

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Jourdain
Given Name	Amy
Person ID	1287223
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287223_Redacted.pdf
Family Name	Jourdain
Given Name	Amy
Person ID	1287223
Title	JPA 3.2: Timperley Wedge
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287223_Redacted.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Sound
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 consider JPA 3.2: Timperley Wedge to be unsound and not positively prepared because it has not been reviewed since Trafford declared a Climate Emergency in November 2018, and has not taken into account Brexit or the Covid pandemic.</p> <p>I consider JPA 3.2: Timperley Wedge to be unsound and not justified because there is insufficient evidence to say that the development is sound, for example, with regards to carbon emissions coming from a change in use of the land.</p> <p>I consider JPA 3.2: Timperley Wedge to be unsound and not consistent with national policy because it falls to meet the requirements of clause 141 on page 42 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>I consider JPA 3.2: Timperley Wedge to be unsound and not effective because I do not believe it to be deliverable or viable nor sustainable due to the level of regular surface water flooding on the site. I attach a document showing many photos of flooding that has occurred in the area in the plan, and that continues to occur on a regular basis. Development in the area would further exacerbate the impact of flooding on existing residents and of particular note are the Commonwealth War Graves at Christ Church graveyard on Thorley Lane, Timperley.</p> <p>I consider JPA 3.2: Timperley Wedge not to be legally compliant because it does not meet the requirements of the Statement of Community Involvement: there has been very poor communication to inform local residents of the plan. I have not received any communication nor information from the council about this plan and neither have my neighbours or friends in the local area, even though we would all be greatly affected by the proposed development.</p>

	<p>I consider JPA 3.2: Timperley Wedge fails to comply with the Duty to Co-operate.</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>In order to be positively prepared, I consider it necessary for the plan to be handled through the local plan with robust consultation with local residents.</p> <p>In order to be justified, I consider it necessary for there to be sufficient evidence to show that the development is sound, in matters such as carbon emissions from the change in use of the land.</p> <p>In order to be consistent with national policy, I consider it necessary for the plan to meet the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework, particularly in respect of clause 141 on page 42.</p> <p>In order to be effective, I consider it necessary for the plan to reconsider the viability and sustainability of building on land liable to flooding, and the impact this will have on existing residents and local amenities.</p> <p>In order to be legally compliant, I consider it necessary for the plan to meet the requirements of the Statement of Community Involvement and be handled through the local plan with robust consultation with local residents.</p> <p>In order to be legally compliant, I consider it necessary for the plan to comply with the Duty to Co-operate.</p>