

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	French
<b>Given Name</b>	David
<b>Person ID</b>	1285685
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	French
<b>Given Name</b>	David
<b>Person ID</b>	1285685
<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>	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>	As stated previously
<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>	Scrap this scheme
<b>Family Name</b>	French
<b>Given Name</b>	David
<b>Person ID</b>	1285685
<b>Title</b>	Our Strategic Objectives
<b>Type</b>	Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Our strategic objectives - Considering the information provided for our strategic objectives, please tick which of these objectives your written comment refers to:</b>	1. Meet our housing need
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Family Name</b>	French
<b>Given Name</b>	David
<b>Person ID</b>	1285685
<b>Title</b>	JPA 27: Land East of Boothstown
<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>	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>	Plans for 300 homes, the majority of which will have 2 or more cars which will all need to use the only major access route, Leigh Road. This route is already akin to a car park during rush hours and will obviously become even busier with this scheme and the other scheme of 1,100 homes at Mosley Common (which are themselves in addition to the hundreds already built or under construction). The recent scheme to "improve" the roudabouts at Junction 13 Worsley has led to traffic becoming even worse, compounded by the idiotic decision to remove the layby bus stop and have this directly on the road, blocking traffic. The increase in already elongated journey times and the extra pollution is unacceptable. The nearest bustop on the guided busway is, at it"s closest to the entrance of the proposed estate on Occupation Road, over 1 mile away and often the buses during rush hour are already full and do not stop. Additionally, where will the extra places for schools, doctors and dentists be?

**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.**

Scrap this scheme which will compound the already horrific traffic problems and the accompanying pollution as well as concreting over more beautiful green belt.