

Family Name	Kelly
Given Name	Jean
Person ID	1286341
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Kelly
Given Name	Jean
Person ID	1286341
Title	JPA 6: West of Wingates / M61 Junction 6
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>Having followed the GMSF process from the beginning, this latest version seems totally incomprehensible to the normal lay person. I have made an attempt to put forward my views despite finding the whole process extremely difficult and restrictive.</p> <p>Positively prepared - This is not appropriate for Westhoughton or its residents. There is nothing positive about proposing to turn a large area of greenbelt land into industrial units. The plans will devastate the natural environment which has been so vital to local residents over the last two years.</p> <p>This proposal can not be justified. Westhoughton already has the Logistics North development, and the Wingates Industrial Estate. The area has more than its share of large industrial development for such a small town. The new development is not close to the motorway junction. Suggesting a new link road to the junction is not a justified solution. This would just move the traffic problem further along. We are aiming for a carbon neutral society. Producing more HGV vehicles emitting fumes, travelling between large distribution centres is not the answer.</p> <p>Effective - It is not effective taking a large area of greenbelt land for this development. There have to be other solutions found on either brownfield sites or land which is not under greenbelt protection.</p> <p>Legally compliant - The proposals will damage the environment and climate, and will not allow the quality of life for future generations to be maintained. They go against the governments own guidelines for greenbelt land, as outlined in the NPPF:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.To check unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas 2.To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. 3.To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. 4.To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns.

	<p>5.To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.</p> <p>There are no exceptional circumstances to justify this removal. Therefore it can not be legally compliant</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 my opinion, there are no modifications which can make this plan legally compliant and sound. The land should remain as greenbelt, for our children and future generations to enjoy. There are few benefits for the people of Westhoughton, and it only creates more pollution and problems for the environment.</p>