Family Name	Hadfield
Given Name	Sophie
Person ID	1286053
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Туре	Web
Include files	PFESophieHadfield.pdf
Family Name	Hadfield
Given Name	Sophie
Person ID	1286053
Title	JP-Strat 14 A Sustainable and Integrated Transport Network
Туре	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	NA
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
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.	ride - meaning those that live nearby cant actually get on a bus so have no choice but to use the car to get into Manchester.
Family Name	Hadfield
Given Name	Sophie
Person ID	1286053
Title	JP-H 1 Scale Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development
Туре	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No

	Tidoos for Everyone Representation 2021
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.	The policy states that building on brownfield sites is priority but some of the sites identified are Greenbelt space therefore how is this justified, effective and legally compliant?
Family Name	Hadfield
Given Name	Sophie
Person ID	1286053
Title	JP-H 2 Affordability of New Housing
Туре	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.	years to be able to afford and made many sacrifices let alone have large mortgages to pay for them. Also paying extremly expensive (Band D & E) council tax rates - will these affordable houses be paying what everyone
Family Name	Hadfield
Given Name	Sophie
Person ID	1286053
Title	JPA 26: Land at Hazelhurst Farm
Туре	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.	The plan states it will "prioritise "brownfiled" sites in the area - this site is not a brownfield site.
	This site can not be justified to be used, before all other acceptable brownfield sites are used.
	The current area is already overly populated and congested. We can not currently get into /out of the local area without sitting in extremly heave traffic at peak and off peak times.
	The road in which 3 roads will lead the this site (Hazlehurst farm) is already in a state of disrepair and can not take any further volumes of cars.
	The local school (Broadoak Primary) was oversubribed this year with over 180 children trying to get 60 places - how can a housing delevoplment be built which will only add to this.
	The current poolution in the area is already at an unacceptable level due to the volume of traffic - this proposal will only add to this and worsen the life of existing residents
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.	This site should not be considered until ALL brownfield sites within the local areas have been built on and are no longer an option. We should not be building on greenbelt land which provides many many locals a little piece of green space in an urban city. The health benefits of this space should be considered.
Family Name	Hadfield
Given Name	Sophie
Person ID	1286053
Title	JPA 27: Land East of Boothstown
Туре	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	This site is greenbelt land, therefore how is this legal before all the brownfield sites are used.

## Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	Places for Everyone Representation 2021	
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.	This land is also on one of the most congested roads within Worsley which makes what should be a 1 mile/few minute journey take sometimes in excess of 30 mins. We can not keep adding to this land with more and more houses.	
Family Name	Hadfield	
Given Name	Sophie	
Person ID	1286053	
Title	Salford - Green Belt Additions	
Туре	Web	
GBA Salford - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this District your response relates to - then respond to the questions below	Salford GBA27 West Salford Greenway	
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.	How is this a green belt addition, is it not already the greenbelt. By adding just 1 area of extra greenbelt and removing at least 2 others is not consistent, effective or legally complaint.	