

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Family Name</b>  | Waterfield  |
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Chris   |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287271   |
| <b>Title</b>  | JPA 1.2: Simister and Bowlee (Northern Gateway)   |
| <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>   | Sound   |
| <b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>  | No  |
| <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> | I do not believe building on the site north of Mosley Common to be justified because there are significant brownfield opportunities within the same region (South of Hindley) |
| <b>Family Name</b>  | Waterfield  |
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Chris   |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287271   |
| <b>Title</b>  | JPA 1.2: Simister and Bowlee (Northern Gateway)   |
| <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>   | Sound   |
| <b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>  | No  |
| <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</b>   | I do not believe building on the site north of Mosley Common to be justified because there are significant brownfield opportunities within the same region (South of Hindley) |

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>  |   |
| <b>Family Name</b>  | Waterfield  |
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Chris   |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287271   |
| <b>Title</b>  | JPA 7: Elton Reservoir Area   |
| <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>   | Sound   |
| <b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>  | No  |
| <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> | I do not believe building on the site north of Mosley Common to be justified because there are significant brownfield opportunities within the same region (South of Hindley) |
| <b>Family Name</b>  | Waterfield  |
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Chris   |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287271   |
| <b>Title</b>  | JPA 8: Seedfield  |
| <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>   | Sound   |
| <b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>  | No  |
| <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</b>   | I do not believe building on the site north of Mosley Common to be justified because there are significant brownfield opportunities within the same region (South of Hindley) |

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>  |   |
| <b>Family Name</b>  | Waterfield  |
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Chris   |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287271   |
| <b>Title</b>  | JPA 9: Walshaw  |
| <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>   | Sound   |
| <b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>  | No  |
| <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> | I do not believe building on the site north of Mosley Common to be justified because there are significant brownfield opportunities within the same region (South of Hindley) |
| <b>Family Name</b>  | Waterfield  |
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Chris   |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287271   |
| <b>Title</b>  | Supporting Evidence   |
| <b>Type</b>   | Web   |
| <b>Family Name</b>  | Waterfield  |
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Chris   |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287271   |
| <b>Title</b>  | JPA 34 M6 Junction 25   |
| <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  |

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>  | No  |
| <b>Family Name</b>   | Waterfield  |
| <b>Given Name</b>  | Chris   |
| <b>Person ID</b>   | 1287271   |
| <b>Title</b>   | Stakeholder Submission  |
| <b>Type</b>  | Web   |
| <b>Family Name</b>   | Waterfield  |
| <b>Given Name</b>  | Chris   |
| <b>Person ID</b>   | 1287271   |
| <b>Title</b>   | Our Vision  |
| <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>  | Unsound   |
| <b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>   | Yes   |
| <b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>Family Name</b>   | Waterfield  |
| <b>Given Name</b>  | Chris   |
| <b>Person ID</b>   | 1287271   |
| <b>Title</b>   | Our Strategic Objectives  |
| <b>Type</b>  | Web   |
| <b>Our strategic objectives - Considering the information provided for our strategic objectives, please tick which of these objectives your written comment refers to:</b> | 2. Create neighbourhoods of choice<br>6. Promote the sustainable movement of people, goods and information<br>8. Improve the quality of our natural environment and access to green spaces<br>10. Promote the health and wellbeing of communities |
| <b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>  | NA  |
| <b>Soundness - Justified?</b>  | NA  |
| <b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>  | NA  |
| <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>Strategic objective 6 - Adding more houses/passengers/cars to the already overloaded roads and guided busway will be ineffective at meeting this strategic objective.</p> <p>Strategic objective 8 - Building on greenbelt will reduce peoples access to green space. The guided busway is used by locals as a walking and running leisure route BECAUSE of the green space that surrounds it. If you remove the green space you will reduce the number of people getting exercise locally. Who wants to go for a walk between to large housing estates? The existing public rights of way that cross the proposed building site are used extensively, but this will stop when it is all houses. Building on the greenfield site North of Mosley Common is not effective in meeting this strategic objective.</p> <p>Strategic objective 10 - The health and wellbeing of the community is directly linked to the green space that surrounds them, the points above also stand for this objective.</p> <p>Strategic objective 2- Using greenfield land like this goes against guidance to use brownfield first. There is a significant proportion of brownfield land in Wigan (South of Hindley) that could be used. The removal of this greenfield site would significantly alter the character of the area, and even with proposed improvements the "local sustainable transport" this plan is build to take advantage of is not fit for purpose, even without the extra houses. These three points make me believe this greenfield development proposal is not legal as there is not a good enough reason and brownfield land is available elsewhere in the region.</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>SO 2 &amp; 6 - Use brownfield sites first. Guarantee a minimum capacity improvement on the guided busway at peak times (it already can't cope). Reduce the number of houses proposed.</p> <p>SO 8&amp;10 - Do not build on greenbelt land that is intrinsic in value to the local area and community. If you do build, build significantly less houses and provide high quality improvements to local public rights of way, linking local woods etc so people will actually continue to use them.</p>  |
| <b>Family Name</b>  | Waterfield  |
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Chris   |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287271   |
| <b>Title</b>  | Our Spatial Strategy  |
| <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   |

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Family Name</b>  | Waterfield   |
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Chris  |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287271  |
| <b>Title</b>  | JPA 1.1 Heywood / Pilsworth (Northern Gateway)   |
| <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>   | Sound  |
| <b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>  | No   |
| <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> | I do not believe building on the site north of Mosley Common to be justified because there are significant brownfield opportunities within the same region (South of Hindley)  |
| <b>Family Name</b>  | Waterfield   |
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Chris  |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287271  |
| <b>Title</b>  | JP-S 1 Sustainable 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</b>   | There will be a huge net loss of green space if this goes ahead. Once the greenbelt is built on there is no going back. Future generations need houses, but not at the cost of open countryside. There is brownfield space in Wigan big enough to accommodate this development which should be used instead. |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>  |   |
| <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> | Don't destroy vast open green spaces.   |
| <b>Family Name</b>  | Waterfield  |
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Chris   |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287271   |
| <b>Title</b>  | JP-S 3 Heat and Energy Networks   |
| <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 site North of Mosley Common is not in an area proposed to be served by a decentralised energy/heat network.                   |
| <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> | The huge brownfield site elsewhere in Wigan (South of Hindley) is served by a proposed decentralised energy network. Build there. |
| <b>Family Name</b>  | Waterfield  |
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Chris   |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287271   |

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Title</b>  | JP-S 4 Resilience   |
| <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>   | NA  |
| <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>                     | Point 12 - The green space here has a huge positive impact on peoples physical health. The busway and local walkways are full of people walking at the weekends. This would stop if the green space disappears, who wants to go for a walk through a housing estate? People will end up driving to another area of countryside just to get out and about. |
| <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> | Significantly reduce the number of houses proposed, or even better build elsewhere on brownfield land elsewhere in Wigan.<br>If houses have to be built here reduce the number significantly and leave some space for people to enjoy the sights, sounds and smells of the countryside right on their front door step.                                    |
| <b>Family Name</b>  | Waterfield  |
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Chris   |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287271   |
| <b>Title</b>  | JP-S 5 Flood Risk and Water Environment   |
| <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>  | Waterfield  |



Places for Everyone Representation 2021

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Chris  |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287271  |
| <b>Title</b>  | JP-S 6 Clean Air   |
| <b>Type</b>   | Web  |
| <b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>   | Unsound  |
| <b>Soundness - Justified?</b>   | Unsound  |
| <b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>   | NA   |
| <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 development North of Mosley Common will increase traffic, especially at the A580/Mosley Common Road junction. This is already an AQMA with declared pollution. Within this zone is a children"s playground, one of very few in the area. Just outside this zone on the main road is a primary school (M28 1AE) which is intended to take some/all the extra children from the 1100 new houses. The development plan already identifies this road junction is not fit for purpose due to insufficient capacity, so they do not accept responsibility for increasing capacity. |
| <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> | Build on brownfield land elsewhere in Wigan.<br>If you must build here, improve the guided bus network and local road junctions to reduce traffic.<br>The guided busway and local roads do not have sufficient capacity at peak times at the moment, building 1100 houses will make this problem significantly worse.<br>The developers should be asked to pay for improvements to the road and bus network to cover existing and future capacity.<br>Move the playground to a less polluted site.   |
| <b>Family Name</b>  | Waterfield   |
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Chris  |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287271  |
| <b>Title</b>  | JP-G 2 Green Infrastructure Network  |
| <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 site North of Mosley common is all part of the green infrastructure network according to the map above. Why build on all that green space?  |
| <b>Family Name</b>  | Waterfield  |
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Chris   |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287271   |
| <b>Title</b>  | JPA 35: North of Mosley Common  |
| <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 am a relatively new resident having lived on REDACTED TEXT for only four years but I love the place. My two daughters have only known this house, and we take great joy from family walks through the area that is to be built on. As you can guess I am against a development at such scale. I appreciate the need for new houses, but so many on such a wonderful green space?</p> <p>Having read the proposal in great detail I am satisfied that the planners have taken several important issues in to consideration, for example the use of SUDS to increase water infiltration to stop flooding. They have also identified the need for an extra health centre which is great news as the local surgery cannot cope as it is.</p> <p>They have failed, in my opinion, to adequately address some other critical issues, these being:</p> <p>There are two areas that are being converted to ""greenbelt"" land to compensate for this large area that is being eradicated. The sites are much smaller in comparison and are already green. I do not believe this is fair to the area as a whole and will result in a significant net loss of green space.</p> <p>The argument they have put forward regarding traffic increase at the A580/Mosley common junction is not good enough. They claim the junction is already not fit for purpose (according to their reference case), so even though they conclude their development will make things worse, it's already not sufficient so they are not responsible for this expected failure and will carry on regardless. If there is a study that says things are not sufficient, why would the council approve further development without asking the developers to pay to improve the junction?</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <p>The increase in traffic will cause air quality problems for the playground at this junction (A580/Mosley Common). There will also be a reduction in air quality right outside St Johns Primary School. The increase in traffic will also make the walk to school from the end of the busway to Ellenbrook Community Primary School even more dangerous than it already is! I realise this is out of your area but surely this must be considered.</p> <p>The planning report states that the farmland does not contribute to the "character of the area". I honestly believe if you were to ask the residents they would disagree with this and I would be interested to know how they came to such a conclusion on what seems to be a subjective matter.</p> <p>There is a concentration of Japanese Knotweed and Giant Hogweed in the area to be developed. What plans have been put in place to manage the spread of this over the course of the development?</p> <p>The bus route is fantastic, but busses are already full at peak times when they get to this area. They have proposed to buy new busses, but this will only solve the current situation. Do you have any details on how many extra busses will be purchased? The bus route is one of the main reasons this development is being allowed on this greenfield site, "existing sustainable transport", but if the bus route does not have capacity then the reasoning to build here is flawed.</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> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improve the junction at the A580/Mosley Common junction.</li> <li>- Move the park that sits on this junction</li> <li>- Reduce the total number of houses to ease pressure on public services and the busway</li> <li>- Keep some open green space around the busway, this significantly contributes to the character of the area. People live, walk and exercise here specifically because of this reason.</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Family Name</b>   | Waterfield   |
| <b>Given Name</b>  | Chris  |
| <b>Person ID</b>   | 1287271  |
| <b>Title</b>   | Salford - Green Belt Additions   |
| <b>Type</b>  | Web  |
| <b>GBA Salford - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this District your response relates to - then respond to the questions below</b>  | <p>Salford GBA28 Part of Logistics North Country Park</p> <p>Salford GBA29 Land West of Burgess Farm</p>   |
| <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   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b></p>   | <p>No</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>The land proposed to be changed to "green belt" is already lovely green space. The land that is due to be converted to housing is also green space. The proposal makes it sound like there is no net change in green land but there will be a dramatic reduction.</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>To make this a "fair swap" some of the land being converted to green belt needs to be not already green space. As "green belt" apparently offers little protection to large developments it seems the redesignation would be a token gesture.</p>                     |