

Family Name	Bradbury
Given Name	Le-Anne
Person ID	1287178
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Bradbury
Given Name	Le-Anne
Person ID	1287178
Title	JPA 1.1 Heywood / Pilsworth (Northern Gateway)
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>First of all, it is not for the general public to determine whether or not this plan is legally compliant, we are not all legally trained, legal minded persons, it is for the GMCA to ensure that they have undertaken all relevant due diligence, tests, consultations and engaged with non bias legal minds and the to prove it is legally compliant.</p> <p>This is meant to be a new plan and therefore the process and consultation process should start again.</p> <p>As this has not be written and undertaking the new consultation, it is using old out of date data, form the original plan which is now many years old and no longer relevant to post covid changes within society . It does not take into account changes in high streets, with a reduced need for people to need to or want to access physical shops. This has left many industrial and retail unit empty that could now be developed.</p> <p>This plan also does not take into account that this council in particular already has enough brownfield sites to meet the housing requirements.</p> <p>The plan also states unrealistic employment figures as a result of building more industrial units, even through the existing site in this particular area is not, and has never been at 100% occupation since these plans began. The suggested employment figures appears to be based on some acceptable formulation rather than taking a more realistic view. The majority of large industrial units these days are more automated business that attract minimal employment opportunities and often low paid.</p> <p>This plan was also originally produced prior to the clean air policy being introduced, this plan provides no provision to address the pollution the destruction of the greenbelt/green lungs of Manchester that are already working hard to absorb the pollution we are already battling. Destroying the fields that help neutralise our pollution and replacing them with more pollution buildings services by polluting vehicles will only have a further negative</p>

	<p>impact. Fining diesel vehicles does not make a house or industrial building more environmentally friendly.</p> <p>Re-labeling existing green spaces such as parks, peoples gardens, grazing land that was missed off the original greenbelt labeling exercise, does not reduce the amount of greenbelt that is under threat of destruction. it is a poor attempt to mislead the public and very underhanded. Lets stops using NET loss and start using true figures.</p> <p>There are absolutely no assurances or suggested policies that will enforce the brownfield first suggestion. I assume this is another veiled attempt to mislead the public - tell them its brownfield first, lets not mention changing the greenbelt labels makes it fair game.</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>Start again with a blank piece of paper and consider all aspect. For example - build low cost, housing near the low income jobs on near the industrial estates instead of making already low income families having to travel miles and adding additional pollution. Make policy that no greenbelt will be re labelled until all brownfield is exhausted. Make it easier, in fact encourage property owners to change the use of a previously industrial building into a residential building. We now have many beautiful ex department stores and offices that would covert into very comfortable residential buildings. Ensure that all future buildings commercial and residential are built to carbon neutral standards and place restricted covenants on them to prohibit any polluting changes, fuels and vehicles from the areas,</p>
<p>Family Name</p>	<p>Bradbury</p>
<p>Given Name</p>	<p>Le-Anne</p>
<p>Person ID</p>	<p>1287178</p>
<p>Title</p>	<p>JPA 2: Stakehill</p>
<p>Type</p>	<p>Web</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>First of all, it is not for the general public to determine whether or not this plan is legally compliant, we are not all legally trained, legal minded persons, it is for the GMCA to ensure that they have undertaken all relevant due diligence, tests, consultations and engaged with non bias legal minds and the to prove it is legally compliant.</p> <p>This is meant to be a new plan and therefore the process and consultation process should start again.</p> <p>As this has not be written and undertaking the new consultation, it is using old out of date data, form the original plan which is now many years old and no longer relevant to post covid changes within society . It does not take into account changes in high streets, with a reduced need for people to need to or want to access physical shops. This has left many industrial and retail unit empty that could now be developed.</p>

This plan also does not take into account that this council in particular already has enough brownfield sites to meet the housing requirements.

The plan also states unrealistic employment figures as a result of building more industrial units, even through the existing site in this particular area is not, and has never been at 100% occupation since these plans began. The suggested employment figures appears to be based on some acceptable formulation rather than taking a more realistic view. The majority of large industrial units these days are more automated business that attract minimal employment opportunities and often low paid.

This plan was also originally produced prior to the clean air policy being introduced, this plan provides no provision to address the pollution the destruction of the greenbelt/green lungs of Manchester that are already working hard to absorb the pollution we are already battling. Destroying the fields that help neutralise our pollution and replacing them with more pollution buildings services by polluting vehicles will only have a further negative impact. Fining diesel vehicles does not make a house or industrial building more environmentally friendly.

Re-labeling existing green spaces such as parks, peoples gardens, grazing land that was missed off the original greenbelt labeling exercise, does not reduce the amount of greenbelt that is under threat of destruction. it is a poor attempt to mislead the public and very underhanded. Lets stops using NET loss and start using true figures.

There are absolutely no assurances or suggested policies that will enforce the brownfield first suggestion. I assume this is another veiled attempt to mislead the public - tell them its brownfield first, lets not mention changing the greenbelt labels makes it fair game.

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 needs to start with a blank piece of paper and consider all aspect. For example - build low cost, housing near the low income jobs on near the industrial estates instead of making already low income families having to travel miles and adding additional pollution. Make policy that no greenbelt will be re labelled until all brownfield is exhausted. Make it easier, in fact encourage property owners to change the use of a previously industrial building into a residential building. We now have many beautiful ex department stores and offices that would covert into very comfortable residential buildings. Ensure that all future buildings commercial and residential are built to carbon neutral standards and place restricted covenants on them to prohibit any polluting changes, fuels and vehicles from the areas,

Then it needs to start the consultation process again,