

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Thomas
Given Name	Rachael
Person ID	1287034
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Thomas
Given Name	Rachael
Person ID	1287034
Title	JPA 31: Godley Green Garden Village
Type	Web
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 proposed development directly conflicts current policies on green belt, environment, flood protection, infrastructure, woodland and wildlife protection. I don't believe compulsory purchase orders for this area are a good investment, there has been no impartial lack consultation and wording on the website and even within this survey are indicative that regardless of response plans will go ahead (and there are various reports on media that developers are already in place).</p> <p>Furthermore I am unfortunate to live between the two proposed developments in Hyde (GGGV and Hyde south apethorn and bowlacre). They are both beautiful areas I have lived in and walked by throughout my life. That two "sides" of gee cross village should lose green belt and therefore the natural benefit to the residents seems completely unjustifiable when brownfield options for affordable housing have been discarded or not explored.</p>
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.	<p>Impartial review (not involving Tameside council or developers) scrutinising the information I have highlighted including a review of the contradictions between policies in regards greenbelt, infrastructure etc and how these items are disregarded in the plans.</p> <p>Modification should place emphasis on current brownfield development for affordable homes and improvements to infrastructure of and where needed for such brownfield sites.</p>
Family Name	Thomas
Given Name	Rachael
Person ID	1287034

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Title	JPA 32: South of Hyde
Type	Web
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 proposed development directly conflicts current policies on green belt, environment, flood protection, infrastructure, woodland and wildlife protection. I don't believe compulsory purchase orders for this area are a good investment, there has been no impartial lack consultation and wording on the website and even within this survey are indicative that regardless of response plans will go ahead (and there are various reports on media that developers are already in place).</p> <p>Furthermore I am unfortunate to live between the two proposed developments in Hyde (GGGV and Hyde south apethorn and bowlacre). They are both beautiful areas I have lived in and walked by throughout my life. That two "sides" of gee cross village should lose green belt and therefore the natural benefit to the residents seems completely unjustifiable when brownfield options for affordable housing have been discarded or not explored.</p>
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.	<p>Impartial review (not involving Tameside council or developers) scrutinising the information I have highlighted including a review of the contradictions between policies in regards greenbelt, infrastructure etc and how these items are disregarded in the plans.</p> <p>Modification should place emphasis on current brownfield development for affordable homes and improvements to infrastructure of and where needed for such brownfield sites.</p>