

Family Name	Voss
Given Name	Anthony And Diane
Person ID	1287298
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Voss
Given Name	Anthony And Diane
Person ID	1287298
Title	Our Vision
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>Contravention of the governments national framework on greenbelt development.</p> <p>Contravention of protected species of the land</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>Reduce it considerably - 23 properties were refused on this land a few years ago how now can 116 properties be justified.</p> <p>We appreciate new properties need to be built but the visual amenity of the land and the disturbance of the wildlife has not been considered in this instance and the proposals should be minimised to comply with the fact the existing footprint of buildings on the land should not be increased it should comply with the guidelines and it should not cause 'substantial harm to the openness of the green belt'. It should also take into consideration of the biodiversity of the land the potential for flooding as there is a brook allegedly running through this land.</p> <p>The brownfield sites in the borough should be ear marked before any green belt land is touched that does not appear to have happened.</p> <p>The local population should have the right to vote on the proposal as we are the people affected and the council is elected by the residents.</p> <p>So it is only right and proper that we have the ultimate say, we did not put them in power to overturn the will of the people and the people in this area do not want and overdevelopment of this magnitude.</p>
Family Name	Voss

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Given Name	Anthony And Diane
Person ID	1287298
Title	Our Strategic Objectives
Type	Web
Our strategic objectives - Considering the information provided for our strategic objectives, please tick which of these objectives your written comment refers to:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Meet our housing need 2. Create neighbourhoods of choice 7. Ensure that districts involved are more resilient and carbon neutral 8. Improve the quality of our natural environment and access to green spaces 10. Promote the health and wellbeing of communities
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Family Name	Voss
Given Name	Anthony And Diane
Person ID	1287298
Title	Our Spatial Strategy
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.	We have already made our views.
Family Name	Voss

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Given Name	Anthony And Diane
Person ID	1287298
Title	JP-Strat 1 Core Growth Area
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
Family Name	Voss
Given Name	Anthony And Diane
Person ID	1287298
Title	JPA 3.2: Timperley Wedge
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 am presuming this includes the Timperley green belt wedge and we strongly object to these proposals because of the following points. Green let sites should not be changed unless there are exceptional circumstances, non exist to make this exceptional. The national framework for green belt land is that the enhanced landscape visual amenity and biodiversity should be retained and any alterations to the buildings on the land should be for the same use and not materially larger than the ones that they replace so this is in violation of the "government national framework". How is this justified to put in place your proposals. The proposal will cause substantial harm to the openness of the green belt and a proposal for the intended number of properties will do nothing to retain the visual amenity. Another major concern is access especially to the world of water site as the entrance on Wood Lane is not feasible, the road is dangerous already, the volume of traffic at peak times is at a standstill now the infra structure in the whole area per se will not be able to cope and will be gridlocked. There are insufficient GP practices to sustain this level of housing in the area, the local population is already at saturation point as there are as said insufficient medical services to cope with the current level and the schools are full. The council itself stated in the press in 28.9.21 that they needed help with the " unprecedented pressure

	<p>on Trafford schools places and the council where appealing foreign support. It is likely that children will have to be bussed out of the area to other school and with the major impact on the roads and traffic of such a scenario this area will become so severe and the likelihood of serious problems in the area will be increased somewhat on an already seriously dangerous lethal road situation. This is I'll founded not thought out and is purely for one thing only money it is not conducive to built in this area at this sort of level, it will destroy it without question.</p> <p>Bear in mind it is in "contravention of the national framework criteria for such land".</p>
<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>	<p>The council should not have the right to overturn the status of this land without a legal review and it should be in compliance with the governmental national framework policy.</p> <p>This is urban sprawl on a large scale again in contravention all of the national framework for green belt land.</p> <p>There are protected species allegedly on this world of water site of newts and bats it is an offence to disturb their habitat so to build in this land is in contravention of these protected species.</p> <p>The light pollution, noise, visual amenity , public transport services GP services and schools will not cope with this sheer density of these proposals and it will seriously impact on the environmental quality of the area.</p> <p>Is this not in contravention of living of the proposed climate changes!</p>