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.</b>	The land North of Smithybridge JPA22 needs to be removed from the PfE.
<b>Family Name</b>	Barlow
<b>Given Name</b>	Jennifer
<b>Person ID</b>	1286908
<b>Title</b>	JPA 24: Roch Valley
<b>Type</b>	Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	I consider JPA24 Roch Valley a policy which is unsound and is not justified as this land is protected open space. There is not the infrastructure to justify further building in this area. The schools in this area are over subscribed, the roads are congested and this land floods. We owe it to our future generations to keep open green spaces, once built on they are gone forever. The pollution caused by more traffic on our extremely busy roads will impact on the air quality, it's not that good as it is! We should be protecting the environment not destroying it
<b>Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.</b>	The modification I am seeking is for JPA24 to be removed from the PfE