

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Rawsterne
<b>Given Name</b>	Alan
<b>Person ID</b>	1286036
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Rawsterne
<b>Given Name</b>	Alan
<b>Person ID</b>	1286036
<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>	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>It doesn't seem democratic having the Greater Manchester MP's and councillors from other GM authorities influencing what happens in parts of Greater Manchester that don't fall within their jurisdiction. For example, I can't ask an MP from Radcliffe to deal with any concern I might have if I don't live in his or her constituency.</p> <p>I believe the Greater Manchester Combined Authority Constitution is undemocratic (see: <a href="https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/media/1387/constitution_2018_final_.pdf">https://www.greatermanchester-ca.gov.uk/media/1387/constitution_2018_final_.pdf</a>) It's focus seems to be the "Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009". The legislation places a duty on local authorities to promote understanding of the functions and democratic arrangements of the authority among local people. I suggest the GMCA members are failing to do this and the GMCA constitution gives little or no consideration to the people (residents) who live in Greater Manchester.</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>	Too many issues to discuss here.
<b>Family Name</b>	Rawsterne
<b>Given Name</b>	Alan
<b>Person ID</b>	1286036
<b>Title</b>	Our Strategic Objectives

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Type	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>	<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>
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA
<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>	I don't know, I'm not a legal expert.
<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>	Too many issues to discuss here.