

<b>Family Name</b>	Lindley
<b>Given Name</b>	Sarah
<b>Person ID</b>	1287568
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Lindley
<b>Given Name</b>	Sarah
<b>Person ID</b>	1287568
<b>Title</b>	JPA 35: North of Mosley Common
<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>I believe the site allocation of JPA35 is a bad idea for the following reasons:</p> <p>Traffic</p> <p>Mosley Common and its surrounding areas already suffer from extremely poor traffic conditions, road use and bus services in the area are already over-subscribed with the town's current population, travelling during non peak times is also bad. As there are no rail transport options in the Mosley Common area, there is a higher reliance and need for residents to use car transportation in order to get around - this only worsening the traffic conditions on the road.</p> <p>By adding more buses to the (already heavily oversubscribed at peak hours) guided busway service, this will further impact local traffic at peak hours because many traffic light systems prioritise guided busway traffic over the standard road network.</p> <p>Residents struggle to go about their daily business currently as a result of the traffic situation. This will only worsen with the addition of more car journeys to the network.</p> <p>Lack of infrastructure and impact on local services</p> <p>The PfE plan does not provide suitable additions to local infrastructure to support the additional people who will be living in the area. There are no additional shops, dentists, gyms, play areas, post offices. The guided busway services are heavily oversubscribed at peak time and other forms of public transport are severely lacking.</p> <p>Green Belt Loss</p> <p>It is unnecessary to remove this land from the greenbelt. There is sufficient land available in brownfield sites to satisfy demand. Loss of this greenbelt land from around Mosley Common will result in a severe reduction of amenity.</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>It does not appear that the exceptional circumstances test has been met to remove this land from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Wildlife Loss</p> <p>The proposed site allocation is made up of numerous fields and woodland areas - there is an abundance of wildlife that live within this part of the green belt. The plans will eliminate habitats and territories for hundreds of species.</p> <p>Land not suitable to build on</p> <p>The land was formerly used for mining and regularly floods. The access roads proposed from Mort Lane and Wellington drive are completely unsuitable as Mort Lane is frequently bumper to bumper with traffic and Wellington drive is a quiet residential road. When the high pressure gas main was laid throughout the site archaeological remains of the roman road were exposed.</p> <p>Air Pollution</p> <p>The site will be adjacent to the new greater Manchester clean air zone and will add significant extra emissions in the form of vehicular traffic.</p> <p>The main road in and out of the area is via Mosley Common road, this road is regularly congested with slow moving traffic and produces a lot of pollution/emissions from cars. This road runs straight in front of a primary school (St Johns Mosley Common Junior &amp; Infant School) - pollution and deadly toxins will be rife in the area during school hours.</p>
<p><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></p>	<p>More concession needs to be made to support the wildlife in the area - there are a number of areas in the site allocation which has great crested newts. THESE ARE PROTECTED BY LAW. We cannot build on a site which has such a huge and varied wildlife population without clear plans to relocate them - if left they will either die or be forced into inappropriate urban areas.</p> <p>I worry for the residents and the children of the area - if the green space that they all use and benefit from disappears I know there will be a sharp increase in mental health and wellbeing issues. The green belt helps us mentally and physically as well as teaching us about nature, animals and the world.</p> <p>The plans have highlighted they will help improve some junctions in the area - this WILL NOT resolve the traffic issues in the area. Even during non peak times the traffic is terrible, bumper to bumper. Either brand new roads are needed in the area or the plans need to be in a different location - the infrastructure can not take much more.</p> <p>People have openly said that they either wouldnt move to the area or are moving away from the area because the traffic is so bad they cant bare to be stuck in it at least twice a day 5 days a week.</p>
<p><b>Family Name</b></p>	<p>Lindley</p>
<p><b>Given Name</b></p>	<p>Sarah</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1287568</p>
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Salford - Green Belt Additions</p>
<p><b>Type</b></p>	<p>Web</p>
<p><b>GBA Salford - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this District your response relates to - then respond to the questions below</b></p>	<p>Salford GBA29 Land West of Burgess Farm</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<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>This green belt addition is proposed as they remove the green belt north of mosley common.</p> <p>Firstly, this land is already green and woodland which people use - so this is just going to be a status change rather than a creation of green space!</p> <p>Secondly, this space is so far away that it is basically unusable by local residents as its too far away to walk to! Leaving mosley common with no green space.</p>
<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>	<p>Dont take all of our current green belt space in mosley common - its so much for so many.</p>