

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Szymala
<b>Given Name</b>	John
<b>Person ID</b>	1286474
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Szymala
<b>Given Name</b>	John
<b>Person ID</b>	1286474
<b>Title</b>	JPA 35: North of Mosley Common
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	<p>The area identified (JPA35: North of Mosley Common) lies adjacent to what was the largest concentration of deep coal mines in England (either side of Bridgewater Road). The site is subject to subsidence and ground instability making it unsuitable for residential development.</p> <p>Many of the old underground mine workings were not properly recorded or mapped.</p> <p>In addition other legacy issues remain from the previous underground mine workings, including the presence of hazardous gases which render the development unsound and potentially lethal.</p> <p>The proposal to build an extra 1100 extra houses in addition to existing developments is also unsound as the local road structure is already operating at over capacity during peak periods.</p> <p>The additional substantial increase in traffic on local roads will cause constant gridlock and and contribute to a great deterioration in air quality caused by traffic fumes.</p> <p>I have been a resident in this locality for over thirty years and now find local services such as GP surgeries, dentists and schools are already overwhelmed.</p> <p>I notice the Peel Development makes no provision to provide additional medical facilities (UNSOUND).</p> <p>I assume that with 1100 new houses, most will have children of school age. The development does not provide for a primary school but suggests that St Johns school could be extended or money given to the local authority. That is rubbish as they could never accommodate such an influx from such a development. (UNSOUND).</p>

	<p>Money to Wigan education department is a cop out as a primary school would never be built in the locality and would need to be in place before the proposed development was occupied (UNSOUND).</p> <p>Mosley Common does not have a senior school the nearest being in Tyldesley and that is already over subscribed, undergoing renovations with no prospect to increase the current occupancy figure of pupils. Where do children of that age go. Money to Wigan Education Authority is a buy off and will not provide a local Secondary School (UNSOUND).</p> <p>The proposal is the erosion of Green belt land between Mosley Common North and Little Hulton.</p>
<p><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></p>	<p>Do not approve the development planning process unless:-</p> <p>Peel Holdings conduct a full and detailed independent land survey in respect of legacy mine workings and ground instability.</p> <p>Peel Holdings conduct a full and detailed independent survey in respect of legacy mine workings and hazardous gas releases.</p> <p>That the development planning process not proceed until Wigan Education Authority cost, approve plans and and build an extension to St Johns primary school or a local new build primary school.</p> <p>That the development planning process not proceed until Wigan Education Authority cost, approve plans and and build a local new build Secondary School or give substantial and robust evidence as where the anticipated increase in pupal numbers would be locally schooled.</p>