

| | |
|---|---|
| Family Name | Edwards |
| Given Name | Emily |
| Person ID | 1286307 |
| Title | Stakeholder Submission |
| Type | Web |
| Family Name | Edwards |
| Given Name | Emily |
| Person ID | 1286307 |
| Title | JPA 14: Broadbent Moss |
| Type | Web |
| Soundness - Positively prepared? | Unsound |
| Soundness - Justified? | Unsound |
| Soundness - Consistent with national policy? | Unsound |
| Soundness - Effective? | Unsound |
| Compliance - Legally compliant? | No |
| Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate? | NA |
| 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. | <p>Due to the close proximity of site allocations JPA 14 and JPA12 on which, biodiversity and subsequent wildlife amalgamate, this plan is not "sound" (para. 35 NPPF).</p> <p>Treating the two sites separately for biodiversity and wildlife, is a failure to adhere to (para 24 NPPF), therefore ceases to qualify as Positively Prepared (para 35 a) NPPF). Like any ecosystem they rely on each other, so by taking one away it affects the other, so they need to be treated as one.</p> <p>The preliminary Ecological Appraisals for both sites are inadequate and flawed; they failed to include numerous protected and endangered species that currently inhabit these two sites. The failure to include these species prevents further and more in depth investigations and analysis from taking place. This is promised in the Places for Everyone"s Policy JPA 14 (para 14). This undermines (para 13) of the same policy and Decision Making clause of NPPF (para 43).</p> <p>To maintain the effective cooperation clause of NPPF (para 24), the building development and disruption on such a large scale on, in and around JPA 14, without a much more detailed and accurate ecological analysis would have devastating consequences for the wildlife in both sites. Our environment is so fragile and such a large scale development would be catastrophic for our wildlife and open space, its our moral duty to protect and preserve all wildlife and open spaces for future generations. We should be looking to preserve these areas not destroy them.</p> |
| Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant | <p>Our environment is so fragile and such a large scale development would be catastrophic for our wildlife and open space, its our moral duty to protect and preserve all wildlife and open spaces for future generations. We should be looking to preserve these areas not destroy them.</p> <p>We need to look at developing brown field sites and regenerating existing areas, not destroying our green belt and wildlife.</p> |

and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.