

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [External Email for Local Plans](#)  
**Subject:** Publication Plan Regulation 19 Spring 2024  
**Date:** 29 May 2024 17:36:22

---

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION-THIS EMAIL WAS SENT FROM OUTSIDE THE COUNCIL. DONT OPEN LINKS OR ATTACHMENTS UNLESS YOURE SURE YOU CAN TRUST THIS SENDER!

From:  
Susan Readshaw

[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

Telephone [REDACTED]  
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Dear Sir or Madam

Thank you for this opportunity to comment on the Publication Plan. As a resident of Wolverhampton whose property is directly adjacent to an area of South Staffordshire Green Belt, I welcome the chance to express my opinions.

I agree that the Local Plan is legally compliant, sound, and complies with Duty to Co-Operate.

I wish to comment further on a number of points raised in the Plan, as follows:-

**Section 1.7** It seems clear to me that the climate change strategy should be integrated with strategic planning responsibilities, and that the Local Plan provides the best opportunity to do this. I therefore agree that the Plan is a suitable vehicle to achieve this aim.

**Section 1.8** I agree that the council should follow the revised NPPF. Climate change is of profound importance worldwide as well as locally, as the Council is aware, so any future plans should consider first and foremost the mitigation of the impact of climate change.

**Section 1.9** I agree that whatever development is necessary should be centred on towns and larger villages where good infrastructure, facilities and public transport links already exist. However, this should not be at the expense of current residents.

**Section 1.17** In view of my comments regarding section 1.8, I agree that the Council should update the Local Plan in line with the revised NPPF. In addition to climate change considerations, the preservation of and access to green spaces is of vital importance for future generations. Once Green Belt land is lost, it is lost for ever.

**Section 2.8** It is clear that development in and around villages with little or no access to services

and facilities, and where transport links are poor (as for example Lower Penn) will result in greater dependence on cars, and therefore flies in the face of the NPPF's emphasis on mitigating climate change, as well as the Council's own commitments. I therefore agree that Tier 4 and 5 villages are unsuitable for development.

**Section 3.7** Since the principle of Duty to Co-operate has been drastically reduced, the Council is free to treat its own needs as of primary importance. Any co-operation with neighbouring areas should not be at the expense of Green Belt land.

**Section 5.3** I agree that the Council should prioritise suitable brownfield sites when allocating sites for development, and should insist that neighbouring authorities do the same. Green Belt land should be protected. Any release of Green Belt land when other sites are available violates the purpose of the concept of Green Belt as laid out in section J of the Glossary.

Yours sincerely  
Susan Readshaw