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| Soundness - Positively prepared? | Unsound |
| Soundness - Justified? | Unsound |
| Soundness - Consistent with national policy? | Unsound |
| Soundness - Effective? | Unsound |
| Compliance - Legally compliant? | Yes |
| Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate? | Yes |
| 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. | I believe the plan is unsound because Green belt land was created to stop our towns joining together creating an urban sprawl. It cannot be justified to reclassify vast areas of greenbelt to be built on when national policies exist to protect Green belt and to reverse the effects of climate change. These plans were also conceived before the global covid pandemic which has had a huge impact on how we all live and work. The green spaces we have are more important than ever for our physical and mental well-being. There are also going to be many more brownfield sites available for repurposing as working from home is allowing organisations to get rid of expensive office space. The plan also talks about creating new Green belt land so there is a smaller net loss of Green belt. This is a shocking attempt to deceive people in my opinion as if this plan goes ahead it clearly demonstrates that Green belt protection is worthless anyway. |
| 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. | Any areas of this development that are on existing Green belt land (i.e. protected from mass development) should be removed from the plan altogether. |

