

Family Name	Dean
Given Name	Terence
Person ID	1287430
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Dean
Given Name	Terence
Person ID	1287430
Title	Our Vision
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Sound
Soundness - Justified?	Sound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Sound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
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.	Other complainants will elucidate the nature of Greenbelt Policy and how any scheme within the currently defined Greenbelt cannot be justified.
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>I recognise that the Greenbelt Policy is in need of revision. It's a policy that has served us well for over 40 years but is now no longer suited to the needs of GM and its citizens.</p> <p>You should promote changes to the Greenbelt Policy before trying, what appears to be forcing developments through, effectively via the backdoor.</p> <p>It's a shameful approach and one that is destined to fail, particularly in areas where the public is savvy enough to know how to deal with such proposals.</p> <p>The public should not need to be so savvy nor spend its time and money contradicting policies contained in the Plan.</p> <p>You are our servants, and you have failed to set a plan that accounts for and understands the needs of the populace!</p>
Family Name	Dean
Given Name	Terence
Person ID	1287430
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 9. Ensure access to physical and social infrastructure</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>NA</p>
<p>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Family Name</p>	<p>Dean</p>
<p>Given Name</p>	<p>Terence</p>
<p>Person ID</p>	<p>1287430</p>
<p>Title</p>	<p>JPA 26: Land at Hazelhurst Farm</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>NA</p>
<p>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</p>	<p>NA</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>The proposed development, whilst welcomed for the provision of new housing, is simply premature and will detract significantly from the overall AMENITY of the area that local residents currently enjoy. Every new development would see an increased use in the private car at peak times. No matter what that quantum, any additional traffic loading of the M60 and its local feeder roads would be unacceptable. Delay times on feeder roads to the M60 are already substantial. Until such times as the shortage of sufficient infrastructure is addressed, all developments in the so-called North-West quadrant of GM, including this one, must be suspended.</p>
	<p>It appears that the authors of the proposals have ignored the multitude of objections from the public to the development at Broadoak and the Racecourse. Objections to those developments, as you know, were supported by doctors from Salford Royal who reported on the nature of Asthma and other lung conditions, they being significant in comparison with other areas of the UK. Pollution levels around the M60 are above acceptable limits;</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>adding further slow moving traffic to the feeder roads and to the motorway itself would be criminal.</p> <p>I appreciate that some of the new housing would be for the existing GM population, and the Vantage bus would see improved usage, but we simply cannot afford to attract more people into the area until the infrastructure can carry them.</p> <p>If these schemes continue to be promoted you can expect a significant backlash from the local populace, who do indeed want to have a greater say in determining their local plan... and this scheme would not be part of it.</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>The plan must promote improvements in infrastructure to the point where new developments can be accommodated. It is simply irresponsibly of any organisation to promote developments that would increase already unacceptable levels of congestion and pollution on our local road network.</p> <p>I suggest you look at a moratorium on development in this area of GM for 5 to 10 years when pollution levels may have subsided - due to the increased use of electric vehicles and the re-regulation of bus services.</p> <p>Further spending on better infrastructure will be required during that period. The work being undertaken by Transport for the North must be promoted in the provision of additional roads/motorways in the North-West Quadrant.</p>
<p>Family Name</p>	Dean
<p>Given Name</p>	Terence
<p>Person ID</p>	1287430
<p>Title</p>	JPA 27: Land East of Boothstown
<p>Type</p>	Web
<p>Soundness - Positively prepared?</p>	Unsound
<p>Soundness - Justified?</p>	Unsound
<p>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</p>	Unsound
<p>Soundness - Effective?</p>	Unsound
<p>Compliance - Legally compliant?</p>	No
<p>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</p>	NA
<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>The proposed development is simply premature and contrary to Greenbelt policy. It would detract significantly from the overall AMENITY of the area that local residents currently enjoy. Every new development would see an increased use in the private car at peak times; no matter what that quantum, any additional traffic loading of the M60 and its local feeder roads would be unacceptable. Delay times on feeder roads to the M60, and particularly along Leigh Road in the morning peak, are already substantial.</p> <p>Until such times as the shortage of sufficient infrastructure is addressed, all developments in the so-called North-West quadrant of GM, including this one, must be suspended.</p> <p>It appears that the authors of the proposals have ignored the multitude of objections from the public to the development at Broadoak and the Racecourse. Objections to those developments, as you know, were supported by doctors from Salford Royal who reported on the nature of Asthma and other lung conditions, they being significant in comparison with other areas of the UK. Pollution levels around the M60 are above acceptable limits;</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>adding further slow moving traffic to the feeder roads and to the motorway itself would be criminal.</p> <p>I appreciate that some of the new housing would be for the existing GM population, but we simply cannot afford to attract more people into the area until the infrastructure can carry them.</p> <p>If these schemes continue to be promoted you can expect a significant backlash from the local populace, who do indeed want to have a greater say in determining their local plan... and this scheme would not be part of it.</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>The plan must promote improvements in infrastructure to the point where new developments can be accommodated. It is simply irresponsibly of any organisation to promote developments that would increase already unacceptable levels of congestion and pollution on our local road network.</p> <p>I suggest you look at a moratorium on development in this area of GM for 5 to 10 years when pollution levels may have subsided - due to the increased use of electric vehicles and the re-regulation of bus services.</p> <p>Further spending on better infrastructure will be required during that period. The work being undertaken by Transport for the North must be promoted in the provision of additional roads/motorways in the North-West Quadrant.</p>
<p>Family Name</p>	Dean
<p>Given Name</p>	Terence
<p>Person ID</p>	1287430
<p>Title</p>	JPA 35: North of Mosley Common
<p>Type</p>	Web
<p>Soundness - Positively prepared?</p>	Unsound
<p>Soundness - Justified?</p>	Unsound
<p>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</p>	Unsound
<p>Soundness - Effective?</p>	Unsound
<p>Compliance - Legally compliant?</p>	NA
<p>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</p>	NA
<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>The proposed development, whilst welcomed for the provision of new housing and associated facilities, including additional use of the busway, is simply premature and will detract significantly from the overall AMENITY of the area that local residents currently enjoy. Additional traffic load, whatever its quantum, is unacceptable. By your own statements, modifications would not address all the traffic issues generated by the proposed developments of the local PfE, nor address prevailing congestion. Any additional traffic loading of the M60 and its local feeder roads would be unacceptable. Until such times as the shortage of sufficient infrastructure is addressed, all developments in the so-called North-West quadrant of GM, including this one, must be suspended.</p> <p>It appears that the authors of the proposals have ignored the multitude of objections from the public to the development at Broadoak and the Racecourse. Objections to those developments, as you know, were supported by doctors from Salford Royal who reported on the nature of Asthma and other lung conditions, they being significant in comparison with other areas of the UK. Pollution levels around the M60 are above acceptable limits;</p>

	<p>adding further slow moving traffic to the feeder roads and to the motorway itself would be criminal.</p> <p>I appreciate that some of the new housing would be for the existing GM population, but we simply cannot afford to attract more people into the area until the infrastructure can carry them.</p> <p>If these schemes continue to be promoted you can expect a significant backlash from the local populace, who do indeed want to have a greater say in determining their local plan.</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>The plan must promote improvements in infrastructure to the point where new developments can be accommodated. It is simply irresponsibly of any organisation to promote developments that would increase already unacceptable levels of congestion and pollution on our local road network.</p> <p>I suggest you look at a moratorium on development in this area of GM for 5 to 10 years when pollution levels may have subsided - due to the increased use of electric vehicles and the re-regulation of bus services.</p> <p>Further spending on better infrastructure will be required during that period. The work being undertaken by Transport for the North must be promoted in the provision of additional roads/motorways in the North-West Quadrant.</p>