

<b>Family Name</b>	Ogden
<b>Given Name</b>	Joyce
<b>Person ID</b>	1287445
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Ogden
<b>Given Name</b>	Joyce
<b>Person ID</b>	1287445
<b>Title</b>	Our Strategic Objectives
<b>Type</b>	Web
<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>2. Create neighbourhoods of choice</p> <p>6. Promote the sustainable movement of people, goods and information</p> <p>8. Improve the quality of our natural environment and access to green spaces</p> <p>9. Ensure access to physical and social infrastructure</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Ogden
<b>Given Name</b>	Joyce
<b>Person ID</b>	1287445
<b>Title</b>	JPA 32: South of Hyde
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	NA
<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>Tameside is not in the Core Growth Area and is not in an area of high population growth and yet we are losing a large proportion of our Green Belt (proposals JPA32 and JPA31).</p> <p>JPA32 starts the ball rolling on effectively joining up the urban conurbations of Tameside with Woodley, Greave/ Romiley resulting in one urban mass with no open space relief.</p> <p>The road infrastructure, specifically the A560 Stockport Road, is already totally saturated with current traffic levels. Indeed the stretch of road from the traffic lights near Homebase in Bredbury to the Traveller's Call junction towards the M60 is at present downright dangerous and it is a miracle that there are not more collisions on this road which is far too narrow for the weight of traffic. At peak times the queues for traffic wanting to access the M60 at Bredbury extend back into Woodley and beyond. Assuming an</p>

average of 1.8 vehicles per new household, the JPA32 proposal could mean up to an additional ~800 vehicles a day trying to access the M60 via Bredbury or Hyde which is completely unsustainable.

There is much mention of Woodley train station in the proposals for JPA32 as part of the transport infrastructure. This station has no parking facilities and is off the busy but relatively narrow A560 with residents' cars parked on either side in near vicinity. At peak hours it can be difficult to navigate the parked cars when there are large vehicles (buses and lorries coming in the opposite direction). While it is admirable to encourage people to walk or cycle to Woodley train station, it is only really going to be of use to people who wish to commute on the Marple Rose Hill - Manchester Piccadilly line; not everyone works close to the stops on this line so there is still the potential for significant car use. Furthermore, how will people with disabilities who are unable to walk or cycle manage?

Gee Cross used to be a small village but with housing development it has grown considerably over the years. However it is important to appreciate that there are fewer shops and facilities in Gee Cross now than there were years ago. An influx of new residents will undoubtedly put strain on healthcare (there is no GP surgery in Gee Cross), schools, and other vital facilities, let alone the transport infrastructure.

The greenbelt in Gee Cross is enjoyed by so many people for walking, horse riding and other outdoor pursuits. From a personal perspective I am appalled that the current proposals could contemplate building on the wonderful open countryside which stretches beyond Lord Derby Road and Bowlacre Road. This proposal would be doing the reverse of the stated Objectives 8 and 10; the proposal will not maximise the health benefits of access to the natural environment and green spaces because these will be removed.

**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.**

A key question is on what basis the numbers of houses supposedly required for Tameside have been calculated to justify the loss of green belt; more details of the Brownfield Sites being considered should be forthcoming.