

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Jenkins
<b>Given Name</b>	Richard
<b>Person ID</b>	1287631
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Jenkins
<b>Given Name</b>	Richard
<b>Person ID</b>	1287631
<b>Title</b>	JPA 31: Godley Green Garden Village
<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>The places for everyone plan does not meet the needs of the local area and does not include all aspects of the areas requirements. There are no plans for further railway services as the current number of trains available on the route is already maximized and there is no chance to increase the number. There are plans for a link road to be put in place from Mottram roundabout taking traffic around Mottram but then ends with the bottle neck where it currently is in Glossop. There are no plans to increase the capacity of roads at the opposite end of the M67 motorway where it meets the M60 / Hyde road junction. The traffic here at peak times is already a mess and there are no plans to make any changes to this. The belief is that most people will use public transport and cycle to work and use the local area. There is nothing in Hyde except food takeaway and charity shops. there is nothing to being people into Hyde centre itself. Until the build is in year 6 there are no plans for schools or other such amenities. The school being planned is for primary aged children and there are no plans for secondary schools. The schools in the local area are already over subscribed with children needing to travel further away from home as it is and this proposed housing estate will only exacerbate the situation further. The plan to build on the green space that is used by the local community including horse riders, dog walkers and ramblers will be a great loss to the area. As well as this there will be a massive impact on the local deer and other wildlife including newts, frogs and bees all of which are important to protect. There are plenty of brownfield sites available in the area that can be built upon with out the need to build on the green belt. I do not believe it to be legally compliant as there was a need for all 9 constituencies to be involved and Stockport council has withdrawn. Tameside Council should do the same. No alternatives have been looked into ad there is no evidence that this has taken place. The local climate will be affected as the housing proposol of 2350 homes will make a massive difference to the air pollution in the area and affect the mental and physical health of all those currently living in the area. The housing proposed</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	takes away the green belt and as such affects climate change. The area proposed is liable to flooding from Werneth Low and will need a lot of ground work doing on it to prevent other established homes in the area becoming flooded as the water will still need to go somewhere.
<b>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.</b>	Do not build on the green belt protected land. This will help with ensuring the wildlife, mental and physical health of us living in the local area is maintained and that the climate remains protected. There are brown field sites with Tameside that can be built upon if needed and these have not been looked into being used.
<b>Family Name</b>	Jenkins
<b>Given Name</b>	Richard
<b>Person ID</b>	1287631
<b>Title</b>	JPA 32: South of Hyde
<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>	Green belt land