

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	Our Vision
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
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.	<p>The Vision is UNSOUND. It fails to focus investment in regeneration of ample brownfield sites and decaying town centers. Further urban sprawl will only exacerbate climate and environmental pressure.</p> <p>"Create Neighbourhoods of choice" quotes "Prioritise the use of brownfield land"</p> <p>"Focus new homes in the Core Growth Area and the town centres"□.. Yet the main focus on this consultation is remapping greenbelt.</p> <p>Greenbelt "Reassignment" is disgusting smoke and mirror to appease the borderline apathetic constituents. The Plan is developer driven, and will see little economic growth for declining and decaying towns all across the region.</p> <p>The true housing demand CAN be achieved without any greenbelt loss (and no reassignment from current allocations).</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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prioritise Brownfield redevelopment - lobby government for more funding to incentivise. 2. Town Centre redevelopment for housing to rebalance shrinking retail demand 3. Build around infrastructure that can feed into borough centres not just Manchester City centre.
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Title	Our Strategic Objectives
Type	Web
Our strategic objectives - Considering the information provided for our strategic objectives, please tick which of these objectives your written comment refers to:	2. Create neighbourhoods of choice
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?	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.	<p>The Vision is UNSOUND. It fails to focus investment in regeneration of ample brownfield sites and decaying town centers. Further urban sprawl will only exacerbate climate and environmental pressure.</p> <p>"Create Neighbourhoods of choice" quotes "Prioritise the use of brownfield land"</p> <p>"Focus new homes in the Core Growth Area and the town centres"□.. Yet the main focus on this consultation is remapping greenbelt.?</p> <p>Greenbelt "Reassignment" is disgusting smoke and mirror to appease the borderline apathetic constituents. The Plan is developer driven, and will see little economic growth for declining and decaying towns all across the region.</p> <p>The true housing demand CAN be achieved without any greenbelt loss (and no reassignment from current allocations).</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.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prioritise Brownfield redevelopment - lobby government for more funding to incentivise. 2. Town Centre redevelopment for housing to rebalance shrinking retail demand 3. Build around infrastructure that can feed into borough centres not just Manchester City centre.
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	Our Spatial Strategy
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	NA
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.	<p>UN SOUND - Fails to focus on economic REGENERATION.</p> <p>The strategy fails to make regenerating town centres and vast areas of brownfield the priority. The news is awash with climate crisis yet the GMCA (specifically tameside council) continues with its militant (threat of CPO) drive to extend urban sprawl to the extents of the greater Manchester boundary.</p> <p>There has been next to zero change since the previous consultation. GMCA clearly has not been putting into focus the effects of the pandemic, global warming, or the growth of online retail.</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>TOWN CENTRE / BROWNFIELD 1st</p> <p>Distribute development evenly across each borough rather than being blinkered on a single "get rich quick" solution which will only drive inner city growth. Any local growth is consequential, unaccountable and under funded. Town centers will remain miserable, uninviting, empty vacuums surrounding the city.</p>
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	JP-Strat 1 Core Growth Area
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Sound
Soundness - Justified?	Sound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Sound
Soundness - Effective?	NA
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	<p>Only criticism of in inner city region is lack of greening, quality public realm and lack of pinpointed focus in clean air zone. The inner city 1/2 mile radius should have a zero CO2 emissions strategy rather than a "punishing stick" for all, region wide approach.</p>

comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	
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.	There remains and will remain a vast quantity of poorly utilised building within the city centre. Stronger incentives are needed to repurpose these.
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	JP-Strat 2 City Centre
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	NA
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
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.	Only criticism of in inner city region is lack of greening, quality public realm and lack of pinpointed focus in clean air zone. The inner city 1/2 mile radius should have a zero CO2 emissions strategy rather than a stick for all region wide approach.
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.	There remains and will remain a vast quantity of poorly utilised building within the city centre. Stronger incentives are needed to repurpose these. Just walk around the city centre and look up, most properties are barely occupied above ground level retail. There is an abundance of architecturally interesting building with next to zero occupancy.
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Person ID	1286215
Title	JP-Strat 12 Main Town Centres
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Sound
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.	Specifically regarding TMBC. The council has invested many hundreds of millions on Ashton-u-Lyne. Mainly on a self serving office rebuild, but positively on further education and local infrastructure. But it has been the ongoing tinkering by successive planning teams that has seen its bus station reworked 3 or 4 times in the last few decades. Clearly incompetent, yet feel what is needed is the bulk of housing to be build on greenbelt as far from the town centre, beggars belief!
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>Reassess the derelict / poorly utilised land in proximity to the Town Centre and public transport connections (train and tram) and there are vast opportunities along the Ashton canal, Ashton Moss / Droylsden tram interconnections that could improve footfall into Ashton. Rather than creating a satellite commuter village for workers in Manchester.</p> <p>A repeated retort by council leaders regarding town centre development "the council does own it"... Well it should, and truly go and demonstrate it can fix, before it goes breaking greenbelt that isn't broken. If Manchester City Council can invest to purchase the former toysrus site, turn it around at profit then so can each council. Use some of that vast GMPF pension fund, but council leaders are not prepared to invest back into your own communities.</p>
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	JP-Strat 13 Strategic Green Infrastructure
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Sound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

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 river Tame continues to be one of the worse nationally for raw sewage discharge and GMCA, Council and Environment Department all just let United Utilities plod along at its own pace, a pace which will not be keeping up with the pace of development being proposed by "Places for Everyone".</p> <p>The previous iteration of this masterplan had the audacity to propose commercial development on greenbelt at Bredbury Industrial estate adjacent to the river Tame nature reserve. No wonder Stockport council has washed its hands of this process.</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>Like CO2, a net zero target needs to be enforced on United Utilities to clean up its act. Set a target and see that is achieved.</p> <p>Swathes of brownfield sites and town center regeneration opportunities are been left to fester while the GMCA eyes glaze over with pound signs from profitable greenbelt land grab.</p>
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	JP-Strat 14 A Sustainable and Integrated Transport Network
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Sound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Sound
Soundness - Effective?	NA
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.	<p>All talk outside of the city centre. Little improvements have been seen from the Cycle Bee project beyond Oxford Rd.</p>
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	JP-S 1 Sustainable Development
Type	Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
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.	Fix what is broken before creating urban sprawl on the outskirts of the region. Town center and brownfield sites continue to be ignored. This is the third iteration of the GMCA consultation, and basically you keep regurgitating the same story over and over.
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	JP-J 1 Supporting Long Term Economic Growth
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
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
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	JP-G 1 Valuing Important Landscapes
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

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.	<p>This policy is 80% focuses on creating urban sprawl in current greenbelt land.</p> <p>Greater Manchester has failed to preserve what little open space there was in the city centre by shrinking Piccadilly Gardens for office/retail space when there still remains an abundance of unoccupied buildings.</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.	Regeneration within the existing developed footprint. Fix what is broken, before breaking greenbelt. The vast number of city/town premises which are under utilised and likely paying zero rates need to have rates applied which will encourage a sell off / regeneration which is needed.
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	JP-G 10 Green Belt
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
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.	Hypocrisy! this entire policy is focused on greenbelt land grab. It will create urban sprawl and it will loose the distinction / identity of neighbourhoods

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

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.	Greenbelt allocations are not necessary to achieve the housing demand. Fix the areas of the region which are broken, there is more than sufficient opportunity to rebuild, repurpose and reuse what have been in decline for decades.
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	JP-G 11 Safeguarded Land
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?	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.	Hypocrisy! how can you be trusted to safeguard future greenbelt when in the same breath this policy is removing vast area of greenbelt (offset by in some cases motorway verges!)
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	JPA 30: Ashton Moss West
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA

Places 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.	Total contradiction to "Vision - Strategic Objective 2", Fails to demonstrate any focus on brownfield regeneration, town centre regeneration.
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.	UN SOUND - Site should offer mixed housing / employment to make benefit of the tram. There are other site in Tameside, for example ABC Wax (Hyde), that could provide employment, better distributing the growth opportunities across the borough.
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	JPA 31: Godley Green Garden Village
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
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>Total contradiction to "Vision - Strategic Objective 2", Fails to demonstrate any focus on brownfield regeneration, town centre regeneration.</p> <p>Tameside Council is clearly driving ahead to push planning for this project ahead of any other initiative to regenerate the borough.</p> <p>GGGV will have limited update to economic growth feed into Tameside, rather it is centered only on rail access to the city center.</p> <p>UN SOUND - The scale of the plan is simply not justified (besides fixing Tameside councils finances). It has little to no cohesion with the spending that has been targeted in Ashton-u-Lyne. The 1st round of GMCA consultation claimed 14000 homes could be built on brownfield, yet TMBC fail to push this available land for regeneration.</p> <p>Like the comment regarding Ashton Moss, TMBC"s put all employment here and all housing there, just exposes their incomitance and lack of vision.</p>

OK it has the train to shuttle commuters into the city centre (how's that improving Ashtons footfall?) Where are the children going to go for further education?

Even the latest proposal for the Mottram bypass fails to be inclusive of access towards Stalybridge/Ashton!

GGV contributes to overall "Urban Sprawl" from Stockport/Manchester to Mottram, the suggestion of it being a Green Village is perverse.

A recognised site on environmental importance - wildlife - Great Crested Newts, Bats etc, TPO's

Flood Risk - the land presents many "issues" water outlets which along with excessive run off water would present a significant risk to lower lying properties in Hyde

Flanked either side by brooks, and unspecified landfill the available land would result in high density housing not executive housing as is proposed

No transport infrastructure has been proposed, no traffic modelling carried out to date. Yet the current motorway, road and rail network cannot cope today.

Rail: Jonathan Reynolds MP states "significant improvements" to Hattersley train station. Yet there is nothing quantifiable in his statements. The train is already standing room only during rush hours, further demand outside the scope of the GMSF (a proposed new Gamesley train station, and new housing development in the Glossop areas) will only make things worse regardless of potential increase to rolling stock on the Glossop-Piccadilly line. The trains are full before they reach Hattersley.

Road: The M67 /M60 and surrounding roads are already over stretched. The M67/M60 junction at Denton is a hashed bodge job, the proposed Mottram bypass simply a half-hearted design which does nothing to disperse traffic beyond Mottram.

The High School is already over-subscribed. The plan only proposes an additional primary school. No details on healthcare etc.

Hyde town centre needs major investment to re-utilise the abandoned properties, re-introduce green spaces

Hattersley regeneration has been slow at best, the retail park approved 2015 remains undeveloped, should this go ahead further decline in Hyde can be expected.

Recreation - This area already provides health benefits to the region, horse riding school, access to Werneth Low country park and beyond for walkers and cycling.

Limited social and entertainment development in the area will either feed business into the City Centre, or increase the reliance on cars within Tameside to benefit from the projects with have been funded in Ashton-U-Lyne and upcoming in Denton. Ashton Moss, with the addition of a new train station would have placed housing close to established infrastructure, yet this has been dropped in favour of further industrial / retail parks.

Along with Stalybridge, Gee Cross and potentially other sites such as Matley Lane, Hartshead and Mossley these sites should only be considered once Brownfield has been exploited.

To summarise Tameside already have sufficient brownfield land to achieve the revised housing demand. Investment in town centres is barely visible beyond where councilors reside in Ashton-Under-Lyne (Stalybridge and Hyde town centres are broken).

**Redacted modification
- Please set out the**

No Greenbelt needs to be consumed or adjusted to suit council and housing developer gains.

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.	
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	JPA 32: South of Hyde
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	NA
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
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.	Total contradiction to "Vision - Strategic Objective 2", Fails to demonstrate any focus on brownfield regeneration, town centre regeneration.
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	Bolton - Green Belt Additions
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No

Places 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.	Just massaging the figures. destroying current greenbelt for easy profitable urban sprawl but offering undesirable land in its place is a disgrace.
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.	Greenbelt release should be the final option, once ALL brownfield sites and town centers have been repurposed then, if and only if there remains a shortage then land may be reassigned.
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	Bury - Green Belt Additions
Type	Web
GBA Bury - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this District your response relates to - then respond to the questions below	<p>Bury GBA03 Pigs Lea Brook 1</p> <p>Bury GBA04 North of Nuttall Park</p> <p>Bury GBA05 Pigs Lea Brook 2</p> <p>Bury GBA06 Hollins Brook</p> <p>Bury GBA07 Off New Road, Radcliffe</p> <p>Bury GBA08 Hollins Brow</p> <p>Bury GBA09 Hollybank Street, Radcliffe</p> <p>Bury GBA10 Crow Lumb Wood</p> <p>Bury GBA11 Nuttall West, Ramsbottom</p> <p>Bury GBA12 Woolfold, Bury</p> <p>Bury GBA13 Nuttall East, Ramsbottom</p> <p>Bury GBA14 Chesham, Bury</p> <p>Bury GBA15 Broad Hey Wood North</p> <p>Bury GBA16 Lower Hinds</p>
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	NA

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

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.	Just massaging the figures. destroying existing greenbelt for easy profitable urban sprawl but offering undesirable land in its place is a disgrace.
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.	Greenbelt release should be the final option, once ALL brownfield sites and town centers have been repurposed then, if and only if there remains a shortage then land may be reassigned.
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	Oldham - Green Belt Additions
Type	Web
GBA Oldham - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this District your response relates to - then respond to the questions below	Oldham GBA17 Land behind Denshaw Village Hall
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	NA
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	Just massaging the figures. destroying existing greenbelt for easy profitable urban sprawl but offering undesirable land in its place is a disgrace.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	
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.	Greenbelt release should be the final option, once ALL brownfield sites and town centers have been repurposed then, if and only if there remains a shortage then land may be reassigned.
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	Rochdale - Green Belt Additions
Type	Web
GBA Rochdale - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this District your response relates to - then respond to the questions below	<p>Rochdale GBA18 Land within the Roch Valley, Smallbridge</p> <p>Rochdale GBA19 Land to west of Stakehill Business Park</p> <p>Rochdale GBA20 Land at Firgrove Playing Fields, Rochdale</p> <p>Rochdale GBA21 Land between railway line and Rochdale Canal, Littleborough</p> <p>Rochdale GBA22 Land north of St Andrew's Church, Dearnley</p> <p>Rochdale GBA23 Land at Townhouse Brook, Littleborough</p> <p>Rochdale GBA24 Land north of Shore, Littleborough</p> <p>Rochdale GBA25 Land at Summit, Heywood</p>
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	NA
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.	Just massaging the figures. destroying existing greenbelt for easy profitable urban sprawl but offering undesirable land in its place is a disgrace.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

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.	Greenbelt release should be the final option, once ALL brownfield sites and town centers have been repurposed then, if and only if there remains a shortage then land may be reassigned.
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	Salford - Green Belt Additions
Type	Web
GBA Salford - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this District your response relates to - then respond to the questions below	Salford GBA26 Land South East of Slack Brook Open Space Salford GBA27 West Salford Greenway Salford GBA28 Part of Logistics North Country Park Salford GBA29 Land West of Burgess Farm Salford GBA30 Blackleach Country Park
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
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.	Just massaging the figures. destroying existing greenbelt for easy profitable urban sprawl but offering undesirable land in its place is a disgrace.
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	Greenbelt release should be the final option, once ALL brownfield sites and town centers have been repurposed then, if and only if there remains a shortage then land may be reassigned.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

you have identified above.	
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	Tameside - Green Belt Additions
Type	Web
GBA Tameside - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this District your response relates to - then respond to the questions below	<p>Tameside GBA31 Fox Platt, Mossley</p> <p>Tameside GBA32 Manor Farm Close, Waterloo, Ashton-under-Lyne</p> <p>Tameside GBA33 Ridge Hill Lane, Ridge Hill, Stalybridge</p> <p>Tameside GBA34 Cowbury Green, Long Row, Carrbrook, Stalybridge</p> <p>Tameside GBA35 Woodview, South View, Carrbrook, Stalybridge</p> <p>Tameside GBA36 Yew Tree Lane, Dukinfield</p> <p>Tameside GBA37 Broadbottom Road, Broadbottom</p> <p>Tameside GBA38 Ardenfield, Haughton Green, Denton</p> <p>Tameside GBA39 Cemetery Road, Denton</p> <p>Tameside GBA40 Hyde Road, Mottram</p> <p>Tameside GBA41 Ashworth Lane, Mottram</p> <p>Tameside GBA42 Horses Field, Danebank, Denton</p>
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	NA
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>Just massaging the figures. destroying existing greenbelt for easy profitable urban sprawl but offering undesirable land in its place is a disgrace.</p> <p>Yet TMBC are going ahead and making this greenbelt land grab, in part requiring compulsory purchase order, the number one priority!</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>Greenbelt release should be the final option, once ALL brownfield sites and town centers have been repurposed then, if and only if there remains a shortage then land may be reassigned.</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	Trafford - Green Belt Additions
Type	Web
GBA Trafford - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this District your response relates to - then respond to the questions below	Trafford GBA43 Midlands Farm, Moss Lane
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
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.	Just massaging the figures. destroying existing greenbelt for easy profitable urban sprawl but offering undesirable land in its place is a disgrace.
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.	Greenbelt release should be the final option, once ALL brownfield sites and town centers have been repurposed then, if and only if there remains a shortage then land may be reassigned.
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	Wigan - Green Belt Additions
Type	Web
GBA Wigan - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this District your	Wigan GBA44 Land off Fir Tree Street, Ince Wigan GBA45 Pennington FC Pitches, Howe Bridge, Atherton

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

response relates to - then respond to the questions below	Wigan GBA46 Hope Carr Nature Reserve, Leigh Wigan GBA47 Crow Orchard Road, Standish Wigan GBA48 North Bradley Lane, Standish Wigan GBA49 Coppull Lane, Wigan
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	NA
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.	Just massaging the figures. destroying existing greenbelt for easy profitable urban sprawl but offering undesirable land in its place is a disgrace.
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.	Greenbelt release should be the final option, once ALL brownfield sites and town centers have been repurposed then, if and only if there remains a shortage then land may be reassigned.
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	Other Comments
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Sound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Family Name	Hullock
Given Name	Michael
Person ID	1286215
Title	Other Comments
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Sound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No