

<b>Family Name</b>	Sherratt
<b>Given Name</b>	Steven
<b>Person ID</b>	1286214
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Sherratt
<b>Given Name</b>	Steven
<b>Person ID</b>	1286214
<b>Title</b>	JPA 26: Land at Hazelhurst Farm
<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>	No
<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>I am a resident in an area affected by the Pffi2021 and in particular the Green Belt land at Hazelhurst Farm (reference JPA 26) identified as housing allocation for around 400 dwellings (the Proposed Developed).</p> <p>I wish to make the following representations with respect to the Pffi2021 in relation to the Proposed Development:</p> <p>1.Destruction of Open Space: the PtE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policv. I refer to paragraph 99 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). The site of the Proposed Development is existing open space and none of the following apply:</p> <p>a.an assessment has not been undertaken which clearly shows that the open space is surplus to requirements. The open space is not surplus to requirements;</p> <p>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</p> <p>c.the Proposed Development is not for alternative sports and recreation provision.</p> <p>2.Negative Impact on Local Wildlife: the Pffi2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policv. I refer to paragraphs 120(b) and 174(b) of the Framework. A variety of local wildlife (birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels) use the site of the Proposed Development. The site performs several local functions: a home for wildlife, an area where locals can practice physical and emotional well-being activities and I understand that it is also an area of food production with the farmer growing wheat.</p>

3. Destruction of the Green Belt: the Pffi2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 137 of the Framework. The Pffi2021 does not recognise the importance of the site of the Proposed Development to prevent urban sprawl. I refer to paragraphs 140 and 141 of the Framework. The PtE2021 does not meet the threshold for exceptional circumstances which justify the alteration of the boundaries of the Green Belt at the site

of the Proposed Development. I refer to paragraph 145 of the Framework. Even if the Green Belt were reduced in size, the PfE2021 does not explain how the local planning authority have planned for the positive use of the remaining Green Belt. I refer to paragraphs 147 and 149 of the Framework. The Proposed Development set out in the PfE2021 is inappropriate development and should only be approved in very special circumstances.

4. Increased Flooding Risk: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 159 - 169 of the Framework. The area around the site of the Proposed Development is prone to flooding. I note that the Council acknowledges the risk of surface water flooding.

5. 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 acknowledges that members of the public may access the stops on the A580 for the Leigh-Salford Manchester rapid transit service to access employment and leisure opportunities in Manchester City Centre. However, it does not acknowledge that members of the public may not choose to use public transport. The PfE2021 fails to adequately take into account the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport networks in the area. The area around the Proposed Development suffers from heavy traffic congestion due to, among other things, its close proximity to two major roads:

a. the A580 which is a major commuter route for traffic to and from Manchester City Centre; a connector road for traffic to join the M61 towards Preston and a connector road for traffic to access the neighbourhoods alongside the A580 (for example, Mosley Common,

Boothstown, Ellesmere, Roe Green, Hazelhurst, Swinton and Pendleton); and

b. the M60 which is a major motorway in the North West of England. The local junction (13) is frequently subject to gridlocked traffic during the week due to both the commuter traffic in and around Greater Manchester as well as heavy goods vehicles connecting to the south of England via the M56 and M6. The area is also subject to grid locked traffic on a weekly basis due to visitors accessing the amenities at Trafford Centre (a multi dining, shopping and entertainment complex) and Old Trafford (the football ground for Manchester United).

The addition of 400 dwellings will only lead to an increase in the traffic congestion in an area in which the transport network is already under considerable strain.

Furthermore, the access points to the Proposed Development can only be through one of the existing cul-de-sac roads off Hazelhurst Road. Hazelhurst Road is already deeply congested with commuter traffic and many residents have to park their vehicles on the street due to a lack of private parking facilities. This is not consistent with the national policy. I refer to paragraph 112(c) of the Framework.

6. 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 A580 and M60 and the existing heavy traffic congestion, our area has a high level of air pollution and regular noise pollution (day and night from the traffic

passing on the M60). The Green Belt land in our area acts as a much-needed buffer for the air and noise pollution. In substantially reducing the Green Belt area at Hazelhurst Farm, the PfE2021 does not take into account and support the delivery of local strategies to improve the health for all sections of the community. The PfE2021 only seeks to address the needs of the new residents of the Proposed Development.

7.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 (for example, there is only one local Co op on Worsley Road with no onsite parking so cars often park on nearby roads when using the local shop and the nearby meeting places and open spaces in Worsley Woods, Roe Green Common and Worsley Common experienced a high proportion of visitors from outside the area during the global pandemic which resulted in a strain on the transport network in the area) and other local services (for example, access to local GPs and Dentists) will be enhanced to sustain the increase in population due to the Proposed Development.

8.Other Representations: please see the Annex to this letter for further representations.

Please note that I wish to be given the opportunity to participate in the Examination in Public and to be kept informed of the progress of PfE2021