

Family Name	Oldfield
Given Name	Graham
Person ID	1287340
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Oldfield
Given Name	Graham
Person ID	1287340
Title	Our Vision
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Sound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
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 am no legal expert but many of much of the plan appears to be a desk based, number crunching exercise, but it fails to take account of the reality on the ground, figures are out of date, the plan is not flexible enough to take into account rapidly shifting population and economic dynamics.
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.	Have a more inclusive, better publicised consultation with bona fide stakeholders - i.e. the people and businesses who live and work here.
Family Name	Oldfield
Given Name	Graham
Person ID	1287340
Title	Supporting Evidence
Type	Web

Redacted comment on supporting documents - Please give details of why you consider any of the evidence not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

Consultation format is too long and too complicated for ordinary individuals to comprehend and make a considered detailed response. The process appears to be set up for experts. We are not experts. I suspect that most people just want to have a say, to try and influence these plans before it is too late.

It must be clear from the climate crisis that we cannot build our way out of the problem - it will make matters worse. Protecting natural assets such as the natural environment, farmland and open space surely make sense. I have no political axe to grind but parties of all persuasions repeat the mantra of "growth". It must be obvious that infinite growth is neither possible, nor desirable, nor deliverable. Surely the plan fails this test of soundness.

The destruction of the Amazon rain forest is universally condemned and rightly so. How can we therefore keep pouring concrete on our own "Amazon rain forest" which is our cherished greenbelt?

If I have misunderstood the question, please consider these points at the appropriate stage in the process.