

Family Name	Valentine
Given Name	Joyce
Person ID	1285875
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Valentine
Given Name	Joyce
Person ID	1285875
Title	JPA 37: West of Gibfield
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.	I consider this plan to be unsound because I have lived in this bungalow since 1959 as a Greenfield site so as not to create urban sprawl between the small towns of Atherton, Westhoughton and Daisy Hill. I have looked out on crops of mixed vegetables, rotated with barley, oats and wheat. Since then cattle have grazed this land for a long period of time. The same land is farmed with two crops of hay annually and still is. I dispute your claim that it is poor agricultural land. We have had to endure the noise and dirt of opencast mining but not on the land up to where the hedge has been restored - this has never been touched for mining. Secondly we have excellent routes to Manchester with the Vantage buses every 10 mins plus 3 stations in the vicinity and easy access to the M61 to travel North or South. Thirdly, I see no evidence of extra jobs brought by the offices already provided. There is ample opportunity already here. There is no money allocated to the Road plans. This was already started years ago and stopped because of lack of funds. There is much conjecture about the plans put forward.
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.	No modifications are necessary as we have a much-loved asset on our doorstep and the loss of this Greenbelt land would destroy over 49 hectares of natural countryside with flora and fauna and a habitat to the considerable wildlife we already have. It is ludicrous to suggest that this beautiful amenity would be enhanced.