

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Hoy
<b>Given Name</b>	Doug
<b>Person ID</b>	1287432
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Hoy
<b>Given Name</b>	Doug
<b>Person ID</b>	1287432
<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>	NA
<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>	<p>These PfE proposals for Broadbent Moss are unsound and not legally compliant. This is not the GMSF and is "substantively different" - Stockport's removal - and as such needs much wider consultation.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.1 of PfE says "all voices must be heard" yet Covid-19 and a general lack of consultation means key groups (mainly, but not exclusively) those without Internet) have not been given an opportunity to have their say (Equality Act, 2010).</p> <p>PfE is inconsistent with national policy (NPPF, 2019 (d).)</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Hoy
<b>Given Name</b>	Doug
<b>Person ID</b>	1287432
<b>Title</b>	Our Strategic Objectives
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Our strategic objectives - Considering the information provided for our strategic objectives, please tick which of these objectives your written comment refers to:</b>	<p>7. Ensure that districts involved are more resilient and carbon neutral</p> <p>10. Promote the health and wellbeing of communities</p>
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<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>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>	<p>These PfE proposals for Broadbent Moss are unsound and not legally compliant. This is not the GMSF and is "substantively different" - Stockport's removal - and as such needs much wider consultation.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.1 of PfE says "all voices must be heard" yet Covid-19 and a general lack of consultation means key groups (mainly, but not exclusively) those without Internet) have not been given an opportunity to have their say (Equality Act, 2010).</p> <p>PfE is inconsistent with national policy (NPPF, 2019 (d).)</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Hoy
<b>Given Name</b>	Doug
<b>Person ID</b>	1287432
<b>Title</b>	JPA 14: Broadbent Moss
<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>	<p>These PfE proposals for Broadbent Moss are unsound and not legally compliant. This is not the GMSF and is "substantively different" - Stockport's removal - and as such needs much wider consultation.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.1 of PfE says "all voices must be heard" yet Covid-19 and a general lack of consultation means key groups (mainly, but not exclusively) those without Internet) have not been given an opportunity to have their say (Equality Act, 2010).</p> <p>PfE is inconsistent with national policy (NPPF, 2019 (d).)</p> <p>These PfE proposals for Broadbent Moss are unsound and not legally compliant. This is not the GMSF and is "substantively different" - Stockport's removal - and as such needs much wider consultation. No-one around Broadbent Moss (Derker) is aware of this and need their say.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.1 of PfE says "all voices must be heard" yet Covid-19 and a general lack of consultation means key groups (mainly, but not exclusively) those without Internet) have not been given an opportunity to have their say (Equality Act, 2010).</p> <p>PfE is inconsistent with national policy (NPPF, 2019 (d).)</p>

These PfE proposals for Broadbent Moss (BM) are unsound as they do not meet the "area"s objectively assessed needs"(NPPF, 35 d) and would destroy the area"s "distinctive character"(PfE, 8.7). In the Preliminary Ecological Analysis (2020, p.22) for BM it states "Woodland, wet grassland and ponds □ would need to be retained and/or compensated for if lost". PfE does NOT state how this will be done.

Further, the GMSF Concept report for BM (para 3.2.2) quotes the Environment Agency stating a "medium to high probability"of flooding surrounding the River Beal. The IPPC report (2021) on Climate Emergency means 1450 houses, in a valley is "unsound"and will NOT make it "more resilient to climate change"(PfE 4.1)