

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Mcdermott
<b>Given Name</b>	Sarah
<b>Person ID</b>	1286727
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Mcdermott
<b>Given Name</b>	Sarah
<b>Person ID</b>	1286727
<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 write to regarding the proposed Places for Everyone site allocation of IPA35, land north of Mosley Common.</p> <p>I strongly object to the proposed development for the following reasons;</p> <p>Traffic - there are already awful levels of traffic in the area and the infrastructure as it currently stands cannot cope with the amount of traffic on the roads, let alone with additional cars that the new houses will bring with them, not just at this development but additional developments in the area (JPA27 East of Boothstown and JPA26 Hazelhurst Farm).</p> <p>Greenbelt Land - this land should only be used in "exceptional circumstances" I fail to understand how this condition has been met. There are already plenty of brownfield sites that could be developed which would fulfil demand. The greenbelt land acts as a boundary to stop urban sprawl and stop towns from merging into one another. It also protects the countryside so that local residents can use it for exercise and leisure. It is also a natural habitat for lots of wildlife which would be greatly affected by the proposal. The PfE is adding greenbelt land in it's proposal as it is consider to meet the purpose and conditions required, therefore how is it justified that this land doesn't meet the purpose and requirements of greenbelt when nothing has changed since it was first introduced as greenbelt. Global population growth and climate change are putting increasing pressure on land, and when we grow less than two-thirds of our own food. Now, more than ever, we need to avoid unnecessarily losing our countryside.</p> <p>Amenities - the area is not well served by local amenities, there is already a lack of shops, leisure facilities, GP's, dentists, nurseries and schools to cope with the needs of the current population size. No thought has been given as to how these amenities will cope with the increase in demand. Section 130(f) of the National Planning Framework states that new</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

developments should have sufficient amenities to support them and the current plans do not fulfil this requirement.

Housing Demand - the "Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Document" states that Wigan Council already has enough properties to meet levels of demand, if this is the case then why develop more, when the target has already been met. It also strengthens the argument for greenbelt land not to be used as the "exceptional circumstances" condition cannot be met.

Consultation - the process to feedback comments is unnecessarily lengthy and prohibits residents from submitting their opinions. Not only is the process obstructive but many residents have not been informed of the plans (the only notification I have seen is a small sign on a lamp post which was not easy to read and I could of easily missed it).

Living right on the Wigan/Salford border, I was not notified of the plans but should this development go ahead my family will be greatly affected by the strain imposed on the local facilities which are used by both Wigan and Salford residents in the Mosley Common/Ellenbrook area.

**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.**

I feel the proposed plans should be rejected in their entirety.