

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Starkey
<b>Given Name</b>	Charlotte
<b>Person ID</b>	1286505
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Starkey
<b>Given Name</b>	Charlotte
<b>Person ID</b>	1286505
<b>Title</b>	Our Vision
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	The so-called Vision still speaks of developing Manchester Airport without any reference to the enormous damage this site does to the planet in terms of pollution, destruction of green belt which should be used for agriculture at a time when our farming infra-structure and food-supply is dangerously dependent on foreign imports. It also speaks in vast, meaningless generalisations copied and pasted from former failed attempts at a "Strategic Framework". Responses by local councillors and planning departments (when, and if, they respond at all which is a rare courtesy from them) reveal that they are echoing mindsets embedded in earlier Strategic Framework documents. In other words, they are still bent on getting their plans through regardless of genuine informed scientific, ecological and social concerns.
<b>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.</b>	Re-address the whole concept of Manchester Airport and its need to become a zero-contributor to climate destruction and to cease the wholesale destruction of the green hinterland. It is at the moment a monstrous cancer.
<b>Family Name</b>	Starkey
<b>Given Name</b>	Charlotte
<b>Person ID</b>	1286505
<b>Title</b>	Our Strategic Objectives
<b>Type</b>	Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	The plan does not define "affordable housing" but emphasises "high quality", in other words, expensive properties to be sold at exorbitant prices to foreign investment as is happening to any development taking place in West Timperley where 30s semis, with serious settlement problems and with a little extension, have suddenly rocketed to the ridiculous figure of £500,000. bought with foreign money by people clearly totally unaware of the valuation of the area and no doubt not interested in that, only in "banking excess cash" from abroad in this country, as if money laundering as happened in the local city. This will happen in Carrington"s proposed development, cutting out local need for housing, appealing only to outside investment for dubious purposes.
<b>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.</b>	The plan needs to specify the exact numbers of affordable homes, and the price-ranges anticipated, along with very clear planning and development criteria that prevent the exploitation both of people and land. In short, Trafford Council needs to be much more proactive in determining the development of the area and accept responsibility for its role instead of leaving it to private profiteers.
<b>Family Name</b>	Starkey
<b>Given Name</b>	Charlotte
<b>Person ID</b>	1286505
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 1 Valuing Important Landscapes
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the</b>	Both in Carrington and Timperley the plan is designed to destroy the green infrastructure that has been an important contributor to the quality of the whole region. In the case of Timperley Wedge it is a well-know fact that a

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	"deal" was done some years ago to preserve the seat of a councillor where green space was under threat, at the expense of Timperley Wedge whose quality far outstrips that of many other places. This smacks of vested interest, using internal power structures at council level, and suggests cronyism of the worst kind. Equally it is clear that Carrington has suffered from a conspiracy of silence among Trafford Council who simply refuse to acknowledge the value of the greens space. This P4E project is simply a rehash of old material, with a few doctored sections.
<b>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.</b>	For housing need build on brownfield sites and use the vast acreage of town centres where there are multiple vacant properties many of which will never be viable businesses. They were not viable before the pandemic in many instances and whole streets contain such properties. Manchester City, Altrincham, Bolton are prime examples.
<b>Family Name</b>	Starkey
<b>Given Name</b>	Charlotte
<b>Person ID</b>	1286505
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 2 Green Infrastructure Network
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	The policy takes absolutely no account of carbon emissions, the contribution of green spaces, peat bogs and woodland to prevent climate damage; it shows no scientific basis for its plans to destroy such locations, no evidence of having sought expert scientific advice, not even any recognition of the multiple media avenues which have explore and are currently exploring the catastrophe that our planet is facing. In short, those who have prepared this document are unqualified for the magnitude of the task they are trying to handle and no amount of document window dressing will change that reality. Bring in experts in the fields of science, climatology and natural disasters in order to give credibility to the areas you attempt to cover.
<b>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</b>	See above.

<b>or soundness matters you have identified above.</b>	
<b>Family Name</b>	Starkey
<b>Given Name</b>	Charlotte
<b>Person ID</b>	1286505
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 3 River Valleys and Waterways
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	The whole plan is basically undermined by past promises (eg. re-the Mersey Valley) broken when councils decide they are no longer interested in the green infrastructure because it does not bring in more money to their coffers.
<b>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.</b>	As above.
<b>Family Name</b>	Starkey
<b>Given Name</b>	Charlotte
<b>Person ID</b>	1286505
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 4 Lowland Wetlands and Mosslands
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound

## Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	You plan to destroy the final remains of the 2nd largest peat bog in this area, and the largest in n. east Cheshire, Carrington Moss; and you care nothing about this hugely important carbon capture pool. Councillors have laughed, snorted, derided any attempt to point to the locations significance. Equally, the emphasis on Manchester Airport speaks volumes about the total lack of interest in the value of Timperley Wedge. At a time when aircraft pollution along with car pollution is greatly increasing the damage to the environment this P4E document is an echo of Nero's fiddling while the planet burns and drowns. Even economically it is madness: recent chaos in the food and other production and distribution chains indicate the we cannot fly ourselves out of chaos: we need farming and manufacturing in green technologies to move forward, not development destruction.
<b>Family Name</b>	Starkey
<b>Given Name</b>	Charlotte
<b>Person ID</b>	1286505
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 10 Green Belt
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	See above. I have stated what is universally understood to be valid criticism.
<b>Family Name</b>	Starkey
<b>Given Name</b>	Charlotte
<b>Person ID</b>	1286505
<b>Title</b>	JPA 33 New Carrington
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Redacted reasons - Please give us details</b>	This has been dealt with above in the discussion of the general plan.

<b>of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	
<b>Family Name</b>	Starkey
<b>Given Name</b>	Charlotte
<b>Person ID</b>	1286505
<b>Title</b>	JPA 3.2: Timperley Wedge
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No