Family Name	Shepherd
Given Name	John
Person ID	1287354
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Туре	Web
Family Name	Shepherd
Given Name	John
Person ID	1287354
Title	Our Vision
Туре	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
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.	Manchester and the constituent authorities, but by the political needs and electoral ambitions of the politicians involved throughout. The whole idea is so far removed from that agreed between George Osbourne and the former
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.	
Family Name	Shepherd
Given Name	John
Person ID	1287354
Title	Our Strategic Objectives
Туре	Web

	Places for Everyone Representation 2021
	1. Meet our housing need
- Considering the information provided for	2. Create neighbourhoods of choice
our strategic objectives,	2 Engling a thrilling and productive accompany in the districts involved
please tick which of	5. Reduce inequalities and improve prosperity
these objectives your written comment refers	
to:	
Soundness - Positively	Unsound
prepared?	
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	Yes
Compliance - In	Yes
accordance with the	
Duty to Cooperate?	
Redacted reasons - Please give us details	As before this is a politically compliant exercise more than it is a strategic planning exercise.
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.	
Family Name	Shepherd
Given Name	John
Person ID	1287354
Title	JP-H 1 Scale Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development
Туре	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In	NA
accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	
Redacted reasons -	In the case of Oldham housing on new sites that WOULD have been built
Please give us details of why you consider the	have been severely hacked back and replaced by housing in Oldham town centre that has NO chance of being built and even if it was no one would
consultation point not	move into the centre from the outside areas! A touch of reality is needed
to be legally compliant,	here! The same applies to the old mill sites in areas that you would not want
	the state of the Proceedings of the Procedings of th
is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to	a stray cat to live in!

co-operate. Please be	
as precise as possible.	
Family Name	Shepherd
Given Name	John
Person ID	1287354
Title	JPA 2: Stakehill
Туре	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
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.	go, such as Kingsway, and other more important proposed sites towards Birch, and with many of the current Stakehill units currently empty, then you can forget anything happening on the Oldham part of this site for the next
Family Name	Shepherd
Given Name	John
Person ID	1287354
Title	JPA 12: Beal Valley
Туре	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
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	already severely congested roads with standing traffic and pollution issues,

motorway connections or to go into Manchester or to reach railway stations,

is unsound or fails to

	Places for Everyone Representation 2021
comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	and which probably have sewage and surface water drainage issues then this fits the bill!
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.	Look at all the much better located greenfield sites that were put forward in the call for sites process, sites that do not have these issues!!
Family Name	Shepherd
Given Name	John
Person ID	1287354
Title	JPA 14: Broadbent Moss
Туре	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
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.	that have traffic having to go through town centres with standing traffic in
	It is called Broadbent Moss because that is what part of it is. Moss and peat lands are carbon stores and water stores and according to policy in other sections of the PfE should not be disturbed. Why is this site being disturbed?
	A part of this site should by now be an 18 hole public golf course with club house. The full story of what has gone on here needs uncovering. It appears that the people of Oldham may have lost millions of pounds in what was laid out to buy in Harley Road Farm and other land to add to already council owned land (around \$\sigma\$1.5 million), and in what was reported by the Oldham Chronicle as millions paid out in compensation to the contractors involved in the dubious joint venture when a change of political control of the council stopped the permission for contaminated waste to be tipped on part of the site. Tens of millions of pounds have been generated by tipping on the site, did the people of Oldham who owned the site at the time get any of it? The people of Oldham did not get their 18 hole golf course and club house, why

	not? Land Registry records appear to indicate that the golf course part of the site was sold on a 250 year lease for a mere □750,000 in 2013 to the contractors involved with no overage clause but with Oldham Council retaining the freehold, although no plan is filed possibly deliberately - why was it sold, why is no plan filed? Then 3 years later part of the golf course site appears in the first GMSF draft, now this PfE allocation, - why? There do not seem to be any sound planning reasons for allocating this site.
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.	Look at all the other much better located greenfield sites that were put forward in the call for sites process, sites that do not have these issues!!
Family Name	Shepherd
Given Name	John
Person ID	1287354
Title	JPA 16: Cowlishaw
Туре	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
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.	This site contained what was for the North of England and Greater Manchester a strategic facility, the Abattoir, a highly successful and prosperous business that employed 40+ people directly together with many other businesses supplied and jobs dependent on this facility, and which fed and kept alive people of Greater Manchester and the North. Government and DEFRA policy is and was to retain and support abattoirs, the current crises over the lack of abattoir capacity and the prospect of animals having to be culled and of food shortages to come emphasises the importance of these facilities. Yet Oldham Council have recently, without carrying out any due diligence, accepted an untrue claim (the filed company accounts and director"s report tell a different story!) that the abattoir was declining and likely to close down soon and given planning permission for the abattoir to be killed off together with 40+ jobs directly and many more businesses and jobs indirectly! All this in desperation to be seen to be doing something by granting permission for 200+ houses as the town continues to decline. A large Irish operator reportedly wanted to buy the site, invest money and create many more jobs but was rebuffed. The whole thing was pre-planned with ownership of the site being transferred to Channel Islands based entity

about 4 years ago. If you kill off strategic facilities and the employment base you might as well forget about housing, affordable or not as no one will have

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

the money to buy it and people will continue to leave Oldham for better housing and employment as they are currently increasingly doing! There are existing severe surface water and sewerage issues with this area. The access issues are bad and the road onto which all the traffic is turned out onto is already massively congested at rush hours - even the planning officer at the publicly broadcast and on Youtube council meeting that approved the application admitted this - she travelled along it twice a day!! As I said in my introductory comments, people can make comments but the chances of them being listened to are remote, there were hundreds of objections to this application, many on very sound grounds. Oldham will just continue to blunder on. Redacted modification Look at all the much better located greenfield sites that were put forward in - Please set out the the call for sites process - sites that do not have these issues!! 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. **Family Name** Shepherd **Given Name** John Person ID 1287354 Title JPA 17: Land South of Coal Pit Lane (Ashton Road) Type Web **Soundness - Positively** Unsound prepared? Soundness - Justified? NA Soundness - Consistent NA with national policy? Soundness - Effective? NA **Compliance - Legally** NA compliant? Compliance - In NA accordance with the **Duty to Cooperate?** Dangerous access at Coal Pit Lane, terribly busy Oldham to Ashton road Redacted reasons already! Long distance to motorway connections, access by vehicle to Please give us details of why you consider the Manchester on already massively congested roads. 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. Redacted modification Dangerous access at Coal Pit Lane, terribly busy Oldham to Ashton road - Please set out the already! Long distance to motorway connections, access by vehicle to modification(s) you Manchester on already massively congested roads. consider necessary to make this section of the

plan legally compliant

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.	
Family Name	Shepherd
Given Name	John
Person ID	1287354
Title	JPA 18: South of Rosary Road
Туре	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
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.	As for Coal Pit Lane above.