

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Hields
Given Name	Malcolm
Person ID	1285902
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Hields
Given Name	Malcolm
Person ID	1285902
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
Family Name	Hields
Given Name	Malcolm
Person ID	1285902
Title	Our Strategic Objectives
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	NA
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
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.	<p>The Pocket Nook site does not meet the Strategic objectives because:</p> <p>It is using good quality cultivated farm land rather than prioritising brown field sites to build on</p> <p>The new homes are not in a town centre and will just produce an urban sprawl of houses destroying the village nature of Lowton. The open views from the A580 are also being destroyed.</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>The new Pocket Nook homes are not within 800 mts of a transport hub and will require a subsidised bus. The service will be infrequent so all the houses will require cars.</p> <p>The Pocket Nook site is known to flood.</p> <p>The almost 600 houses are unable to justify a self-financing bus service so either all the houses will have to have cars or the tax payer will have to subsidise the bus.</p> <p>The project can only go ahead if the land is compulsory purchased. This project does not justify compulsory purchase.</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>Do not suggest building on green field land that the owner intends to continue being used to farm.</p>
<p>Family Name</p>	<p>Hields</p>
<p>Given Name</p>	<p>Malcolm</p>
<p>Person ID</p>	<p>1285902</p>
<p>Title</p>	<p>JP-G 6 Urban Green Space</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>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>All the green spaces that made Lowton a good place to live are being used for building on.</p> <p>The "plan" seems to be to build on any piece of land.</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</p>	<p>I would consider the plan to be legal if the views of the elected representatives of Lowton were acted upon.</p>

of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.	
Family Name	Hields
Given Name	Malcolm
Person ID	1285902
Title	JPA 36: Pocket Nook
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.	<p>I do not consider this proposal to be legally compliant because this proposal continues to be pushed forward when the Public Enquire at the Sports Village clearly decided that house building in Lowton should be limited.</p> <p>I do not think the Council have co-operated with local Council Tax Payers because the proposal has been rejected by all the elected Councillors and the elected MP. Previously Mr Burnham also stated Lowton could not take the number of houses proposed. I am disappointed that the unelected planners continue to disregard the local elected representatives making a mockery of democracy.</p> <p>To access this site there will need to be an additional junction onto the by-pass which will delay traffic, increase CO2 and further back up traffic on the A580 at peak times reducing highway safety due to stationary traffic on a dual carriageway road. The use of so called Smart Traffic controls at the Winwick Lane/ Newton Road / Kenyon Lane / Church Lane / A580 junction confirms that this traffic light technology does not prevent traffic jamming up where there are too many junctions in a short length of road. There is no evidence that the Council planners will reduce the likelihood of rear end crashes by adding a further junction.</p> <p>Carr Brook runs through the proposed building site which is shown on the flood map as an area that floods. With Climate Change expected to produce more extreme weather it is wrong for a Council to suggest building in such an area. In addition I understand HS2 intend to pump water into Carr Brook which could increase the flow. National policy is not to build where flooding is likely.</p> <p>At the West end of the Pocket Nook site a bridge will need to cross the HS2 railway line at great expense using money that could be better used constructing a Lane Head by-pass or the much needed Kenyon Junction station. This is not an effective use of limited financial resources as it will either reduce the affordability of the house prices or reduce the amount of 106 money (or Government money)that could be used to reduce the congestion already caused by excessive building to the detriment of residents.</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>Since the expansion of housing in Lowton in the last few years I have noticed that the bats hedgehogs and frogs that used to cross my garden have disappeared and I understand that further building in the Pocket Nook area will destroy land that is home to red leg partridge and field hares.</p> <p>I am aware that the Council were informed at the time the Pocket Nook plan was first proposed that much of the land is not for sale and that the current owner wishes to continue using the land for agricultural purposes. I also attended a meeting at Leigh Library where Mr Burnham stated that Compulsory Purchase was not something that should be used and yet the plan is only achievable if this happens. Compulsory Purchase should not be used to force through these proposals.</p> <p>I am very unhappy that Council Tax Payers funds have continued to be wasted pushing this proposal to build on the Pocket Nook green fields which is not a justified use of Council resources.</p> <p>I am unhappy that the Council are encouraging building houses on green farm land when brownfield sites are available in Wigan and Greater Manchester.</p> <p>I see no proposals to eliminate the Lane Head junction snarl up which should be addressed by the Council before there are any proposals to building further houses in the area so I do not consider the proposal is positively prepared.</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 should be scrapped and building should be on brownfield sites away from watercourses that flood.</p> <p>The plan is unsound because it is being put forward before all the current congestion problems are eliminated. There are no plans to build a health centre or shops. The Council have managed to remove the local Civic Hall so there is no centre in the village.</p> <p>The farmers wish to keep his land should be respected.</p>
<p>Family Name</p>	<p>Hields</p>
<p>Given Name</p>	<p>Malcolm</p>
<p>Person ID</p>	<p>1285902</p>
<p>Title</p>	<p>JP-D1 Infrastructure Implementation</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>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</p>	<p>The plan does not do what the elected representatives of the local people want.</p> <p>There is no Lane Head by-pass or a station for Lowton / Leigh</p>

to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.