

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Armer
Given Name	Alastair
Person ID	1286506
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Armer
Given Name	Alastair
Person ID	1286506
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?	Yes
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>My objections to the proposed plans at Mosley common are numerous and interlinked. Objections are along 3 areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The re-designation of greenbelt land 2.Increased traffic in an already heavily congested area. 3.The scale and location of the proposed development in one single area <p>GREENBELT</p> <p>Green belts areas are a supposed to be a buffer between town and countryside, to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, protecting our countryside from encroachment. The current open spaces around Mosley common are enjoyed by all local residents, act as a natural boundary between the Salford/Wigan border and prevent urban sprawl. National policy states that Green Belt boundaries in development plans should be altered only exceptionally and should not normally be needed to be altered at the end of the plan period. Your own "Places For Everyone"plan states the focus is on making the most of our brownfield sites, prioritising redevelopment of town centres and other sustainable locations.</p> <p>The development of the existing brownfield site is encouraged, but the vast majority of proposed housing is on designated greenbelt land. What is the point of redesignating land as greenbelt, if you can just decide to re-designate it and build on it anyway?</p> <p>The proposed increase in greenbelt land in the local area, which is already a green area anyway, is much less than the greenbelt land being taken away by housing, so at a detriment to the local residents. Much loved dog walking areas and open areas would be removed. Higher pollution is an obvious concern too.</p> <p>TRAFFIC</p>

The use of public transport and the guided busway is encouraged, but the vast majority of people living around the guided busway do not make use of it on a regular basis.

Touted as a fast network into the city centre, the guided busway is anything but. It is quicker and easier for residents to drive to their place of work. Investment for the area to link into the existing tram network, although more expensive, would be much better utilised by residents.

As a result of this poor transport infrastructure, almost every house in the area has at least one car within their household.

Your own "Places For Everyone" document, at 11.362, states the A577/A580 junction is regularly congested at peak times. The proposals only discuss improving capacity at this junction. That is woefully short of what will be needed with all the extra cars on the road in this area. Substantial road widening with loss of existing houses would be needed. What about cars just deciding to bypass this area and go along the Bridgewater road to pick up the B5232 and onto the A580 instead? This area already sees increased traffic, particularly St Mary's church and Ellenbrook village shops and is also heavily congested at peak times, particularly in the morning. There is no mention of this issue in the plans.

In summary, there are already too many vehicles on the road in the local area leading to congestion because the road network is already operating at over capacity. Only major and expensive road widening works would bring about substantial and meaningful improvement. Tinkering with a road junction would do nothing to improve network capacity. The traffic plan falls woefully short of what would actually be needed in this area, and in short there is no easy solution. The only sensible solution is to not increase the problem and not build more houses in the area.

DEVELOPMENT LOCATION AND SCALE

If brownfield development is a priority, as set out in your "Places For Everyone" document, there is extensive brownfield land in the Hindley Green area that could be redeveloped.

If transport is a priority, then development to the west of Tyldsley and St. George's park where there is much more greenbelt land available in and around the guided busway makes much more sense. This is also an area of deprivation, as stated in your own "Places For Everyone" document (Aug 2021) at picture 2.2, so increased funding in this area would be welcomed. There is also a primary school, St. Gabriels, and a high school, Fred Longworth, in the immediate area.

There is too much building north of the A580 East Lancs road, as already highlighted with traffic problems. Consider building to the south in the Higher Green area instead.

Develop areas where there is less traffic, and higher deprivation. This surely makes sense.

Such a large scale development will bring too many problems and strain on local resources.

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.

This resident understands the need to build more homes, but any development needs to be sympathetic to the surrounding area. A compromise could be reached here to meet the planned housing targets:

A more sympathetic development of no more than 400 houses to the west of Honksford brook would be acceptable, which would also surround the new Parr Bridge commercial development. This would reduce the strain on Bridgewater Road and on the A577. Developing the area to the west of Tyldsley and St. George's park around the guided busway or south of the East Lancs in Higher Green would be fairer, to spread out the impact of any housebuilding to the local residents and road network.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	Thank you for your time in considering my opinions. I would welcome any dialogue to discuss further.
Family Name	Armer
Given Name	Alastair
Person ID	1286506
Title	Salford - Green Belt Additions
Type	Web
GBA Salford - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this District your response relates to - then respond to the questions below	Salford GBA29 Land West of Burgess Farm
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	Yes
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.	The proposed increase in greenbelt land in the local area, which is already a green area anyway, is much less than the greenbelt land being taken away by housing, so at a detriment to the local residents. Much loved dog walking areas and open areas would be removed. Higher pollution is an obvious concern too.
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.	Reduce the size of the development, to keep the size of greenbelt being added to the immediate area the same as green space land being taken away. A more sympathetic development of no more than 400 houses to the west of Honksford brook would be acceptable, which would also surround the new Parr Bridge commercial development. This would reduce the strain on Bridgewater Road and on the A577. Developing the area to the west of Tyldsley and St. George's park around the guided busway or south of the East Lancs in Higher Green would be fairer, to spread out the impact of any housebuilding to the local residents and road network.
Family Name	Armer
Given Name	Alastair
Person ID	1286506
Title	Supporting Evidence
Type	Web

Redacted comment on supporting documents - Please give details of why you consider any of the evidence not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

My objections to the proposed plans at Mosley common are numerous and interlinked. Objections are along 3 areas:

- 1.The re-designation of greenbelt land
- 2.Increased traffic in an already heavily congested area.
- 3.The scale and location of the proposed development in one single area

GREENBELT

Green belts areas are a supposed to be a buffer between town and countryside, to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, protecting our countryside from encroachment. The current open spaces around Mosley common are enjoyed by all local residents, act as a natural boundary between the Salford/Wigan border and prevent urban sprawl. National policy states that Green Belt boundaries in development plans should be altered only exceptionally and should not normally be needed to be altered at the end of the plan period. Your own 'Places For Everyone' plan states the focus is on making the most of our brownfield sites, prioritising redevelopment of town centres and other sustainable locations.

The development of the existing brownfield site is encouraged, but the vast majority of proposed housing is on designated greenbelt land. What is the point of redesignating land as greenbelt, if you can just decide to re-designate it and build on it anyway?

The proposed increase in greenbelt land in the local area, which is already a green area anyway, is much less than the greenbelt land being taken away by housing, so at a detriment to the local residents. Much loved dog walking areas and open areas would be removed. Higher pollution is an obvious concern too.

TRAFFIC

The use of public transport and the guided busway is encouraged, but the vast majority of people living around the guided busway do not make use of it on a regular basis.

Touted as a fast network into the city centre, the guided busway is anything but. It is quicker and easier for residents to drive to their place of work. Investment for the area to link into the existing tram network, although more expensive, would be much better utilised by residents.

As a result of this poor transport infrastructure, almost every house in the area has at least one car within their household.

Your own 'Places For Everyone' document, at 11.362, states the A577/A580 junction is regularly congested at peak times. The proposals only discuss improving capacity at this junction. That is woefully short of what will be needed with all the extra cars on the road in this area. Substantial road widening with loss of existing houses would be needed. What about cars just deciding to bypass this area and go along the Bridgewater road to pick up the B5232 and onto the A580 instead? This area already sees increased traffic, particularly St Mary's church and Ellenbrook village shops and is also heavily congested at peak times, particularly in the morning. There is no mention of this issue in the plans.

In summary, there are already too many vehicles on the road in the local area leading to congestion because the road network is already operating at over capacity. Only major and expensive road widening works would bring about substantial and meaningful improvement. Tinkering with a road junction would do nothing to improve network capacity. The traffic plan falls woefully short of what would actually be needed in this area, and in short there is no easy solution. The only sensible solution is to not increase the problem and not build more houses in the area.

DEVELOPMENT LOCATION AND SCALE

If brownfield development is a priority, as set out in your 'Places For Everyone' document, there is extensive brownfield land in the Hindley Green area that could be redeveloped.

If transport is a priority, then development to the west of Tyldsley and St. George's park where there is much more greenbelt land available in and around the guided busway makes much more sense. This is also an area of deprivation, as stated in your own 'Places For Everyone document (Aug 2021) at picture 2.2, so increased funding in this area would be welcomed. There is also a primary school, St. Gabriels, and a high school, Fred Longworth, in the immediate area.

There is too much building north of the A580 East Lancs road, as already highlighted with traffic problems. Consider building to the south in the Higher Green area instead.

Develop areas where there is less traffic, and higher deprivation. This surely makes sense.

Such a large scale development will bring too many problems and strain on local resources.

POTENTIAL SOLUTION

This resident understands the need to build more homes, but any development needs to be sympathetic to the surrounding area. A compromise could be reached here to meet the planned housing targets:

A more sympathetic development of no more than 400 houses to the west of Honksford brook would be acceptable, which would also surround the new Parr Bridge commercial development. This would reduce the strain on Bridgewater Road and on the A577. Developing the area to the west of Tyldsley and St. George's park around the guided busway or south of the East Lancs in Higher Green would be fairer, to spread out the impact of any housebuilding to the local residents and road network.

Thank you for your time in considering my opinions. I would welcome any dialogue to discuss further.