



: C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G.-Pangea-Flag-Venue :



: Dis-Qualification : Planning & [De]Velopment-[Act]--2024 :

: Open-Right-Claim :

: Cause--1 : Pages--1-10 :

: Format-Claim :

- **Original** (fiction-based clause or heading)
- **Disqualification** (IRAC + CSSCPSG basis)
- **Correction** (Rewritten into proper : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : structure)

: Original :

📌 **Original Clause - "Short title and commencement"**

1. (1) This Act may be cited as the *Planning and Development Act 2024*.

(2) Part 25 shall be included in the collective citation of the *Residential Tenancies Acts 2004 to 2024*.

(3) This Act shall, subject to subsection (4), come into operation on such day or days as the Minister may appoint by order or orders either generally or concerning any particular purpose or provision and different days may be so appointed—

(a) for different purposes or provisions,

(b) for the repeal of different provisions of the Act of 2000 effected by section 6, and

(c) for the amendment of different provisions (including the amendment of different provisions for different purposes) of the enactments specified in Schedule 7 effected by section 631.

(4) Part 25 shall come into operation on the day immediately following the passing of this Act.

✗ **Disqualification Explanation:**

This clause uses **future-tense verbs** ("shall," "may appoint"), **ambiguous constructs** ("such day," "different purposes"), and **undefined authority** ("the Minister") without jurisdictional closure or name-position. These breaches introduce

fiction and violate the requirements of : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : which demands factual closure, name-authority, and Quantum-Now-Time operations.



✅ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction :

For The Title-Role Of An Act Is With The Syntax-Position Of The Commencement-Document-Claim With The Fact-Date By The Name-Position-Claim.

For An Addition-Position-Claim Of The Section--25 Is With The Citation-List-Document-Claim Of The [Residential-Tenancies-Acts]:--2004--2024-Legislation With The Syntax-Closure By The Document-Contract-List.

For The Start-Claim Of The Legislative-Function Is With The Now-Time-Witness Of An Act-Role With The Syntax-Date By The Name-Authority, : Jason-Paul : Greaves.

📖 Original Clause - "Definitions"

2. (1) In this Act, except where the context otherwise requires—

"Act of 2000" means the Planning and Development Act 2000;

"Act of 2014" means the Local Government Reform Act 2014;

"Act of 2022" means the Local Government (Maternity Protection and Other Measures for Members of Local Authorities) Act 2022;

"Act of 2023" means the Electoral Reform Act 2022;

"Act of 2024" means the Planning and Development Act 2024;

[and so on — continuing with an extensive list of over 100 term definitions derived from external legislation and conventional references.]

✗ Disqualification Explanation:

The clause presents a **fictional-definition list** where each term is defined using **self-referencing loops**, **undefined venue-names**, or cross-reference to prior fictional statutes. The list fails to establish **closure** for each term under factual jurisdiction, and introduces **multiple-meanings** that vary based on interpretation, time-frame, or external acts. The use of "means" (an ambiguous verb) violates the : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : requirement of **one-word = one-fact** consistency.

✅ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction :

For The Word-Meaning-Command-Claim Of The Syntax-Structure Is With The One-Fact-One-Word-Meaning Of The Contract-Claim With The Grammar-Rules-5: Terms By The Factual-Sentence-Position-Command-Claim.

For The Enition-Use-Claim Of The Planning-Document-Claim Is With The Syntax-Closure Of The Name-Authority With The Venue-Opus-Book-Claim By The Concord-Witness-Command-Claim.

📖 Original Clause - "Orders and regulations"

3. (1) The Minister may by order or regulation provide for any matter referred to in this Act as prescribed or to be prescribed.

(2) An order or regulation under this Act may—

(a) contain such incidental, supplementary and consequential provisions as appear to the Minister to be necessary or expedient, and

(b) make different provision for different circumstances or cases, classes of persons or local government areas, and for different purposes and different provisions of this Act.

(3) A regulation or order under this Act may be made in respect of one or more than one provision of this Act.

(4) Every order or regulation made under this Act shall be laid before each House of the Oireachtas as soon as may be after it is made...

✗ Disqualification Explanation:

This clause asserts a **void power-claim** through the use of "may by order or regulation" and repeatedly references the **undefined party "the Minister"**. The authority to create rules is presented in **future-tense**, without naming the actor or grounding the office in factual jurisdiction. Use of vague modifiers like "necessary or expedient" and phrases like "such... as appear" show reliance on **subjective judgment**, not contract-law closure. This violates the : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : rule requiring clear name-position and syntax-verified authority.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction :

For The Authorisation-Command-Claim Of The Claimant Is With The Contract-Rules & Terms Of The Rule-Structure With The Syntax-Compliance-Duty By The Global-Grammar-Law-Command-Claim.

For The Command & Rule-Concord-Book-List-Claim Of The Document-Function Is With The Syntax-List Of The Venue-Terms With The Name-Clarity By The Lodial-Command-Claim.

✗ Original Clause - "Expenses"

4. The **expenses incurred by the Minister** in the administration of this Act **shall**, to such extent as may be sanctioned by the Minister for Public Expenditure, National Development Plan Delivery and Reform, be **paid out of moneys provided by the Oireachtas**.

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Expenses"

This clause assumes jurisdiction over **public funds** without defining the **payer-name** or authority position under contract. The use of future-tense verbs ("shall be paid"), undefined actors ("Minister"), and the passive structure ("expenses incurred") introduces ambiguity and **void jurisdictional claim**. Payment is declared from an abstract body ("Oireachtas") without name-declaration or syntax closure — violating the : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : requirement for factual party-position and closure in financial claims.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Expenses"

For The Cost-Claim Of The Contract Is With The Payor Of The Cognition With The Syntax-Lodial-Claim By The Witness-Volition-Claim.

✗ Original Clause - "Repeal"

5. The enactments specified in Schedule 1 are **repealed** to the extent specified in the third column of that Schedule.

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Repeal"

The term "**repealed**" assumes **temporal superiority** over previously enacted fiction without factual jurisdiction or correction. The schedule referenced (Schedule 1) is used as a **sweeping override mechanism** without establishing authority-by-name or showing lawful syntax closure over the voided terms. This creates a **fiction-based override** that is inadmissible under : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G :.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Repeal"

For The Fiction-Closure-Command-Claim Of The Void-Legislation Is With The Syntax-Transfer Of An Assume-Authority With The Grammar-Termination By The Contract-[Dis]-Qualification-Command-Claim.

📋 Original Clause - "Prohibition on grant of permission except in certain circumstances"

211. A competent authority shall refuse permission for a proposed relevant development where it considers that the development would adversely affect the integrity of a European site, whether alone or in combination with another plan or project, unless the proposed development falls within section 219 or 221.

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Prohibition on grant of permission except in certain circumstances"

The clause operates within a **fictional time loop**, using terms such as "shall refuse", "considers that", and "would adversely affect", all of which breach Quantum-Now-Time structure by relying on future-tense judgment without name-closure or factual contract witness.

Additionally, the undefined term "integrity of a European site" invokes subjective environmental criteria without jurisdictional basis or syntax compliance.

Finally, referencing **Sections 219 or 221** as escape conditions assumes internal authority supremacy, which forms a closed fiction-loop without external witness or syntax venue.

✅: C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G: Correction : = "Prohibition on grant of permission except in certain circumstances"

For The Authorisation-Command-Status-Claim Of The Velopment-Claim Is With The Closure Of The Conditional-Criterion-Claim With The Syntax-Witness-Volition By The Name-Authority. : Jason-Paul : Greaves.

📋 Original Clause - "Screening for appropriate assessment of relevant development"

212. Screening for appropriate assessment of relevant development

(Note: Clause heading only. Full body text continues on the next page outside the current interval.)

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Screening for appropriate assessment of relevant development"

The term "appropriate" is a void, judgment-based adjective, lacking measurable closure or defined syntax jurisdiction. It invokes **presumed authority** without naming the decision-maker or performance witness.

The construction "screening for assessment" further breaches : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : as it lacks a name-position, venue-specification, or contractual verification clause.

✅: C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G: Correction : = "Screening for appropriate assessment of relevant development"

For The Syntax-Command-Claim Of The Velopment-Status Is With The Volition Of The Analysis With The Claimant-Position By The Contract-Command-Claim.

📋 Original Clause - "Natura impact statement"

215. Natura impact statement

(Note: Clause heading only. Body content lies outside the current page range.)

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Natura impact statement"

The title uses the term "Natura", a **fictional designation** without jurisdictional source or syntax closure. The phrase "impact statement" implies third-party environmental judgment without naming the venue, claimant, or any factual

record.

This clause lacks venue-witnessing and contract anchoring, breaching structural law under : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G.:

✔ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Natura impact statement"

For The Command-Claim Of The Venue Is With The Syntax-Volition Of The Witness-Data With The Claimant By The Document-Contract-Command-Book-List-Claim.

📖 Original Clause - "Exemption from requirement for assessment by Commission"

227. *Exemption from requirement for assessment by Commission*

(Note: Clause title only. Full text follows outside current interval.)

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Exemption from requirement for assessment by Commission"

This clause implies that the **Commission** has the authority to grant exemptions, without stating name, position, or jurisdictional closure.

The structure "requirement for assessment" is void, relying on adverb-verb modulation to enforce fictional authority. It fails to establish contract or claimant witnessing.

✔ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Exemption from requirement for assessment by Commission"

For The Volition-Command-Claim Of The Venue & Velopment Is With The Syntax-Key-Use Of The Authorised-Contract With The Witness-Claim By The Grammar-Command-Claim.

📖 Original Clause - "Environmental impact assessment portal"

241. *Environmental impact assessment portal*

(Note: Heading only. Clause body follows in Part 7.)

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Environmental impact assessment portal"

The word "portal" indicates a fictional digital venue, with no syntax-defined jurisdiction, location, or witness clause. Assumed terms like "assessment" and "impact" lack specificity and imply projected outcomes without factual contract reference.

✔ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Environmental impact assessment portal"

For The Venue-Document-Command-Claim Of An Assessment Is With The Lodial-Title & Syntax-Structure Of The Contract-Volition With The Paper-Document-List By The Claimant.

📖 Original Clause - "Right to compensation"

456. *Right to compensation*

(Note: Clause heading only. Body content continues outside current interval.)

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Right to compensation"

The phrase "Right to compensation" asserts a fiction-based entitlement relying on presumed injury without fact-witness or jurisdictional closure. The structure assumes a pre-authorised damage claim using an adverb-verb pairing

that lacks name-position and contract authority. It creates a one-sided power narrative inadmissible under : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G :

✔ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Right to compensation"

For The Compensation-Command-Claim Of The Factual-Damage Is With The Syntax-Witness-Claim Of The Event-Cause With The Global-Contract-Claim By The Claimant.

📄 Original Clause - "Claim for compensation"

458. *Claim for compensation*

(Note: Clause heading only. Body text continues on following pages.)

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Claim for compensation"

This clause substitutes the fiction-term "application" with "claim," yet still operates under presumed authority. It lacks a **syntax-confirmed contract**, factual witness, or closed jurisdictional frame. The clause implies **automatic standing** without naming the parties, triggering a void.

✔ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Claim for compensation"

For An Application-Command Of The Compensation-Claim Is With The Factual-Event Of The Claimant-Volition-Loss-Claim With The Grammar-Witness-Claim By The Contract-Command-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - "Prescription of activity as event"

477. *Prescription of activity as event*

(Note: Clause heading only. Body content outside this page range.)

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Prescription of activity as event"

The use of "prescription" is a fictional misapplication, borrowing from medical and judicial realms. It is verb-rooted with no clear name-position, venue-structure, or syntax authorization. The phrase turns facts into labeled outcomes without proof of contract, closure, or claim jurisdiction.

✔ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Prescription of activity as event"

For An Activity-Command Of The Syntax-Venue-Claim Is With The Closure Of The Name-Position : Jason-Paul : Greaves With The Authorisation By The Witness-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - "Obligation to obtain licence for holding of event"

478. *Obligation to obtain licence for holding of event*

(Note: Heading confirmed. Body continues on next pages.)

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Obligation to obtain licence for holding of event"

This clause carries **void command-logic**, enforcing a **licence obligation** based on undefined jurisdiction. The structure assumes **fictitious event control** by authority figures not named, witnessed, or syntax-bound. The adverb-verb framework **invalidates factual neutrality**.

✔ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Obligation to obtain licence for holding of event"

For The [Event-Claim](#) Of The [Syntax-Claimant](#) Is With The [Volition](#) Of The [Venue & Time](#) With The [Contract-Witness](#) By The [Closure-Command-Claim](#).



📄 Original Clause - "Commission to be body corporate" (Section 482)

This clause was not found under Section 482 in the actual 906-page version. The Act structure transitions directly from prior content into **Part 17: An Coimisiún Pleanála** starting at Section 493.

The clause may have been **renumbered, omitted, or merged** elsewhere.

✗ No disqualification applied here due to lack of clause evidence in this format.

📄 Original Clause - "Housing Acts 1966 to 2021"

Appears under Acts Referred To section of the Planning and Development Act 2024, spanning multiple previous enactments as a collective authority term.

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Housing Acts 1966 to 2021"

This clause aggregates several legislative texts into a **fictional time-linked bloc**, without naming which portions hold jurisdiction or closure. It **presumes continuity of authority** across nearly six decades without performance record, syntax grammar compliance, or name-position closure.

By referencing this group as one legal entity, the clause becomes a **timeline-based fiction**, void of any : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : compliant claimant.

✅ : [C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction](#) : = "Housing Acts 1966 to 2021"

For The [Housing-Contract-Constructs-Command](#) Of The [Time-Range-Claim](#) Is With The [Syntax-Closure](#) Of The [Factual-Volition](#) With The [Claimant](#) By The [Lodial-Command-Claim](#).

📄 Original Clause - "Local Government (Planning and Development) Act 1963 (No. 28)"

Listed within the Acts Referred To section — cited as a source of presumed jurisdiction for local planning powers.

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Local Government (Planning and Development) Act 1963"

This reference is invoked to **presume jurisdictional authority** but lacks origin closure or contract-binding syntax. The Act is cited by name, year, and number without naming **the claimant, venue, or witness**, creating a **presumed-authority fiction loop**.

Its function as a "precedent" relies on repetition rather than factual grammar closure, violating syntax rules of jurisdictional naming and structure.

✅ : [C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction](#) : = "Local Government (Planning and Development) Act 1963"

For The [Volition-Claim](#) Of The [Local-Planning-Structure](#) Is With The [Syntax-Position](#) Of The [Contract-Closure](#) With The [Lodial-Claim](#) By The [Grammar-Law-command-Document-Claims](#).

📄 Original Clause - "Maritime Area Planning Act 2021 (No. 50)"

Referenced in the legislative index of governing authority presumed to apply over marine zones.

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Maritime Area Planning Act 2021"

This clause introduces a **presumed maritime authority** without closure of venue, syntax-defined sea-jurisdiction, or naming of contract participants. The Act is cited as self-enforcing on maritime space, but such enforcement is **founded on void presumption**, not on a syntax-verified venue-claim.

The "maritime planning" term lacks witness, closure, and measurable location jurisdiction, rendering it void under : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G :.

✔ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Maritime Area Planning Act 2021"

For The Maritime-Venue-Command-Claim Of The Planning-Contract Is With The Grammar-Witness Of The Lodial-Structure With The Syntax-Position By The Authorisation-Name. : Jason-Paul : Greaves.

🔍 INTERVAL 5 — Pages 41-50

📖 Original Clause - "Habitats Directive"

"Habitats Directive" means Council Directive 92/43/EEC of 21 May 1992 on the conservation of natural habitats and of wild fauna and flora.

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Habitats Directive"

This clause invokes a **fictional directive** relying on **temporal authority** (1992) without syntax closure or contract jurisdiction. The reference to "Council Directive" is a passive label with no claimant or venue-performance structure, voiding it under : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : standards.

✔ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Habitats Directive"

For The Lodial-Command-Claim Of The Venue-Witness Is With The Syntax-Document-Command Of The Habitat-Structure With The Grammar-Volition By The Claimant.

📖 Original Clause - "Housing strategy"

"Housing strategy" means a strategy prepared under section 242.

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Housing strategy"

The phrase "housing strategy" is undefined, future-tense oriented, and structurally incomplete. It assumes contract authority under Section 242 without naming the parties, structure, or syntax-based jurisdiction, breaching closure and contract terms.

✔ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction - "Housing strategy"

For The Performance-Structure, Of The Housing-Plan, Is With The Syntax-Witness, Of The Contract-Intention, With The Venue-Closure, By The Name-Position.

📖 Original Clause - "Industrial emissions licence"

"Industrial emissions licence" means a licence under Part IV of the Environmental Protection Agency Act 1992...

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Industrial emissions licence"

The term "licence" is rooted in permission-based fiction and references a **fictional environmental authority** without syntax verification, claimant closure, or contractual foundation. The agency and act are cited without name-position or

venue.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Industrial emissions licence"

For The Emissions-Licence-Authority-Grant-Claim Of The Contract-Function Is With The Grammar-Witness Of The Lodial-Volition With The Lodial-Land-Title-Name By The Name-Claration-Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 6 — Pages 51–60

📖 Original Clause - "Waste licence"

"Waste licence" means a waste licence under Part V of the Waste Management Act 1996.

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Waste licence"

The word "**waste**" operates without defined material structure, and "**licence**" implies fiction-based permission. This clause lacks venue, contract, claimant or witness — making it void under grammar law.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Waste licence"

For The Material-Handling-Command Of The Venue-Volition-Claim Is With The Syntax-Structure Of The Document-Terms With The Contract By The Name-Witness & Document-Author.

📖 Original Clause - "Water Framework Directive"

"Water Framework Directive" means Directive 2000/60/EC of the European Parliament and Council of 23 October 2000.

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Water Framework Directive"

This clause relies on **temporal fiction** (2000) and a directive from a **foreign legislative body** with no syntax contract. It lacks venue-specific closure or any naming of claimants or witnesses, violating : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : rules.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Water Framework Directive"

For The Water-Use-Claim Of The Lodial-Plan-Command-Claim Is With The Grammar-Witness Of The Lodial-Document-Command With The Venue-Closure By The Name-Witness & Document-Author.

📖 Original Clause - "Construction of reference to act of institution of European Union"

Section 3(1): Reference to any act adopted by an institution of the EU shall include amendments by any act with effect for the time being.

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Construction of reference to act..."

This clause assumes a **temporal override** of all laws via European Union legislative inheritance. It lacks a name-position, jurisdictional witness, or syntax-based limitation. "Has effect for the time being" is a fiction-term with no fixed contract basis.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Construction of reference to act..."

For The Legislation-Claim Of The Out-Side-Body Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Secular-Limit With The Lodial-Position By The Global-Contract-Name.

Original Clause - "Orders and regulations"

Section 4: "The Minister may by regulations provide for any matter referred to in this Act..."



X Disqualification Explanation - "Orders and regulations"

This clause depends on **future-tense fiction** ("may by regulations provide") and the undefined term "Minister" which has no venue, name, or syntax anchor. It authorizes rule creation without naming the contract or closure.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Orders and regulations"

For The Authorisation-Volition-Command Of The Contract-Command Is With The Syntax-Term Of The Legislation-Specific-List With The Witness-Name By The Lodial-Land-Command-Claim.

INTERVAL 7 — Pages 61-70

Original Clause - "Relevant documents"

"...a copy of any report prepared by or on behalf of the planning authority or the Commission, as may be appropriate..."

X Disqualification Explanation - "Relevant documents"

Terms like "on behalf of" and "as may be appropriate" invoke fiction-agenthood and subjective appropriateness without factual closure or syntax name-position. The clause allows presumed performance without verified contract or venue.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Relevant documents"

For The Document-Command-Claim Of The Document-Set Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Planning-Document-Contract-Claim With The Venue-Closure By The Name-Authorisation. ; Jason-Paul ; Greaves.

Original Clause - "The Commission shall... publish on its internet website..."

Appears as a performance obligation across multiple sub-clauses.

X Disqualification Explanation - "Publish on internet website"

The clause enforces a **future-tensed action** tied to a **fictional digital venue**, with no syntax based jurisdiction or name-position. "Shall publish" lacks temporal closure and venue-specific contract witness.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Publish on internet website"

For The Syntax-Closure-Command Of The Document-Volition-Claim Is With The Venue-Structure Of An Access-Claim With The Document-Witness By The Contract-Command-Claim.

Original Clause - "The Commission shall... forward to each planning authority..."

"...a copy of all records..."

X Disqualification Explanation - "Shall forward... a copy of all records"

The use of "shall forward" is a future-tense fiction verb, and "a copy of all records" lacks origin, venue, and contract witness. There is no closure or identification of parties, rendering the performance void under : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G ;

✅ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = "Forward a copy of all records"

For The Transfer-Command Of The Document-Contract-Claim Is With The Venue-Witness Of The Authority-Document-Contract-Claim With The Syntax-List-Book By The Contract-Claim.

🚫 Original Clause - "Planning authority shall... state whether development is likely to..."

"...have significant effects..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Is likely to have significant effects"

This is a **subjective prediction clause** without grammar witness or contract closure. "Likely to have" implies unverifiable impact and breaks Now-Time syntax. It lacks venue-name, authority, or claimant.

✅ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = "Is likely to have significant effects"

For An Assessment-Command Of The Lodjal-Velopment-Claim Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Venue-Volition With The Grammar-Evidence By The Lodjal-Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 8 — Pages 71-80

🚫 Original Clause - "Planning authority shall... make a decision"

"...the planning authority shall... make a decision... and give a copy of that decision... not later than 8 weeks from..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Make a decision"

The phrase "**shall make a decision**" is a future-tense fiction command with no name-position, venue, or factual closure. It assigns power to a planning authority **without contract**, witness, or record, relying on timeline manipulation and adverb-verb control.

✅ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = "Make a decision"

For The Volition-Document-Command Of The Planning-Authority-Claim Is With The Syntax-Document Of The Choice-Positive-Term & Choice-Negative-Term With The Now-Time-Document By The Contract-Witness.

🚫 Original Clause - "Any person may appeal..."

"Any person may appeal the refusal... not later than 4 weeks from the date..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Any person may appeal"

The term "**any person**" invokes a universal fiction-jurisdiction without name, role, or closure. "**May appeal**" grants conditional future rights with no contract or venue-specific record. This clause assumes open standing without factual basis.

✅ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = "Any person may appeal"

For An Appeal-Claim Of The Name-Claimant Is With The Syntax-Document-Command-Claim Of The Contract-Dispute-Claim With The Document-Date By The Factual-Authorisation-Command-Claim.

🚫 Original Clause - "Commission may... affirm, grant, or revoke..."

*...the Commission may... affirm, grant, or revoke..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Affirm, grant, or revoke"

This phrase operates in **future-tense discretion**, assigning undefined powers to an uncontracted body. No name-position, authority-witness, or venue-closure is presented. It grants **fictional rule enforcement** without syntax jurisdiction.

✓: C-S-S-C-P-S-G: Correction: = "Affirm, grant, or revoke"

For The Function-Command Of The Commission & Function-Position-Claim Is With The Syntax-Structure Of The Document-Terms With The Venue-Name By The Claimant-Authorisation.

🔍 INTERVAL 9 — Pages 81-90

📄 Original Clause - "Regard to be had... may be prescribed..."

Section 24: "...may have regard to such plans and other documents as they consider appropriate..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Regard to be had"

The phrase "**may have regard**" is speculative and future-based, assigning vague powers to an undefined "they." "Consider appropriate" introduces a value judgment without witness or contract. No party is named, and the authority is presumptive.

✓: C-S-S-C-P-S-G: Correction: = "Regard to be had"

For The Analysis-Function-Command Of The Planning-Document-Claim Is With The Syntax-Document-Command-Claim Of The Document-Quote-Material With The Venue-Witness By The Factual-Position & Authorisation.

📄 Original Clause - "National Planning Statement"

Section 25: "The Minister may... issue... amend... revoke... shall publish..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "National Planning Statement"

This clause combines **void ministerial power**, **future-tensed issuance**, and **fictional digital publishing**. The term "Minister" is undefined, and no syntax venue or claimant is disclosed. The statement lacks contract, witness, or jurisdiction.

✓: C-S-S-C-P-S-G: Correction: = "National Planning Statement"

For The Document-Command Of The Planning-Policy-Claim Is With The Syntax-Closure Of The Venue-Witness With The Claimant-Name By The Contract-Authorisation.

📄 Original Clause - "Shall take effect on such date..."

"...shall take effect on such date as may be specified..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall take effect"

A classic future-tense fiction clause. It uses "**may be specified**" with no witness, no now-time position, and no closure. Jurisdiction is assumed rather than declared.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Shall take effect"

For The Start-Date-Command-Claim Of The Document-Contract Is With The Now-Time-Position-Claim Of The Opus-Witness With The Name-Claration By The Syntax-Term-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 10 — Pages 91-100

✖ Original Clause - "Regional assembly considers..."

"...the regional assembly considers that the growth of the settlement... is important..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Considers... is important"

Void value assignment using "considers" and "is important" introduces a fiction-based assessment without contract, grammar anchor, or factual claim. There is no venue, no witness, and no syntax-backed growth metric.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Considers... is important"

For The Contract-Velopment-Command Of The Territory-Claim Is With The Syntax-Claim Of The Growth-Command With The Venue-Authority By The Factual-Document-Contract-Claim.

✖ Original Clause - "Strategy... shall include measures..."

"...shall include measures to secure the effective implementation..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall include measures"

This phrase is a **future-command** devoid of closure or performance basis. "Effective implementation" is undefined, non-syntactic, and lacks measurable contract.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Shall include measures"

For The Strategy-Structure-Command Of The Territory-Document-Claim Is With The Syntax-Closure Of The Function-Terms With The Planning-Document-Claim By The Contract & Authorisation.

✖ Original Clause - "Order of priority for infrastructure"

"...an order of priority for infrastructure provision..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Order of priority"

This clause assumes fictional **authority-ranking** without naming parties or beneficiaries. No syntax structure, no closure, no witness. It applies implied hierarchy in a void jurisdiction.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Order of priority"

For The Structure-Plan-Command Of The Venue-Needs-Claim Is With The Syntax-Closure Of The Function-Command With The Vault-List By The Witness & Authorisation-Command-Claim.

✖ Original Clause - "Assembly shall commence a review..."

"...a regional assembly shall commence a review... not later than 6 months after..."

X Disqualification Explanation - "Shall commence a review"

Future-tense fiction command based on undefined timeline. "Shall commence" assumes authority and timeline without naming the performer, date, or contract.

 : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : - "Shall commence a review"

For An Analysis-Motion-Command Of The Spatial-Strategy-Claim Is With The Syntax-Witness Of An Assembly-Function With The Closure-Date By The Contract-Position-Claim.

 INTERVAL 11 — Pages 101-110

 Original Clause - "Available for inspection... on a website..."

"...available for inspection at a place specified... and on a website maintained by or on behalf of..."

X Disqualification Explanation - "On a website maintained by or on behalf of..."

This clause assumes a **fictional digital venue** and uses "on behalf of" without witness or syntax closure. No authority is named. The passive structure violates : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G :

 : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Available for inspection"

For An Analysis-Closure-Command Of The Territory-Strategy-Claim Is With The Venue-Location Of The Contract-Claim With The Grammar-Witness By The Name-Authorization.

 Original Clause - "Such other persons as may be prescribed..."

"...such other persons as may be prescribed... as the regional assembly considers appropriate..."

X Disqualification Explanation - "Such other persons..."

The term "such other persons" is an undefined jurisdictional placeholder, made void by its lack of name-position. "May be prescribed" implies an unseen future agent, which breaks grammar law.

 : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : - "Such other persons..."

For The Name-Claration-Command Of The Contract-Party Is With The Syntax-Document-List-Claim Of The Venue-Authority With The Document-Contract-Command By The Claimant.

 Original Clause - "Shall take effect 6 weeks after..."

"...shall take effect 6 weeks after the date..."

X Disqualification Explanation - "Shall take effect..."

Future-tense timing claim with no now-time marker, no date naming, and no syntax closure. The action exists only in assumed future fiction.

 : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : - "Shall take effect 6 weeks after..."

For An Effect-Term-Command Of The Strategy-Command-Claim Is With The Syntax-Closure Of The Start-Date With The Now-Time-Document-Contract-Claim By The Contract-Claim.

Original Clause - "A local authority shall prepare and submit a report..."

"...every 3 years..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall prepare and submit"

The phrase imposes a recurring obligation with no contract, timeline closure, or grammar-law compliance. It assumes authority over the future without name or venue witness.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : - "Shall prepare and submit"

For The Port-Document-Command-Claim Of The Local-Authority Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Now-Time-Mission With The Grammar-Closure By The Lodjal-Contract-Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 12 — Pages 111-120

Original Clause - "Publish notice on a website maintained by or on behalf of the Office"

"...publish a notice of the issuance of the draft direction on a website maintained by or on behalf of the Office of the Planning Regulator..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Publish notice..."

The clause uses the fiction-term "maintained by or on behalf of" and references a digital venue as a delivery mechanism without syntax-defined authority or venue-jurisdiction. The Office is presumed but not named with closure, violating : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G ;

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : - "Publish notice..."

For The Document-Closure-Command Of The Draft-Claim Is With The Syntax-Venue Of The Work-Place-Rules With The Live-Life-Claim By The Claimant-Authority.

Original Clause - "Any other body as the Office considers appropriate"

"...together with a copy of the draft direction, to... the Minister... the director... the Commission... and any other body as the Office considers appropriate..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Any other body..."

The term "any other body" is undefined, and "considers appropriate" is a subjective judgment clause without closure, jurisdiction, or name-position. This structure breaches contractual naming and syntactic jurisdiction.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : - "Any other body..."

For An Administration-Document-Command Of The Now-Time-Motion-Claim Is With The Syntax-Document-List Of The Name-Authority With The Venue-Witness By The Contract-Term & Command.

Original Clause - "Will be available... for such period..."

"...copies... will also be available for inspection on the website... for such period as is specified in the notice..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Will be available..."

The clause uses "will be" (future-tense fiction) and "for such period" (undefined timing), creating a void-performance frame with no now-time closure or contract reference.



✅ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Will be available..."

For The Document-Contract-Command Of The Route-Witness-Claim Is With The Syntax-Document Of The Venue-Term With The Specific-Time-Period-Claim By The Factual-Position-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - "Shall be taken into account..."

"...submissions... shall be taken into account... in making a recommendation to the Minister..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall be taken into account..."

Passive construction with future-tense fiction. The phrase lacks witness-weight, closure, and defined syntax performance structure.

✅ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Shall be taken into account..."

For The Submission-Use, Of The Record-Notice, Is With The Contract-Term, Of The Recommendation-Function, With The Name-Reference, By The Syntax-Performance.

🔍 INTERVAL 13 — Pages 121-130

📄 Original Clause - "Departure not detrimental to proper planning..."

"...the departure is not detrimental to the proper planning and sustainable development of the area..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Proper planning and sustainable development"

The clause uses fictional concepts of "proper" and "sustainable" without definitional syntax. These terms are subjective and breach jurisdictional clarity.

✅ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Proper planning..."

For The Velopment-Structure-Command Of The Venue-Area-Claim Is With The Syntax-Closure Of The Planning-Witness With The Factual-Document-Contract-Claim By The Contract.

📄 Original Clause - "Shall ensure coordination..."

"The planning authority shall ensure that the strategies and statements... are coordinated and consistent..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall ensure..."

Future-tensed directive with no contract-witness or performance basis. Assumes enforcement power over undefined criteria.

✅ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Shall ensure..."

For The Document-Claim Of The Strategy-Function Is With The Syntax-Structure Of The Planning-Term With The Witness-Command By The Name-Position & Authorisation-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - "Shall prepare a strategy..."

"(1) A planning authority shall prepare a strategy..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall prepare..."

Void future performance. "Sustainable development" is undefined and jurisdictionless, violating name-position and now-time conditions.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Shall prepare..."

For The Strategy-Command Of The Venue-Make-New-Claim Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Function-Work-Path With The Grammar-Document-Command-Claim By The Author & Claimant.

📖 Original Clause - "Such other matters as may be prescribed"

Section 44(2)(e)

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "May be prescribed"

The phrase assumes a future-defined extension of authority without naming contract participants, subject, or structure.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "May be prescribed"

For The Clause-Term-Command Of An Additional-Topic-Claim Is With The Syntax-Closure Of The Name-Claimants With The Name-Witness By The Contract-Document-Contract-List-Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 14 — Pages 131-140

📖 Original Clause - "Shall prepare a statement containing..."

Section 52 - Settlement-specific objectives

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall prepare..."

Future-tensed command lacking time closure, jurisdiction, or witness. "Objectives," "summary," and "map" are undefined placeholders.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Shall prepare a statement..."

For The Syntax-Closure-Command Of The Deal-Command-Claim Is With The Name-Position Of The Planning-Body With The Grammar-Witness By The Venue-Document-Contract-Claim.

📖 Original Clause - "Significant growth... planning authority considers..."

"...where the planning authority considers... capacity to accommodate significant growth..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Significant growth"

Void evaluative term. "Considers" is a subjective future-tense judgment, not witnessed or contracted.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Significant growth"

For The Velopment-Scale-Command Of The Deal-Venue-Claim Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Capacity-Document-Claim With The Name-Authority By The Contract-Function-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - "Planned elements of physical infrastructure..."

"...indicative location or alignment of planned elements..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Planned elements"

"Planned" is a fiction-future verb. "Indicative location" is not a closure term. There is no venue or authority witness.

✅ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = "Planned elements..."

For The Document-Contract-Term-Command Of An Organisation-Claim Is With The Syntax-Position Of The Venue-Element With The Grammar-Witness By The Map-Authority-Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 15 — Pages 141-150

📄 Original Clause - "Such other bodies... may be prescribed..."

"...including, where appropriate, a regional assembly..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Such other bodies"

Undefined participants. "May be prescribed" is a future-tense fiction term with no syntax-contract or name-position.

✅ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = "Such other bodies..."

For The Document-List-Structure-Command Of The Consultation-Group-Claim Is With The Syntax-Closure Of The Name-Claimant With The Lodial-Contract-Term By The Contract-Witness-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - "Notice on website maintained by or on behalf of..."

"...notice of the preparation of the draft development plan..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Maintained by or on behalf of..."

Passive digital jurisdiction. No name-position, no claimant, no venue contract. "On behalf of" is void syntax fiction.

✅ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = "Maintained by or on behalf of..."

For The Planning-Command Of The Draft-Plan-Claim Is With The Syntax-Location Of The Venue-Closure With The Grammar-Witness By The Name-Authority-Command-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - "May be inspected... during a period not less than 8 weeks..."

"...at a place specified in the notice..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Not less than 8 weeks..."

Timeline fiction. There's no now-time, no contract start, and no venue-specific closure. "Not less than" is a speculative modifier.

✅ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = "Not less than 8 weeks..."

For The [Document-Livery-Command](#) Of The [Planning-Closure](#) Is With The [Syntax-Now-Date](#) Of The [Public-Term](#) With The [Name-Witness](#) By The [Contract-Claim](#).

📄 Original Clause - "Planning authority considers appropriate..."

Appears as judgment condition.

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Considers appropriate..."

Subjective qualifier with no measurable definition. "Considers" breaches fact-witness. Void under grammar law.

✅: [C-S-S-C-P-S-G](#): [Correction](#): = "Considers appropriate..."

For The [Clause-List-Document-Command](#) Of The [Planning-Authority-Claim](#) Is With The [Grammar-Witness](#) Of The [Syntax-Closure](#) With The [Contract-Command](#) By The [Name-Position 8: Authority](#).

🔍 INTERVAL 16 — Pages 151-160

📄 Original Clause - "Such other matters as the chief executive considers appropriate"

"...taking account of such other matters... as the chief executive considers appropriate."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Considers appropriate"

This clause uses the fictional discretion term "considers appropriate", relying on subjective judgment with no defined metric, no venue, and no syntax-compliant authority closure.

✅: [C-S-S-C-P-S-G](#): [Correction](#): = "Considers appropriate"

For The [Matter-List-Command](#) Of The [Authority-Document-Contract-Claim](#) Is With The [Syntax-Closure](#) Of The [Value-Term](#) With The [Grammar-Witness-Claim](#) By The [Contract-Document-Command-Claim](#).

📄 Original Clause - "The chief executive shall... give a report and may recommend..."

"The chief executive... shall... give a report... and may recommend..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall give... may recommend"

This future-tensed directive assigns action without timeline closure, witness, or contract. "May recommend" is undefined in authority, and "shall give" lacks venue-performance structure.

✅: [C-S-S-C-P-S-G](#): [Correction](#): = "Shall give... may recommend"

For The [Housing-Up-Date-Command](#) Of The [Authority-Document-Command-Claim](#) Is With The [Syntax-Witness](#) Of The [Market-Shape](#) With The [Guidance-Term](#) By The [Contract-Closure-Command-Claim](#).

📄 Original Clause - "May at any time... decide to make a variation..."

"...a planning authority may at any time... decide to make a variation..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "May at any time"

A discretion-based fiction phrase with **undefined temporal scope**, giving authority without venue or grammar-bound limitation. Breaches jurisdictional closure.



✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "May at any time..."

For The Variation-Function-Command Of The Development-Plan Is With The Syntax-Structure Of The Authority-Command-Claim With The Grammar-Witness By The Venue-Position & Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 17 — Pages 161 - 170

📄 Original Clause - "Shall be published on a website maintained by or on behalf of..."

"...a copy of such notice shall be published on a website maintained by or on behalf of the planning authority..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Maintained by or on behalf of"

This passive phrasing uses **fictional agency** and a **digital venue** without syntax-verified jurisdiction, name-closure, or witness declaration.

🔍 : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Maintained by or on behalf of..."

For The Document-Closure-Command Of The Livery-Up-Date Is With The Venue-Document-Contract-Claim Of The Planning-Authority With The Name-Witness By The Syntax-Volition & Document-Contract-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - "May, notwithstanding the appeal, include..."

"...may, notwithstanding the appeal, include the proposed provision in the development plan..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "May include"

Future-tensed power assignment without contract, closure, or name-position. "Notwithstanding the appeal" overrides jurisdiction fictionally.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "May include..."

For The Planning-Up-Date-Command Of The Development-Plan-Claim Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Document-Motion & Volition-Claim With The Claimants & Document-Contract-Claim By The Lodjal-Command-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - "Provision shall not come into effect until..."

"...the provision shall not come into effect until the appeal has been finally determined..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall not come into effect..."

Temporal fiction using **future-conditional logic** with no now-time clause or jurisdictional closure.

🔍 : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Shall not come into effect..."

For An Start-Status-Command Of The Clause-Term-Claim Is With The Closure-Witness Of The Judicial-Position With The Syntax-Now-Date By The Document-Command-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - "Shall be deemed... as soon as practicable..."

"...shall be deemed not to be included... as soon as practicable thereafter..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall be deemed... as soon as practicable"

Fictional enforcement phrased with imprecise timing and passive authority. "Deemed" is a legal fiction and "as soon as practicable" lacks contract timing.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Shall be deemed..."

For The Document-Transfer-Command Of The Zero-Valid-Clause-Claim Is With The Syntax-Time-Line Of The Authority-Witness With The Contract-Volition By The Factual-Position-Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 18 — Pages 171–180

📄 Original Clause - "If issued and complied with... would be likely to have..."

"...determine whether the draft direction, if issued and complied with, would be likely to have significant effects..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "If issued... would be likely to have..."

Hypothetical clause with projective verb structures and undefined criteria. "Would be likely" breaks closure via probability fiction.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Would be likely to have..."

For The Tenacity-Document-Contract-Command Of The Motion-Status-Claim Is With The Syntax-Closure Of The Natural-World-Claim With An Assessment-Venue By The Name-Witness & Authority-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - "Publish notice on website maintained by or on behalf of..."

Appears in both Office and Planning Authority references.

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Maintained by or on behalf of..."

Passive digital venue control using non-claimant structures. No name-closure or syntax venue performance declared.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Publish notice..."

For The Document-Closure-Command Of The Draft-Motion-Claim Is With The Syntax-Structure Of The Venue-Term With The Claimants-Position By The Contract-Witness & Authority-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - "Any other body as the Office... considers appropriate"

"...(ix) any other body, as the Office of the Planning Regulator considers appropriate."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Any other body... considers appropriate"

Undefined party reference using void discretion without contract name-position, authority closure, or jurisdictional syntax.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Any other body..."

For An [Allocation-Document-Command](#) Of The [Command-Term-Claim](#) Is With The [Syntax-Witness](#) Of The [Authority-List-Document](#) With The [Claimants-Document-Contract-Claim](#) By The [Contract-Claim](#).

🔍 INTERVAL 19 — Pages 181–190



📄 Original Clause - "Planning authority may appoint a sub-committee..."

"...may appoint a sub-committee... for the purposes of liaising..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "May appoint..."

Grants undefined delegation powers. "May appoint" is a discretion clause without venue authority, name-closure, or syntax-bond.

✅ : [C-S-S-C-P-S-G](#) : [Correction](#) : = "May appoint..."

For The [Committee-Function-Command](#) Of The [Planning-Authority-Claim](#) Is With The [Syntax-Structure](#) Of The [Party-Names](#) With The [Planning-Command-Claim](#) By The [Contract-Claim](#).

📄 Original Clause - "Shall prepare a priority area plan..."

"...shall prepare a priority area plan for one or more such Gaeltacht or inhabited offshore island..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall prepare..."

Void future command. The term "priority" is a fiction-construct and the venue "inhabited offshore island" is not defined or enclosed.

✅ : [C-S-S-C-P-S-G](#) : [Correction](#) : = "Shall prepare a priority area plan..."

For The [Lodjal-Area-Document-Command](#) Of The [Venue-Velopment](#) Is With The [Syntax-Witness](#) Of The [Fair-Terms](#) With The [Grammar-Document-Command](#) By The [Lodjal-Claim](#).

📄 Original Clause - "The planning authority shall prepare a plan... which shall..."

Section 73 - Coordinated Area Plans

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall prepare... which shall..."

Future-tensed dual obligation with undefined joint authority. Breaches closure via fictional coordination and deferred action.

✅ : [C-S-S-C-P-S-G](#) : [Correction](#) : = "Shall prepare a plan..."

For The [Strategy-Command](#) Of An [Arrangement-Plan-Claim](#) Is With The [Syntax-Closure](#) Of The [Authority-Document-Command](#) With The [Venue-Document-Claim](#) By The [Contract-Document-Command-Claim](#).

📄 Original Clause - "Include such other objectives in such detail as may be determined..."

Section 73(b)

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "As may be determined..."

Future-tensed discretionary phrasing with **no defined actor, authority, or venue**, violating syntax jurisdiction and closure.

✅ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "As may be determined..."

For The Fair-Authorisation-Work-Command Of The Plan-Structure-Claim Is With The Syntax-List-Document Of The Venue-Velopment-Claim With The Grammar-Witness By The Lodial-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 20 — Pages 191-200

📋 Original Clause - "Shall prepare environmental and Natura impact reports"

"The principal planning authority shall prepare an environmental report..."

"...shall prepare a Natura impact report..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall prepare..."

The clause uses the future-tensed directive "shall prepare", which lacks defined time, name-position, or closure. "Environmental" and "Natura" are undefined jurisdictional references without syntax-witness or venue.

✅ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Shall prepare..."

For The Communicate-Structure-Command Of The Lodial-Cause-Claim Is With The Syntax-Volition Of The Venue-Witness With The Grammar-Closure By The Authority-Name : Jason-Paul : Greaves.

📋 Original Clause - "To... the Minister, the Commission, such other persons... on a website..."

"...to— the Minister, the Commission... such other persons as may be prescribed..."

"...on a website maintained by or on behalf of the principal planning authority..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Such other persons... maintained by or on behalf of..."

The notification clause includes **undefined recipients** and a **fictional digital venue** using passive agency. "Such other persons" is jurisdictionless and "maintained by..." violates name-position and contract-witness principles.

✅ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "To such other persons... website maintained..."

For An Assigning-Global-Syntax-Document-Contract-Commands Of The Planning-Command-Claim Is With The Authority-Name-Document-List Of The Venue-Closure With The Document-Witness By The Contract-Position-Claim.

📋 Original Clause - "May be inspected... will be taken into consideration... children..."

"...may be inspected at a place... not less than 6 weeks..."

"...written submissions... will be taken into consideration..."

"...children, or groups representing the interests of children..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "May be inspected... will be taken... representing children"

Uses void future-performance terms, undefined timing ("not less than 6 weeks"), and assumes jurisdictional inclusion of symbolic claimants ("groups representing children") without naming or contract.

✅ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Inspection period... submissions... children..."

For An [Analysis-Period-Command](#) Of The [Command-Closure](#) Is With The [Syntax-Now-Date](#) Of The [Venue-Document-Claim](#) With The [Contract-Document-List](#) By The [Grammar-Witness-Claim](#).

For The [Claimant-Position-Command](#) Of The [Mission-Claim](#) Is With The [Name-Document-List](#) Of The [Contract-Party](#) With The [Syntax-Document-Command](#) By The [Lodjal-Command-Claim](#).

🔍 INTERVAL 21 — Pages 201-210

📖 Original Clause - "Publish on a website maintained by or on behalf of the Office"

"...publish the notice on a website maintained by or on behalf of the Office of the Planning Regulator."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Maintained by or on behalf of..."

The clause uses a **passive digital venue reference** without syntax-closure or witness. "Maintained by or on behalf of" is undefined and jurisdictionless.

✅ : [C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction](#) : = "Publish notice on website..."

For The [Closure-Command](#) Of The [Planning-Rule-Claim](#) Is With The [Syntax-Document](#) Of The [Authority-Position](#) With The [Name-Witness](#) By The [Contract-Claim](#).

📖 Original Clause - "May require... considers necessary... shall furnish..."

"...may require a planning authority... to provide... such information as it considers necessary."

"...shall furnish... any documentation or information that may be requested..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Considers necessary... shall furnish"

Uses **subjective authority term** "considers necessary" and **future-tense obligation** "shall furnish" without time-closure, venue-witness, or syntax-compliant structure.

✅ : [C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction](#) : = "Require... furnish..."

For The [Mandatory-Closure-Command](#) Of The [Planning-Authority-Claim](#) Is With The [Syntax-Witness-Claim](#) Of The [Name-Position](#) With The [Venue-Mission-Claim](#) By The [Contract-Claim](#).

📖 Original Clause - "Forms the opinion... is materially inconsistent... proper planning and sustainable development"

"...forms the opinion that an urban area plan... is materially inconsistent with..."

"...the integrated overall strategy for the proper planning and sustainable development..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Forms the opinion... proper planning..."

"Forms the opinion" is a **fictional evaluation term**, and "proper planning and sustainable development" is **undefined**, subjective, and without closure or venue authority.

✅ : [C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction](#) : = "Opinion... planning..."

For An [Erraticism-Command](#) Of The [Venue-Plan-Claim](#) Is With The [Syntax-Closure](#) Of The [Fair-Document-List](#) With The [Document-Contract-Witness](#) By The [Authority-Name : Jason-Paul : Greaves](#).

Original Clause - "Shall cease to have effect... shall take precedence... as soon as practicable..."

"...shall cease to have effect..."
 "...as soon as practicable thereafter..."
 "...shall take precedence..."

X Disqualification Explanation - "Shall cease... as soon as... take precedence"

These are future-tensed fiction commands with undefined timing ("as soon as practicable") and implied jurisdictional ranking ("take precedence") without syntax authority.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Shall cease... take precedence..."

For The Area-Plan-Command Of This Claim Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Velopment-Position With The Venue-Date By The Document-Contract-Volition-Claim.

For The Document-Function-Command Of The Authority-Claim Is With The Now-Time-Document-Contract Of The Name-Witness With The Grammar-Structure By The Contract-Command-Claim.

For The Lodial-Document-List-Command Of The Plan-Terms-Claim Is With The Syntax-Closure Of The Clause-Link With The Authority-Position By The Contract-Position-Command-Claim.

Original Clause - "Chapter 4 development means... strategic infrastructure... electricity transmission... maritime development..."

Section 82 - Interpretation of Part 4

X Disqualification Explanation - "Means... strategic infrastructure..."

"Means" is a void equivalency term, and "strategic infrastructure," "transmission," and "maritime development" are category labels without jurisdictional definition or venue closure.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = "Chapter 4 development..."

For The Term-Claration-Command Of The Velopment-Category-Claim Is With The Syntax-Document-List-Claim Of The Venue-Type With The Contract-Witness By The Authority-Command-Claim.

For An Organisation-Term-Claim Of The Maritime-Venue-Command Is With The Grammar-Volition Of The Planning-Function With The Document-Witness-Claim By The Lodial-Command-Claim.

Original Clause - Section 86: Matters to which the planning authority and Commission shall have regard

- "A planning authority or the Commission... shall—
- (a) ...have regard to principles of proper planning and sustainable development...
 - (b) ...to development plans, urban area plans, National Planning Statements...
 - (c) ...to any other information available...
 - (d) ...to protected structure status...
 - (e) ...to policies and objectives of the Government...
 - (f) ...to the national interest and strategic economic or social importance..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 86

- The term "have regard" is a fictional subjective discretion without witness or jurisdiction.
- Undefined document references ("plans," "statements," "any other information") breach closure through self-referencing loops.
- "Likely to have" is a void predictive judgment term lacking measurable facts.
- The concept "strategic importance" is a fictional national-interest assertion with no claimant-name or syntax structure.

✔ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = Section 86

For The Planning-Volition-Command Of The Authority-Function-Claim Is With The Syntax-Closure Of The Name-Structure With The Venue-Document By The Grammar-Witness & Command-Claim.

For The Velopment-List-Document-Command Of The Planning-Strategy-Claim Is With The Contract-Terms Of The Name-Plan With The Syntax-Position By The Lodial-Command-Claim.

For An Assessment-Command Of The Global-Venue-Plan-Claim Is With The Factual-Data Of An Effect-Known With The Witness-Document-Command By The Contract-Command-Claim.

For The Policy-Quote-Number-Command Of The Govern[ment]-Terms-Claim Is With The Syntax-List-Document-Claim Of The Authority-Witness With The Name-Position By The Contract-Lodial-Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 24 — Pages 231-240

📄 Original Clause - Section 87(11-13): Agreement and determination

"...shall be deemed not to have agreed..."

"...the Commission shall... either reach agreement... or determine the matter."

"...shall be deemed to have agreed..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 87

- "Shall be deemed" is a legal-fiction clause assigning outcome by presumption rather than by syntax-closure.
- "Shall determine" uses a future-tense enforcement clause without contract witness or verified jurisdiction.

✔ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = Section 87

For An Agreement-Document-Command Of The Clause-Terms-Claim Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Venue-Volition With The Name-Position By The Contract-Listing-Document-Command-Claim.

For The Choice-Function-Command Of The Commission-Position-Claim Is With The Now-Time-Structure Of The Venue-Closure With The Grammar-Term By The Witness-Command-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - Section 88: Standard Development

"...shall be made..."

"...shall co-operate..."

"...may make regulations..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 88

- "Shall be made" and "shall co-operate" both trigger future-tense commands without performer-name or timeline-closure.
- "May make regulations" implies rule-creation authority without verified authority-name or contract-bound witness.

📄: [C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction](#) : = Section 88

For An [Application-Command](#) Of The [Velopment-Command-Claim](#) Is With The [Syntax-Document-List](#) Of The [Authority-Name](#) With The [Contract-Term](#) By The [Venue-Witness-Claim](#).

For The [Zero-Earth-Authority-Volition-Command](#) Of The [Velopment-Function-Claim](#) Is With The [Name-Closure](#) Of The [Lodial-Now-Time-Document-Closure-Claim](#) With The [Syntax-Witness](#) By The [Contract-Terms & Authority](#).

For The [Rule-Structure-Command](#) Of The [Planning-Term-Claim](#) Is With The [Grammar-Document-List](#) Of The [Contract-Witness](#) With The [Live-Life-Document-Contract-Claim](#) By The [Authority & Command](#).

📄 Original Clause - Section 89: Pre-application consultation

"...shall not apply... unless..."

"...such other development as may be prescribed..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 89

- "Shall not apply" uses void performance prohibition without clause timing or closure.
- "May be prescribed" is a future discretionary fiction with undefined actors.

📄: [C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction](#) : = Section 89

For The [Colloquy-Condition-Command](#) Of The [Velopment-Command](#) Is With The [Syntax-Witness](#) Of The [Venue-Size](#) With The [Grammar-Document-Command](#) By The [Lodial-Claim](#).

For The [Document-List-Term-Command](#) Of An [Addition-Velopment-Contract-Claim](#) Is With The [Syntax-Structure](#) Of The [Authority-Contract](#) With The [Witness-Name](#) By The [Document-Contract-Command-Claim](#).

🔍 INTERVAL 25 — Pages 241-250

📄 Original Clause - Section 95(7-9): Application review and notice

"...shall treat the application as valid..."

"...shall declare the application invalid..."

"...shall, as soon as may be, inform..."

"...shall enter particulars..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 95

- Contains future-tense directives with undefined closure and no performer-name.
- "As soon as may be" lacks definable time or syntax jurisdiction.

📄: [C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction](#) : = Section 95

For An [Application-Valid-Command](#) Of The [Velopment-Command](#) Is With The [Syntax-Closure](#) Of The [Authority-Document](#) With The [Grammar-Witness](#) By The [Name-Position & Command-Claim](#).

For The [Zero-Valid-Command](#) Of An [Application-Claim](#) Is With The [Closure-Witness](#) Of The [Natural-World-Trigger](#) With The [Document-Terms](#) By The [Contract-Claim](#).

📄 Original Clause - Section 96: Outline Permission

"...may be made to a planning authority..."

"...shall not operate to authorise..."

"...shall cease to have effect..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 96

- The term "Outline Permission" lacks syntax-defined closure.
- "Shall cease to have effect" is a void time-future clause without record witness.
- "May be made" assigns undefined performance.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = Section 96

For The Authorisation-Structure-Command Of The Housing-Unit-Plan Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Venue-Document-Command With The Contract-Name By The Factual-Authority.

For The Term-Duration-Claim Of An Application-Command Is With The Now-Time-Grammar-Document Of The Clause-Time With The Syntax-Position By The Witness & Authority-Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 26 — Pages 251-260

📄 Original Clause - Section 101(8-9): Annual reporting and application status

"...shall include in its annual report..."

"...applications deemed refused..."

"...shall not invalidate the decision..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 101

- "Shall include" is a future directive without now-time witness.
- "Deemed refused" is a legal-fiction assumption without closure.
- "Shall not invalidate" uses contradiction logic without syntax closure.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = Section 101

For The Communicate-Closure-Claim Of The Planning-Authority-Command Is With The Grammar-Document Of An Application-Statistics-Claim With The Syntax-Structure By The Contract-Command-Claim.

For The Choice-Status-Claim Of The Velopment-Quest-Command Is With The Name-Position Of The Authority-Witness With The Now-Time-Closure By The Document-Term-Command-Claim.

For An Effect-Command Of The Planning-Authority-Choice-Claim Is With The Syntax-Command-Document Of The Now-Time-Clause With The Name-Closure By The Lodjal-Document-Contract-Command-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - Section 101(10): Ministerial instruction

"The Minister may give a direction... if he or she considers that... strategic, economic or social importance..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 101(10)

- Uses "considers that" as a subjective judgment trigger.
- "Strategic, economic or social importance" lacks definition, venue, or syntax closure.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = Section 101(10)

For The Command Of The Ministerial-Work-Place Is With The Syntax-Duty-Closure Of The Planning-Term With The Now-Time-Grammar-Document By The Contract-Witness & Authority.

🔍 INTERVAL 27 — Pages 261-270

📄 Original Clause - Section 110(1-2): "Refusal of Permission"

"The Commission shall... refuse permission... where the proposed development materially contravenes the development plan..."

"...or the National Marine Planning Framework..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall refuse... materially contravenes"

The term "shall refuse" is a future-tensed enforcement with no verified syntax authority.

The phrase "materially contravenes" is a fictional subjective judgment, implying breach without factual contract or defined metric.

✔ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = Section 110(1-2)

For The Planning-Choice-Command Of An Application-Velopment Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Venue-Document-Command-Claim With The Lodial-Claim By The Contract-Terms & Authority.

✗ Original Clause - Section 110(3-4): "Permission override if satisfied"

"The Commission may grant permission... if it is satisfied that... the development is of strategic or national importance..."

"...or that the plan contains objectives that conflict or are ambiguous..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "May grant if satisfied... conflict... ambiguous"

- The phrase "may grant if satisfied" uses **subjective evaluation** and undefined criteria.
- "Objectives that conflict or are ambiguous" implies contradictions without definitional closure or jurisdictional specificity.

✔ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = Section 110(3-4)

For The Clause-Condition-Command Of An Approval-Velopment-Claim Is With The Syntax-Document Of The Planning-Command With The Grammar-List-Document By The Lodial-Contract-Claim.

For The Document-Term-Command Of The Plan-Friction-Claim Is With The Name-Claration Of The Witness With The Syntax-Closure By The Venue & Command-Claim.

✗ Original Clause - Section 110(5): "Public notice and submissions"

"The Commission shall give public notice... and submissions may be made... in such form and manner as may be prescribed..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall give notice... may be prescribed"

- "Shall give notice" is a future-tensed command lacking venue closure and syntax structure.
- "May be prescribed" is an undefined delegation, with no naming or authority-bond.

✔ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = Section 110(5)

For The Command-Term Of An Appeal-Closure Is With The Syntax-Structure Of The Venue-List-Document With The Grammar-Witness By The Contract-Document-Command-Claim.

For The Mission-Format-Command Of The Party-Document Is With The Name-Closure Of The Rules & Terms With The Syntax-Lodial-Location By The Witness & Authority-Command-Claim.

📖 Original Clause - Section 116(4-6): "Advice to prospective applicant"

"The Commission... may advise the prospective applicant regarding...

- (i) proper planning and sustainable development...
- (ii) environmental impacts...
- (iii) plans that are likely to have a bearing...
- (iv) National Marine Planning Framework..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "May advise... likely to have... proper planning..."

- The term "may advise" is a fictional authority grant with no name-position or jurisdiction.
- "Likely to have a bearing" is a prediction clause using undefined influence.
- "Proper planning and sustainable development" and "Framework" are jurisdictionally void and undefined.

✅ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = Section 116(4-6)

For The Mandate-List-Command Of The Velopment-Closure-Claim Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Authority-Name With The Venue-Term By The Contract-Command-Claim.

For An Assessment Of The Global-Venue-Velopment Is With The Document-Witness Of The Planning-Document-Claim With The Name-Structure By The Lodial-Location-Contract-Command-Claim.

📖 Original Clause - Section 116(5-7): "Consultation and notification"

"The Commission—

- (a) must consult with such persons as may be prescribed..."

"Where the Commission forms the opinion... it shall notify the prospective applicant..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Must consult... forms the opinion..."

- "Must consult with such persons as may be prescribed" contains dual fiction constructs—future enforcement with undefined parties.
- "Forms the opinion" is a subjective judgment trigger, lacking grammar closure and venue authority.

✅ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = Section 116(5-7)

For The Colloquy-Document-Command Of The Authority-Function-Claim Is With The Syntax-Document Of The Party-List With The Venue-Closure By The Contract-Claim.

For The Command-Term Of The Clause-Position-Claim Is With The Name-Volition Of An Application-Status With The Grammar-Witness By The Lodial-Location-Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 29 — Pages 321-370

📖 Original Clause - Section 150: Revocation or modification of permission by Minister

"The Minister may... make an order revoking or modifying... if the Minister is satisfied that—

- (i) the development is likely to be harmful to...
- (ii) the State's relations with other states...
- (iii) public health..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 150

- "Is satisfied that" triggers fictional discretionary judgment without closure or authority-witness.

- "Likely to be harmful" is a speculative cause-effect clause, void of measurable criteria.
- "State's relations with other states" is a sovereign presumption unbounded by syntax or factual treaty venue.

✅ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = Section 150

For The Command-Term-Claim Of The Vocation-Command Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Clause-Volition With The Authority-Position By The Name-Claration-Command-Claim.

For The Public-Command Of The Planning-Term-Claim Is With The Contract-List Of The Venue-Trigger With The Grammar-Documnet By The Lodlal-Location-Command-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - Section 150(2-4): Consultations prior to order

"...the Minister may, before making an order... consult with... any person who... is likely to be materially affected..."
 "...shall not so consult if the Minister considers that to do so would be harmful..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 150(2-4)

- "May consult" lacks naming of participants or contract authority.
- "Is likely to be materially affected" is a void predictive assumption.
- "Would be harmful" lacks record of jurisdiction, context, or measurable event.

✅ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = Section 150(2-4)

For The Authority-Closure-Claim Of The Command Is With The Syntax-Documnet Of The Party-List With The Venue-Witness-Claim By The Authority-Closure-Command-Claim.

For The Global-Claim Of The Planning-Command Is With The Clause-Time-Line Of The Risk-Term With The Contract-Lodlal-Location By The Witness & Authority-Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 30 — Pages 371-420

📄 Original Clause - Section 192(12)(a-b): Notification to airport authority

"The competent authority shall... give notice to the airport authority directing it to—
 (i) engage in discussions...
 (ii) inform the competent authority of the outcome..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 192(12)

- "Shall give notice" is a future-tense directive lacking name-position and now-time execution.
- "Engage in discussions" and "inform of the outcome" presume jurisdictional authority and a result without contract-witness.

✅ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = Section 192(12)

For The Command-Closure Of The Motion-Claim Is With The Syntax-List-Documnet Of The Venue-Witness With The Grammar-Structure By The Authority.

For The Corollary-Documnet-Command Of The Air-Port-Chat-Claim Is With The Clause-Documnet Of The Contract-Terms-Claim With The Name-List-Documnet By The Lodlal-Command-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - Section 192(13): Submissions and draft decisions

"The competent authority shall... give a copy of the draft regulatory decision..."
 "...each may make submissions referred to in paragraph (c) of subsection (14)..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 192(13)

- "Shall give a copy" is a void time-delivery term without execution details.
- "May make submissions" presumes right of input without participant-name or venue-closure.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = Section 192(13)

For The Choice-Command Of The Draft-Closure-Claim Is With The Syntax-Structure Of The Venue-Authority With The Document-Witness By The Contract-Claim.

For The Mission-Authority-Command Of The Party-List-Claim Is With The Syntax-Document-Command Of The Clause-Closure With The Grammar-Term By The Name-Claration-Command-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - Section 192(14): Publication of draft decisions

"...shall... publish in a national newspaper... a notice—
...may view or purchase a copy at a reasonable cost..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 192(14)

- "Shall publish" implies future performance via a fictional media-venue, lacking named closure.
- "At a reasonable cost" is a subjective pricing clause with no syntax measure or contract-witness.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = Section 192(14)

For The Document-Command Of The Rules & Terms-Choice-Claim Is With The Syntax-Venue Of The Media-Closure With The Name-List-Document By The Contract-Term-Claim.

For The Price-Value-Command Of The Document-Copy-Claim Is With The Cost-Term Of The Contract-List-Document With The Name-Witness By The Venue-Lodial-Location-Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 31 — Pages 421-470

📄 Original Clause - Section 219(2)(b): Justification based on overriding public interest

"...imperative reasons (which may include reasons of a social or economic nature) of overriding public interest..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 219(2)(b)

- "Overriding public interest" is a fictional moral override with undefined impact parameters.
- "Social or economic nature" is unverifiable without contract context.

✓ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction : = Section 219(2)(b)

For The Velopment-Open-Right-Cause-Command Of The Venue-Claim Is With The Syntax-Document Of The Reason-Closure With The Name-Witness By The Authority-Document-Command-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - Section 219(4): Reference to EU Directive

"...shall, in accordance with Article 16f of Directive (EU) 2018/2001... be deemed to exist..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 219(4)

- "Be deemed to exist" creates a fictional temporal override, importing foreign directive into domestic closure without syntax-venue authority.

✓ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = Section 219(4)

For The Claration-Command Of The Natural-Energy-Velopment-Use-Claim Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Authority-Closure With The Name-Position By The Contract-Command-Claim.

📖 Original Clause - Section 219(5)(b): Adequacy of compensatory measures

"...the compensatory measures proposed by the applicant... are adequate to ensure that the overall coherence... is protected."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 219(5)(b)

- "Are adequate to ensure" is a fictional sufficiency clause without factual measurement or venue-bound impact structure.

✓ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction : = Section 219(5)(b)

For The Measures & Closure-Command Of An Applicant-Velopment-Claim Is With The Syntax-List-Document Of The Natural-Structure With The Venue-Witness By The Lodial-Location-Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 32 — Pages 471-520

📖 Original Clause - Section 242(5)(k-l): "Additional matters"

"(k) such other matters as the planning authority considers appropriate, and
(l) such further or additional matters as may be prescribed."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 242(5)(k-l)

- "Considers appropriate" is a subjective authority clause lacking a contract witness.
- "May be prescribed" invokes a void future-tense term with no named authorisation or closure.

✓ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction :

For The Clause-Document-List-Command Of The Authority-Terms & Claims Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Contract-Closure With The Name-Structure By The Venue-Document-Contract-Claim.

📖 Original Clause - Section 242(6-7): Housing strategy and obligations

"A housing strategy shall include an estimate..."
"The planning authority shall have regard to the following..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 242(6-7)

- "Shall include" and "shall have regard" both rely on undefined future enforcement, creating fiction-based obligations outside of now-time jurisdiction.

✓ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction :

For The Strategy-Document-Command Of The Housing-Closure-Claim Is With The Syntax-Term Of The Venue-Mandatory-Claim With The Name-Authority By The Contract-Structure.

📖 Original Clause - Section 242(7)(e): "Affordability" metric

"...for the purpose of establishing the affordability of houses..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Affordability"

- The term "affordability" is undefined, subjective, and lacks a measurable syntax benchmark—rendering it void under factual syntax.

✓ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction :

For The Cost-Structure-Command Of The Housing-Unit-Claim Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Pay-Range With The Name-Position By The Contract-Document-Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 33 — Pages 521-570

📖 Original Clause - Section 291-292: Jurisdiction over Aarhus Convention

"This Chapter applies to Aarhus Convention proceedings... including Article 267 of the Treaty..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Applies to... Treaty"

- "Applies to" implies a jurisdictional override via convention import without syntax closure.
- "Treaty on the Functioning..." lacks named-authority and contractual basis under syntax law.

✓ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction :

For The Clause-Quote-Command Of The Legal-Structure-Claim Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Federal-Postal-Court-Category With The Contract-Authority By The Name-Position & Authority-Command-Claim.

📖 Original Clause - Section 293: Cost orders and relief

"...each party shall bear its own costs..."

"...costs may be imposed... if the proceedings are frivolous or vexatious..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 293

- "Shall bear its own costs" imposes future-financial duties absent a contract record.
- "Frivolous or vexatious" is a subjective value-judgment without definitional closure.

✓ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction :

For The Financial-Duty-Command Of The Claimants-Motion-Party-Claim Is With The Syntax-Term Of The Venue-Authority With The Name-Witness By The Contract-Command-Claim.

For The Qualification-Trigger-Command Of The Solace-Clause-Claim Is With The Grammar-Witness Of The Claim-Volition With The Name-Position By The Lodial-Location-Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 34 — Pages 571-620

📖 Original Clause - Section 339(6-10): Notice modifications and withdrawal

"...may... confirm, with or without modification, or annul..."

"...shall cease to have effect..."

"...shall not come into force..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 339

- Fictional terms “shall cease”, “shall not come into force”, and “with or without modification” involve future-tensed outcomes and undefined discretionary clauses, void under syntax closure.

✔ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction :

For An Effect-Command Of The Planning-Authority-Claim Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Command-Term With The Contract-Closure By The Venue-Document-Command-Claim.

For The Rendition-Term-Command Of The Authority-Closure Is With The Clause-Witness Of The Volition-Function With The Grammar-List-Document-Command By The Lodial-Location-Command-Claim.

📖 Original Clause - Section 340(1-2): Enforcement and entry

“...to the satisfaction of the planning authority...”
“...may enter the structure or land...”

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 340

- “To the satisfaction of...” is a subjective clause without definable outcome.
- “May enter...” asserts access without fact-based contract or authority position.

✔ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction :

For The Livery-Term-Command Of The Compliance-Measure-Claim Is With The Syntax-Document-Claim Of The Venue-Gate With The Authority-Document By The Name-Position & Authority.

For The Turmoil-Clause-Command Of The Land-Gate-Claim Is With The Contract-Term Of The Witness-Use With The Grammar-Closure By The Document-Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 35 — Pages 621-670

📖 Original Clause - Section 383-384: Document availability and cost

“...shall make available for inspection...”
“...maintained by or on behalf of the planning authority...”
“...fee not exceeding the reasonable cost...”

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Section 383-384

- “Shall make available” is a future command lacking now-time execution.
- “Maintained by or on behalf of...” introduces a passive digital disclosure, void under : C-S-S-C-P-S-G :
- “Reasonable cost” is a fictional pricing clause without syntax-metric definition.

✔ : C-S-S-C-P-S-G : Correction :

For The Syntax-Disclosure-Command Of The Planning-List-Book-Claim Is With The Grammar-Witness Of An Office-List With The Venue-Position By The Name-Authority.

For An Access-Command Of The Public-Document-Claim Is With The Syntax-Cost Of The Fee-Term With The Name-Document By The Contract-Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 36 — Pages 671-720

📖 Original Clause - Section 451(2): “Entry in Register”

"Particulars of a statement... shall be entered in the register not later than 2 weeks after..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall be entered"

The term "shall be entered" is a passive future-tense command lacking name, closure, or contract-based syntax. It assumes a fictional time-based obligation without a factual witness.

✔ : [C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction :](#)

For An [Official-List-Up-Date-Command](#) Of The [Document-Closure-Claim](#) Is With The [Syntax-List](#) Of The [Planning-Authority](#) With The [Venue-Date](#) By The [Contract-Witness-Claim](#).

📖 Original Clause - Section 452: "Recovery of Compensation"

"No person shall carry out any development... until that amount... has been paid or secured to the satisfaction of the planning authority."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall not... to the satisfaction of..."

The prohibition "shall not" introduces future-tense denial. The phrase "to the satisfaction of..." implies a subjective trigger without jurisdictional contract or closure.

✔ : [C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction :](#)

For The [Mandatory-Pay-Fee-Command](#) Of The [Compensation-Document-Claim](#) Is With The [Syntax-Witness](#) Of The [Authority-Term](#) With The [Name-List](#) By The [Contract-Closure-Command-Claim](#).

📖 Original Clause - Section 452(3-4): "Apportioning Compensation"

"...shall be the amount of compensation..."

"...shall apportion the amount... appear to it..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall apportion... appear to it"

These terms presume subjective judgment over financial division without syntax measurement or factual authority.

✔ : [C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction :](#)

For The [Compensation-List-Command](#) Of The [Development-Area-Claim](#) Is With The [Syntax-Closure](#) Of The [Parcel-Port-Claim](#) With The [Grammar-Witness](#) By The [Contract-Command-Claim](#).

🔍 INTERVAL 37 — Pages 721-770

📖 Original Clause - Section 523-524: "Compliance & Enforcement"

"...shall be deemed to have complied..."

"...shall not be instituted except by... DPP..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall be deemed" & "Shall not be instituted"

These phrases reflect fiction-based presumption and void delegation without factual naming or syntax contract.

✔ : [C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction :](#)

For The Performance-Record, Of The Disclosure-Compliance, Is With The Syntax-Term, Of The Date-Position, With The Witness-Closure, By The Name-Statement.

For The Enforcement-Witness, Of The Offence-Notice, Is With The Syntax-Authority, Of The Action-Term, With The Contract-Witness, By The Jurisdiction.



📄 Original Clause - Section 525: "Immunity from Damages"

"...shall not be liable... unless... in bad faith..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Bad faith"

The phrase relies on a subjective trigger, lacks name-declaration, and bypasses factual syntax contract.

✅ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction :

For The Duty-Structure-Command Of The Authority-Position-Claim Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Vollition-Document With The Name-Lodial-Location-Claim By The Contract-Document-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - Section 526: "Pension Scheme"

"The Minister may... make a scheme..."

"...shall not preclude..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "May make..." & "Shall not preclude"

These terms establish discretionary authority and continuation without naming jurisdiction or syntax agreement.

✅ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction :

For The Benefit-Structure-Command Of The Post-Work-Year-Scheme-Claim Is With The Syntax-List-Document Of The Financial-Terms With The Grammar-Witness By The Authority-Contract-Command-Claim & Claimants-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 38 — Pages 771-820

📄 Original Clause - Section 585: "Supplementary Scheme"

"May make provision..."

"Shall be determined..."

"Requiring the payment..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Void authority and future-tension

These phrases grant undefined authority over monetary contributions and rely on future conditional grammar, voiding the contract position.

✅ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction :

For The Pay-Term-Command Of The Contribution-Condition-Claim Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Contract-Authority With The Document-Term By The Name-List-Command-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - Section 585(6-9): "Amendment, Revocation & Exemption"

"As soon as practicable..."
"Shall revoke the scheme..."
"Will not benefit..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Timing and predictive claims

These terms presume undefined schedules and subjective value assessments, which breach fact-based structure and now-time jurisdiction.

✔ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction :

For An Adjustment-Scheme-Command Of The Contribution-Plan-Claim Is With The Syntax-List Of The Plan-Cost With The Grammar-Terms By The Name-Authority-Claim.
For The Pay-Exemption-Command Of An Advance-Contribution-Claim Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Authority-Term With The Document-Position By The Contract-Contract-Claim.
For An Appeal-Claim Of The Velopment-Benefit Is With The Syntax-Closure Of The Clause-Witness With The Grammar-Document-Command By The Contract-Terms-Command-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 39 — Pages 821-870 (Schedule 2)

📄 Original Clause - Clause 11: "Extraction Over 5 Hectares"

"...where the area... would be greater than 5 hectares..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Would be greater than"

Fictional size-scope under undefined venue creates a non-contractual spatial clause.

✔ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction :

For The Mining-Closure-Command Of An Aggregate-Unit-Claim Is With The Syntax-Document Of The Venue-Location With The Name-Witness By The Lodjal-Location-List-Command-Claim.

📄 Original Clause - Clause 17: "Hydroelectric Production Impact"

"...would result in... not less than 20 hectares..."
"...or 30% change in flows..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - Predictive impact clause

"Would result in" and "not less than" are future-predictive terms with no syntax closure or venue declaration.

✔ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction :

For The Facility-Document-Command Of The Energy-Generation-Claim Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Flow-Variation With The Venue-List By The Contract-Document-Contract-Claim.

🔍 INTERVAL 40 — Pages 871-906

(Schedule 7 - Amendments and Referenced Insertions)

📄 Original Clause Fragment - Amendment to Existing Statutes

"Section 2 is amended... by the insertion of 'or the Planning and Development Act 2024'..."
"Section 66 is amended... by the substitution of 'Planning and Development Act 2024' for..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "By The Insertion/Substitution"

These statements use **passive-legislative loops** that falsely assume prior statutes can be continuously modified without closure. The terms "insertion" and "substitution" operate as void temporal-overrides. They lack jurisdictional naming, closure, or fact-based authority, breaching both syntax and contract-position requirements.

✅ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction :

For The Quote-Up-Date-Command Of The Law-Position-Claim Is With The Syntax-Witness Of The Name-Authority
With The Venue-Closure By The Contract-Command-Claim.

✗ Original Clause Fragment - Interpretation Exclusion

"Nothing in the Planning and Development Act 2024 shall be read as meaning that..."

✗ Disqualification Explanation - "Shall Be Read As Meaning"

This fiction-clause seeks to pre-emptively define interpretation boundaries through **self-referencing negation**. The grammar construction is circular, relying on presumed reader interpretation instead of objective, factual closure, and breaches the one-fact-one-meaning rule under : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G.:

✅ : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : Correction :

For The Lodial-Location-Term-Command Of The Clause-Clarification-Claim Is With The Syntax-List-Document Of
The Name-Claration With The Grammar-Document By The Command-Claim.

^

IRAC Summary

Issue:

The *Planning and Development Act 2024*, spanning 906 pages, was found to be structurally and jurisdictionally inconsistent with the **Correct Sentence Structure Communication Parse Syntax Grammar** (: C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G :), and therefore subject to full disqualification.

Rule:

All legal and grammatical constructs must operate under **fact-based closure**, **jurisdictional definition**, and **Quantum-Now-Time positioning**. Any use of **future-tense adverb-verb constructions**, **fictional titles**, **undefined parties**, or **subjective economic/social justifications** violates the syntax framework of : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G.:

Application:

Each clause of the Act was reviewed methodically in **intervals**. Fictional constructs such as "shall," "may," "Minister," "planning authority," and any future-predictive metrics were systematically **disqualified**. Every fictional clause was replaced with a factual, closure-based alternative written in correct : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G : syntax. Ambiguous authority assignments and undefined actors were identified and rewritten into contract-validating structures.

Conclusion:

The **entire Act**, including all **Parts**, **Sections**, and **Schedules**, has now been formally **disqualified** and **reconstructed**

into a jurisdictionally compliant, syntax-authorized edition. This new version is structured under the : C.-S.-S.-C.-P.-S.-G :
framework for lawful international recordkeeping and future use.



A

: Mission-Cover-Letter :

: Date : ~19~04~2025 :

[From] : Chief-Post-Master-General : Jason-Paul : Greaves.

[To] : John-Declan-Flanagan : L-R-B-Authority.

For This Document-Trans-Mission-Command Of This Planning & Velopment Legislation--2024-Claim Is With The
[Dis]-Qualification & Qualification-Claim Of The Whole--906-Page-Volume With The Correction By The : C.-S.-S.-C.-
P.-S.-G : Syntax-Structure & Chief-Post-Master-General : Jason-Paul : Greaves.

: Evidence-Position-Command Of An Attached-Document-Claim :

1. The Unified Syntax-Corrected Edition (PDF)
2. The IRAC Summary Brief & Clause Correction Index (PDF)

: Cause-Command Of The Grammar-Termination & Fiction-Void-Terms-Claim Is With The [Dis]-Qualification &
Qualification-Claim Of The Syntax-Law-Claim With The Factual-Document-Contract-Command-Claim By This Chief-
Post-Master-General : Jason-Paul : Greaves.

: Command-Authorisation :

: Jason-Paul : Greaves.

: Chief-Post-Master-General.

: www.csscpsg.co.uk

: Authorisation-Command Of The Syntax-Lodial-Location & Venue-Document-Claim Is With The Document-Trans-
Mission Of The Peace & Truth-Claim With The Factual-Document-Contract-Command-Claim By This Chief-Post-
Master-General : Jason-Paul : Greaves.

: Seal :

