

Family Name	Rogers
Given Name	Stephanie
Person ID	1287454
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Rogers
Given Name	Stephanie
Person ID	1287454
Title	Our Vision
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
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>Traffic has been a problem for years, and you have compounded this issue with the developments already in place, to give credence to Peel for more of these "affordable" "places for everyone" malarkey is making a fool out of our council, and makes you appear both weak and greedy. The congestion commuters are already facing in Boothstown is at a complete gridlock from the surrounding areas which also have new developments, add this to the every increasing visitors to the RHS and you have a pollution nightmare, and all this when you are trying to achieve "cleaner" air will not be helping. You were also so very naive in the belief of the guided busway, and the new developments that it would attract families with just 1 or no cars, such a joke! Each house you build should have had the capacity to keep 2 cars on the drive a minimum and the garages you have signed off on are unusable and nothing more than a glorified shed for tools and storage.</p> <p>Carrying on with pollution, the queues to gain access to the M60 start well before Boothstown, and you allow all these vehicles to traipse through what once was a tiny village, with a small main road which barely allows two cars to safely pass each other once there are parked vehicles, this results in the hours and hours of standstill traffic, causing untold amounts of pollution which our children are unbeknownst breathing this all in Monday to Friday whilst waiting for their school bus, which incidentally is always late due to the shear amount of traffic coming from Ellenbook side into Boothstown.</p> <p>This also takes us on to the increased noise pollution too, which I understand you have already agreed this will be an issue due to the proximity to Leigh Road?</p> <p>Alderwood which forms part of this site provides a quiet rural environment in what is generally an urban area. This development could have a serious affect on the woods, already allowing RHS to be built and killing most of the family of wild roe deer was savage enough, but to now also take away their</p>

last remaining fields is unforgiveable and will have a severe detrimental affect on the area.

Ask yourself why, even though you are well over the 100% requirement for "places for everyone" are you hell bent on allocating more 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.

Going back to the guided busway, myself and my family are reasonably fir and we CAN walk to the guided busway, which is the only direct route into Manchester since you savaged the bus routes from Boothtown, but how did this affect the elderly, infirm or disabled? Do you believe that agreeing to this additonal houses will bring only fit and healthy people? No disable? No elderly? The guided busway is also so very over-subscribed from Leigh and Wigan. Are you expecting them all to have their own cars? Oh wait, that"s right, you"re not building houses with enough room for vehicles to be kept off road because they will be using the non-existent public transport!

Along with transport in and out of the village, what about schools? Dentists (i"ll let you now, there are non in the area now, I have to travel 10 miles to my own?! GP"s (again, our local Facebook page is regularly filled with threads on not being able to see a GP due to the demand on an already overworked surgery! If you do not have sufficient requirements for the residence of the areas at the moment, then there should NEVER be any agreements for more housing without these amenities being built FIRST, not just agreed to in planning, but physically BUILT and up and running first! Without this you are only creating even more congestion on the roads with residence trying to commute out of the area.

This site is in close proximity to many heritage assets and the RHS Bridgewater Gardens. This development could significantly harm the setting of these heritage assets.

Flooding, we have a severe problem in Boothstown since the building of even more houses in the area, I relocated here over 20 years ago and we never had such issues, now its a weekly occurrence should we have a heavy downpour. Local businesses are suffering already with the impact of COVID and yet you deem it responsible to agree for Peel build even more shoddy houses on the few flood plains we have left, it really is a disgrace.

<p>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.</p>	<p>The entirety of not just Boothstown, but Ellenbrook and Mosely Common should be removed from the Greater Manchester plan (Places for Everyone) priority should instead be given to those sites which do not have the constraints of these sites. Greenbelt or Green Field sites should not be built on until all brown field sites have been exhausted and this is in the whole of Greater Manchester!</p>
<p>Family Name</p>	<p>Rogers</p>
<p>Given Name</p>	<p>Stephanie</p>
<p>Person ID</p>	<p>1287454</p>
<p>Title</p>	<p>Our Strategic Objectives</p>
<p>Type</p>	<p>Web</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<p>Our strategic objectives - Considering the information provided for our strategic objectives, please tick which of these objectives your written comment refers to:</p>	<p>1. Meet our housing need 7. Ensure that districts involved are more resilient and carbon neutral 8. Improve the quality of our natural environment and access to green spaces 9. Ensure access to physical and social infrastructure 10. Promote the health and wellbeing of communities</p>
<p>Soundness - Positively prepared?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Justified?</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Soundness - Effective?</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Compliance - Legally compliant?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>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>	<p>As above, you really are purposely making this long and difficult in the hope people abandon having their say! Traffic has been a problem for years, and you have compounded this issue with the developments already in place, to give credence to Peel for more of these "affordable" "places for everyone" malarkey is making a fool out of our council, and makes you appear both weak and greedy. The congestion commuters are already facing in Boothstown is at a complete gridlock from the surrounding areas which also have new developments, add this to the every increasing visitors to the RHS and you have a pollution nightmare, and all this when you are trying to achieve "cleaner" air will not be helping. You were also so very naive in the belief of the guided busway, and the new developments that it would attract families with just 1 or no cars, such a joke! Each house you build should have had the capacity to keep 2 cars on the drive a minimum and the garages you have signed off on are unusable and nothing more than a glorified shed for tools and storage.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Salford are not required under the national requirements to build any further housing in the area. You are NOT prioritising Brownfield over greenbelt, there have been a brownfield site in Boothstown for over 15 years and you have not even attempted to build on this, just our ever decreasing greenbelt. The infrastructure is NOT there to support these houses. There will NOT be any reduction in inequalities or but will almost certainly decrease prosperity and devalue the entire area, also rendering us all uninsurable due to increased flooding already happening in the area. We certainly won't be carbon neutral with the increased emissions from the 2-3 additional vehicles per house! And how can you improve the access to natural outdoors, when your plan is to pave the entire lot over!! NOt everyone can afford to buy a pass for the RHS is that was your thinking behind that jibberish! And no one will be productive when commuting becomes either impossible or is even left at the standard we are already at, taking hours to get to a job is NEVER going to be productive in anyone's eyes really is it? COME ON SALFORD, GET IT TOGETHER AND BACK THE RESIDENTS OF YOUR AREA UP WITH THIS!</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Rogers
Given Name	Stephanie
Person ID	1287454
Title	Our Spatial Strategy
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
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>Salford are not required under the national requirements to build any further housing in the area.</p> <p>You are NOT prioritising Brownfield over greenbelt, there have been a brownfield site in Boothstown for over 15 years and you have not even attempted to build on this, just our ever decreasing greenbelt.</p> <p>The infrastructure is NOT there to support these houses.</p> <p>There will NOT be any reduction in inequalities or but will almost certainly decrease prosperity and devalue the entire area, also rendering us all uninsurable due to increased flooding already happening in the area.</p> <p>We certainly won't be carbon neutral with the increased emissions from the 2-3 additional vehicles per house!</p> <p>And how can you improve the access to natural outdoors, when your plan is to pave the entire lot over!! NOT everyone can afford to buy a pass for the RHS is that was your thinking behind that jibberish!</p> <p>And no one will be productive when commuting becomes either impossible or is even left at the standard we are already at, taking hours to get to a job is NEVER going to be productive in anyone's eyes really is it?</p> <p>COME ON SALFORD, GET IT TOGETHER AND BACK THE RESIDENTS OF YOUR AREA UP WITH THIS!</p>
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.	Pull this area, until every brownfield site of built on first.
Family Name	Rogers
Given Name	Stephanie
Person ID	1287454
Title	JP-Strat 1 Core Growth Area

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
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>Salford are not required under the national requirements to build any further housing in the area.</p> <p>You are NOT prioritising Brownfield over greenbelt, there have been a brownfield site in Boothstown for over 15 years and you have not even attempted to build on this, just our ever decreasing greenbelt.</p> <p>The infrastructure is NOT there to support these houses.</p> <p>There will NOT be any reduction in inequalities or but will almost certainly decrease prosperity and devalue the entire area, also rendering us all uninsurable due to increased flooding already happening in the area.</p> <p>We certainly won't be carbon neutral with the increased emissions from the 2-3 additional vehicles per house!</p> <p>And how can you improve the access to natural outdoors, when your plan is to pave the entire lot over!! NOT everyone can afford to buy a pass for the RHS is that was your thinking behind that jibberish!</p> <p>And no one will be productive when commuting becomes either impossible or is even left at the standard we are already at, taking hours to get to a job is NEVER going to be productive in anyone's eyes really is it?</p> <p>COME ON SALFORD, GET IT TOGETHER AND BACK THE RESIDENTS OF YOUR AREA UP WITH THIS!</p>
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.	Pull this area, until every brownfield site of built on first.
Family Name	Rogers
Given Name	Stephanie
Person ID	1287454
Title	JP-Strat 2 City Centre
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?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
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.	If you gridlock the area with more vehicles, increase flooding and have zero increase in infrastructure, you cannot have any compliance, see previous boxes, it"s all relevant to each one of these ridiculous questions
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.	Pull this area, until every brownfield site of built on first.
Family Name	Rogers
Given Name	Stephanie
Person ID	1287454
Title	JP-Strat 3 The Quays
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Sound
Soundness - Justified?	Sound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Sound
Soundness - Effective?	Sound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	Yes
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	Yes
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	Yes, the quays are a perfect brownfield site to build on!

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	
Family Name	Rogers
Given Name	Stephanie
Person ID	1287454
Title	JP-Strat 4 Port Salford
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Sound
Soundness - Justified?	Sound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Sound
Soundness - Effective?	Sound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	Yes
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	Yes
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.	Again yes, more developments here
Family Name	Rogers
Given Name	Stephanie
Person ID	1287454
Title	JP-Strat 5 Inner Areas
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Sound
Soundness - Justified?	Sound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Sound
Soundness - Effective?	Sound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	Yes
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	Yes
Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to	Yes, langworthy area has been destitute for decades

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	
Family Name	Rogers
Given Name	Stephanie
Person ID	1287454
Title	JP-Strat 6 Northern Areas
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Family Name	Rogers
Given Name	Stephanie
Person ID	1287454
Title	JP-G 10 Green Belt
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Family Name	Rogers
Given Name	Stephanie
Person ID	1287454
Title	Other Comments
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No