

Family Name	Davies
Given Name	Catherine
Person ID	1286042
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Davies
Given Name	Catherine
Person ID	1286042
Title	Our Vision
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.	JPA-7 The wording is too ambiguous to be legally compliant; eg para 1.23 - what does "not insignificant " actually mean? Does it mean "substantial"? Because of this lack of clarity, I cannot see how it is legal.
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.	PfE legality is not established- need to investigate and review the changes to the plans to establish legality.
Family Name	Davies
Given Name	Catherine
Person ID	1286042
Title	Our Strategic Objectives
Type	Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<p>Our strategic objectives - Considering the information provided for our strategic objectives, please tick which of these objectives your written comment refers to:</p>	<p>1. Meet our housing need 2. Create neighbourhoods of choice 5. Reduce inequalities and improve prosperity 6. Promote the sustainable movement of people, goods and information 9. Ensure access to physical and social infrastructure 10. Promote the health and wellbeing of communities</p>
<p>Soundness - Positively prepared?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Justified?</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Soundness - Effective?</p>	<p>NA</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>Somehow I could not tick "unsound " on some of the boxes?</p> <p>The whole plan is riddled with inconsistencies- I cannot see how it can possibly be legal or stand up to scrutiny within the planning process. To be specific:</p> <p>Strategic Objective 1: "affordable homes?" No. Not for ordinary Radcliffe people they aren't. Many local people work in retail, eg the market, Asda, Lidl and Dunelm. Could they afford these new houses? It would not appear so. Which brings me to strategic objective 5 - "to reduce inequality and improve prosperity ". Not for local people- how will the residents of Rupert Street or Coomasie Street possibly benefit from the new houses being built? The houses will be bought up by better- off people from outside the area and the new development will become part of Manchester"s commuter belt. This will probably achieve the strategic objective of "reducing the number of wards in the 10% most deprived nationally " but only in that we are "importing"professionals from other parts of Greater Manchester to improve our statistics! Very cynical. The existing residents will not benefit at all but will lose their free access to the beautiful countryside that will vanish beneath the new houses. So - strategic objective 10 - cannot possibly be met- the "health and well-being " of ordinary local people can only be damaged by the loss of our much-loved greenbelt land.</p> <p>Strategic objective 2 - "prioritise the use of brownfield land" and promote "local transport hubs" is clearly another inconsistency. There are many small pockets of brownfield land across Bury (and Greater Manchester) which can be used, spreading the burden on the local infrastructure across a wider area. The local Metrolink line is already struggling to keep up with demand. Adding a new station will only increase the overcrowding on the teams and make life miserable for commuters further down the line.</p> <p>Finally, strategic objective 6 (and also 9) - how can any notion of "promoting the sustainable movement of people" etc possibly be achieved by this massive housing development? There is a naive notion that everyone will use the Metrolink. As just mentioned, I'm sure many new residents will, especially the young. However, thousands of new homes will mean thousands more cars on the small roads between Bury and Radcliffe. Traffic problems, pollution and bottle-necks will be created and, again, it will be the poorest people in Radcliffe who will suffer the most as drivers caught in the jams find rat-runs through the narrow, terraced side streets. If the developers are</p>

	<p>serious about promoting sustainable transport, I take it that the new houses will not have driveways or garages? No, of course not.</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>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My above point about para 1.23 2. The use of greenfield over brownfield sites - specifically around the canal and Elton reservoir- is a clear breach of the NPPF and GMCA guidelines- they need to return to the planning stage and re-examine all possible brownfield alternatives... 3. especially as this was not done before and (as Bury council revealed in a Freedom of Information response) the meetings where Elton etc was chosen were not legitimate council meetings with minutes or a list of attendees. Therefore, as the meetings were not legitimate, neither is the decision and they must return to the planning stage to make it so, especially in the light of such strong local opposition. 4. Re-examine the planning application for the individual housing designs to ensure that there is room to park no more than one car per house. If there is driveway or garage space for more than one car per house, we will see a minimum of 7000 extra cars on the road and strategic objective 6 cannot be met. 5. An alternative- free at the point of use - health and leisure facility must be provided and funded by Bury council and Peel to compensate the local people for the loss of their access to the greenbelt for health and leisure. If not, objectives 5 and 10 cannot be met and the proposal is inconsistent and at odds with itself.