

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Thornton
<b>Given Name</b>	Stephen
<b>Person ID</b>	1286856
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Thornton
<b>Given Name</b>	Stephen
<b>Person ID</b>	1286856
<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>	As a resident of Simister we have already been subjected to unacceptably high levels of pollution derived from our proximity to the motorway network. Aside from the as yet unassessed impact of the Northern Loop project at Simister Island M60 we will as part of the Places for Everyone project see unrivalled development of both residential and employment infrastructure in the northeastern corner of the M60. I understand that pollution levels are already 3 x the recommended levels by WHO so quite how the project aims to reconcile the already existing pollution levels with the likely impact of the development in both built in material(s) and construction phase emissions with the legacy of increased traffic and residential emissions is difficult to understand.
<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>	Spend more time looking into the development of brown field. Undertake a multiagency review of the ability of the extant network to handle traffic volumes as frankly the smart motorway development of recent years has seemingly had a marginal effect on the smoothing of traffic in the northeastern corner of the M60. The concentration of traffic in the quadrant could potentially contribute to the M60 becoming amongst the most polluting sectors of motor way of the country.
<b>Family Name</b>	Thornton
<b>Given Name</b>	Stephen
<b>Person ID</b>	1286856
<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>	As already highlighted the north eastern corner of the M60 already experiences levels of pollution in excess of recommended WHO levels. Irrespective how well intentioned the development will be there is absolutely no chance of these levels remaining the same let alone reducing.
<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>	Any plan to develop the northeastern corner of the M60 has to ensure that any work is carbon neutral from the outset combined with significant investment in the extant network of facilities, road network and homes to assist in the reduction and mitigation of pollution levels.
<b>Family Name</b>	Thornton
<b>Given Name</b>	Stephen
<b>Person ID</b>	1286856
<b>Title</b>	JPA 1.1 Heywood / Pilsworth (Northern Gateway)
<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>	As already highlighted in other areas the development places a significant development slap bang in the middle of one of the most polluted motorway networks in the country as it already stands. Quite how any development in

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>	this area (residential or commercial) can improve environmental conditions is hard to comprehend.
<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>	Highlighted already. Detailed multi agency review of pollution and environmental impact of both the Northern Gateway development and the Northern Loop solution to Simister Island.
<b>Family Name</b>	Thornton
<b>Given Name</b>	Stephen
<b>Person ID</b>	1286856
<b>Title</b>	JPA 1.2: Simister and Bowlee (Northern Gateway)
<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 proposal to restrict access to Simister Lane from the allocation will not suffice. Simister already suffers increased traffic at peak times and experiences significant congestion on Heywood Road resulting from a lack of enforcement on Blueball lane. This lane I understand will remain open after the allocation. Nothing in the PFE indicates how this lane will be modified to stop the potential increase in hundreds of journey"s through Simister resulting from the allocation.
<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>	Quite how you can restrict access to a farm lane that furnishes the farmer access to his property beyond the allocation is a problem that has plagued residents of Simister for years.