

| | |
|---|---|
| Family Name | Jones |
| Given Name | John |
| Person ID | 1286275 |
| Title | Stakeholder Submission |
| Type | Web |
| Family Name | Jones |
| Given Name | John |
| Person ID | 1286275 |
| Title | JPA 31: Godley Green Garden Village |
| 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>The proposed development of Godley Green does not take account of the significant impact on ecology or wildlife. The proposed area is entirely rural and wildlife will be decimated. It is not shown how the impact on ecology and suffering of wildlife can be mitigated.</p> <p>Trees, hedgerows and fields will be destroyed which will increase the carbon impact on the environment. It is not shown that Godley Green Village could contribute to achieving zero carbon impact by 2050. In fact it appears that it would create a significant carbon increase which can never be reduced.</p> <p>It is not shown that other areas of Tameside have been considered. There are many brownfield sites. In addition investment in existing housing stock and industry is much better for the well-being, ecology, the environment and business. In particular Hyde is suffering from a woeful lack of investment. Hattersley is not much better. Godley Green would not improve the outlook for Hyde.</p> <p>It is stated that "Garden City principles will be enshrined throughout" and there is much made of the benefits for increased employment. The proposed area does not provide any significant provision for local employment. In effect Godley Green would be little better than a dormitory town.</p> <p>Transport and travel are not properly dealt with. The M67 already suffers from significant tailbacks at peak time. Plans for any kind of improvement are not being implemented. Godley Green would only make matters worse. The existing rail network does not support commuting to Manchester - before COVID 19 there were no seats on trains at peak times and there was inadequate space for bicycles. As the effects of the pandemic ease and commuting returns to former peak levels the railways will not be able to support the increased demand from Godley Green.</p> |

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>The Godley Green proposals make no allowance for increasing support for education and child care. Existing schools in Hyde and Hattersley are already near or exceeding capacity.</p> <p>There has been minimal engagement with the local community, otherwise the above comments would have been fully addressed, instead of passing them off as irrelevant or of minor concern.</p> <p>Scrapping this development and investing in developing existing housing, education, transport and industry, particularly in Hyde, will bring a much better and sustainable return on investment.</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>Scrapping this development and investing in developing existing housing, education, transport and industry, particularly in Hyde, will bring a much better and sustainable return on investment.</p> <p>Taking a serious look at all areas of Tameside and brownfield sites will show better alternatives. In addition 2350 new homes is an overestimate and the number of new homes really needed should be much lower if account is taken of importing existing housing stock.</p> <p>Wherever new housing is built a high proportion of affordable homes must be provided.</p> |
| <p>Family Name</p> | Jones |
| <p>Given Name</p> | John |
| <p>Person ID</p> | 1286275 |
| <p>Title</p> | JPA 32: South of Hyde |
| <p>Type</p> | Web |
| <p>Soundness - Positively prepared?</p> | Unsound |
| <p>Soundness - Justified?</p> | Unsound |
| <p>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</p> | Unsound |
| <p>Soundness - Effective?</p> | Unsound |
| <p>Compliance - Legally compliant?</p> | No |
| <p>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</p> | No |
| <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>This existing area has a network of footpaths and is a haven for wildlife. This contributes significantly to the health and well being of the local community.</p> <p>440 homes in this space will have a significant impact on local wildlife and ecology.</p> <p>It is not demonstrated how the impact on road traffic will be mitigated.</p> <p>Increased provision for school places is not addressed.</p> <p>There has been little effort to engage with the local community.</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</p> | <p>The number of houses should be much reduced or the plans scrapped.</p> <p>A high proportion of affordable homes should be allowed for to support local needs.</p> <p>Engage with the local community.</p> |

**or soundness matters
you have identified
above.**