

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Grant
<b>Given Name</b>	Katherine
<b>Person ID</b>	1287508
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Grant
<b>Given Name</b>	Katherine
<b>Person ID</b>	1287508
<b>Title</b>	JP-S 1 Sustainable Development
<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 plan does not take the need for future generations access to green spaces, clean air, and nature into consideration
<b>Family Name</b>	Grant
<b>Given Name</b>	Katherine
<b>Person ID</b>	1287508
<b>Title</b>	JP-S 2 Carbon and Energy
<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>	Retrofitting of existing buildings and housing stock is more carbon efficient than building new homes, as stated by both RIBA and historic England (
<b>Family Name</b>	Grant
<b>Given Name</b>	Katherine
<b>Person ID</b>	1287508
<b>Title</b>	JP-S 3 Heat and Energy Networks
<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>	Grant
<b>Given Name</b>	Katherine
<b>Person ID</b>	1287508
<b>Title</b>	JP-S 4 Resilience
<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</b>	Building on Greenbelt and greenfield sites will increase the risk of localised flash flooding as ground which previously absorbed rainfall is concreted over (in the case of Robert Fletcher"s site in Oldham there is a large meadow which floods every winter)

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	
<b>Family Name</b>	Grant
<b>Given Name</b>	Katherine
<b>Person ID</b>	1287508
<b>Title</b>	JP-S 5 Flood Risk and Water Environment
<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>	Water UK have issued a ten point plan for "21st century rivers, from recovery to renewal" and this policy does not match these ten points
<b>Family Name</b>	Grant
<b>Given Name</b>	Katherine
<b>Person ID</b>	1287508
<b>Title</b>	JP-S 6 Clean Air
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<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,</b>	The increase in roads proposed, without greater weight given to public transport improvements, will decrease air quality. For example the proposed development at Robert Fletcher"s mill in Oldham will result in a significant increase in traffic past a local primary school (greenfield st Mary"s, situated close to the proposed new road) without any consideration being given to

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>	the impact of construction traffic, loss of trees, long term increases in traffic, and there are no proposed improvements to local public transport
<b>Family Name</b>	Grant
<b>Given Name</b>	Katherine
<b>Person ID</b>	1287508
<b>Title</b>	JP-S 7 Resource Efficiency
<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>	Recycling is not consistent across greater Manchester and the policy does not adequately address this issue
<b>Family Name</b>	Grant
<b>Given Name</b>	Katherine
<b>Person ID</b>	1287508
<b>Title</b>	JPA 15: Chew Brook Vale (Robert Fletchers)
<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</b>	It does not go far enough in mitigating the impact on the existing community, in particular the increase in traffic. It does not go far enough in protecting the local water courses (for example from run off from new roads etc) It is not specific enough on how the Peak District, moors, and dovestones will

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<p><b>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>benefit (for example increased parking etc). It does not enhance the local public transport in any specific an meaningful way (for instance increased train services and better links to the station such as improves pedestrian access, cycle lanes etc). The visual impact from the existing Greenbelt will be significant and this is not adequately considered. Increased traffic from commercial use has not been adequately considered. The environmental impact of this construction will be significant and specific trade offs should be made- for example wildlife corridors, more Greenbelt allocation in the local area, investment in the Peak District park etc</p>
<p><b>Family Name</b></p>	<p>Grant</p>
<p><b>Given Name</b></p>	<p>Katherine</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1287508</p>
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Supporting Evidence</p>
<p><b>Type</b></p>	<p>Web</p>