

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Collins
Given Name	Peter
Person ID	1287199
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Collins
Given Name	Peter
Person ID	1287199
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.	<p>The plan has not been positively prepared. It has carried forward from the GMSF old population data and takes no account of the effects of Brexit and Covid 19.</p> <p>The plan is not justified. It does not represent sustainable development, especially now that we have a widely recognised climate emergency. Green Belt should not be removed under any circumstances, and Green Spaces should be added to, not built on.</p> <p>Public consultation has been virtually non-existent. Public meetings should have been held, and door-to-door leafleting. Many people I know are totally unaware of the plan, and those that are are tearing their hair out trying to make sense out of all the planning legalise in this "opportunity to respond".</p>
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.	<p>The Vision should be withdrawn and replaced with a document that makes the climate emergency the overarching consideration in any new plan. There are no 'exceptional circumstances' in which Green Built should be removed, it must be added to and enhanced.</p>
Family Name	Collins
Given Name	Peter
Person ID	1287199
Title	JP-Strat 7 North East Growth Corridor

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
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>Not positively prepared or justified. Old population data has been used. Changes post-Brexit and Covid, and the current climate emergency, have not been recognised and reflected in the plan.</p> <p>People who live in the area have not been properly consulted. I only found out about it when I joined a local Facebook protest group. My wife and most of my friends and neighbours were unaware of the plan and the huge impact it would have on their lives. There have been no public consultation meetings, no leaflet deliveries to households, and very little coverage in the media.</p> <p>I might add that this present "consultation" is a joke. I consider myself to be reasonably intelligent, but my degree is in science, not planning law. I've just spent 8 hours going through it and much of it is incomprehensible. How you expect people to wade through all this guff and make informed comment is beyond me.</p>
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.	Reject it and consult people comprehensively, and in a manner that they can understand.