

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Tyldesley
<b>Given Name</b>	Mark
<b>Person ID</b>	1286691
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Include files</b>	<a href="#">PFEMarkTyldesly.pdf</a>
<b>Family Name</b>	Tyldesley
<b>Given Name</b>	Mark
<b>Person ID</b>	1286691
<b>Title</b>	Our Spatial Strategy
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<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 proposal for Hazlehurst farm does not consider the current need of local people in terms of traffic, use of green belt and pressure of local services.</p> <p>The houses / development in Worsley / Boothstown will increase the population by about 12,00 houses on top of other new build in the area. Schools, GP"s , roads are already under pressure and they is VERY VERY poor public transport. The V1-2 bus is very poor with full / no buses at peak times. Also, everyone does not need to travel to Manchester or Leigh. Other areas of Manchester are not served by public transport. This development will mean more cars on the road.</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>	Limit the use of greenbelt development in Worsley / Boothstown and improve public transport first.
<b>Family Name</b>	Tyldesley
<b>Given Name</b>	Mark
<b>Person ID</b>	1286691
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 1 Core Growth Area
<b>Type</b>	Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Sound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>	Would need to be supported by an increase in public transport.
<b>Family Name</b>	Tyldesley
<b>Given Name</b>	Mark
<b>Person ID</b>	1286691
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 2 City Centre
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Sound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Family Name</b>	Tyldesley
<b>Given Name</b>	Mark
<b>Person ID</b>	1286691
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 3 The Quays
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Sound

## Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Family Name</b>	Tyldesley
<b>Given Name</b>	Mark
<b>Person ID</b>	1286691
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 4 Port Salford
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Sound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Family Name</b>	Tyldesley
<b>Given Name</b>	Mark
<b>Person ID</b>	1286691
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 5 Inner Areas
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Sound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Family Name</b>	Tyldesley
<b>Given Name</b>	Mark
<b>Person ID</b>	1286691
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 9 Southern Areas
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Sound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Family Name</b>	Tyldesley
<b>Given Name</b>	Mark
<b>Person ID</b>	1286691
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 10 Manchester Airport
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Sound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Family Name</b>	Tyldesley
<b>Given Name</b>	Mark
<b>Person ID</b>	1286691
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 11 New Carrington
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Sound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Family Name</b>	Tyldesley
<b>Given Name</b>	Mark
<b>Person ID</b>	1286691
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 12 Main Town Centres
<b>Type</b>	Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Sound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Family Name</b>	Tyldesley
<b>Given Name</b>	Mark
<b>Person ID</b>	1286691
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 13 Strategic Green Infrastructure
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Sound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Family Name</b>	Tyldesley
<b>Given Name</b>	Mark
<b>Person ID</b>	1286691
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 14 A Sustainable and Integrated Transport Network
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Sound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Sound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<b>Family Name</b>	Tyldesley
<b>Given Name</b>	Mark
<b>Person ID</b>	1286691

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Title</b>	JP-H 1 Scale Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development
<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>I refer to the PfE2021 and in particular JPA26 Land at Hazelhurst Farm identified as housing allocation for around 400 dwellings (the Proposed Developed).</p> <p>I am a resident in an area affected by the PfE2021 and the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The test for soundness set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is whether the PfE2021 is:</p> <p>Positively prepared - providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area"s objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;</p> <p>Justified - an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;</p> <p>Effective- deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common group; and</p> <p>Consistent with national policy - enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.</p> <p>I wish to make the following representations with respect to the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development:</p> <p>Increased Traffic Congestion - the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 104 and 105 of the Framework. The PfE2021 does not take into account the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport networks in my area. The area around the Proposed Development already suffers from heavy traffic congestion:</p> <p>Worsley Road and the East Lancs Road are both at maximum capacity and there are no plans in place to address the issues arising from the current volume of traffic using this road;</p> <p>the surrounding roads in Worsley and Boothstwon to the A572 and the Proposed Development (Ellenbrook Road, Walkden Road, Worsley Road and Barton Road) are also subject to heavy traffic flow on a regular basis. Both the A572 and the surrounding roads are also used by traffic accessing the amenities at RHS Bridgewater.</p> <p>The access road into the development is inadequate and will congest Hazelhurst Road, again which is busy with double parked cars.</p>

The addition of 400 dwellings will only lead to an increase in the traffic congestion in an area in which the transport network is already under considerable strain.

In terms of public transport services, Worsley and Boothstown are not well connected. The main public transport services are the buses on the East Lancashire Road (a service which is already oversubscribed). Bus services within Worsley have been seriously curtailed in recent years. People need to travel to other locations such as Media City, Trafford Park and Manchester Airport. All these are not served by bus services and travelling by car is the only option.

Increased Air and Noise Pollution: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 93, 104(d) and 105 of the Framework. Due to the close proximity of the M60 and the existing heavy traffic flow on the A572 / A580, our area has a high level of air and noise pollution. The Green Belt land in our area acts as an important buffer for the air and noise pollution.

Lack of Suitable Infrastructure: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraph 93 of the Framework. The PfE2021 does not address how the use of shared spaces, community facilities and other local services (for example, GPs, dentists, schools, etc) will be enhanced to sustain the increase in population due to the Proposed Development. In particular, the local schools in this area are already oversubscribed so children will have to travel greater distances to access both primary and secondary education.

Destruction of Open Space: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraph 99 of the Framework. The site of the Proposed Development is existing open space and none of the following apply:

an assessment has not been undertaken which clearly shows that the open space is surplus to requirements. The open space is close to many heritage sites and also RHS Bridgewater and the Framework acknowledges that an open spaces purpose may simply be as an area of local countryside;

it has not been demonstrated that the loss of Green Belt resulting from the Proposed Development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision for the community in this area in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; and

the Proposed Development is not for alternative sports and recreation provision.

Destruction of the Green Belt: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 137, 140, 141, 147 and 149 of the Framework. The PfE2021 does not recognise the importance of the site of the Proposed Development to prevent urban sprawl. The Framework states that there must be exceptional circumstances which justify the alteration of the boundaries of Green Belt land. In this case there are no exceptional circumstances and furthermore the Proposed Development is an inappropriate development. I also note that there are alternative brownfield sites available in this area which can be used for development.

Negative Impact on Local Ecology: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 120(b) and 174(b) of the Framework. Alderwood forms part of the site of the Proposed Development. It is a quiet rural environment which is used for physical and mental wellbeing activities.

**Family Name**

Tyldesley

**Given Name**

Mark

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Person ID</b>	1286691
<b>Title</b>	JP-H 2 Affordability of New Housing
<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 comments above regarding the development at Hazlehurst
<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>	None
<b>Family Name</b>	Tyldesley
<b>Given Name</b>	Mark
<b>Person ID</b>	1286691
<b>Title</b>	JP-H 3 Type Size and Design of New Housing
<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



Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Tyldesley
<b>Given Name</b>	Mark
<b>Person ID</b>	1286691
<b>Title</b>	JP-H 4 Density of New Housing
<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>Family Name</b>	Tyldesley
<b>Given Name</b>	Mark
<b>Person ID</b>	1286691
<b>Title</b>	JPA 26: Land at Hazelhurst Farm
<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>I refer to the PfE2021 and in particular JPA26 Land at Hazelhurst Farm identified as housing allocation for around 400 dwellings (the Proposed Developed).</p> <p>I am a resident in an area affected by the PfE2021 and the Proposed Development.</p> <p>The test for soundness set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) is whether the PfE2021 is:</p> <p>Positively prepared - providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area"s objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;</p> <p>Justified - an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;</p>

Effective- deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common group; and

Consistent with national policy - enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the Framework.

I wish to make the following representations with respect to the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development:

Increased Traffic Congestion - the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 104 and 105 of the Framework. The PfE2021 does not take into account the impact of the Proposed Development on the transport networks in my area. The area around the Proposed Development already suffers from heavy traffic congestion:

Worsley Road and the East Lancs Road are both at maximum capacity and there are no plans in place to address the issues arising from the current volume of traffic using this road;

the surrounding roads in Worsley and Boothstwon to the A572 and the Proposed Development (Ellenbrook Road, Walkden Road, Worsley Road and Barton Road) are also subject to heavy traffic flow on a regular basis. Both the A572 and the surrounding roads are also used by traffic accessing the amenities at RHS Bridgewater.

The access road into the development is inadequate and will congest Hazelhurst Road, again which is busy with double parked cars.

The addition of 400 dwellings will only lead to an increase in the traffic congestion in an area in which the transport network is already under considerable strain.

In terms of public transport services, Worsley and Boothstwon are not well connected. The main public transport services are the buses on the East Lancashire Road (a service which is already oversubscribed). Bus services within Worsley have been seriously curtailed in recent years. People need to travel to other locations such as Media City, Trafford Park and Manchester Airport. All these are not served by bus services and travelling by car is the only option.

Increased Air and Noise Pollution: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 93, 104(d) and 105 of the Framework. Due to the close proximity of the M60 and the existing heavy traffic flow on the A572 / A580, our area has a high level of air and noise pollution. The Green Belt land in our area acts as an important buffer for the air and noise pollution.

Lack of Suitable Infrastructure: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraph 93 of the Framework. The PfE2021 does not address how the use of shared spaces, community facilities and other local services (for example, GPs, dentists, schools, etc) will be enhanced to sustain the increase in population due to the Proposed Development. In particular, the local schools in this area are already oversubscribed so children will have to travel greater distances to access both primary and secondary education.

Destruction of Open Space: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraph 99 of the Framework. The site of the Proposed Development is existing open space and none of the following apply:

an assessment has not been undertaken which clearly shows that the open space is surplus to requirements. The open space is close to many heritage sites and also RHS Bridgewater and the Framework acknowledges that an open spaces purpose may simply be as an area of local countryside;

	<p>it has not been demonstrated that the loss of Green Belt resulting from the Proposed Development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision for the community in this area in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; and</p> <p>the Proposed Development is not for alternative sports and recreation provision.</p> <p>Destruction of the Green Belt: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 137, 140, 141, 147 and 149 of the Framework. The PfE2021 does not recognise the importance of the site of the Proposed Development to prevent urban sprawl. The Framework states that there must be exceptional circumstances which justify the alteration of the boundaries of Green Belt land. In this case there are no exceptional circumstances and furthermore the Proposed Development is an inappropriate development. I also note that there are alternative brownfield sites available in this area which can be used for development.</p> <p>Negative Impact on Local Ecology: the PfE2021 in relation to the Proposed Development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 120(b) and 174(b) of the Framework. Alderwood forms part of the site of the Proposed Development. It is a quiet rural environment which is used for physical and mental wellbeing activities.</p> <p>The proposal for Hazlehurst farm does not consider the current need of local people in terms of traffic, use of green belt and pressure of local services.</p> <p>The houses / development in Worsley / Boothstown will increase the population by about 12,00 houses on top of other new build in the area. Schools, GP"s , roads are already under pressure and they is VERY VERY poor public transport. The V1-2 bus is very poor with full / no buses at peak times. Also, everyone does not need to travel to Manchester or Leigh. Other areas of Manchester are not served by public transport. This development will mean more cars on the road.</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>Limit the use of greenbelt development in Worsley / Boothstown and improve public transport first.</p>
<p><b>Family Name</b></p>	<p>Tyldesley</p>
<p><b>Given Name</b></p>	<p>Mark</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1286691</p>
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>JPA 27: Land East of Boothstown</p>
<p><b>Type</b></p>	<p>Web</p>
<p><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>	<p>in relation to Land East of Boothstown (Leigh Road) adjacent to RHS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Traffic: Heavy traffic along Leigh Road (A572) already at maximum capacity with no future plan agreed to resolve existing problems.</li> <li>2. Congestion: All surrounding Roads to Leigh Road and this proposed development namely, Ellenbrook Road, Walkden Road, Worsley Road and Barton Road will be further impacted by the proposed 300 houses adding up to 600 extra cars. Problems have already been encountered with the additional traffic to and from RHS. These roads are already overloaded.</li> </ol>

3. Pollution: Atmospheric pollution from queuing vehicles along Leigh Road and from the motorway which is already one of the worst in Europe). Noise pollution. Salford Council already admit that noise will be an issue on this site due to its proximity to Leigh Road.
4. Ecology: Alderwood which forms part of this site provides a quiet rural environment in what is generally an urban area. This development could have a serious affect on the woods.
5. Greenbelt: Greenbelt was designated in the first place to protect it from development the loss of which would have a detrimental affect on the surrounding areas. Green belt should remain a natural buffer between built up areas providing some natural space for local people. Regard should be had for public rights of way which give people access to a small piece of countryside in an urban area.
6. Public Transport: Worsley and Boothstown is badly provided for in terms of public transport with only one main route into Manchester along the East Lancashire Road but this is mainly oversubscribed from Leigh and Wigan. Bus services from/through Boothstown have been seriously curtailed in recent years making access to doctors surgeries, hospitals, shops and schools extremely difficult.
7. Schools: Local schools are all oversubscribed meaning that children will have to travel greater distances to both primary and secondary schools adding further to congestion.
8. Heritage: This site is in close proximity to many heritage assets and the RHS Bridgewater Gardens. This development could significantly harm the setting of these heritage assets.
9. General infrastructure: As mentioned lack of suitable road network, access to most other services (Shops, Doctors, Chemists and hospitals). Access will be from Occupation Road (adjacent to the RHS) adding further strain to Leigh Road. Is there adequate access to main sewers without overloading existing sewers (already flood problems in the area)?
10. This site should be removed from the Greater Manchester plan (Places for Everyone) priority should instead be given those sites which do not have the constraints of this site. Greenbelt or Green Field sites should not be built on until all brown field sites have been exhausted.

**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.**

None