There are a number of parts of this Bill that I support:

- increased community engagement and
- increased transparency of ownership.

However I do not support:

- particularly the reintroduction of non-domestic rates for shootings and deer forests. This will bring another layer of bureaucracy; not all areas of land involves commercial shooting / deer stalking; environmental areas are included; no type of appeal in place; amongst many other reasons.
- the provisions relating to the right to buy land to further sustainable development as there is no evidence for its existence in addition to those that already take place.
- deer management is unnecessary: it will bring in another layer of bureaucracy and it is self-regulatory already, which works well. Different interpretations could arise from area to area.
- The widening of the successors for tenancies is not helpful for the future of tenanted land coming available – this land will be even more unlikely to be returned to the landlord in the future, therefore another discouragement to the landlord to make land available.

Overall I am also concerned about the “woolliness” of this possible legislation, it is lacking in ‘specifics’ and I am concerned that other snippets of legislation can be added without any further debate or just placed as an addendum to the Bill.

There is a lack of evidence that a great deal of this Bill is indeed necessary. There is a lack of a clear policy objective and it appears to want to add a greater burden on the private landowner to deliver public interest aims.