

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	Our Vision
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Meet our housing need</li> <li>2. Create neighbourhoods of choice</li> <li>3. Ensure a thriving and productive economy in the districts involved</li> <li>5. Reduce inequalities and improve prosperity</li> <li>6. Promote the sustainable movement of people, goods and information</li> <li>7. Ensure that districts involved are more resilient and carbon neutral</li> <li>8. Improve the quality of our natural environment and access to green spaces</li> <li>9. Ensure access to physical and social infrastructure</li> <li>10. Promote the health and wellbeing of communities</li> </ol>
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes

<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	NA
<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>It is vital to link railway station developments with land use planning. Stations cannot be separated from a consideration of the immediate area they serve. A fully accessible, safe and secure station with good facilities will not achieve its potential if the catchment area, especially close to the station, is inaccessible. Research shows that the majority of a station's catchment patronage comes from within 800 to 1000 metres of the station. Therefore, cycling and walking are important. This relationship has led to the development of a concept called 'Station Development Zones'.</p> <p>GMCA can support the creation of Station Development Zones by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Capturing aspirations and prioritising the works to be progressed;</li> <li>(ii) Working with TfGM and all local authorities to improve areas outside the immediate operational railway station which could encompass environmental, access and integration improvements (embracing waymarking, walking, cycling and other public transport); and</li> <li>(ii) Working with rail industry partners to improve areas within extent the station.</li> <li>(iii) Favour developments adjacent or close to railway stations (which are often brownfield).</li> <li>(iv) Implement S106 to encourage repurposing of older buildings as against demolition and replacement with poorer quality, shorter-life-span modern buildings.</li> </ul>
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	Our Spatial Strategy
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>There is inadequate emphasis on the development of rail corridors.</p> <p>It is vital to link station developments with land use planning. Stations cannot be separated from a consideration of the immediate area they serve. A fully accessible, safe and secure station with good facilities will not achieve its potential if the catchment area, especially close to the station, is inaccessible. Research shows that the majority of a station's catchment patronage comes from within 800 to 1000 metres of the station. Therefore, cycling and walking are important. This relationship has led to the development of a concept called "Station Development Zones".</p> <p>GMCA should support the creation of Station Development Zones by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Capturing aspirations and prioritising the works to be progressed;</li> </ul>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>(ii) Working with local authorities TfGM etc. to improve areas outside the immediate operational station which could encompass environmental, access and integration improvements (embracing walking, cycling and other public transport); and</p> <p>(ii) Working with rail industry partners to improve areas within extent the station.</p>
<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>	<p>Sadly, the reality is that local opposition will make it more difficult to implement housing developments. It is vital to have coordinated plans that make best use of land and in particular brown field sites close to public transport corridors - supported by walking and cycling. In turn these routes need to avoid congested road corridors - with their atmospheric and particulate pollution (already beyond safe levels in many parts of Gtr Manchester).</p> <p>It is also necessary to avoid the awful Manhattanisation of Gtr Manchester. The ugly - high rise buildings that are spring-up everywhere, dominating and over-shadowing other older - human-scale - buildings.</p>
<p><b>Family Name</b></p>	<p>Chapman</p>
<p><b>Given Name</b></p>	<p>Roy</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1287552</p>
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>JP-Strat 1 Core Growth Area</p>
<p><b>Type</b></p>	<p>Web</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b></p>	<p>Sound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Justified?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b></p>	<p>Sound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Effective?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><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>	<p>There is too much encroachment on open spaces and Green Belt. The UK has one of the lowest percentages tree cover in Europe and many of our towns and cities are already too congested with housing - made worse by the lack of adequate resources (shops, schools, health care etc.).</p> <p>Even before it starts the Spaces for Everyone process is hamstrung. The misguided "Right to Buy" policy means that too many Council houses have been sold too cheaply and have not been replaced. The Right to Buy policy must be scrapped. If it remains at the very least the discount given to Council tenants buying their home must not exceed 15%. Councils will then obtain money in excess of the cost of building replacements.</p>
<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</b></p>	<p>It is vital to have coordinated plans that make best use of land and in particular brown field sites close to public transport corridors - supported by walking and cycling. In turn these routes need to avoid congested road corridors - with their atmospheric and particulate pollution (already beyond safe levels in many parts of Gtr Manchester).</p> <p>As an example, there is no sound, sustainable, public transport or cycling and walking plan for Carrington. Instead all that is proposed is yet another link road that will simply add to existing congestion.</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>you have identified above.</b>	<p>As I stated previously, it is necessary to avoid the awful Manhattanisation of Gtr Manchester. The ugly - high rise buildings that are spring-up everywhere, dominating and over-shadowing other older buildings.</p> <p>There is already too much encroachment on open spaces and Green Belt. The UK has one of the lowest percentages tree cover in Europe and many of our towns and cities are already too congested with housing - made worse by the lack of adequate resources (shops, schools, health care etc.).</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 2 City Centre
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>There is too much emphasis on the Regional Centre. Developments in other areas and the Gtr Manchester towns should be encouraged and supported, possibly even financially. The greater focus on the Regional Centre will only fuel commuting and reliance on car travel. Covid 19 has shown that working from home/remote working is in many cases feasible and equally productive to being forced to work in an office. Employment, and the spin-offs from that should be better dispersed across all Gtr Manchester.</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>See above. there needs to be greater recognition of the impact of Covid 19. This has impacted on work patterns. The Spaces for All plan has not been amended adequately to reflect that there are alternatives to an economically over-heating Regional Centre and that employment can be dispersed and modernised. Gtr Manchester is simply reflecting what is wrong Nationally, too much focus on one area. Nationally, there is too much investment in and so concentration of business, employment etc., on the South East and within that Central London. In the north we must not repeat this mistake with too much focus on Manchester City Centre.</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 3 The Quays
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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 Quays is one of Gtr Manchester"s and the City of Salford"s success stories. However, the costs of property in the area means it is out of the financial reach of many Gtr Manchester citizens and home seekers etc. However, the Council is hamstrung as to what it can do in investing in "affordable housing" close to the Quays.
<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>	See previous comments.
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 4 Port Salford
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant,</b>	Being close t the M60 motorway and the road to Warrington, the development at Port Salford will become too reliant on car access. The Policy does not emphasise in enough detail the need to extend Metrolink or an alternative cheaper 3rd generation tram system to Port Salford. Gtr Manchester should have included a commitment and project plan for an extension to Port Salford

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<p><b>is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b></p>	<p>as part of the Trafford Extension, to be completed within 2 years and in advance of any more developments in the area.</p> <p>Well over 100 years ago the Metropolitan Railway built extensions of its networks to the North of London as a way of encouraging development. Gtr Manchester should follow this example and so public transport investment should proceed - and so underpin - not follow housing and other developments.</p>
<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>	<p>See comments above. There must be a very early commitment to extending the Metrolink or another tramway AND in advance of any less justified extensions of the network.</p>
<p><b>Family Name</b></p>	<p>Chapman</p>
<p><b>Given Name</b></p>	<p>Roy</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1287552</p>
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Other Comments</p>
<p><b>Type</b></p>	<p>Web</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Justified?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b></p>	<p>Sound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Effective?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Family Name</b></p>	<p>Chapman</p>
<p><b>Given Name</b></p>	<p>Roy</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1287552</p>
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>JP-Strat 6 Northern Areas</p>
<p><b>Type</b></p>	<p>Web</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Justified?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b></p>	<p>Sound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Effective?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>

<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>See previous comments. There is already too much encroachment on open spaces and Green Belt. The UK has one of the lowest percentages tree cover in Europe and many of our towns and cities are already too congested with housing - made worse by the lack of adequate resources (shops, schools, health care etc.).</p> <p>There are high-sounding promises in the policy, but they will not be realised. The outcome will be that greedy developers with an eye on maximum profits will quickly build on any released Green Built land or open spaces, whilst older older, more difficult - but better to - develop buildings will still lie empty or worse be demolished to be replaced by ugly, short life span buildings.</p> <p>The result is that across the City Region and especially in the regional centre there i blandness, unattractive developments and ugly excessively large buildings totally lacking in character.</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 development of brown-field sites must take precedence - and must be written into all GM authorities plans.</p> <p>Also, the shameful pool of empty houses across the city must be tackled. There are many houses lying empty. These must be brought back into use.</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 7 North East Growth Corridor
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>See previous comments. As elsewhere in the NE Growth Corridor, there is already too much encroachment on open spaces and Green Belt. The UK has one of the lowest percentages tree cover in Europe and many of our towns and cities are already too congested with housing - made worse by the lack of adequate resources (shops, schools, health care etc.).</p> <p>There are high-sounding promises in the policy, but they will not be realised. The outcome will be that greedy developers with an eye on maximum profits will quickly build on any released Green Built land or open spaces, whilst</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>older older, more difficult - but better to - develop buildings will still lie empty or worse be demolished to be replaced by ugly, short life span buildings.</p> <p>The result is that across the City Region and especially in the regional centre there is blandness, unattractive developments and ugly excessively large buildings totally lacking in character</p>
<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>	<p>See previous comments. The development of brown-field sites must take precedence - and must be written into all GM authorities plans.</p> <p>Also, the shameful pool of empty houses across the city must be tackled. There are many houses lying empty. These must be brought back into use.</p>
<p><b>Family Name</b></p>	Chapman
<p><b>Given Name</b></p>	Roy
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	1287552
<p><b>Title</b></p>	JP-Strat 8 Wigan Bolton Growth Corridor
<p><b>Type</b></p>	Web
<p><b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b></p>	Unsound
<p><b>Soundness - Justified?</b></p>	Unsound
<p><b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b></p>	Sound
<p><b>Soundness - Effective?</b></p>	Unsound
<p><b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b></p>	Yes
<p><b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b></p>	Yes
<p><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>	<p>See previous comments. These also apply to this corridor. There are high-sounding promises in the policy, but they will not be realised. The outcome will be that greedy developers with an eye on maximum profits will quickly build on any released Green Built land or open spaces, whilst older older, more difficult - but better to - develop buildings will still lie empty or worse be demolished to be replaced by ugly, short life span buildings.</p> <p>The result is that across the City Region and already it is happening in this corridor, r, there is blandness, unattractive developments and ugly excessively large buildings totally lacking in character</p>
<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>	See previous comments. These also apply to this section



Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 9 Southern Areas
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<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>	See previous comments. These also apply to this corridor. There are high-sounding promises in the policy, but they will not be realised. The outcome will be that greedy developers with an eye on maximum profits will quickly build on any released Green Built land or open spaces, whilst older older, more difficult - but better to - develop buildings will still lie empty or worse be demolished to be replaced by ugly, short life span buildings. The result is that already across the Southern area, there is blandness, unattractive developments and ugly excessively large buildings totally lacking in character
<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>	See previous comments in other sections. These also apply here.
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 10 Manchester Airport
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<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>See Previous comments as these also apply to the Airport. There are high-sounding promises in the policy, but they will not be realised. The outcome will be that greedy developers with an eye on maximum profits will quickly build on any released Green Built land or open spaces.</p> <p>The Airport is still a long-way from achieving its target of journeys to and from the airport being by public or sustainable transport.</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>	See previous comments.
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 11 New Carrington
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	NA
<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>See previous comments. These also apply to New Carrington. There are high-sounding promises in the policy, but they will not be realised. The outcome will be that greedy developers with an eye on maximum profits will quickly build on any released Green Built land.</p> <p>For example, the Carrington Moss development will lead t the loss of vital green space - the green lung the area needs. There are no firm plans for any substantial public transport enhancements, whilst the new Carrington Link Road will go ahead. Tis will ensure that from the outset development in this area will be car based and dependent. For example the area is traversed by a disused railway line, which should already be under-development as a combined cycle and 3rd generation tramway corridor.</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>	See previous comments as these also apply here.
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 12 Main Town Centres
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>Again, some high-sounding promises, not supported by substance and specific investment. There needs to be RADICAL rethink about the Gtr Manchester town centres. The awful, out-dated shopping precincts cannot be saved and should be demolished. The District authorities should have financial assistance to do so.</p> <p>In that Gtr Manchester towns should follow the example of Stockton and Nottingham and demolish their ugly, mostly empty, 1970"s precincts.</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>	See previous comments.
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 13 Strategic Green Infrastructure

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Type	Web
<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>	Again, high-sounding promises. There is already too much encroachment on open spaces and Green Belt. The UK has one of the lowest percentages tree cover in Europe and many of our towns and cities are already too congested with housing - made worse by the lack of adequate resources (shops, schools, health care etc.).
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 14 A Sustainable and Integrated Transport Network
Type	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>Again, high sounding plans. Much of this echoes previous plans going back 20 years, little of which has been achieved.</p> <p>Metrolink is too costly to build and alternatives - 3rd generation trams - must be developed as an alternative.</p> <p>Also, It is vital to link station developments with land use planning. Stations cannot be separated from a consideration of the immediate area they serve. A fully accessible, safe and secure station with good facilities will not achieve its potential if the catchment area, especially close to the station, is inaccessible. Research shows that the majority of a station"s catchment patronage comes from within 800 to 1000 metres of the station. Therefore, cycling and walking are important. This relationship has led to the development of a concept called "Station Development Zones".</p> <p>GMCA should support the creation of Station Development Zones by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Capturing aspirations and prioritising the works to be progressed;</li> <li>(ii) Working with local authorities TfGM 3rd parties and the railway industry, to improve areas outside the immediate operational station which could encompass environmental, access and integration improvements (embracing walking, cycling and other public transport); and</li> <li>(ii) Working with rail industry partners to improve areas within extent the station.</li> </ul>
<b>Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the</b>	See previous comments

<b>plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.</b>	
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-S 1 Sustainable Development
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>	As stated before, high sounding promises and aims. Will they be met? I fear developer greed, inadequate planning officers, poorly coordinated plans etc will fail to deliver what are - in fact - competing challenges. Economic development almost always results in unsustainable developments and the destruction of the environment.
<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 plan cannot be modified, as the problem lies with the faults in the planning system. Local authorities have limited powers and ability to really stand-up to and defeat developers.
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-S 2 Carbon and Energy
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>As stated before, high sounding promises and aims. Will they be met? I fear developer greed, inadequate planning officers, poorly coordinated plans etc will fail to deliver what are - in fact - competing challenges. Economic development almost always results in unsustainable developments and the destruction of the environment.</p> <p>Many of the measures listed will be very costly. Will sufficient money be raised, will central Government provide adequate funding? All are doubtful. Only time will decide whether or not the plan is effective.</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-S 4 Resilience
<b>Type</b>	Web
<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>As stated before, high sounding promises and aims. Will they be met? I fear developer greed, inadequate planning officers, poorly coordinated plans etc will fail to deliver what are - in fact - competing challenges. Economic development almost always results in unsustainable developments and the destruction of the environment.</p> <p>Many of the measures listed will be very costly. Will sufficient money be raised, will central Government provide adequate funding? All are doubtful. The biggest challenge will be winning the argument with the Gtr Manchester population. Selfish attitudes could undermine the best laid plans. Only time will decide whether or not the plan is effective.</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-S 6 Clean Air
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	NA

<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>	As stated before, high sounding promises and aims. Will they be met? I fear developer greed, inadequate planning officers, poorly coordinated plans etc will fail to deliver what are - in fact - competing challenges. Economic development almost always results in unsustainable developments and the destruction of the environment.  Many of the measures listed will be very costly. Will sufficient money be raised, will central Government provide adequate finding? All are doubtful. The biggest challenge will be winning the argument with the Gtr Manchester population. Selfish attitudes could undermine the best laid plans.  Only time will decide whether or not the plan is effective.
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-S 7 Resource Efficiency
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	NA
<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>	As stated before, high sounding promises and aims. Will they be met? I fear developer greed, inadequate planning officers, poorly coordinated plans etc will fail to deliver what are - in fact - competing challenges. Economic development almost always results in unsustainable developments and the destruction of the environment.  Many of the measures listed will be very costly. Will sufficient money be raised, will central Government provide adequate finding? All are doubtful. The biggest challenge will be winning the argument with the Gtr Manchester population. Selfish attitudes could undermine the best laid plans.  Only time will decide whether or not the plan is effective.
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-J 1 Supporting Long Term Economic Growth
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>As stated before, high sounding promises and aims. Will they be met? I fear developer greed, inadequate planning officers, poorly coordinated plans etc will fail to deliver what are - in fact - competing challenges. Economic development almost always results in unsustainable developments and the destruction of the environment.</p> <p>Many of the measures listed will be very costly. Will sufficient money be raised, will central Government provide adequate funding? All are doubtful.</p> <p>The biggest challenge will be winning the argument with the Gtr Manchester population. Selfish attitudes could undermine the best laid plans.</p> <p>Only time will decide whether or not the plan is effective.</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-J 2 Employment Sites and Premises
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>As stated before, high sounding promises and aims. Will they be met? I fear developer greed, inadequate planning officers, poorly coordinated plans etc will fail to deliver what are - in fact - competing challenges. Economic development almost always results in unsustainable developments and the destruction of the environment.</p> <p>Many of the measures listed will be very costly. Will sufficient money be raised, will central Government provide adequate funding? All are doubtful.</p> <p>The biggest challenge will be winning the argument with the Gtr Manchester population. Selfish attitudes could undermine the best laid plans.</p> <p>One key element of employment that is not dealt with in the plan is the changed world of work post-Covid 19. The ability to work from home has improved and increased. There must be adequate wifi and other systems designed to encourage this - and so reduce the need for journeys to work. Also, such measures will encourage SME"s to be established in home offices/premises.</p> <p>Only time will decide whether or not the plan is effective.</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy



Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-J 3 Office Development
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	NA
<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>As stated before, high sounding promises and aims. Will they be met? I fear developer greed, inadequate planning officers, poorly coordinated plans etc will fail to deliver what are - in fact - competing challenges. Economic development almost always results in unsustainable developments and the destruction of the environment.</p> <p>Many of the measures listed will be very costly. Will sufficient money be raised, will central Government provide adequate funding? All are doubtful.</p> <p>The biggest challenge will be winning the argument with the Gtr Manchester population. Selfish attitudes could undermine the best laid plans.</p> <p>One key element of employment that is not dealt with in the plan is the changed world of work post-Covid 19. The ability to work from home has improved and increased. There must be adequate wifi and other systems designed to encourage this - and so reduce the need for journeys to work. Also, such measures will encourage SME"s to be established in home offices/premises.</p> <p>The need for office accommodation will be less in future.</p> <p>Only time will decide whether or not the plan is effective.</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-H 1 Scale Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes

<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>Sadly, the reality is that local opposition will make it more difficult to implement housing developments. It is vital to have coordinated plans that make best use of land and in particular brown field sites close to public transport corridors - supported by walking and cycling. In turn these routes need to avoid congested road corridors - with their atmospheric and particulate pollution (already beyond safe levels in many parts of Gtr Manchester).</p> <p>It is also necessary to avoid the awful Manhattanisation of Gtr Manchester. The ugly - high rise buildings that are spring-up everywhere, dominating and over-shadowing other older buildings.</p> <p>There is too much encroachment on open spaces and Green Belt. The UK has one of the lowest percentages tree cover in Europe and many of our towns and cities are already too congested with housing - made worse by the lack of adequate resources (shops, schools, health care etc.).</p> <p>Even before it starts the Spaces for Everyone process is hamstrung. The misguided "Right to Buy" policy means that too many Council houses have been sold too cheaply and have not been replaced. The Right to Buy policy must be scrapped. If it remains at the very least the discount given to Council tenants buying their home must not exceed 15%. Councils will then obtain money in excess of the cost of building replacements.</p> <p>There is too much encroachment on open spaces and Green Belt. The UK has one of the lowest percentages tree cover in Europe and many of our towns and cities are already too congested with housing - made worse by the lack of adequate resources (shops, schools, health care etc.).</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-H 2 Affordability of New Housing
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>47. Affordability of new housing</p> <p>A key challenge and priority for the districts involved is to ensure that new housing comes forward at a price that potential occupiers can afford.</p> <p>Overall, the nine districts are relatively affordable places to live on average compared to some other parts of the UK, particularly London and the South.</p> <p>However, affordability has been worsening in recent years and there is a significant number of households who are unable to find suitable homes at an affordable cost.</p> <p>View the policy...</p> <p>Policy JP-H 2</p> <p>Substantial improvements will be sought in the ability of people to access housing at a price they can afford, including through:</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>Significantly increasing the supply of new housing across the nine districts, in accordance with Policy JP-H 1 "Scale, Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development" (Places for Homes), thereby reducing the potential for a shortfall to lead to large house price and rent increases</p> <p>Aiming to deliver at least 50,000 additional affordable homes across the nine districts up to 2037, with at least 60% being for social rent or affordable rent</p> <p>Support provision of affordable housing, either on- or off-site, as part of new developments (avoiding where possible clusters of tenure to deliver mixed communities), with locally appropriate requirements being set by each local authority</p> <p>Working with Government to maximise the amount of public funding being directed towards the provision of new affordable housing</p> <p>Increasing the supply of low-cost market housing, to complement the provision of affordable homes and diversify options for low income households.</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-H 3 Type Size and Design of New Housing
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>Sadly, the reality is that local opposition will make it more difficult to implement housing developments. It is vital to have coordinated plans that make best use of land and in particular brown field sites close to public transport corridors - supported by walking and cycling. In turn these routes need to avoid congested road corridors - with their atmospheric and particulate pollution (already beyond safe levels in many parts of Gtr Manchester).</p> <p>It is also necessary to avoid the awful Manhattanisation of Gtr Manchester. The ugly - high rise buildings that are spring-up everywhere, dominating and over-shadowing other older buildings.</p> <p>There is too much encroachment on open spaces and Green Belt. The UK has one of the lowest percentages tree cover in Europe and many of our towns and cities are already too congested with housing - made worse by the lack of adequate resources (shops, schools, health care etc.).</p> <p>Even before it starts the Spaces for Everyone process is hamstrung. The misguided "Right to Buy" policy means that too many Council houses have been sold too cheaply and have not been replaced. The Right to Buy policy must be scrapped. If it remains at the very least the discount given to Council tenants buying their home must not exceed 15%. Councils will then obtain money in excess of the cost of building replacements.</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	There is already too much encroachment on open spaces and Green Belt. The UK has one of the lowest percentages tree cover in Europe and many of our towns and cities are already too congested with housing - made worse by the lack of adequate resources (shops, schools, health care etc.). Allied to this there is a grossly inadequate use of brownfield sites and repurposing of excellent older buildings of real quality. The tax system actually incentivises the demolition and replacement of older buildings - Gtr Manchester is hamstrung by national planning and laws and tax arrangements.
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 1 Valuing Important Landscapes
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>	There is already too much encroachment on open spaces and Green Belt. The UK has one of the lowest percentages tree cover in Europe and many of our towns and cities are already too congested with housing - made worse by the lack of adequate resources (shops, schools, health care etc.). Only time will tell if the laudable aims are achieved.
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 2 Green Infrastructure Network
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 6 Urban Green Space
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>There is already too much encroachment on open spaces and Green Belt. The UK has one of the lowest percentages tree cover in Europe and many of our towns and cities are already too congested with housing - made worse by the lack of adequate resources (shops, schools, health care etc.).</p> <p>The existing green spaces must be safeguarded and enlarged.</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 7 Trees and Woodland
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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</b>	<p>There is already too much encroachment on open spaces and Green Belt. The UK has one of the lowest percentages tree cover in Europe and many of our towns and cities are already too congested with housing - made worse by the lack of adequate resources (shops, schools, health care etc.).</p> <p>The existing green spaces must be safeguarded and enlarged. Within that the areas of percentage devoted to trees and woodland must be dramatically increased.</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 8 Standards for Greener Places
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Sound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 9 A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Sound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 10 Green Belt
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>There is already too much encroachment on open spaces and Green Belt. The UK has one of the lowest percentages tree cover in Europe and many of our towns and cities are already too congested with housing - made worse by the lack of adequate resources (shops, schools, health care etc.).</p> <p>The Green Belt should be retained and enlarged.</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-C1 An Integrated Network
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>Again, high sounding plans. Much of this echoes previous plans going back 20 years, little of which has been achieved.</p> <p>Metrolink is too costly to build and alternatives - 3rd generation trams - must be developed as an alternative.</p> <p>Also, It is vital to link station developments with land use planning. Stations cannot be separated from a consideration of the immediate area they serve. A fully accessible, safe and secure station with good facilities will not achieve its potential if the catchment area, especially close to the station, is inaccessible. Research shows that the majority of a station"s catchment patronage comes from within 800 to 1000 metres of the station. Therefore, cycling and walking are important. This relationship has led to the development of a concept called "Station Development Zones".</p> <p>GMCA should support the creation of Station Development Zones by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Capturing aspirations and prioritising the works to be progressed;</li> <li>(ii) Working with local authorities TfGM 3rd parties and the railway industry, to improve areas outside the immediate operational station which could encompass environmental, access and integration improvements (embracing walking, cycling and other public transport); and</li> <li>(ii) Working with rail industry partners to improve areas within extent the station.</li> </ul>
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-C3 Public Transport
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-C4 Streets for All
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-C5 Walking and Cycling Network
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes



Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-C7 Transport Requirements of New Developments
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>	See previous comments on transport.
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JPA 29: Port Salford Extension
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant,</b>	See previous comments about the need to quickly extend the Metrolink to Port Salford in Section 24..

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JP-C3 Public Transport
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Family Name</b>	Chapman
<b>Given Name</b>	Roy
<b>Person ID</b>	1287552
<b>Title</b>	JPA 33 New Carrington
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	NA