

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Chandler
<b>Given Name</b>	Esther
<b>Person ID</b>	1286851
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Chandler
<b>Given Name</b>	Esther
<b>Person ID</b>	1286851
<b>Title</b>	Our Vision
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>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.</b>	<p>The document "Habitat Regulations Assessment of PfE" (02.02.01) provided is draft status. The public should have the final issue report made available for the full consultation period.</p> <p>The environmental assessments are limited in scope and consider only the impact on Ramsar, SAC"s and SPA"s. The evidence is therefore that appropriate environmental impact assessments have not been carried out on the effects of building on green spaces on either the direct habitat lost, or the knock on effects to neighbouring habitats and impact on local communities. I note that in the case of the proposed sight at JPA 35: North of Mosley Common, this green space consistently has standing water, a possible environment for great crested newts (protected species) and that bats are known to be in the area (also protected). There is a legal obligation to assess the risks to these species, yet no evidence of consideration has been put forwards. Other proposed sites may face similar environmental issues.</p>
<b>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.</b>	<p>Full environmental impact reports should be carried out on the specific sites and effects on surrounding areas, including the impact of habitat loss on protected species. The effect of loss of green space should be assessed against the objective of "A place at the forefront of action on climate change with clean air and a flourishing natural environment." In addition, the knock on effect to local areas should be considered, including a full drainage assessment to assess the increased risks of flooding, given the proposal to significantly increase the surface water run off into local drainage systems. Full and final reports should be made available for the full consultation period.</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Chandler
<b>Given Name</b>	Esther

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Person ID</b>	1286851
<b>Title</b>	Our Strategic Objectives
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Our strategic objectives - Considering the information provided for our strategic objectives, please tick which of these objectives your written comment refers to:</b>	7. Ensure that districts involved are more resilient and carbon neutral 8. Improve the quality of our natural environment and access to green spaces 10. Promote the health and wellbeing of communities
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>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.</b>	<p>The document "Habitat Regulations Assessment of PfE" (02.02.01) provided is draft status. The public should have the final issue report made available for the full consultation period.</p> <p>The environmental assessments are limited in scope and consider only the impact on Ramsar, SAC"s and SPA"s. The evidence is therefore that appropriate environmental impact assessments have not been carried out on the effects of building on green spaces on either the direct habitat lost, or the knock on effects to neighbouring habitats and impact on local communities. I note that in the case of the proposed sight at JPA 35: North of Mosley Common, this green space consistently has standing water, a possible environment for great crested newts (protected species) and that bats are known to be in the area (also protected). There is a legal obligation to assess the risks to these species, yet no evidence of consideration has been put forwards. Other proposed sites may face similar environmental issues.</p>
<b>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.</b>	Full environmental impact reports should be carried out on the specific sites and effects on surrounding areas, including the impact of habitat loss on protected species. The effect of loss of green space should be assessed against the objective of "A place at the forefront of action on climate change with clean air and a flourishing natural environment." In addition, the knock on effect to local areas should be considered, including a full drainage assessment to assess the increased risks of flooding, given the proposal to significantly increase the surface water run off into local drainage systems. Full and final reports should be made available for the full consultation period.
<b>Family Name</b>	Chandler
<b>Given Name</b>	Esther
<b>Person ID</b>	1286851
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 1 Valuing Important Landscapes

## Places for Everyone Representation 2021

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.	There is a complete mismatch between the policy and the proposal. The policy appears to be to protect green spaces and improve the local habitat/environment, yet the proposal (JPA35: North of Mosley Common) is to build housing onto green space, destroying local habitats, without provision for improved transport adding to local congestion problems.
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 proposal should be compliant with the policy of protecting green spaces, especially those important to local communities.
Family Name	Chandler
Given Name	Esther
Person ID	1286851
Title	JP-G 2 Green Infrastructure Network
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	There is a complete mismatch between the policy and the proposal. The policy appears to be to protect green spaces and improve the local habitat/environment, yet the proposal (JPA35: North of Mosley Common) is

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>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.</b>	to build housing onto green space, destroying local habitats, without provision for improved transport adding to local congestion problems. No greenfield sites should be turned into housing developments, we need our local habitats for local biodiversity, to help fight climate change (carbon stores), to improve local air quality, and for the wellbeing of local residents.
<b>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.</b>	No greenfield sites should be turned into housing developments, we need our local habitats for local biodiversity, to help fight climate change (carbon stores), to improve local air quality, and for the wellbeing of local residents.
<b>Family Name</b>	Chandler
<b>Given Name</b>	Esther
<b>Person ID</b>	1286851
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 4 Lowland Wetlands and Mosslands
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Family Name</b>	Chandler
<b>Given Name</b>	Esther
<b>Person ID</b>	1286851
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 8 Standards for Greener Places
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>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.</b>	The proposal to build on greenfield site JPA35: North of Mosley Common is in direct contradiction to the policy. This is unsound.
<b>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.</b>	The proposed development at JPA 35 North of Mosley Common (greenfield site) should be retracted
<b>Family Name</b>	Chandler
<b>Given Name</b>	Esther
<b>Person ID</b>	1286851
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 9 A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>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.</b>	The proposal to build on greenfield site JPA35: North of Mosley Common is in direct contradiction to the policy. This is unsound.
<b>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</b>	The proposed development at JPA 35 North of Mosley Common (greenfield site) should be retracted

<b>or soundness matters you have identified above.</b>	
<b>Family Name</b>	Chandler
<b>Given Name</b>	Esther
<b>Person ID</b>	1286851
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 10 Green Belt
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>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.</b>	The policy of building on greenbelt is in direct contradiction to our national objectives of reducing our carbon emissions to protect the climate. Not only does the building development have significant carbon costs, the loss of carbon sinks should be considered.
<b>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.</b>	The proposed development at JPA 35 North of Mosley Common (greenfield site) and other green belt spaces should be retracted
<b>Family Name</b>	Chandler
<b>Given Name</b>	Esther
<b>Person ID</b>	1286851
<b>Title</b>	JPA 35: North of Mosley Common
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound

<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>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.</b>	<p>This development looks to add more residents to an area already in an unsustainable situation with regarding local amenities (doctors, schools) and transport problems, with no planned improvements for existing locals.</p> <p>It is already incredibly stressful living in the area from a travel perspective. The local bus route (V1&amp;V2) does not have enough service during peak times. It faces delays into town at the end of the guided busway as traffic queues back from the junction with the A580 at Newearth Road. (This also affects those travelling by car). There is no planned improvement to this junction which I believe to already be at capacity; indeed the junction at Mosley Common Road and Walked Road (either side) are also heavily congested. The queuing traffic in the morning already has a significant affect on local air quality (I frequently need to take my inhaler when walking for the bus during rush hour). The proposal to add around 1400 more vehicles to this local section of road is just unthinkable; the knock on affect on air quality alone. Consideration should also be given to the loss of green space; this habitat is full of trees and plants which are helping to clean the local air.</p> <p>I note that there is no proposal included to improve local traffic flow on to motorway junctions; the mitigation is that as it gets worse, people will undergo "behaviour change". In my view we are already at the point where anyone who has the option of "behaviour change" would already do so. There is not solution proposed to ease local unsustainable transport problems. Adding to these problems is in direct opposition to the objective to "ensure all new developments are sustainably integrated into Greater Manchester"s transport network or supported by new infrastructure."</p> <p>The loss of local habitat by building on a greenfield site has not been properly assessed, either for its direct impact or for the knock effects on neighbouring habitats or for the impact on local residents. Consideration of local and national climate targets has not been considered or addressed. The loss of local biodiversity has not been considered. In addition, the proposed site is often observed to contain standing water. We know the likelihood of flooding is being increased by climate change; and yet here is a proposal to hard landscape an area which currently absorbs flood water; there has been no assessment of the affects on local drainage systems form increased surface water run off. We are increasingly hearing of councils installing costly new schemes to help provide pockets of wildlife in cities and improve air quality, and yet here is a proposal to remove the protection on area that already achieves these objectives; this is short sighted.</p>
<b>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.</b>	<p>The proposed development at JPA 35 North of Mosley Common (greenfield site) should be retracted.</p> <p>In line with the stated "Places for Everyone" objective, local brownfield sites should be identified for regeneration with proper, robust plans in place to provide for local amenities and improvements in local transport.</p>