

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Chicot
Given Name	Mark
Person ID	1287410
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287410_WalshawObjection_Redacted.pdf PFE1287410_GreenBeltRemovalObjection.pdf PFE1287410_BurnhamResponse.pdf PFE1287410_GreenbeltRemovalObjection3.pdf PFE1287410_GreenBeltRemovalObjection2.pdf
Family Name	Chicot
Given Name	Mark
Person ID	1287410
Title	Our Vision
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287410_GreenbeltRemovalObjection3.pdf PFE1287410_GreenBeltRemovalObjection2.pdf PFE1287410_BurnhamResponse.pdf PFE1287410_GreenBeltRemovalObjection.pdf PFE1287410_WalshawObjection_Redacted.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	It is questionable whether the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework (GMSF) and Places for Everyone (PfE) can be treated effectively as the same plan. The legality must therefore be decided in court before PfE can or should proceed any further. It's assumed that transitioning between a joint development plan (PfE) and a spatial framework (GMSF) can be accepted without a significant re-write. Whilst the GMSF may have been established as legally compliant (compliance with Reg 18 of the Town and Country Planning regs) and therefore could possibly proceed to final public consultation and submission under Reg 19 (this current stage) PfE legality has not been established. It cannot be assumed that Reg 18 is automatically satisfied for PfE if there is any subsantial difference within the scope between PfE and the GMSF. Paragraph 1.23 states "The changes between GMSF 2020 and PfE 2021 are not insignificant in numerical terms, indeed all sections of the plan have seen some form of change." So, is "not insignificant" the same or very similar as "substantial", if so, the plan is not legal. This can only be established by a proper judicial review. So until proven otherwise the plan must be deemed illegal and not put to Government.

Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.	That's for you to make right. My services are currently not for hire.
Family Name	Chicot
Given Name	Mark
Person ID	1287410
Title	Our Strategic Objectives
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287410_WalshawObjection_Redacted.pdf PFE1287410_GreenBeltRemovalObjection.pdf PFE1287410_BurnhamResponse.pdf PFE1287410_GreenbeltRemovalObjection3.pdf PFE1287410_GreenBeltRemovalObjection2.pdf
Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.	The word ensure appears to be used far to much because one cannot ensure. What's being laid out, this grand design, will ultimately fail to deliver.
Family Name	Chicot
Given Name	Mark
Person ID	1287410
Title	JP-Strat 7 North East Growth Corridor
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287410_GreenbeltRemovalObjection3.pdf PFE1287410_GreenBeltRemovalObjection2.pdf PFE1287410_BurnhamResponse.pdf PFE1287410_GreenBeltRemovalObjection.pdf PFE1287410_WalshawObjection_Redacted.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.	Your vision might look good on paper (maps, spreadsheets etc) but the reality is just that, reality. The vision and reality don't look to meet in any meaningful way.
Family Name	Chicot
Given Name	Mark
Person ID	1287410
Title	JP-Strat 13 Strategic Green Infrastructure
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287410_WalshawObjection_Redacted.pdf PFE1287410_GreenBeltRemovalObjection.pdf PFE1287410_BurnhamResponse.pdf PFE1287410_GreenbeltRemovalObjection3.pdf PFE1287410_GreenBeltRemovalObjection2.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.	So no developments on or near greenfield and bluefield sites in the Greater Manchester area? Just concentrating on redeveloping brownfield and sites of dereliction. Fantastic news or is it? Nothing works better than a wholly natural system for natural health. We exist outside natural systems.
Family Name	Chicot
Given Name	Mark
Person ID	1287410
Title	JPA 7: Elton Reservoir Area
Type	Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<p>Include files</p>	<p>PFE1287410_GreenbeltRemovalObjection3.pdf PFE1287410_GreenBeltRemovalObjection2.pdf PFE1287410_BurnhamResponse.pdf PFE1287410_GreenBeltRemovalObjection.pdf PFE1287410_WalshawObjection_Redacted.pdf</p>
<p>Soundness - Positively prepared?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Justified?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Effective?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Compliance - Legally compliant?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</p>	<p>Bury Council have not been transparent at all in communicating the proposals to residents. This is contrary to their own guidelines and the result is that many residents are simply unaware of the proposals. Not enough has been done to identify and allocate brownfield sites and derelict buildings/properties as a means of fulfilling future housing requirements. This should be done before there is any consideration to developing greenfield sites. Also these proposals are on the basis of providing "affordable housing". What guarantees do we have that developers will build to this remit, rather than building luxury 4/5 bedroom homes in order to maximise profits? The increase in local population will adversely impact already struggling transport networks. Roads are already busy particularly during peak times. A minor accident or temporary traffic lights often result in roads being completely gridlocked. An increase in traffic will only worsen this. I do not believe that developers can adequately mitigate the impact on traffic. There simply isn't the room to widen roads in order to accommodate more traffic as all the major roads are lined by houses. An increase in traffic will also have an adverse impact on health due to increased pollution. Not to mention the impact on mental wellbeing if there are no spaces available for people to enjoy being outside in the fresh air. Details also need to be published outlining what action will be taken to reduce extra pressure on social services such as doctors and schools. Changing the designated greenbelt site will have a detrimental impact on a number of extant species that are not found elsewhere in the borough. I am concerned about the impact building on these areas will have on wildlife. I note there are Sites of Biological Interest within the proposed building areas. I do not see how can Bury Council and developers can mitigate the impact development will have on these sites if they are building on greenbelt land. The boxing day floods of 2015 were devastating for some local residents. We cannot fully understand the impact building will have on flood risks but surely if there are no fields left to soak up rainwater it will only increase the risk. There are also a number of Tree Preservation Orders within many of the sites. Felling these trees will have a detrimental impact on future flooding.</p>
<p>Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters</p>	<p>Bury MBC has proved time and time again unreliable and inept when designating land for any type of development. At present this is unchanged. Only pressure from borough residents may change their behaviour as help from other sources appears lacking.</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

you have identified above.	
Family Name	Chicot
Given Name	Mark
Person ID	1287410
Title	JPA 8: Seedfield
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287410_WalshawObjection_Redacted.pdf PFE1287410_GreenBeltRemovalObjection.pdf PFE1287410_BurnhamResponse.pdf PFE1287410_GreenbeltRemovalObjection3.pdf PFE1287410_GreenBeltRemovalObjection2.pdf
Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.	The infrastructure is present on the Seedfield site but the pressure on local roads, schools etc might prove difficult to overcome..