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Representation

Please use a separate form for each representation.

Which part of the Publication Plan does your representation relate to?

Site Specific Part 2 Local Plan - Publication Plan - Sustainability Appraisal

Tests of Soundness

Do you consider the Local Plan is sound in terms of being:

Justified
Effective
Positively prepared
Consistent with National Policy

Reasons

Please give the reason(s) why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the statutory Duty to Cooperate.

Within Table 11.6 “summary of effects”, we disagree with the “score” for biodiversity because:

(a) Biodiversity net gain is not explicated defined or committed too within the Plan. A specific overarching policy for biodiversity net gain is required within the Plan. (b) Natural England disagree with the conclusions of the HRA(c) As indicated above, there are policy wording changes and additions that are required to ensure all policies are sound.
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