

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Sarras
Given Name	Hazel
Person ID	1286475
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Sarras
Given Name	Hazel
Person ID	1286475
Title	Our Vision
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?	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 do not agree with using designated green belt land for the building of new houses when there are plenty of empty homes on the market.
Family Name	Sarras
Given Name	Hazel
Person ID	1286475
Title	Our Strategic Objectives
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Sarras
Given Name	Hazel
Person ID	1286475
Title	JPA 7: Elton Reservoir Area
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
Family Name	Sarras
Given Name	Hazel
Person ID	1286475
Title	JPA 9: Walshaw
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?	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.	The plan is unjustified as there is no need or to build additional houses. The data used is out of date. Since the plans have been prepared the numbers of people living in the northwest particularly Walshaw has declined. The infrastructure notably roads, doctors, schools could not accommodate this additional number of people/ cars in the area. This would also contribute to continued poor air quality which is supposedly a target to improve. I totally oppose this plan and the destruction of our small green belt sanctuary
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	No building of any new houses. It's not required or needed, there are plenty of homes available for families

**or soundness matters
you have identified
above.**