

Family Name	Smith
Given Name	Claire
Person ID	1287489
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Smith
Given Name	Claire
Person ID	1287489
Title	JPA 19: Bamford / Norden
Type	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.	<p>The site is unsound for many reasons firstly there are insufficient school places. There is no proposal for any additional schools to be built and the schools that are in the surrounding areas are already full and Over subscribed this therefore shows that the site fails to comply with PF a objective nine and is not consistent with NPPF chapter 8 paragraph 95.</p> <p>Also in Rochdale there is no acute shortage of large detached executive homes in Rochdale therefore there is no need to build on the greenbelt as we do not need these houses. The only acute shortage is for truly affordable homes and large detached executive homes is not that. In Rochdale we can build on brownfield sites first and would cover 99% Of the housing needs in the borough. Rochdale MBC have a local housing need of 8048 and land available for 7997 houses and therefore means we do not need to build on the Greenbelt.</p> <p>The only reason why Rochdale want to build on the greenbelt is for profits only. The site fails to comply with PFA objective to and is not consistent with NPPF chapter 2</p> <p>Further more the site has pylons running through it and there have been many studies to show this can cause leukaemia to children living within 50 m of the lines. How can this even be possible to be acceptable to allow houses to be built on such land that is so dangerous to our children"s health. Therefore the site fails to comply with PFE objective 10 and it"s not consistent with NPPF chat to 8.</p> <p>The site is not consistent with national policy.</p>
Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the	The modification we are seeking is for JPA 19 Bamford/Norden to be removed from the PFE

plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf
Family Name	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	Our Vision
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf
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.	It is questionable whether PfE and the GMSF can effectively be treated as the same plan. Legality must be decided in court before "Places for Everyone" can proceed any further. It is assumed that a transition between a spatial framework (GMSF) and a Joint Development plan (PfE) is acceptable without a significant re-write. While the GMSF may have been established as legally compliant (complies with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning regulations) and could therefore possibly proceed to final public consultation and submission under Regulation 19 (this current stage) PfE legality is not established. If there is any substantial difference in scope between the GMSF and PfE it cannot be assumed that Regulation 18 is Automatically satisfied for PfE. Para 1.23 states "The changes made between GMSF 2020 and PfE 2021 are not insignificant in numerical terms, indeed all sections of the plan have seen some form of change." So, is "not insignificant" the same as "substantial", if it is, the plan is not legal. This can only be established by a proper judicial review. So until proven otherwise the plan must be considered illegal and not put to Government.

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.

The plan uses 2014 data to predict housing need and ignores the potential impact of Brexit and Covid-19. Housing need must be re-assessed using the latest (2018) ONA population predictions and take into account the effect of Covid on work patterns.

? There is little detail on how the required infrastructure will be paid for. The plan needs to be revised to identify how all the infrastructure will be paid

? There are no partners or industries identified for employment provision. Major partners for employment provision should be identified.

? There has been poor public consultation, a lack of accessible information and little spent by councils in generating awareness. Interest in the plan has mainly been generated by local protest groups. The public consultations should be repeated, providing clear, understandable information. They should be designed to encourage rather than discourage public input.

? The site selection process has been opaque with no explanation as to why some sites in the 'call for sites' were excluded from the plan.

https://mappinggm.org.uk/call-for-sites/#os_maps_outdoor/16/53.6380/-2.3228

The process should be repeated using National and GMCA guidelines for site selection. Meetings with public representation should be held and minutes should be published. The rationale for the selection/rejection of every site should be available including considered alternatives.

? Several of the authorities involved have consistently failed to meet housing delivery targets. An effective a plan must be deliverable. The plan relies on the cooperation of property developers. There is no indication of how delivery targets will be maintained. A strategy to guarantee housing delivery rates must be provided. This cannot be left to any local authority that is currently behind on housing targets. Clear delivery plans for infrastructure should be included.

? PfE shows removal of greenbelt protection for some areas and creation of greenbelts in others. There is no proof of exceptional circumstances required in the National Planning Policy Framework to justify this.

? In addition to PfE each authority needs to come up with its own local plan. No details have been given about when these plans will be available.

? There are no details of how Duty to Cooperate will be achieved. Following their withdrawal Stockport will effectively become a neighbouring borough. However, it is not acceptable to limit neighbouring boroughs to Stockport since each of the authorities in the plan is also neighbouring to other authorities outside of the plan e.g. Bury is neighbours with Rossendale, Bolton neighbours Blackburn with Darwen, Wigan neighbours St Helens and Trafford neighbours Cheshire area.

? A change in the methodology for Manchester City Council was resulted in a 35% uplift for the Manchester City Council area. The revised Local Housing Need methodology states that the 35% uplift is to be met within the district and not redistributed (see Places for Everyone Joint Committee documentation, 20th July 2021, author Paul Dennett, Page 7 section 2.2 (ii)

https://democracy.greatermanchesterca.gov.uk/documents/s15613/PFE_JC_July2021

This represents a significant change between the previous spatial framework the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and the current joint development plan Places for Everyone.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	Our Strategic Objectives
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf
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?	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>The plan uses 2014 data to predict housing need and ignores the potential impact of Brexit and Covid-19. Housing need must be re-assessed using the latest (2018) ON population predictions and take into account the effect of Covid on work patterns.</p> <p>? There is little detail on how the required infrastructure will be paid for. The plan needs to be revised to identify how all the infrastructure will be paid</p> <p>? There are no partners or industries identified for employment provision. Major partners for employment provision should be identified.</p> <p>? There has been poor public consultation, a lack of accessible information and little spent by councils in generating awareness. Interest in the plan has mainly been generated by local protest groups. The public consultations should be repeated, providing clear, understandable information. They should be designed to encourage rather than discourage public input.</p> <p>? The site selection process has been opaque with no explanation as to why some sites in the "call for sites" were excluded from the plan.</p> <p>https://mappinggm.org.uk/call-for-sites/#os_maps_outdoor/16/53.6380/-2.3228</p> <p>The process should be repeated using National and GMCA guidelines for site selection. Meetings with public representation should be held and minutes should be published. The rationale for the selection/rejection of every site should be available including considered alternatives.</p> <p>? Several of the authorities involved have consistently failed to meet housing delivery targets. An effective a plan must be deliverable. The plan relies on the cooperation of property developers. There is no indication of how delivery targets will be maintained. A strategy to guarantee housing delivery rates must be provided. This cannot be left to any local authority that is currently behind on housing targets. Clear delivery plans for infrastructure should be included.</p> <p>? PfE shows removal of greenbelt protection for some areas and creation of greenbelts</p>

in others. There is no proof of exceptional circumstances required in the National Planning Policy Framework to justify this.

? In addition to PfE each authority needs to come up with its own local plan. No details have been given about when these plans will be available.

? There are no details of how Duty to Cooperate will be achieved. Following their withdrawal Stockport will effectively become a neighbouring borough. However, it is not acceptable to limit neighbouring boroughs to Stockport since each of the authorities in the plan is also neighbouring to other authorities outside of the plan e.g. Bury is neighbours with Rossendale, Bolton neighbours Blackburn with Darwen, Wigan neighbours St Helens and Trafford neighbours Cheshire area.

? A change in the methodology for Manchester City Council was resulted in a 35% uplift for the Manchester City Council area. The revised Local Housing Need methodology states that the 35% uplift is to be met within the district and not redistributed (see Places for Everyone Joint Committee documentation, 20th July 2021, author Paul Dennett, Page 7 section 2.2 (ii)

https://democracy.greatermanchesterca.gov.uk/documents/s15613/PFE_JC_July2021

This represents a significant change between the previous spatial framework the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and the current joint development plan Places for Everyone.

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.

The plan uses 2014 data to predict housing need and ignores the potential impact of Brexit and Covid-19. Housing need must be re-assessed using the latest (2018) ONA population predictions and take into account the effect of Covid on work patterns.

? There is little detail on how the required infrastructure will be paid for. The plan needs to be revised to identify how all the infrastructure will be paid

? There are no partners or industries identified for employment provision. Major partners for employment provision should be identified.

? There has been poor public consultation, a lack of accessible information and little spent by councils in generating awareness. Interest in the plan has mainly been generated by local protest groups. The public consultations should be repeated, providing clear, understandable information. They should be designed to encourage rather than discourage public input.

? The site selection process has been opaque with no explanation as to why some sites in the 'call for sites' were excluded from the plan.

https://mappinggm.org.uk/call-for-sites/#os_maps_outdoor/16/53.6380/-2.3228

The process should be repeated using National and GMCA guidelines for site selection. Meetings with public representation should be held and minutes should be published. The rationale for the selection/rejection of every site should be available including considered alternatives.

? Several of the authorities involved have consistently failed to meet housing delivery targets. An effective a plan must be deliverable. The plan relies on the cooperation of property developers. There is no indication of how delivery targets will be maintained. A strategy to guarantee housing delivery rates must be provided. This cannot be left to any local authority that is currently behind on housing targets. Clear delivery plans for infrastructure should be included.

? PfE shows removal of greenbelt protection for some areas and creation of greenbelts

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>in others. There is no proof of exceptional circumstances required in the National Planning Policy Framework to justify this.</p> <p>? In addition to PfE each authority needs to come up with its own local plan. No details have been given about when these plans will be available.</p> <p>? There are no details of how Duty to Cooperate will be achieved. Following their withdrawal Stockport will effectively become a neighbouring borough. However, it is not acceptable to limit neighbouring boroughs to Stockport since each of the authorities in the plan is also neighbouring to other authorities outside of the plan e.g. Bury is neighbours with Rossendale, Bolton neighbours Blackburn with Darwen, Wigan neighbours St Helens and Trafford neighbours Cheshire area.</p> <p>? A change in the methodology for Manchester City Council was resulted in a 35% uplift for the Manchester City Council area. The revised Local Housing Need methodology states that the 35% uplift is to be met within the district and not redistributed (see Places for Everyone Joint Committee documentation, 20th July 2021, author Paul Dennett, Page 7 section 2.2 (ii) https://democracy.greatermanchesterca.gov.uk/documents/s15613/PFE_JC_July2021)</p> <p>This represents a significant change between the previous spatial framework the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and the current joint development plan Places for Everyone.</p>
Family Name	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	JP-G 1 Valuing Important Landscapes
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf
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	<p>Legal Compliance</p> <p>? It is questionable whether PfE and the GMSF can effectively be treated as the same plan. Legality must be decided in court before "Places for Everyone" can proceed any further. It is assumed that a transition between a spatial framework (GMSF) and a Joint Development plan (PfE) is acceptable without a significant re-write. While the GMSF may have been established as legally compliant (complies with Regulation 18</p>

co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

of the Town and Country Planning regulations) and could therefore possibly proceed to final public consultation and submission under Regulation 19 (this current stage) if PfE legality is not established. If there is any substantial difference in scope between the GMSF and PfE it cannot be assumed that Regulation 18 is Automatically satisfied for PfE. Para 1.23 states "The changes made between GMSF 2020 and PfE 2021 are not insignificant in numerical terms, indeed all sections of the plan have seen some form of change." So, is "not insignificant" the same as "substantial", if it is, the plan is not legal. This can only be established by a proper judicial review. So until proven otherwise the plan must be considered illegal and not put to Government.

Soundness

? The plan uses 2014 data to predict housing need and ignores the potential impact of Brexit and Covid-19. Housing need must be re-assessed using the latest (2018) ON population predictions and take into account the effect of Covid on work patterns.

? There is little detail on how the required infrastructure will be paid for. The plan needs to be revised to identify how all the infrastructure will be paid

? There are no partners or industries identified for employment provision. Major partners for employment provision should be identified.

? There has been poor public consultation, a lack of accessible information and little spent by councils in generating awareness. Interest in the plan has mainly been generated by local protest groups. The public consultations should be repeated, providing clear, understandable information. They should be designed to encourage rather than discourage public input.

? The site selection process has been opaque with no explanation as to why some sites in the "call for sites" were excluded from the plan.

https://mappinggm.org.uk/call-for-sites/#os_maps_outdoor/16/53.6380/-2.3228

The process should be repeated using National and GMCA guidelines for site selection. Meetings with public representation should be held and minutes should be published. The rationale for the selection/rejection of every site should be available including considered alternatives.

? Several of the authorities involved have consistently failed to meet housing delivery targets. An effective a plan must be deliverable. The plan relies on the cooperation of property developers. There is no indication of how delivery targets will be maintained. A strategy to guarantee housing delivery rates must be provided. This cannot be left to any local authority that is currently behind on housing targets. Clear delivery plans for infrastructure should be included.

? PfE shows removal of greenbelt protection for some areas and creation of greenbelts in others. There is no proof of exceptional circumstances required in the National Planning Policy Framework to justify this.

? In addition to PfE each authority needs to come up with its own local plan. No details have been given about when these plans will be available.

? There are no details of how Duty to Cooperate will be achieved. Following their withdrawal Stockport will effectively become a neighbouring borough. However, it is not acceptable to limit neighbouring boroughs to Stockport since each of the authorities in the plan is also neighbouring to other authorities outside of the plan e.g. Bury is neighbours with Rossendale, Bolton neighbours Blackburn with Darwen,

Wigan neighbours St Helens and Trafford neighbours Cheshire area.
 ? A change in the methodology for Manchester City Council was resulted in a 35% uplift for the Manchester City Council area. The revised Local Housing Need methodology states that the 35% uplift is to be met within the district and not redistributed (see Places for Everyone Joint Committee documentation, 20th July 2021, author Paul Dennett, Page 7 section 2.2 (ii) https://democracy.greatermanchesterca.gov.uk/documents/s15613/PFE_JC_July2021)
 This represents a significant change between the previous spatial framework the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and the current joint development plan Places for Everyone.

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.

Legal Compliance
 ? It is questionable whether PfE and the GMSF can effectively be treated as the same plan. Legality must be decided in court before 'Places for Everyone' can proceed any further. It is assumed that a transition between a spatial framework (GMSF) and a Joint Development plan (PfE) is acceptable without a significant re-write. While the GMSF may have been established as legally compliant (complies with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning regulations) and could therefore possibly proceed to final public consultation and submission under Regulation 19 (this current stage) PfE legality is not established. If there is any substantial difference in scope between the GMSF and PfE it cannot be assumed that Regulation 18 is Automatically satisfied for PfE. Para 1.23 states 'The changes made between GMSF 2020 and PfE 2021 are not insignificant in numerical terms, indeed all sections of the plan have seen some form of change.' So, is 'not insignificant' the same as 'substantial', if it is, the plan is not legal. This can only be established by a proper judicial review. So until proven otherwise the plan must be considered illegal and not put to Government.

Soundness
 ? The plan uses 2014 data to predict housing need and ignores the potential impact of Brexit and Covid-19. Housing need must be re-assessed using the latest (2018) ONS population predictions and take into account the effect of Covid on work patterns.
 ? There is little detail on how the required infrastructure will be paid for. The plan needs to be revised to identify how all the infrastructure will be paid
 ? There are no partners or industries identified for employment provision. Major partners for employment provision should be identified.
 ? There has been poor public consultation, a lack of accessible information and little spent by councils in generating awareness. Interest in the plan has mainly been generated by local protest groups. The public consultations should be repeated, providing clear, understandable information. They should be designed to encourage rather than discourage public input.
 ? The site selection process has been opaque with no explanation as to why some sites in the 'call for sites' were excluded from the plan.
https://mappinggm.org.uk/call-for-sites/#os_maps_outdoor/16/53.6380/-2.3228
 The process should be repeated using National and GMCA guidelines for site selection. Meetings with public representation should be held and minutes should be published. The rationale for the selection/rejection of every site should be available including considered alternatives.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

? Several of the authorities involved have consistently failed to meet housing delivery targets. An effective a plan must be deliverable. The plan relies on the cooperation of property developers. There is no indication of how delivery targets will be maintained. A strategy to guarantee housing delivery rates must be provided. This cannot be left to any local authority that is currently behind on housing targets. Clear delivery plans for infrastructure should be included.

? PfE shows removal of greenbelt protection for some areas and creation of greenbelts in others. There is no proof of exceptional circumstances required in the National Planning Policy Framework to justify this.

? In addition to PfE each authority needs to come up with its own local plan. No details have been given about when these plans will be available.

? There are no details of how Duty to Cooperate will be achieved. Following their withdrawal Stockport will effectively become a neighbouring borough. However, it is not acceptable to limit neighbouring boroughs to Stockport since each of the authorities in the plan is also neighbouring to other authorities outside of the plan e.g. Bury is neighbours with Rossendale, Bolton neighbours Blackburn with Darwen, Wigan neighbours St Helens and Trafford neighbours Cheshire area.

? A change in the methodology for Manchester City Council was resulted in a 35% uplift for the Manchester City Council area. The revised Local Housing Need methodology states that the 35% uplift is to be met within the district and not redistributed (see Places for Everyone Joint Committee documentation, 20th July 2021, author Paul Dennett, Page 7 section 2.2 (ii) https://democracy.greatermanchesterca.gov.uk/documents/s15613/PFE_JC_July2021)

This represents a significant change between the previous spatial framework the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and the current joint development plan Places for Everyone.

Family Name	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	JP-G 2 Green Infrastructure Network
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf
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>Legal Compliance</p> <p>? It is questionable whether PfE and the GMSF can effectively be treated as the same plan. Legality must be decided in court before "Places for Everyone" can proceed any further. It is assumed that a transition between a spatial framework (GMSF) and a Joint Development plan (PfE) is acceptable without a significant re-write. While the GMSF may have been established as legally compliant (complies with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning regulations) and could therefore possibly proceed to final public consultation and submission under Regulation 19 (this current stage) PfE legality is not established. If there is any substantial difference in scope between the GMSF and PfE it cannot be assumed that Regulation 18 is Automatically satisfied for PfE. Para 1.23 states "The changes made between GMSF 2020 and PfE 2021 are not insignificant in numerical terms, indeed all sections of the plan have seen some form of change." So, is "not insignificant" the same as "substantial", if it is, the plan is not legal. This can only be established by a proper judicial review. So until proven otherwise the plan must be considered illegal and not put to Government.</p> <p>Soundness</p> <p>? The plan uses 2014 data to predict housing need and ignores the potential impact of Brexit and Covid-19. Housing need must be re-assessed using the latest (2018) ONA population predictions and take into account the effect of Covid on work patterns.</p> <p>? There is little detail on how the required infrastructure will be paid for. The plan needs to be revised to identify how all the infrastructure will be paid</p> <p>? There are no partners or industries identified for employment provision. Major partners for employment provision should be identified.</p> <p>? There has been poor public consultation, a lack of accessible information and little spent by councils in generating awareness. Interest in the plan has mainly been generated by local protest groups. The public consultations should be repeated, providing clear, understandable information. They should be designed to encourage rather than discourage public input.</p> <p>? The site selection process has been opaque with no explanation as to why some sites in the "call for sites" were excluded from the plan.</p> <p>https://mappinggm.org.uk/call-for-sites/#os_maps_outdoor/16/53.6380/-2.3228</p> <p>The process should be repeated using National and GMCA guidelines for site selection. Meetings with public representation should be held and minutes should be published. The rationale for the selection/rejection of every site should be available including considered alternatives.</p> <p>? Several of the authorities involved have consistently failed to meet housing delivery targets. An effective a plan must be deliverable. The plan relies on the cooperation of property developers. There is no indication of how delivery targets will be maintained. A strategy to guarantee housing delivery rates must be provided. This cannot be left to any local authority that is currently behind on housing targets. Clear delivery plans for infrastructure should be included.</p> <p>? PfE shows removal of greenbelt protection for some areas and creation of greenbelts</p>

in others. There is no proof of exceptional circumstances required in the National Planning Policy Framework to justify this.

? In addition to PfE each authority needs to come up with its own local plan. No details have been given about when these plans will be available.

? There are no details of how Duty to Cooperate will be achieved. Following their withdrawal Stockport will effectively become a neighbouring borough. However, it is not acceptable to limit neighbouring boroughs to Stockport since each of the authorities in the plan is also neighbouring to other authorities outside of the plan e.g. Bury is neighbours with Rossendale, Bolton neighbours Blackburn with Darwen, Wigan neighbours St Helens and Trafford neighbours Cheshire area.

? A change in the methodology for Manchester City Council was resulted in a 35% uplift for the Manchester City Council area. The revised Local Housing Need methodology states that the 35% uplift is to be met within the district and not redistributed (see Places for Everyone Joint Committee documentation, 20th July 2021, author Paul Dennett, Page 7 section 2.2 (ii)
https://democracy.greatermanchesterca.gov.uk/documents/s15613/PFE_JC_July2021

This represents a significant change between the previous spatial framework the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and the current joint development plan Places for Everyone.

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.

Legal Compliance

? It is questionable whether PfE and the GMSF can effectively be treated as the same plan. Legality must be decided in court before 'Places for Everyone' can proceed any further. It is assumed that a transition between a spatial framework (GMSF) and a Joint Development plan (PfE) is acceptable without a significant re-write. While the GMSF may have been established as legally compliant (complies with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning regulations) and could therefore possibly proceed to final public consultation and submission under Regulation 19 (this current stage) PfE legality is not established. If there is any substantial difference in scope between the GMSF and PfE it cannot be assumed that Regulation 18 is Automatically satisfied for PfE. Para 1.23 states 'The changes made between GMSF 2020 and PfE 2021 are not insignificant in numerical terms, indeed all sections of the plan have seen some form of change.' So, is 'not insignificant' the same as 'substantial', if it is, the plan is not legal. This can only be established by a proper judicial review. So until proven otherwise the plan must be considered illegal and not put to Government.

Soundness

? The plan uses 2014 data to predict housing need and ignores the potential impact of Brexit and Covid-19. Housing need must be re-assessed using the latest (2018) ONA population predictions and take into account the effect of Covid on work patterns.

? There is little detail on how the required infrastructure will be paid for. The plan needs to be revised to identify how all the infrastructure will be paid

? There are no partners or industries identified for employment provision. Major partners for employment provision should be identified.

? There has been poor public consultation, a lack of accessible information and little spent by councils in generating awareness. Interest in the plan has mainly been generated by local protest groups. The public consultations should be repeated,

providing clear, understandable information. They should be designed to encourage rather than discourage public input.

? The site selection process has been opaque with no explanation as to why some sites in the 'call for sites' were excluded from the plan.

https://mappinggm.org.uk/call-for-sites/#os_maps_outdoor/16/53.6380/-2.3228

The process should be repeated using National and GMCA guidelines for site selection. Meetings with public representation should be held and minutes should be published. The rationale for the selection/rejection of every site should be available including considered alternatives.

? Several of the authorities involved have consistently failed to meet housing delivery targets. An effective a plan must be deliverable. The plan relies on the cooperation of property developers. There is no indication of how delivery targets will be maintained. A strategy to guarantee housing delivery rates must be provided. This cannot be left to any local authority that is currently behind on housing targets. Clear delivery plans for infrastructure should be included.

? PfE shows removal of greenbelt protection for some areas and creation of greenbelts in others. There is no proof of exceptional circumstances required in the National Planning Policy Framework to justify this.

? In addition to PfE each authority needs to come up with its own local plan. No details have been given about when these plans will be available.

? There are no details of how Duty to Cooperate will be achieved. Following their withdrawal Stockport will effectively become a neighbouring borough. However, it is not acceptable to limit neighbouring boroughs to Stockport since each of the authorities in the plan is also neighbouring to other authorities outside of the plan e.g. Bury is neighbours with Rossendale, Bolton neighbours Blackburn with Darwen, Wigan neighbours St Helens and Trafford neighbours Cheshire area.

? A change in the methodology for Manchester City Council was resulted in a 35% uplift for the Manchester City Council area. The revised Local Housing Need methodology states that the 35% uplift is to be met within the district and not redistributed (see Places for Everyone Joint Committee documentation, 20th July 2021, author Paul Dennett, Page 7 section 2.2 (ii))

https://democracy.greatermanchesterca.gov.uk/documents/s15613/PFE_JC_July2021

This represents a significant change between the previous spatial framework the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and the current joint development plan Places for Everyone.

Family Name	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	JP-G 3 River Valleys and Waterways
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf

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	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	JP-G 4 Lowland Wetlands and Mosslands
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf
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	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	JP-G 5 Uplands
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Family Name	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	JP-G 6 Urban Green Space
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf
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	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	JP-G 7 Trees and Woodland
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf
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

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	JP-G 8 Standards for Greener Places
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf
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	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	JP-G 9 A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf
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	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	JP-G 10 Green Belt
Type	Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Include files	PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf
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	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	JP-G 11 Safeguarded Land
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf
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	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	JPA 7: Elton Reservoir Area
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf
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>? The PfE indicates in Para 1.63 point 2 that the most up to date information be used in plan making, so being the most recent Bury's Housing Development Needs Assessment 2020 must be taken into consideration: https://www.bury.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=15866</p> <p>? The site selection process for Bury has been especially opaque. Little information has been given about why other more apparently suitable sites were rejected, or what alternatives were considered. Bury Council admitted in a Freedom of Information response that site selection was decided at a series of informal meetings with no list of attendees or minutes available. This site choice cannot be justified as the most appropriate when no reasonable alternatives appear to have been examined. The Elton Reservoir site does not meet the selection criteria laid down in the NPPF or the GMCA guidelines: https://www.bury.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=16330</p> <p>Radcliffe the location of Elton Reservoir has the least expensive housing in Bury but was selected in preference to sites in other other areas where affordable housing is required.</p> <p>? Para 11.105 p 264 states: " The allocation [Elton Reservoir] is almost entirely surrounded by the existing urban area"</p> <p>Filling this green belt site in will contribute to creating urban sprawl contrary to compliance with National Policy NPPF para 134 parts a,c and e.</p> <p>? Para 11.105 p 264 states: "Although the allocation has the capacity to deliver a total of around 3,500 new homes, it is anticipated that around 1,900 of these will be delivered within the plan period. Nevertheless, it is considered necessary to release the site in full at this stage given that the scale of the proposed development means that it will need to be supported by significant strategic infrastructure and this level of investment needs the certainty that the remaining development will still be able to come forward beyond the plan period".</p> <p>Such gross over release of greenbelt is entirely contrary to National Guidelines, which regards greenbelt as a precious resource not to be squandered. JPA7 fails to identify the source of infrastructure funding, indeed shortfalls are expected see para 12.16 of PfE. Site owners Peel are not specifically mentioned as being a contributor to the infrastructure funding.</p> <p>Questions should be asked regarding the reasons for Bury Council offering up a huge amount of greenbelt at Elton Reservoir that is not required during the plan</p>

period (and may never be required) instead of retaining it in accordance with National Policy.

? The Elton site apparently cost Peel £27M (as detailed in the site allocation topic paper) for approx 260 hectares (£104K per hectare) as greenbelt. Allowing a conservative price uplift of around 60 times for green belt conversion to development land, the land for the initial 1900 site becomes worth around £875M. Adding in the land for the totally unjustified additional housing beyond the plan period adds approx another £750 M. The implication being that unless Peel get the whole £1.325 Billion up front they can't offer any upfront funding for the infrastructure. Infrastructure that would not be needed if the development does not go ahead. Peel have indicated that they will possibly build some homes but will definitely split the site into lots to be developed by other developers so they (Peel) would avoid contributions this way. It would be left to Bury to extract the funding from other as yet unknown developers. Bury have a very poor reputation for obtaining developer contributions for infrastructure and developers always try to wriggle out of any obligations. It seems Peel have duped Bury Council into ignoring National Policy and granting them a huge financial bonus with no commitment to do anything.

? Site wildlife, flood risk and other surveys have been carried out by consultancies on behalf of and paid for by developers rather than entirely independent wildlife organisations or the Department of the Environment so must be considered potentially biased. This is particularly important at Elton Reservoir as there are currently problems with the reservoir wall which are being addressed by the Canal and Rivers trust. These measures may be suitable for providing some protection to open fields but are they suitable to protect homes from flooding if there is a breach? Such surveys should be entirely independent of benefiter influence.

? As part of the infrastructure a new secondary school for Radcliffe is mentioned. A new secondary free school for Radcliffe is already planned funded by the Government. The proposed new school will not even cater for existing Radcliffe pupil numbers. Since the proposed school is indicated on the site already reserved for the free school we must assume PfE document refers to the school already planned.

Regeneration for Radcliffe the location of the Elton Reservoir development is also mentioned as part of the infrastructure funding. A regeneration plan for Radcliffe is already in place. Bury Council have applied for Government levelling up funding and have stated that even if the application does not succeed the regeneration will go ahead using existing Council money. Bury Council have stated that regeneration and the new school for Radcliffe are not dependent on PfE going ahead.

Any mention/implication that PfE will contribute to providing a new secondary school (unless it is a second school) and regeneration for Radcliffe must be removed from JPA-7.

? Bury Council have consistently failed to meet housing delivery targets and are now in breach of the presumption. To be effective a plan must actually be deliverable. The plan relies heavily on the cooperation of property developers. There is no indication of how they will be made to keep up with targets and what sanctions will apply if they don't. At a Council meeting held on 9/9/21 the Leader of Bury Council Eammon O'Brien confirmed that it was "unlikely" that the proposed building rates for all developments

in Bury (as laid out in JPA7 Elton Reservoir Topic Paper PfE 2021, section 27.8 page 52) would be met as they were "unrealistic". So the plan cannot be considered to be effective. So the plan fails the deliverability test in terms of "soundness".

? As part of the overall plan Bury have modified green belt boundaries and allocation in such a way to make it appear that less greenbelt is being sacrificed. So the loss of the Elton Reservoir site greenbelt has been partially offset by creating extensive greenbelt in other areas without justifying exceptional circumstances. This is not in accordance with National Policy.

? PfE puts the majority of housing in the west of Bury (Elton Reservoir site) while locating the jobs on the east side of Bury on the M66 Northern Gateway corridor the other side of an already congested Bury town centre. The proposed new link road will not help this problem as it links one congested area to another.

? PfE para1.42 states:

"The majority of development between 2021 and 2037 (the "plan period") will be on land within the urban area, most of which is brownfield land"

PfE favours a brownfield first policy wherever possible as does National Policy. Bury Council have informed the public in Bury that they will implement a brownfield first policy; however they are going for immediate green belt release (see JPA7 Elton Reservoir Topic Paper PfE 2021, section 27.9 page 52). When questioned at a council meeting on 9/9/21 the Leader of the Council Eammon O'Brien clarified this statement by saying that for anything the council themselves build they would adopt a brownfield first policy but claimed that the council have no control over the actions of private developers, in reality they do, as they could limit the release of green belt sites in accordance with National Policy NPPF 134 par

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.

Legal Compliance

? It is questionable whether PfE and the GMSF can effectively be treated as the same plan. Legality must be decided in court before 'Places for Everyone' can proceed any further. It is assumed that a transition between a spatial framework (GMSF) and a Joint Development plan (PfE) is acceptable without a significant re-write. While the GMSF may have been established as legally compliant (complies with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning regulations) and could therefore possibly proceed to final public consultation and submission under Regulation 19 (this current stage) PfE legality is not established. If there is any substantial difference in scope between the GMSF and PfE it cannot be assumed that Regulation 18 is Automatically satisfied for PfE. Para 1.23 states 'The changes made between GMSF 2020 and PfE 2021 are not insignificant in numerical terms, indeed all sections of the plan have seen some form of change.' So, is 'not insignificant' the same as 'substantial', if it is, the plan is not legal. This can only be established by a proper judicial review. So until proven otherwise the plan must be considered illegal and not put to Government.

Soundness

? The plan uses 2014 data to predict housing need and ignores the potential impact of Brexit and Covid-19. Housing need must be re-assessed using the latest (2018) ONA population predictions and take into account the effect of Covid on work patterns.

? There is little detail on how the required infrastructure will be paid for. The plan needs to be revised to identify how all the infrastructure will be paid

? There are no partners or industries identified for employment provision. Major partners for employment provision should be identified.

? There has been poor public consultation, a lack of accessible information and little spent by councils in generating awareness. Interest in the plan has mainly been generated by local protest groups. The public consultations should be repeated, providing clear, understandable information. They should be designed to encourage rather than discourage public input.

? The site selection process has been opaque with no explanation as to why some sites in the 'call for sites' were excluded from the plan.

https://mappinggm.org.uk/call-for-sites/#os_maps_outdoor/16/53.6380/-2.3228

The process should be repeated using National and GMCA guidelines for site selection. Meetings with public representation should be held and minutes should be published. The rationale for the selection/rejection of every site should be available including considered alternatives.

? Several of the authorities involved have consistently failed to meet housing delivery targets. An effective a plan must be deliverable. The plan relies on the cooperation of property developers. There is no indication of how delivery targets will be maintained. A strategy to guarantee housing delivery rates must be provided. This cannot be left to any local authority that is currently behind on housing targets. Clear delivery plans for infrastructure should be included.

? PfE shows removal of greenbelt protection for some areas and creation of greenbelts in others. There is no proof of exceptional circumstances required in the National Planning Policy Framework to justify this.

? In addition to PfE each authority needs to come up with its own local plan. No details have been given about when these plans will be available.

? There are no details of how Duty to Cooperate will be achieved. Following their withdrawal Stockport will effectively become a neighbouring borough. However, it is not acceptable to limit neighbouring boroughs to Stockport since each of the authorities in the plan is also neighbouring to other authorities outside of the plan e.g. Bury is neighbours with Rossendale, Bolton neighbours Blackburn with Darwen, Wigan neighbours St Helens and Trafford neighbours Cheshire area.

? A change in the methodology for Manchester City Council was resulted in a 35% uplift for the Manchester City Council area. The revised Local Housing Need methodology states that the 35% uplift is to be met within the district and not redistributed (see Places for Everyone Joint Committee documentation, 20th July 2021, author Paul Dennett, Page 7 section 2.2 (ii))

https://democracy.greatermanchesterca.gov.uk/documents/s15613/PFE_JC_July2021

This represents a significant change between the previous spatial framework the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and the current joint development plan Places for Everyone.

Family Name

Smith

Given Name

Craig

Person ID

1287048

Title

JPA 8: Seedfield

Type

Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<p>Include files</p>	<p>PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf</p>
<p>Soundness - Positively prepared?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Justified?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Effective?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Compliance - Legally compliant?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>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>	<p>Legal Compliance</p> <p>? It is questionable whether PfE and the GMSF can effectively be treated as the same plan. Legality must be decided in court before "Places for Everyone" can proceed any further. It is assumed that a transition between a spatial framework (GMSF) and a Joint Development plan (PfE) is acceptable without a significant re-write. While the GMSF may have been established as legally compliant (complies with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning regulations) and could therefore possibly proceed to final public consultation and submission under Regulation 19 (this current stage) PfE legality is not established. If there is any substantial difference in scope between the GMSF and PfE it cannot be assumed that Regulation 18 is Automatically satisfied for PfE. Para 1.23 states "The changes made between GMSF 2020 and PfE 2021 are not insignificant in numerical terms, indeed all sections of the plan have seen some form of change." So, is "not insignificant" the same as "substantial", if it is, the plan is not legal. This can only be established by a proper judicial review. So until proven otherwise the plan must be considered illegal and not put to Government.</p> <p>Soundness</p> <p>? The plan uses 2014 data to predict housing need and ignores the potential impact of Brexit and Covid-19. Housing need must be re-assessed using the latest (2018) ONA population predictions and take into account the effect of Covid on work patterns.</p> <p>? There is little detail on how the required infrastructure will be paid for. The plan needs to be revised to identify how all the infrastructure will be paid</p> <p>? There are no partners or industries identified for employment provision. Major partners for employment provision should be identified.</p> <p>? There has been poor public consultation, a lack of accessible information and little spent by councils in generating awareness. Interest in the plan has mainly been generated by local protest groups. The public consultations should be repeated, providing clear, understandable information. They should be designed to encourage rather than discourage public input.</p> <p>? The site selection process has been opaque with no explanation as to why some sites in the "call for sites" were excluded from the plan.</p>

https://mappinggm.org.uk/call-for-sites/#os_maps_outdoor/16/53.6380/-2.3228

The process should be repeated using National and GMCA guidelines for site selection. Meetings with public representation should be held and minutes should be published. The rationale for the selection/rejection of every site should be available including considered alternatives.

? Several of the authorities involved have consistently failed to meet housing delivery targets. An effective a plan must be deliverable. The plan relies on the cooperation of property developers. There is no indication of how delivery targets will be maintained. A strategy to guarantee housing delivery rates must be provided. This cannot be left to any local authority that is currently behind on housing targets. Clear delivery plans for infrastructure should be included.

? PfE shows removal of greenbelt protection for some areas and creation of greenbelts in others. There is no proof of exceptional circumstances required in the National Planning Policy Framework to justify this.

? In addition to PfE each authority needs to come up with its own local plan. No details have been given about when these plans will be available.

? There are no details of how Duty to Cooperate will be achieved. Following their withdrawal Stockport will effectively become a neighbouring borough. However, it is not acceptable to limit neighbouring boroughs to Stockport since each of the authorities in the plan is also neighbouring to other authorities outside of the plan e.g. Bury is neighbours with Rossendale, Bolton neighbours Blackburn with Darwen, Wigan neighbours St Helens and Trafford neighbours Cheshire area.

? A change in the methodology for Manchester City Council was resulted in a 35% uplift for the Manchester City Council area. The revised Local Housing Need methodology states that the 35% uplift is to be met within the district and not redistributed (see Places for Everyone Joint Committee documentation, 20th July 2021, author Paul Dennett, Page 7 section 2.2 (ii))

https://democracy.greatermanchesterca.gov.uk/documents/s15613/PFE_JC_July2021

This represents a significant change between the previous spatial framework the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and the current joint development plan Places for Everyone.

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.

Legal Compliance

? It is questionable whether PfE and the GMSF can effectively be treated as the same plan. Legality must be decided in court before 'Places for Everyone' can proceed any further. It is assumed that a transition between a spatial framework (GMSF) and a Joint Development plan (PfE) is acceptable without a significant re-write. While the GMSF may have been established as legally compliant (complies with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning regulations) and could therefore possibly proceed to final public consultation and submission under Regulation 19 (this current stage) PfE legality is not established. If there is any substantial difference in scope between the GMSF and PfE it cannot be assumed that Regulation 18 is Automatically satisfied for PfE. Para 1.23 states 'The changes made between GMSF 2020 and PfE 2021 are not insignificant in numerical terms, indeed all sections of the plan have seen some form of change.' So, is 'not insignificant' the same as 'substantial', if it is, the plan is not legal. This can only be established by a proper judicial review. So until

proven otherwise the plan must be considered illegal and not put to Government.

Soundness

? The plan uses 2014 data to predict housing need and ignores the potential impact of Brexit and Covid-19. Housing need must be re-assessed using the latest (2018) ONS population predictions and take into account the effect of Covid on work patterns.

? There is little detail on how the required infrastructure will be paid for. The plan needs to be revised to identify how all the infrastructure will be paid

? There are no partners or industries identified for employment provision. Major partners for employment provision should be identified.

? There has been poor public consultation, a lack of accessible information and little spent by councils in generating awareness. Interest in the plan has mainly been generated by local protest groups. The public consultations should be repeated, providing clear, understandable information. They should be designed to encourage rather than discourage public input.

? The site selection process has been opaque with no explanation as to why some sites in the 'call for sites' were excluded from the plan.

https://mappinggm.org.uk/call-for-sites/#os_maps_outdoor/16/53.6380/-2.3228

The process should be repeated using National and GMCA guidelines for site selection. Meetings with public representation should be held and minutes should be published. The rationale for the selection/rejection of every site should be available including considered alternatives.

? Several of the authorities involved have consistently failed to meet housing delivery targets. An effective a plan must be deliverable. The plan relies on the cooperation of property developers. There is no indication of how delivery targets will be maintained. A strategy to guarantee housing delivery rates must be provided. This cannot be left to any local authority that is currently behind on housing targets. Clear delivery plans for infrastructure should be included.

? PfE shows removal of greenbelt protection for some areas and creation of greenbelts in others. There is no proof of exceptional circumstances required in the National Planning Policy Framework to justify this.

? In addition to PfE each authority needs to come up with its own local plan. No details have been given about when these plans will be available.

? There are no details of how Duty to Cooperate will be achieved. Following their withdrawal Stockport will effectively become a neighbouring borough. However, it is not acceptable to limit neighbouring boroughs to Stockport since each of the authorities in the plan is also neighbouring to other authorities outside of the plan e.g. Bury is neighbours with Rossendale, Bolton neighbours Blackburn with Darwen, Wigan neighbours St Helens and Trafford neighbours Cheshire area.

? A change in the methodology for Manchester City Council was resulted in a 35% uplift for the Manchester City Council area. The revised Local Housing Need methodology states that the 35% uplift is to be met within the district and not redistributed (see Places for Everyone Joint Committee documentation, 20th July 2021, author Paul Dennett, Page 7 section 2.2 (ii)

https://democracy.greatermanchesterca.gov.uk/documents/s15613/PFE_JC_July2021

This represents a significant change between the previous spatial framework the

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and the current joint development plan Places for Everyone.
Family Name	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	JPA 9: Walshaw
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf
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>Legal Compliance</p> <p>? It is questionable whether PFE and the GMSF can effectively be treated as the same plan. Legality must be decided in court before "Places for Everyone" can proceed any further. It is assumed that a transition between a spatial framework (GMSF) and a Joint Development plan (PFE) is acceptable without a significant re-write. While the GMSF may have been established as legally compliant (complies with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning regulations) and could therefore possibly proceed to final public consultation and submission under Regulation 19 (this current stage) PFE legality is not established. If there is any substantial difference in scope between the GMSF and PFE it cannot be assumed that Regulation 18 is Automatically satisfied for PFE. Para 1.23 states "The changes made between GMSF 2020 and PFE 2021 are not insignificant in numerical terms, indeed all sections of the plan have seen some form of change." So, is "not insignificant" the same as "substantial", if it is, the plan is not legal. This can only be established by a proper judicial review. So until proven otherwise the plan must be considered illegal and not put to Government.</p> <p>Soundness</p> <p>? The plan uses 2014 data to predict housing need and ignores the potential impact of Brexit and Covid-19. Housing need must be re-assessed using the latest (2018) ONA population predictions and take into account the effect of Covid on work patterns.</p> <p>? There is little detail on how the required infrastructure will be paid for. The plan needs to be revised to identify how all the infrastructure will be paid for.</p> <p>? There are no partners or industries identified for employment provision. Major partners for employment provision should be identified.</p>

? There has been poor public consultation, a lack of accessible information and little spent by councils in generating awareness. Interest in the plan has mainly been generated by local protest groups. The public consultations should be repeated, providing clear, understandable information. They should be designed to encourage rather than discourage public input.

? The site selection process has been opaque with no explanation as to why some sites in the "call for sites" were excluded from the plan.

https://mappinggm.org.uk/call-for-sites/#os_maps_outdoor/16/53.6380/-2.3228

The process should be repeated using National and GMCA guidelines for site selection. Meetings with public representation should be held and minutes should be published. The rationale for the selection/rejection of every site should be available including considered alternatives.

? Several of the authorities involved have consistently failed to meet housing delivery targets. An effective a plan must be deliverable. The plan relies on the cooperation of property developers. There is no indication of how delivery targets will be maintained. A strategy to guarantee housing delivery rates must be provided. This cannot be left to any local authority that is currently behind on housing targets. Clear delivery plans for infrastructure should be included.

? PfE shows removal of greenbelt protection for some areas and creation of greenbelts in others. There is no proof of exceptional circumstances required in the National Planning Policy Framework to justify this.

? In addition to PfE each authority needs to come up with its own local plan. No details have been given about when these plans will be available.

? There are no details of how Duty to Cooperate will be achieved. Following their withdrawal Stockport will effectively become a neighbouring borough. However, it is not acceptable to limit neighbouring boroughs to Stockport since each of the authorities in the plan is also neighbouring to other authorities outside of the plan e.g. Bury is neighbours with Rossendale, Bolton neighbours Blackburn with Darwen, Wigan neighbours St Helens and Trafford neighbours Cheshire area.

? A change in the methodology for Manchester City Council was resulted in a 35% uplift for the Manchester City Council area. The revised Local Housing Need methodology states that the 35% uplift is to be met within the district and not redistributed (see Places for Everyone Joint Committee documentation, 20th July 2021, author Paul Dennett, Page 7 section 2.2 (ii))

https://democracy.greatermanchesterca.gov.uk/documents/s15613/PFE_JC_July2021

This represents a significant change between the previous spatial framework the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and the current joint development plan Places for Everyone.

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

Legal Compliance

? It is questionable whether PfE and the GMSF can effectively be treated as the same plan. Legality must be decided in court before 'Places for Everyone' can proceed any further. It is assumed that a transition between a spatial framework (GMSF) and a Joint Development plan (PfE) is acceptable without a significant re-write. While the GMSF may have been established as legally compliant (complies with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning regulations) and could therefore possibly proceed

you have identified above.

to final public consultation and submission under Regulation 19 (this current stage) PfE legality is not established. If there is any substantial difference in scope between the GMSF and PfE it cannot be assumed that Regulation 18 is Automatically satisfied for PfE. Para 1.23 states 'The changes made between GMSF 2020 and PfE 2021 are not insignificant in numerical terms, indeed all sections of the plan have seen some form of change.' So, is 'not insignificant' the same as 'substantial', if it is, the plan is not legal. This can only be established by a proper judicial review. So until proven otherwise the plan must be considered illegal and not put to Government.

Soundness

? The plan uses 2014 data to predict housing need and ignores the potential impact of Brexit and Covid-19. Housing need must be re-assessed using the latest (2018) ONA population predictions and take into account the effect of Covid on work patterns.

? There is little detail on how the required infrastructure will be paid for. The plan needs to be revised to identify how all the infrastructure will be paid

? There are no partners or industries identified for employment provision. Major partners for employment provision should be identified.

? There has been poor public consultation, a lack of accessible information and little spent by councils in generating awareness. Interest in the plan has mainly been generated by local protest groups. The public consultations should be repeated, providing clear, understandable information. They should be designed to encourage rather than discourage public input.

? The site selection process has been opaque with no explanation as to why some sites in the 'call for sites' were excluded from the plan.

https://mappinggm.org.uk/call-for-sites/#os_maps_outdoor/16/53.6380/-2.3228

The process should be repeated using National and GMCA guidelines for site selection. Meetings with public representation should be held and minutes should be published. The rationale for the selection/rejection of every site should be available including considered alternatives.

? Several of the authorities involved have consistently failed to meet housing delivery targets. An effective a plan must be deliverable. The plan relies on the cooperation of property developers. There is no indication of how delivery targets will be maintained. A strategy to guarantee housing delivery rates must be provided. This cannot be left to any local authority that is currently behind on housing targets. Clear delivery plans for infrastructure should be included.

? PfE shows removal of greenbelt protection for some areas and creation of greenbelts in others. There is no proof of exceptional circumstances required in the National Planning Policy Framework to justify this.

? In addition to PfE each authority needs to come up with its own local plan. No details have been given about when these plans will be available.

? There are no details of how Duty to Cooperate will be achieved. Following their withdrawal Stockport will effectively become a neighbouring borough. However, it is not acceptable to limit neighbouring boroughs to Stockport since each of the authorities in the plan is also neighbouring to other authorities outside of the plan e.g. Bury is neighbours with Rossendale, Bolton neighbours Blackburn with Darwen, Wigan neighbours St Helens and Trafford neighbours Cheshire area.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>? A change in the methodology for Manchester City Council was resulted in a 35% uplift for the Manchester City Council area. The revised Local Housing Need methodology states that the 35% uplift is to be met within the district and not redistributed (see Places for Everyone Joint Committee documentation, 20th July 2021, author Paul Dennett, Page 7 section 2.2 (ii) https://democracy.greatermanchesterca.gov.uk/documents/s15613/PFE_JC_July2021 This represents a significant change between the previous spatial framework the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and the current joint development plan Places for Everyone.</p>
Family Name	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	Bury - Green Belt Additions
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf
GBA Bury - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this District your response relates to - then respond to the questions below	<p>Bury GBA03 Pigs Lea Brook 1 Bury GBA04 North of Nuttall Park Bury GBA05 Pigs Lea Brook 2 Bury GBA06 Hollins Brook Bury GBA07 Off New Road, Radcliffe Bury GBA08 Hollins Brow Bury GBA09 Hollybank Street, Radcliffe Bury GBA10 Crow Lumb Wood Bury GBA11 Nuttall West, Ramsbottom Bury GBA12 Woolfold, Bury Bury GBA13 Nuttall East, Ramsbottom Bury GBA14 Chesham, Bury Bury GBA15 Broad Hey Wood North Bury GBA16 Lower Hinds</p>
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	<p>It is questionable whether PFE and the GMSF can effectively be treated as the same plan. Legality must be decided in court before "Places for Everyone" can proceed any further. It is assumed that a transition between a spatial framework (GMSF) and a</p>

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

Joint Development plan (PfE) is acceptable without a significant re-write. While the GMSF may have been established as legally compliant (complies with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning regulations) and could therefore possibly proceed to final public consultation and submission under Regulation 19 (this current stage) PfE legality is not established. If there is any substantial difference in scope between the GMSF and PfE it cannot be assumed that Regulation 18 is Automatically satisfied for PfE. Para 1.23 states "The changes made between GMSF 2020 and PfE 2021 are not insignificant in numerical terms, indeed all sections of the plan have seen some form of change." So, is "not insignificant" the same as "substantial", if it is, the plan is not legal. This can only be established by a proper judicial review. So until proven otherwise the plan must be considered illegal and not put to Government.

Soundness

? The plan uses 2014 data to predict housing need and ignores the potential impact of Brexit and Covid-19. Housing need must be re-assessed using the latest (2018) ON population predictions and take into account the effect of Covid on work patterns.

? There is little detail on how the required infrastructure will be paid for. The plan needs to be revised to identify how all the infrastructure will be paid

? There are no partners or industries identified for employment provision. Major partners for employment provision should be identified.

? There has been poor public consultation, a lack of accessible information and little spent by councils in generating awareness. Interest in the plan has mainly been generated by local protest groups. The public consultations should be repeated, providing clear, understandable information. They should be designed to encourage rather than discourage public input.

? The site selection process has been opaque with no explanation as to why some sites in the "call for sites" were excluded from the plan.

https://mappinggm.org.uk/call-for-sites/#os_maps_outdoor/16/53.6380/-2.3228

The process should be repeated using National and GMCA guidelines for site selection. Meetings with public representation should be held and minutes should be published. The rationale for the selection/rejection of every site should be available including considered alternatives.

? Several of the authorities involved have consistently failed to meet housing delivery targets. An effective a plan must be deliverable. The plan relies on the cooperation of property developers. There is no indication of how delivery targets will be maintained. A strategy to guarantee housing delivery rates must be provided. This cannot be left to any local authority that is currently behind on housing targets. Clear delivery plans for infrastructure should be included.

? PfE shows removal of greenbelt protection for some areas and creation of greenbelts in others. There is no proof of exceptional circumstances required in the National Planning Policy Framework to justify this.

? In addition to PfE each authority needs to come up with its own local plan. No details have been given about when these plans will be available.

? There are no details of how Duty to Cooperate will be achieved. Following their withdrawal Stockport will effectively become a neighbouring borough. However, it is not acceptable to limit neighbouring boroughs to Stockport since each of the

authorities in the plan is also neighbouring to other authorities outside of the plan e.g. Bury is neighbours with Rossendale, Bolton neighbours Blackburn with Darwen, Wigan neighbours St Helens and Trafford neighbours Cheshire area.

? A change in the methodology for Manchester City Council was resulted in a 35% uplift for the Manchester City Council area. The revised Local Housing Need methodology states that the 35% uplift is to be met within the district and not redistributed (see Places for Everyone Joint Committee documentation, 20th July 2021, author Paul Dennett, Page 7 section 2.2 (ii) https://democracy.greatermanchesterca.gov.uk/documents/s15613/PFE_JC_July2021)

This represents a significant change between the previous spatial framework the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and the current joint development plan Places for Everyone.

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.

It is questionable whether PfE and the GMSF can effectively be treated as the same plan. Legality must be decided in court before 'Places for Everyone' can proceed any further. It is assumed that a transition between a spatial framework (GMSF) and a Joint Development plan (PfE) is acceptable without a significant re-write. While the GMSF may have been established as legally compliant (complies with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning regulations) and could therefore possibly proceed to final public consultation and submission under Regulation 19 (this current stage) PfE legality is not established. If there is any substantial difference in scope between the GMSF and PfE it cannot be assumed that Regulation 18 is Automatically satisfied for PfE. Para 1.23 states 'The changes made between GMSF 2020 and PfE 2021 are not insignificant in numerical terms, indeed all sections of the plan have seen some form of change.' So, is 'not insignificant' the same as 'substantial', if it is, the plan is not legal. This can only be established by a proper judicial review. So until proven otherwise the plan must be considered illegal and not put to Government.

Soundness

? The plan uses 2014 data to predict housing need and ignores the potential impact of Brexit and Covid-19. Housing need must be re-assessed using the latest (2018) ONS population predictions and take into account the effect of Covid on work patterns.

? There is little detail on how the required infrastructure will be paid for. The plan needs to be revised to identify how all the infrastructure will be paid

? There are no partners or industries identified for employment provision. Major partners for employment provision should be identified.

? There has been poor public consultation, a lack of accessible information and little spent by councils in generating awareness. Interest in the plan has mainly been generated by local protest groups. The public consultations should be repeated, providing clear, understandable information. They should be designed to encourage rather than discourage public input.

? The site selection process has been opaque with no explanation as to why some sites in the 'call for sites' were excluded from the plan.

https://mappinggm.org.uk/call-for-sites/#os_maps_outdoor/16/53.6380/-2.3228

The process should be repeated using National and GMCA guidelines for site selection. Meetings with public representation should be held and minutes should be published. The rationale for the selection/rejection of every site should be available

including considered alternatives.

? Several of the authorities involved have consistently failed to meet housing delivery targets. An effective a plan must be deliverable. The plan relies on the cooperation of property developers. There is no indication of how delivery targets will be maintained. A strategy to guarantee housing delivery rates must be provided. This cannot be left to any local authority that is currently behind on housing targets. Clear delivery plans for infrastructure should be included.

? PfE shows removal of greenbelt protection for some areas and creation of greenbelts in others. There is no proof of exceptional circumstances required in the National Planning Policy Framework to justify this.

? In addition to PfE each authority needs to come up with its own local plan. No details have been given about when these plans will be available.

? There are no details of how Duty to Cooperate will be achieved. Following their withdrawal Stockport will effectively become a neighbouring borough. However, it is not acceptable to limit neighbouring boroughs to Stockport since each of the authorities in the plan is also neighbouring to other authorities outside of the plan e.g. Bury is neighbours with Rossendale, Bolton neighbours Blackburn with Darwen, Wigan neighbours St Helens and Trafford neighbours Cheshire area.

? A change in the methodology for Manchester City Council was resulted in a 35% uplift for the Manchester City Council area. The revised Local Housing Need methodology states that the 35% uplift is to be met within the district and not redistributed (see Places for Everyone Joint Committee documentation, 20th July 2021, author Paul Dennett, Page 7 section 2.2 (ii))

https://democracy.greatermanchesterca.gov.uk/documents/s15613/PFE_JC_July2021

This represents a significant change between the previous spatial framework the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and the current joint development plan Places for Everyone.

Family Name	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	Supporting Evidence
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf
Redacted comment on supporting documents - Please give details of why you consider any of the evidence not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	<p>It is questionable whether PfE and the GMSF can effectively be treated as the same plan. Legality must be decided in court before 'Places for Everyone' can proceed any further. It is assumed that a transition between a spatial framework (GMSF) and a Joint Development plan (PfE) is acceptable without a significant re-write. While the GMSF may have been established as legally compliant (complies with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning regulations) and could therefore possibly proceed to final public consultation and submission under Regulation 19 (this current stage) PfE legality is not established. If there is any substantial difference in scope between the GMSF and PfE it cannot be assumed that Regulation 18 is Automatically satisfied.</p>

for PfE. Para 1.23 states 'The changes made between GMSF 2020 and PfE 2021 are not insignificant in numerical terms, indeed all sections of the plan have seen some form of change.' So, is 'not insignificant' the same as 'substantial', if it is, the plan is not legal. This can only be established by a proper judicial review. So until proven otherwise the plan must be considered illegal and not put to Government.

Soundness

? The plan uses 2014 data to predict housing need and ignores the potential impact of Brexit and Covid-19. Housing need must be re-assessed using the latest (2018) ONA population predictions and take into account the effect of Covid on work patterns.

? There is little detail on how the required infrastructure will be paid for. The plan needs to be revised to identify how all the infrastructure will be paid

? There are no partners or industries identified for employment provision. Major partners for employment provision should be identified.

? There has been poor public consultation, a lack of accessible information and little spent by councils in generating awareness. Interest in the plan has mainly been generated by local protest groups. The public consultations should be repeated, providing clear, understandable information. They should be designed to encourage rather than discourage public input.

? The site selection process has been opaque with no explanation as to why some sites in the 'call for sites' were excluded from the plan.

https://mappinggm.org.uk/call-for-sites/#os_maps_outdoor/16/53.6380/-2.3228

The process should be repeated using National and GMCA guidelines for site selection. Meetings with public representation should be held and minutes should be published. The rationale for the selection/rejection of every site should be available including considered alternatives.

? Several of the authorities involved have consistently failed to meet housing delivery targets. An effective plan must be deliverable. The plan relies on the cooperation of property developers. There is no indication of how delivery targets will be maintained. A strategy to guarantee housing delivery rates must be provided. This cannot be left to any local authority that is currently behind on housing targets. Clear delivery plans for infrastructure should be included.

? PfE shows removal of greenbelt protection for some areas and creation of greenbelts in others. There is no proof of exceptional circumstances required in the National Planning Policy Framework to justify this.

? In addition to PfE each authority needs to come up with its own local plan. No details have been given about when these plans will be available.

? There are no details of how Duty to Cooperate will be achieved. Following their withdrawal Stockport will effectively become a neighbouring borough. However, it is not acceptable to limit neighbouring boroughs to Stockport since each of the authorities in the plan is also neighbouring to other authorities outside of the plan e.g. Bury is neighbours with Rossendale, Bolton neighbours Blackburn with Darwen, Wigan neighbours St Helens and Trafford neighbours Cheshire area.

? A change in the methodology for Manchester City Council was resulted in a 35% uplift for the Manchester City Council area. The revised Local Housing Need methodology states that the 35% uplift is to be met within the district and not

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>redistributed (see Places for Everyone Joint Committee documentation, 20th July 2021, author Paul Dennett, Page 7 section 2.2 (ii) https://democracy.greatermanchesterca.gov.uk/documents/s15613/PFE_JC_July2021 This represents a significant change between the previous spatial framework the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework and the current joint development plan Places for Everyone.</p>
Family Name	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	Other Comments
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf
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	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	Other Comments
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf
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	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Title	Other Comments
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf
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	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	Other Comments
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf
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	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	Other Comments
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Family Name	Smith
Given Name	Craig
Person ID	1287048
Title	JPA 1.2: Simister and Bowlee (Northern Gateway)
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287048_SOSGeneral.pdf PFE1287048_Legality_Simister.pdf PFE1287048_ObjectionToPlan.pdf PFE1287048_SOSElton.pdf PFE1287048_SOSWalshaw.pdf
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