

I stand by what I said in the council response to their proposals, namely,

The proposals are unsound and the proposed plan should be referred back to the council for amendment for the following reasons.

1. No explanation as to how they arrived at their housing figures. For the last few years the council have exceeded government targets and the assumption must be the requirements are too high. Housing should be decided on a needs basis and NOT what developers seek.

2. The consultation stage stated they would need to expand into greenfield sites (3) to achieve targets and an implication that not all of the 3 northern sites would be needed.

What they have done is to use these sites as the basis for the housing requirements. There are numerous other smaller sites available. This is essentially lazy planning.

Use big sites as an easy way to get their numbers. At the time I commented that 1 or more of these sites should be withdrawn

3. We have a local plan 2011- 2030. The council now want a new plan to cover 2020 to 2040. It should be 2031 to 2050.

4. It appears the plan is written to suit major developers and not one of NEEDS.

CAN THESE COMMENTS BE USED IN THE HEARING SESSION (S)