

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<b>Title</b>	Other Comments
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<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>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<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>	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>Not enough information has been made available to the general public so that a fair and detailed examination could be carried out. In particular in Rochdale small notice pinned to telegraph poles etc in out of the way places in my opinion does not represent an honest attempt to inform the general public of what this plan sets out to do.</p> <p>This process has been ongoing for six or seven years and much of the detailing and information is now out of date and consequently flawed</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>The use of up to date information would and should be used. The majority of the plan is based upon the pre covid state. The post covid world is a much changed place. Demands for industry and housing have changed during this last two years</p> <p>The plan should be withdrawn from the examination and a further public consultation should now take place in this post covid world.</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<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>	<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>	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>	Out of date information and the changed world following covid, this plan no longer reflects the current state of Greater Manchester
<b>Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to</b>	The plan should be withdrawn and a further consultation with the public should now take place using up to date information.

<b>make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.</b>	
<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<b>Title</b>	Our Spatial Strategy
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<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>The public consultation has been very poor. The opportunity for the public to inspect the documentation has been affected and eroded due to the covid epidemic and the Local Authorities reluctance quite rightly to keep the usual places where the public can gain access to examine the the details</p> <p>Regards Effective there is very little within the strategy regarding partners and industries that will give assistance in the undertaking of this section of the plan</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>The public consultations should be repeated now that public buildings are opening giving the public the opportunity to really understand the intentions of Greater Manchester. And on top of this the detailing should be in crystal clear English to give everyone a complete understanding, with no clouding of any issues.</p> <p>Major partners should be identified.</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 1 Core Growth Area
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<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>	Same comments as Spatial Strategy above
<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>	Same comments as Spatial Strategy above
<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 2 City Centre
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<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</b>	Same comments as Spatial Strategy above

<b>comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	
<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>	Same comments as Spatial Strategy above
<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 3 The Quays
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<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>	Same comments as Spatial Strategy above
<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>	Same comments as Spatial Strategy above
<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 4 Port Salford
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<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>	Same comments as Spatial Strategy above
<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>	Same comments as Spatial Strategy above
<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 7 North East Growth Corridor
<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>	NA
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	NA

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<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>The plan does not meet the requirements for sustainable development. Land is a scarce resource. The plan appears only to outline the benefits of housing , transport, employment land but very little on the effects of development and the impacts this has .</p> <p>Examples included increased carbon emissions , effect on the rural economy, the effect of the loss of green space on the mental and physical health of residents and possible cost of increased needs for health care</p> <p>Green space which will be more than decimated if the plan goes ahead has been identified as a necessity during this pandemic and to see more disappear will have a detrimental effect on the population</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>Changes in land use on health and carbon emissions should be fully evaluated and given more weight in the decisions on green field and green belt land. Therefore the plan needs to re written to comply with national legislation</p>
<p><b>Family Name</b></p>	<p>Scanlon</p>
<p><b>Given Name</b></p>	<p>Andrew</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1287228</p>
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>JP-Strat 10 Manchester Airport</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>NA</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>The plan is to double the capacity of the airport over the period. This cannot be consistent with the intention to reduce and even become carbon neutral.</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</b></p>	<p>The plan needs re-evaluating and re-written to comply with National legislation</p>

<b>of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.</b>	
<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 13 Strategic Green Infrastructure
<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>	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>Information regarding loss of green land and green belts not presented in an easily understandable form. The plan states "The plan will provide opportunities enhance new and existing wild life and geological sites". How can this be when existing greenbelt is being decimated. The plan is unsound on this basis.</p> <p>There is also doubt as to whether it is compliant with National Policy os sustainable development</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>	The plan needs to babe re-written in a more understandable format so that the amount of green land and green belt land is easily calculable and also preferably in crystal clear English not in planning speak.
<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 14 A Sustainable and Integrated Transport Network
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	NA



Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<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>The proposal is not appropriate for my locality and cannot be achieved . Main roads are already at full capacity and these are crumbling under the existing volume of traffic.</p> <p>The proposal can neither be achieved or within the timescale provided. The idea that 50% of the population, bearing in mind that we are an ageing population will get on their bikes on the already busy roads or walk is just pie in the sky</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>	The Sustainable transport strategy requires an immediate overhaul. The plan requires a major revision.
<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<b>Title</b>	JP-S 1 Sustainable Development
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<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>	The plan does not meet the requirements of sustainable development. The plan only appears to outline the benefits of housing, transport, employment land, but very little on the effects of development and the impact it has.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<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>	Changes in land use health and carbon emissions should be fully evaluated and given more weight in the decision on green field and green belt land. The plan needs to be re-written to comply with national legislation
<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<b>Title</b>	JP-S 2 Carbon and Energy
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<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>	The policy is not effective or achievable in the timescale required. The Government strategy is carbon neutral by 2050
<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>	The plan is not consistent with National Policy and therefore requires a re-write
<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<b>Title</b>	JP-S 3 Heat and Energy Networks

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	NA
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	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>	The proposal will not be achievable in the time scale required. Details of how and when these changes are to be made is almost none existent. Without such detailing a forecast cannot be proven. Mention is made of district heating schemes. Rochdale had such a system in the past and this was ripped out due to lack of economy so how come it will be more economic in the future?
<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>	Much more detailing and programming is required to justify the section of the plan. Needs re-writing
Family Name	Scanlon
Given Name	Andrew
Person ID	1287228
Title	JP-S 4 Resilience
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	NA
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
<b>Redacted reasons - Please give us details</b>	Without submitted evidence it is not possible to determine whether the resilience proposals are realistic. it is also impossible to know whether all

<b>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>	the alternatives have been considered. At the minute it appears to be a wish list
<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>	More details are required on this section. The plan needs re-writing
<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<b>Title</b>	JP-S 5 Flood Risk and Water Environment
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<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>	The proposals cannot be achieved in the time allocated. New development and associated drainage appears to stop at the boundary of the development. The could and surface water then runs into the existing over capacity main sewers. In many areas of the GM swallow holes are forming due to the precarious state of our ancient drainage systems. Additional flow will only make the situation worse. Run off from the developments onto surrounding areas will lead to more flooding
<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</b>	More detailing and concrete ideas are required with necessary legal duties on developers a are required and written into the plan. The plan needs re-writing

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>you have identified above.</b>	
<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<b>Title</b>	JP-H 1 Scale Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA
<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>	The housing estimates for my locality are based on assumptions that are out of date and are significantly higher than the current requirement. The majority appear to be built on green belt and therefore no in line with the national policy viz building on brown field sites
<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>	The plan requires re-writing to comply with current data and in accordance with national policy
<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<b>Title</b>	JP-D1 Infrastructure Implementation
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<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>	The proposals although laudable are not achievable in many instances. Services at present are at full capacity and without a major investment and the further use of green field and green belt over and above the proposed developments will not be achievable
<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>	The out of date housing and industry proposals require a more detailed approach based on current data. The plan requires a re-write
<b>Family Name</b>	Scanlon
<b>Given Name</b>	Andrew
<b>Person ID</b>	1287228
<b>Title</b>	Rochdale - Green Belt Additions
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>GBA Rochdale - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this District your response relates to - then respond to the questions below</b>	Rochdale GBA19 Land to west of Stakehill Business Park
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	NA
<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>	NA
<b>Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not</b>	This area of land is already being used as allotments , school playing fields and pasture land. It has no other economic use. To count this as additional green belt is dubious to say the least.

**to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.**

**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.**

There is no real need to classify this as green belt and the Council should not be allowed to use this to reduce the area of green belt being taken for development.