

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Schofield
Given Name	Dan
Person ID	1286973
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286973.png
Family Name	Schofield
Given Name	Dan
Person ID	1286973
Title	Our Vision
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286973.png
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>I refer to the PfE2021 and in particular the land East of Boothstown (Leigh Road) identified as housing allocation for around 300 dwellings (the Proposed Developed).</p> <p>I am a resident in an area affected by the PfE2021 and the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The test for soundness set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is whether the PfE2021 is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Positively prepared - providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area"s objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development; - Justified - an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence; - Effective- deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common group; and - Consistent with national policy - enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework. <p>I wish to make the following representations with respect to the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development:</p> <p>1. 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</p>

impact of the Proposed Development on the transport networks in my area. The area around the Proposed Development already suffers from heavy traffic congestion:

- a. 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;
- b. 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. Both the A572 and the surrounding roads are also used by traffic accessing the amenities at RHS Bridgewater.

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.

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.

2. 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.

3. 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.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>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.</p> <p>7. Other Representations: please see the Annex to this letter.</p> <p>I wish to participate in the Examination in Public and to be kept informed of the progress of PfE2021.</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.	As set out above.
Family Name	Schofield
Given Name	Dan
Person ID	1286973
Title	Our Strategic Objectives
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286973.png
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
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Family Name	Schofield
Given Name	Dan
Person ID	1286973
Title	Our Spatial Strategy
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286973.png

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

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	Schofield
Given Name	Dan
Person ID	1286973
Title	JPA 27: Land East of Boothstown
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286973.png
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>Dear Sirs</p> <p>Re: Submission of Representations in relation to the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Publication Draft 2021 (PfE2021)</p> <p>I refer to the PfE2021 and in particular the land East of Boothstown (Leigh Road) identified as housing allocation for around 300 dwellings (the Proposed Developed).</p> <p>I am a resident in an area affected by the PfE2021 and the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The test for soundness set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is whether the PfE2021 is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Positively prepared - providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area"s objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development; - Justified - an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence; - Effective- deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common group; and

- Consistent with national policy - enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

I wish to make the following representations with respect to the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development:

1. 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:

a. 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;

b. 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. Both the A572 and the surrounding roads are also used by traffic accessing the amenities at RHS Bridgewater.

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.

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.

2. 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.

3. 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,

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>7. Other Representations: please see the Annex to this letter.</p> <p>I wish to participate in the Examination in Public and to be kept informed of the progress of PfE2021.</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.	As set out above.
Family Name	Schofield
Given Name	Dan
Person ID	1286973
Title	Other Comments
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286973.png
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