

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Orford
Given Name	Rob
Person ID	1287179
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Include files	PFERobOrford.pdf PFERobOrford_Email_Redacted.pdf
Family Name	Orford
Given Name	Rob
Person ID	1287179
Title	Our Vision
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
Family Name	Orford
Given Name	Rob
Person ID	1287179
Title	Our Strategic Objectives
Type	Web
Our strategic objectives - Considering the information provided for our strategic objectives, please tick which of these objectives your written comment refers to:	1. Meet our housing need
Family Name	Orford
Given Name	Rob
Person ID	1287179
Title	JPA 26: Land at Hazelhurst Farm
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
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>I wish to make the following representations with respect to the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic: only three possible points of access - off various cul de sacs from Hazelhurst Road, off Richmond Drive via service road alongside East Lancashire Road, Partington Street and directly off the East Lancashire Road near to M61 slip road. 2. Congestion: 400 hundred houses could mean up to 800 extra vehicles using Hazelhurst Road (already unsuitable for additional vehicles), access to and from the East Lancashire Road, access to Worsley Road (already heavily congested). 3. Pollution: Atmospheric pollution from queuing vehicles from the motorway and the East Lancashire Road (already one of the worst in Europe). Noise pollution. 4. Ecology: Nature conservation the land includes and is adjacent to areas of biological importance/Worsley Woods all of which could be adversely impacted by the development of a large number of houses. 5. Greenbelt: Greenbelt was designated in the first place to protect it from development the loss of which would have a detrimental affect on the surrounding areas. Green belt should remain a natural buffer between built up areas providing some natural space for local people. Regard should be had for public rights of way which give people access to a small piece of countryside in an urban area. 6. Public Transport: Worsley is badly provided for in terms of public transport with only one main route into Manchester along the East Lancashire Road but this is mainly oversubscribed from Leigh and Wigan. There are no bus services along Hazelhurst Road making access to doctors surgeries, hospitals, shops and schools extremely difficult. 7. Schools: Although it is suggested that a new primary school could be built as part of the development (subject to funding) it would have added implications from those travelling from a wider area to the school in relation to further local congestion. 8. General infrastructure: As mentioned lack of suitable road network, access to the site, access to most other services (Shops, Doctors, Chemists and hospitals) Is there adequate access to main sewers without overloading existing sewers (already flood problems in the area). 9. This site should be removed from the Greater Manchester plan (Places for Everyone) but priority should instead be given those sites which do not have the constraints of Hazelhurst Farm. Greenbelt or Green Field sites should not be built on until all brown field sites have been exhausted. The council published its most recent brownfield land register in December 2020. It identifies brownfield sites with the potential to accommodate over 8,800 new homes across the borough.
Family Name	Orford
Given Name	Rob
Person ID	1287179

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Title	JPA 27: Land East of Boothstown
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
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>I wish to make the following representations with respect to the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increased Traffic Congestion - the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 104 and 105 of the Framework. The PfE2021 does not take into account the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport networks in my area. The area around the Proposed Development already suffers from heavy traffic congestion: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the A572 (Leigh Road) is at maximum capacity and there are no plans in place to address the issues arising from the current volume of traffic using this road; the surrounding roads to the A572 and the Proposed Development (Ellenbrook Road, Walkden Road, Worsley Road and Barton Road) are also subject to heavy traffic flow on a regular basis, including the exit (junction 13) off the M60. Both the A572 and the surrounding roads are also used by traffic accessing the amenities at RHS Bridgewater. <p>I regularly cycle along these roads at around 5pm in the evening and the traffic already queues back along the A572 all the way back to Worsley Brow roundabout and down the M60 junction 13 slip road. I have video footage showing the extent of the problem and impact on my safety as a cyclist, with cars pulling out in front of me & passing too close due to the volume of traffic on the roads.</p> <p>The addition of 300 dwellings will only lead to an increase in the traffic congestion in an area in which the transport network is already under considerable strain.</p> <p>In terms of public transport services, Worsley and Boothstown are not well connected. The main public transport services are the buses on the East Lancashire Road (a service which is already oversubscribed). Bus services within Boothstown itself have been seriously curtailed in recent years.</p> Increased Air and Noise Pollution: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 93, 104(d) and 105 of the Framework. Due to the close proximity of the M60 and the existing heavy traffic flow on the A572, our area has a high level of air and noise pollution. The Green Belt land in our area acts as an important buffer for the air and noise pollution. Lack of Suitable Infrastructure: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraph 93 of the Framework. The PfE2021 does not address how the use of shared spaces, community facilities and other local services (for example, GPs, dentists, schools, etc) will be enhanced to sustain the increase in population

due to the Proposed Development. In particular, the local schools in this area are already oversubscribed so children will have to travel greater distances to access both primary and secondary education.

4. Destruction of Open Space: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraph 99 of the Framework. The site of the Proposed Development is existing open space and none of the following apply:

- a. an assessment has not been undertaken which clearly shows that the open space is surplus to requirements. The open space is close to many heritage sites and also RHS Bridgewater and the Framework acknowledges that an open spaces purpose may simply be as an area of local countryside;
- b. it has not been demonstrated that the loss of Green Belt resulting from the Proposed Development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision for the community in this area in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; and
- c. the Proposed Development is not for alternative sports and recreation provision.

5. Destruction of the Green Belt: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 137, 140, 141, 147 and 149 of the Framework. The PfE2021 does not recognise the importance of the site of the Proposed Development to prevent urban sprawl. The Framework states that there must be exceptional circumstances which justify the alteration of the boundaries of Green Belt land. In this case there are no exceptional circumstances and furthermore the Proposed Development is an inappropriate development. I also note that there are alternative brownfield sites available in this area which can be used for development.

6. Negative Impact on Local Ecology: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 120(b) and 174(b) of the Framework. Alderwood forms part of the site of the Proposed Development. It is a quiet rural environment which is used for physical and mental wellbeing activities.

This site should be removed from the Greater Manchester plan (Places for Everyone) priority should instead be given those sites which do not have the constraints of this site. Greenbelt or Green Field sites should not be built on until all brown field sites have been exhausted. The council published its most recent brownfield land register in December 2020. It identifies brownfield sites with the potential to accommodate over 8,800 new homes across the borough.

Family Name	Orford
Given Name	Rob
Person ID	1287179
Title	JPA 35: North of Mosley Common
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA

Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
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>I wish to make the following representations with respect to the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Increased Traffic Congestion - the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 104 and 105 of the Framework. The PfE2021 does not take into account the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport networks in my area. The area around the Proposed Development already suffers from heavy traffic congestion: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the A577 (Mosley Common Road) is at maximum capacity and there are no plans in place to address the issues arising from the current volume of traffic using this road. This road already queues from the junction with A5082 (Mort Lane) all the way to the junction with the A580 (East Lancashire Road); the surrounding roads to the Proposed Development (A5082 Mort Lane, B5232 Bridgewater Road & A580 East Lancashire Road) are also subject to heavy traffic flow on a regular basis, including the Junction with Mosley Common Road & the East Lancashire Road. The area by St John's school and Eddie's motor spares is a bottleneck due to insufficient parking for current residents and this would only be exacerbated by this proposed development. <p>I regularly cycle along these roads at around 5pm in the evening and the traffic already queues from Mort Lane junction along Mosley Common Road to the junction with the East Lancashire Road. I have video footage showing the extent of the problem and impact on my safety as a cyclist, with cars pulling out in front of me & passing too close due to the volume of traffic on the roads.</p> <p>The addition of 1100 dwellings will only lead to an increase in the traffic congestion & pollution in an area in which the transport network is already under considerable strain.</p> <p>In terms of public transport services, there are no nearby train stations and the guided busway is already heavily subscribed with most buses arriving at Sale Lane/Newearth Road stops already full with passengers at rush hours.</p> Increased Air and Noise Pollution: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 93, 104(d) and 105 of the Framework. Due to the existing heavy traffic flow along the A577 Mosley Common Road, our area has a high level of air and noise pollution. With constantly queuing traffic along Mosley Common Road, the air pollution is already bad at morning & evening rush hours with cars stationary and engines running. The Green Belt land in our area acts as an important buffer for the air and noise pollution. Lack of Suitable Infrastructure: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraph 93 of the Framework. The PfE2021 does not address how the use of shared spaces, community facilities and other local services (for example, GPs, dentists, schools, etc) will be enhanced to sustain the increase in population due to the Proposed Development. In particular, the local schools in this area are already oversubscribed so children will have to travel greater distances to access both primary and secondary education. Destruction of the Green Belt: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 137, 140, 141, 147 and 149 of the Framework. The PfE2021 does not recognise the importance of the site of the Proposed Development to prevent urban sprawl. The Framework states that there must be exceptional circumstances

which justify the alteration of the boundaries of Green Belt land. In this case there are no exceptional circumstances and furthermore the Proposed Development is an inappropriate development. I also note that there are alternative brownfield sites available in this area which can be used for development.

5. Negative Impact on Local Ecology: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 120(b) and 174(b) of the Framework. This area North of Mosley Common is a quiet rural environment which is used for physical and mental wellbeing activities, along paths which transverse the fields.

This site should be removed from the Greater Manchester plan (Places for Everyone) priority should instead be given those sites which do not have the constraints of this site. Greenbelt or Green Field sites should not be built on until all brown field sites have been exhausted. Using Places for Everyone own numbers, Wigan has more supply identified than the amount they need to deliver over 17 years with some to spare. This is without any greenbelt allocations - section 7.12 of the plan states that there is enough supply to meet the need.