

<b>Family Name</b>	Mcgrath
<b>Given Name</b>	Sue
<b>Person ID</b>	1287221
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Mcgrath
<b>Given Name</b>	Sue
<b>Person ID</b>	1287221
<b>Title</b>	Our Vision
<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>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>The vision as laid out here is directly contradicted by the reality of what is actually happening at this moment in Greater Manchester and looks set to continue. For example, Oldham are currently trying to force through speculative volume housing developments that are not needed by anyone, (housing for greed not need by volume housebuilders). Developments which will cause environmental destruction, (including driving a road through an ancient woodland), increased air pollution and traffic problems and additional pressure on local schools and healthcare systems. Such unwanted speculative housing schemes with the resultant problems they bring are becoming an increasingly common problem throughout Greater Manchester as well as nationally. This is underpinned and supported by the actions of the Unitary Authority actively encouraging the continued destruction of Manchester's history and architecture by speculative developments of housing for greed, (there is no actual need for the flats in the city centre since they are unaffordable for most people and are designed purely around the fashionable choices of the affluent), and unnecessary and equally speculative commercial office developments creating a miserable, grey and excessively bland city centre devoid of any of those individual and graceful architectural characteristics that gave visual representation of our history as a Northern industrial city.</p> <p>On top of this is the Clean Air proposal which, strangely but not surprisingly, appears to not be tackling head on the most common air polluters - private cars but will be adding costs to public transport, (including taxis), and commercial vehicle traffic. Even though public transport makes a hugely valuable and "no-brainer" contribution to the reduction in air pollution by reducing car journeys, when properly managed, and commercial vehicle traffic is required for deliveries to businesses in the city centre. Adding costs to public transport will of course hit those dependent on this to get to work and other activities and actually penalise people who may have made a</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>choice to travel by public transport as a way of contributing to the fight against climate change, perhaps even forcing them back into their cars.</p> <p>All the above make the vision statement untrue and pointless as what is actually happening on the ground is the very opposite of what the Council states are its aims.</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>The vision does not need to be changed. Your plan and actions now and in the future need to reflect your stated aims.</p>
<p><b>Family Name</b></p>	<p>Mcgrath</p>
<p><b>Given Name</b></p>	<p>Sue</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1287221</p>
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Our Strategic Objectives</p>
<p><b>Type</b></p>	<p>Web</p>
<p><b>Our strategic objectives - Considering the information provided for our strategic objectives, please tick which of these objectives your written comment refers to:</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Meet our housing need</li> <li>2. Create neighbourhoods of choice</li> <li>3. Ensure a thriving and productive economy in the districts involved</li> <li>4. Maximise the potential arising from our national and international assets</li> <li>5. Reduce inequalities and improve prosperity</li> <li>6. Promote the sustainable movement of people, goods and information</li> <li>7. Ensure that districts involved are more resilient and carbon neutral</li> <li>8. Improve the quality of our natural environment and access to green spaces</li> <li>9. Ensure access to physical and social infrastructure</li> <li>10. Promote the health and wellbeing of communities</li> </ol>
<p><b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Justified?</b></p>	<p>NA</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b></p>	<p>NA</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Effective?</b></p>	<p>NA</p>
<p><b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b></p>	<p>NA</p>
<p><b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b></p>	<p>NA</p>
<p><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</b></p>	<p>They all seem to reference the environment, social justice and housing issues. However, there is:</p> <p>no definite commitment against environmental destruction;</p> <p>stated presumption against development in greenbelt;</p> <p>no commitment to actually expanding and looking after our green spaces;</p> <p>no presumption against speculative volume housing development;</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<p><b>co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b></p>	<p>no commitment to improvement of existing housing stock instead of building new; no commitment to at least looking at ways to make existing housing stock affordable by controlling rents and putting pressure on estate agents to control house prices and profiteering on older stock.</p> <p>Your statements about public transport appear to be directly contradicted by your plans to penalise public transport providers with the clean air charges. Unless this is supported by an active effort by the Council and the Mayor to get public transport providers to move to electric and hybrid vehicles it has no benefit outside being a source of revenue to the Unitary Authority.</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>There needs to be definitive commitment to the above mentioned.</p>
<p><b>Family Name</b></p>	<p>Mcgrath</p>
<p><b>Given Name</b></p>	<p>Sue</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1287221</p>
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>JPA 14: Broadbent Moss</p>
<p><b>Type</b></p>	<p>Web</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Justified?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Effective?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b></p>	<p>NA</p>
<p><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>	<p>I would refer you to the following:</p> <p>NPPF 35d - the area"s objectively assessed needs - your proposals do not meet these.</p> <p>PfE 8.7 - your own plans refer to the distinctive character of the area yet plan to destroy it through your proposals to encourage the building of housing that is not needed in this area as it will not be affordable and is not housing for those that actually need a home, (see current plan for executive homes which Oldham is trying to force through and destroy ancient woodland in the process).</p> <p>The Preliminary Ecological Analysis 2020 p.22 for this area refers to the need to retain woodland, wet grassland and ponds - no definitive commitment is made in the PfE to how this will be done or even that it will be done.</p> <p>You refer to increasing resilience to climate change for Greater Manchester yet propose to actively encourage the building of 1450 homes in an area with "medium to high probability" of flooding surrounding the River Beal,</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

(please see the Environment Agency report quoted in the GMSF Concept Report for this area.