

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Howard
Given Name	Paul
Person ID	1287408
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Howard
Given Name	Paul
Person ID	1287408
Title	Our Vision
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Sound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
Family Name	Howard
Given Name	Paul
Person ID	1287408
Title	JPA 26: Land at Hazelhurst Farm
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	NA
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
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	As a resident of REDACTED TEXT for over 20 years REDACTED TEXT I would object to housing on this area for multiple reasons. If testing of public transport or traffic flow has been tested in the last 18 months this is not consistent with normal. I have had to travel into Manchester for work consistently at peak times as well as taking one of my children to a local Grammar school at Urmston. The morning traffic for years has been unbearable at times and adding at this site would make access to the roundabout or East Lancs significantly worse.

you have identified above.

I would add that the comments around bus access are laughable as you cannot get on the V1 or V2 service at the park and ride during rush hour as already full! How you expect to add 400 homes to this is not realistic and would add to the constant queuing we as a family endure every day.

As a keen walker and dog owner we access Green area from our house which would simply disappear for us and local residents immediately. This is the only reasonable Green area we have used for 20 years given proximity to motorway and East Lancashire Road. All the traffic would no doubt flow on to Hazelhurst Road based on the details I have read. Given it is already difficult to access local shops, doctors surgery and dentist as examples how this supports makes no sense to any of us who live in Worsley.

This consultation has not been made easy to provide comments or object and this site proves the case. People in the area in the majority disagree but find it difficult to make their views known. This site is clear evidence and volume of questions totally confusing for people. Clearly designed so people are lost and simply give up.

Many residents are selling because of these plans which is incredibly disappointing- our neighbours who have lived here for 50 years one of many. If you believe this is welcomed or will create a greater community then sadly mistaken.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Howard
Given Name	Scott
Person ID	1285907
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Howard
Given Name	Scott
Person ID	1285907
Title	JPA 35: North of Mosley Common
Type	Web
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.	<p>Can I first please refer you to key issues from the Consultation that were previously raised at https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/GMCAFiles/PFE/Supporting%20documents/20210324%20PFE%20Consultation%20Summary%20Report.pdf</p> <p>All of the issues highlighted within this previous round of consultation are valid. I have highlighted the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Greenbelt: I believe that the allocation would conflict with the at least 2 of the 5 purposes of the Greenbelt: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; <p>The plans do not take into account committed development in Salford and in particular the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Biodiversity: Does this allocation require that the biodiversity NET GAIN (10%) is met (see the Environment Bill consultation) - Out of date documents: For example the "indicative masterplan" does not include Transport and the Greater Manchester and Peel and Wigan Council will be fully aware of this. Additionally, it does not include the following: -Transport: There is a fundamental issue with existing transport conditions in Mosley Common. As shown in the Local Authority's Locality Assessment Report, it is concluded that the traffic impacts of the allocation are not significantly worse than those experienced in the reference case situation and are within the capacity of the road network. As shown in the Topic Paper "For North of Mosley Common, the transport assessment concludes that the allocation is not at, or exceeding operational capacity, in both the "Reference Case" and "with PFE" scenarios. How can this be mitigated?!? It states that "However, at a cumulative level with other PFE allocations, it has not been possible to mitigate the entire PFE impacts on the road network. Fundamentally, the detailed reports and topic paper state highway mitigation is not currently or from the proposed allocation. <p>The policy recognises " the A577/A580 junction is regularly congested at peak times and other junctions as applicable" WHAT improvements would adequately mitigate this? Within the Transport Locality Assessment - Wigan, it states within Table 4, by 2040 (reference case) peak hour arrivals being 345. The allocation is for 1,200 DWELLINGS. A four bedroom house would be coming in and out of the development site.</p>

	<p>Environment: What would be the proposed plan for existing mature trees and hedges?</p> <p>And finally, Education: This is quite a selective point but I cannot comprehend HOW S... is in relation to the following: "primary education facilities will be required on-site, as</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 you have identified above.</p>	<p>As stated in my response above, the site allocation in its current form, cannot be accessed, revisited and put out to local residents so they will have the opportunity to review and</p>