

Comment from K Tipler

I would like further clarification on the definition of previously developed land amendment referred to.

Does this cover say land previously used for industrial purposes where the property was subsequently knocked down and the land left for a 'prolonged period' of non-use?

As extra housing is still required in the district will the other amendments outlined mean RDC can and will reassess areas for development even though they may be designated say green belt, but would not now be regarded as suitable for agricultural/recreational purposes? This in preference to building on agricultural or woodland areas.

Will the amendments mean RDC becomes more or less restrictive in their approach to development? If they become more restrictive this is likely to have a negative effect on the prosperity of the local population, and this should be taken into account.