

Family Name	Seward
Given Name	Geoffrey
Person ID	1286892
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Seward
Given Name	Geoffrey
Person ID	1286892
Title	Our Vision
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>VISION: The needs of Bury for compliance with this plan has not been established in any meaningful way within the Town itself or the surrounding communities that will be severely impacted. Bury's future housing need is ill defined and based on largely out of date calculations. The Housing Need Assessment was carried out by Arc4, who were supposed to carry out a non-biased survey of housing need. However, they have a partnership with Greater Manchester Housing Partnership, an organisation of housing associations, including Six Town Housing in Bury. The assessment was therefore not impartial.</p> <p>The loss of the Walshaw site greenbelt has been partially offset by creating extensive but unusable greenbelt in other areas without justifying exceptional circumstances. This is not in accordance with National Policy. The true value of the walshaw greenbelt is not presented in a meaningful way as it provides a buffer to urban sprawl that would result from the plan and its use during the Covid emergency as been invaluable to the mental health and general wellbeing of many community residents.</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.	Evaluate (1) Bury's true housing need over the coming 10 -15 years and (2) make sure development is Brownfield as much as possible and sited in the most sustainable locations which reduce the need for car travel, for example by maximising residential densities around transport hubs.
Family Name	Seward

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Given Name	Geoffrey
Person ID	1286892
Title	JPA 9: Walshaw
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?	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>The GM allocation 9 Walshaw is unsound because of the opacity of the site selection process for housing. Bury MBC have not been able to provide minutes of meetings to show when discussed and who was present. (borderline legality issues?) The needs of the Walshaw/Tottington community have been overlooked and treasured green open space as a buffer to urban sprawl linking the communities with Bury have been dismissed. Mass urbanisation of communities is not sound policy particularly when they do not relate to areas of planned industrial growth or sound means of transport infrastructure to the City of Manchester or the motorway system in general. No independent transport surveys can be accessed for the Walshaw plan but 40 years of residence in the area indicates that the vision for Walshaw will be a transport infrastructure disaster. The planned new transport links from the 1250 new homes are fatuous given that all roads lead onto already busy, narrow, roads on the "wrong" side of Bury and Radcliffe.</p> <p>Healthcare facilities and School place provision is vague at best within the plan. Secondary schools the area are full to capacity and nothing new is in the plan other than words about off-site secondary school provision and funding contributions - presumably from developers. Good luck with that! Again more traffic movement if it were to be provided. All of which provides potentially unacceptable impacts upon road safety which will be in conflict with paragraph 11 of the NPPF.</p> <p>There is scant evidence about the deliverability of this scheme, particularly in a meaningful timeframe. Various land development companies are involved (VHW Land Partnership (Walshaw) Limited, Redrow homes, HIMOR Land limited as well as Bury Council. Each has their own interest and stakeholders to reconcile in all aspects of this large development which means several years of outline planning and agreement over section 106 provisions with interested housing builders. If and when building work begins the communities around the edges of the site will be subjected to several years of disruption, pollution and property blight caused by the work.</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	Evaluate (1) Bury's true housing need over the coming 10 -15 years and (2) make sure development is Brownfield as much as possible and where necessary smaller sites are developed in sustainable locations which reduce the need for car travel, for example by maximising residential densities around transport hubs.

**you have identified
above.**