

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

| | |
|---|---|
| Family Name | Kelly |
| Given Name | Angela |
| Person ID | 1286138 |
| Title | Stakeholder Submission |
| Type | Web |
| Family Name | Kelly |
| Given Name | Angela |
| Person ID | 1286138 |
| Title | JPA 27: Land East of Boothstown |
| Type | Web |
| Soundness - Positively prepared? | Unsound |
| Soundness - Justified? | Unsound |
| Soundness - Consistent with national policy? | NA |
| 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. | This plan is completely unsound. Under current conditions this area and surrounding areas have horrendous congestion at both peak and non-peak times, there are already insufficient quotas of both doctors and dentists (at my own personal GP surgery the average wait for a routine appointment is 3-4 weeks!!). I know of people who could not find ANY dentists with NHS provision & struggled to find a private dentist accepting new patients. How much worse is this all going to be by increasing an already over-burdened and over-loaded area with such a huge influx of people and their respective vehicles?? This is madness beyond belief! NO planning should be given consent in places already at full or over-capacity in all the above areas. Are we expected to live so miserably because we choose to be urban rather than rural?□□. |
| Family Name | Kelly |
| Given Name | Angela |
| Person ID | 1286138 |
| Title | JPA 35: North of Mosley Common |
| Type | Web |
| Soundness - Positively prepared? | Unsound |
| Soundness - Justified? | Unsound |
| Soundness - Consistent with national policy? | NA |
| 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. | This plan is completely unsound. Under current conditions this area and surrounding areas have horrendous congestion at both peak and non-peak times, there are already insufficient quotas of both doctors and dentists (at my own personal GP surgery the average wait for a routine appointment is 3-4 weeks!!). I know of people who could not find ANY dentists with NHS provision & struggled to find a private dentist accepting new patients. How much worse is this all going to be by increasing an already over-burdened and over-loaded area with such a huge influx of people and their respective vehicles?? This is madness beyond belief! NO planning should be given consent in places already at full or over-capacity in all the above areas. Are we expected to live so miserably because we choose to be urban rather than rural?□□. |