

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Worsley
<b>Given Name</b>	Katherine
<b>Person ID</b>	1287219
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Include files</b>	<a href="#">PFE1287219_TelegraphArticle.jpeg</a> <a href="#">PFE1287219_TraffordGreenBelt.jpeg</a> <a href="#">PFE1287219_BoltonGreenBelt.jpeg</a> <a href="#">PFE1287219_HarlexConsultation.pdf</a> <a href="#">PFE1287219_RochdaleGreenBelt.jpeg</a> <a href="#">PFEKateWorsley_Email_Redacted.pdf</a> <a href="#">PFEKateWorsley_Objection_Redacted.pdf</a>
<b>Family Name</b>	Worsley
<b>Given Name</b>	Katherine
<b>Person ID</b>	1287219
<b>Title</b>	Our Vision
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Include files</b>	<a href="#">PFE1287219_RochdaleGreenBelt.jpeg</a> <a href="#">PFE1287219_HarlexConsultation.pdf</a> <a href="#">PFE1287219_BoltonGreenBelt.jpeg</a> <a href="#">PFE1287219_TraffordGreenBelt.jpeg</a> <a href="#">PFE1287219_TelegraphArticle.jpeg</a>
<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>	NA
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	NA
<b>Family Name</b>	Worsley
<b>Given Name</b>	Katherine
<b>Person ID</b>	1287219
<b>Title</b>	JPA 3.2: Timperley Wedge
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Include files</b>	<a href="#">PFE1287219_TelegraphArticle.jpeg</a> <a href="#">PFE1287219_TraffordGreenBelt.jpeg</a> <a href="#">PFE1287219_BoltonGreenBelt.jpeg</a> <a href="#">PFE1287219_HarlexConsultation.pdf</a> <a href="#">PFE1287219_RochdaleGreenBelt.jpeg</a>
<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>This plan is unsound as it is already out of date and is not relevant in many cases put forward planned for the development. It can not adequately educate the children in this plans new houses based on this proposal either. It is not what is right for the area and should not be accepted.</p> <p>""Inside a Green Belt, approval should not be given, except in very special circumstances.""</p> <p>Because the Government have considered relaxing the classification of very special circumstances this should not mean this is the first and only option proposed by Trafford Council and adopted into this plan.</p> <p>There is not a shortage of housing in Trafford as can be seen from the amount of land built on the attachment (this % has increased due to several additional developments)@ 49% with Natural land &lt;1% compared to Rochdale for example at 26% and 31% respectively and Cheshire East built on 8% with Cheshire West on 10%. This is already heavily built up.</p> <p>Trafford statistics compared to Manchester are quite close but Manchester is not having the same demands placed upon it to meet the targets which I agree with so Trafford which is not an inner city area should be reduced from this high target figure.</p> <p>100 years ago there were 157 market garden businesses in Sale and Altrincham. Only a few remain and those are mainly in the green belt area outlined for development.</p> <p>All others have been sold for housing.</p> <p>My neighbour REDACTED TEXT said there is a covenant on the green belt land on Thorley Lane REDACTED TEXT. Is this not going to be considered in this decision as it was to try to protect the small areas of land not already being built on? It may not seem very rural around this area of Green belt but it is all that is left.</p> <p>I am from the local farming community and know how hard it is to get access to land in the area as its wanted to be used for development so very short leases only are being allowed. The negative impact on the wildlife and nature corridor areas will be huge. I lived on a farm which is now a housing development.</p> <p>Trafford is already heavily built up. The Authority is popular due to location and success of the Education establishments within it but these can not cope with this development which is known.</p> <p>Trafford promised in its long term plan to protect as we have very little green belt in the borough and it will soon disappear.</p> <p>Carrington Development runs upto the Stamford Brook area in Timperley.</p> <p>This is Urban Sprawl Development on Greenbelt in areas where the importance of the Environment as we all know is high on the agenda, in an Authority which is already significantly more built up than all other GM regions except for Central Manchester.</p> <p>Trafford development is being targeted in the South for profit not progress as developers are already trying to start building now on Green belt in Timperley expecting approval.</p>

Brownfield sites are not a priority - WHY? These brownfield sites will increase as peoples way of living and working changes after Covid and Brexit so i think this is being pushed through in Trafford before those statistics clearly highlight this in the long term plan.

The mayor promised to save the green belt land but the pressure to build on this valuable land which we need to protect is not now needed to meet pressure of the current targets. However, this is only an estimate based on current projections.

The air quality will be affected which is a concern for all in the areas of South Trafford which is targeted with numbers of new houses which seems too high.

Affordable Housing is not possible in WA15 for most families or as first time homes as it the most expensive post code in Trafford and surrounding the Green belt area is more affordable housing than anything which will be built unless small apartments which is not in keeping with the needs in the area.

Most will want to buy the houses for the schools which are all successful and oversubscribed. New school places will not be popular and secondary schools not established will not be wanted.

The doctors dentist etc are all full. Trafford only has one small hospital, Wythenshawe will be under a lot more pressure.

The traffic is already very heavy, infrastructure can not cope. An extra 1700 homes with 3/4 bed houses would mean an extra 9,000 people potentially living in Timperley with no space in the schools and a grid locked village.

Thousands of homes have been built in recent years in South Trafford especially in Timperley - most on National Trust land. Altrincham has really felt the pressure on the infrastructure since this new estate was built.

Altrincham/Timperley current plans for development and additional National Trust land and the cow field development due to go to planning will be adding a significant number of houses to an area which will struggle to function so this Timperley wedge land should be protected to stop the area being totally ruined and an unpleasant place to live both for health reasons and environmental reasons.

Green belt should be protected so the wildlife and air from the airport pollution has some room and space to enable us to breathe. It should not be changed for urban sprawl which is what green belt is protecting areas from and pollution.

Sadly in reality these houses will also be bought by investors and sold at a premium after the developers have made a huge profit.

There is a lot of affordable housing in the area with 2 council estates across the road and the largest affordable housing Estate possibly in Europe 5 mins drive away.

The secondary schools are heavily oversubscribed so there is nowhere for the older children to go after primary which is well known.

**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.**

Green belt land should only be considered if in the future when all other development on Brownfield sites are considered as a priority and developments completed; and the Authority then should consider this option as potentially very special circumstances. From the proposal I expect the Green belt areas will be the first areas developed and then the other areas possibly won't be, especially if large areas of office space development also become available as these are far easier to develop than brownfield sites which are not as desirable to developers of course. I think this request is a reasonable one if Traffords housing development team can not reduce this.

Why so many shops and new offices when the country has most of the offices and shops now empty - this plan is already outdated. This needs to be reviewed post covid and brexit so this plan unsound.

**Redacted general comment - Please add any comments not addressed above**

The website does not clearly outline the proposal for the Timperley wedge under Trafford but it is clearly in Trafford.

The consultation under Trafford only shows New Carrington which runs upto West Timperley.

I have commented as I am not sure of the legality of the plans in Carrington but covered Timperley too.

I have managed to add some useful documents I would like to be considered and have others to object to the development proposals.

This site is not easy to follow and I am not clear why it has been designed in such a complicated way – I would say it is not user friendly and perhaps this is intentional.

Please see the attached as I am not able to attach this as a comment due to this not being clear, however knowing my personal details at length is.

Can you confirm this will be considered as I am emailing this due to the lack of clarity on how to comment on the extensive site details.

Timperley Development on Green belt objection to be considered:

Circular 42/55 from 3 August 1955 set out the original Green Belt policy:

"Inside a Green Belt, approval should not be given, except in very special circumstances."

Because the Government have considered relaxing the classification of very special circumstances this should not mean this is the first and only option proposed by Trafford Council and adopted into this plan.

There is not a shortage of housing in Trafford as can be seen from the amount of land built on the attachment (this % has increased due to several additional developments)@ 49% with Natural land <1% compared to Rochdale for example at 26% and 31% respectively and Cheshire East built on 8% with Cheshire West on 10%. This is already heavily built up.

Trafford statistics compared to Manchester are quite close but Manchester is not having the same demands placed upon it to meet the targets which I agree with so Trafford which is not an inner city area should be reduced from this high target figure.

100 years ago there were 157 market garden businesses in Sale and Altrincham. Only a few remain and those are mainly in the green belt area outlined for development. All others have been sold for housing. My neighbour REDACTED TEXT and said there is a covenant on the green belt land on Thorley Lane REDACTED TEXT. Is this not going to be considered in this decision as it was to try to protect the small areas of land not already being built on? It may not seem very rural around this area of Green belt but it is all that is left. I am from the farming community and know how hard it is to get access to land in the area as its wanted to be used for development so very short leases only are being allowed.

There is not a shortage of housing in Trafford overall based on the size of the Local Authority as can be seen from the supporting documents attached of land built on @ 49% with Natural land <1% compared to Rochdale for example at 26% and 31% respectively and Cheshire East built on 8% with Cheshire West on 10%.

Trafford is already heavily built up. The Authority is popular due to location and success of the Education establishments within it but these can not cope with this development which is known.

Trafford statistics compared to Manchester are quite close, both are built up and with less than 1% Natural land but Manchester is not having the same demands placed upon it to meet the targets.

Trafford promised in its long term plan to protect as we have very little green belt in the borough and it will soon disappear.

Carrington Development runs upto the Stamford Brook area in Timperley. This is Urban Sprawl Development on Greenbelt in areas where the importance of the Environment as we all know is high on the agenda, in an Authority which is already significantly more built up than all other GM regions except for Central Manchester.

Trafford development is being targeted for profit not progress as developers are already trying to start building now on Green belt in Timperley expecting approval.

Brownfield sites are not a priority and they will increase as peoples way of living and working changes after Covid and Brexit so i think this is being pushed through in Trafford before those statistics are clear as this is a long term plan.

The mayor promised to save the green belt land but the pressure to build on this valuable land which we need to protect is not now needed to meet pressure of the current targets. However, this is only an estimate based on current projections.

The air quality will be affected which is a concern for all in the areas of South Trafford which is targeted with numbers of new houses which seems too high.

Affordable Housing is not possible in WA15 for most families or as first time homes as it the most expensive post code in Trafford and surrounding the Green belt area is more affordable housing than anything which will be built unless small apartments which is not in keeping with the needs in the area.

Most will want to buy the houses for the schools which are all successful and oversubscribed. New school places will not be popular and secondary schools not established will not be wanted.

The doctors dentist etc are all full. Trafford only has one small hospital, Wythenshawe will be under a lot more pressure.

The traffic is already very heavy, infrastructure can not cope. An extra 1700 homes with 3/4 bed houses would mean an extra 9,000 people potentially living in Timperley with no space in the schools and a grid locked village.

Thousands of homes have been built in recent years in South Trafford especially in Timperley - most on National Trust land. Altrincham has really felt the pressure on the infrastructure since this new estate was built.

Altrincham/Timperley current plans for development and additional National Trust land and the cow field development due to go to planning will be adding a significant number of houses to an area which will struggle to function so this Timperley wedge land should be protected to stop the area being totally ruined and an unpleasant place to live both for health reasons and environmental reasons.

Green belt should be protected so the wildlife and open space we walk in and play football on can be saved for future generations to enjoy in Altrincham and Wythenshawe. It should not be changed for urban sprawl which is what green belt is protecting areas from

Sadly in reality these houses will be bought by investors and sold at a premium. There is a lot of affordable housing in the area with 2 council estates across the road and the largest affordable housing Estate possibly in Europe 5 mins drive away.

<b>Family Name</b>	Worsley
<b>Given Name</b>	Katherine
<b>Person ID</b>	1287219
<b>Title</b>	JPA 33 New Carrington
<b>Type</b>	Web



Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<p><b>Include files</b></p>	<p><a href="#">PFE1287219_RochdaleGreenBelt.jpeg</a>  <a href="#">PFE1287219_HarlexConsultation.pdf</a>  <a href="#">PFE1287219_BoltonGreenBelt.jpeg</a>  <a href="#">PFE1287219_TraffordGreenBelt.jpeg</a>  <a href="#">PFE1287219_TelegraphArticle.jpeg</a></p>
<p><b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Justified?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Effective?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<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>There is not a shortage of housing in Trafford overall based on the size of the Local Authority as can be seen from the supporting documents attached of land built on @ 49% with Natural land &lt;1% compared to Rochdale for example at 26% and 31% respectively and Cheshire East built on 8% with Cheshire West on 10%.</p> <p>Trafford is already heavily built up. The Authority is popular due to location and success of the Education establishments within it but these can not cope with this development which is known.</p> <p>Trafford statistics compared to Manchester are quite close, both are built up and with less than 1% Natural land but Manchester is not having the same demands placed upon it to meet the targets.</p> <p>Trafford promised in its long term plan to protect as we have very little green belt in the borough and it will soon disappear.</p> <p>Carrington Development runs upto the Stamford Brook area in Timperley.</p> <p>This is Urban Sprawl Development on Greenbelt in areas where the importance of the Environment as we all know is high on the agenda, in an Authority which is already significantly more built up than all other GM regions except for Central Manchester.</p> <p>Trafford development is being targeted for profit not progress as developers are already trying to start building now on Green belt in Timperley expecting approval.</p> <p>Brownfield sites are not a priority and they will increase as peoples way of living and working changes after Covid and Brexit so i think this is being pushed through in Trafford before those statistics are clear as this is a long term plan.</p> <p>The mayor promised to save the green belt land but the pressure to build on this valuable land which we need to protect is not now needed to meet pressure of the current targets.</p> <p>However, this is only an estimate based on current projections.</p> <p>The air quality will be effected which is a concern for all in the areas of South Trafford which is targeted with numbers of new houses which seems too high.</p> <p>Affordable Housing is not possible in WA15 for most families or as first time homes as it the most expensive post code in Trafford and surrounding the Green belt area is more affordable housing than anything which will be built unless small apartments which is not in keeping with the needs in the area.</p>

Most will want to buy the houses for the schools which are all successful and oversubscribed. New school places will not be popular and secondary schools not established will not be wanted.

The doctors dentist etc are all full. Trafford only has one small hospital, Wythenshawe will be under a lot more pressure.

The traffic is already very heavy, infrastructure can not cope. An extra 1700 homes with 3/4 bed houses would mean an extra 9,000 people potentially living in Timperley with no space in the schools and a grid locked village.

Thousands of homes have been built in recent years in South Trafford especially in Timperley - most on National Trust land. Altrincham has really felt the pressure on the infrastructure since this new estate was built.

Altrincham/Timperley current plans for development and additional National Trust land and the cow field development due to go to planning will be adding a significant number of houses to an area which will struggle to function so this Timperley wedge land should be protected to stop the area being totally ruined and an unpleasant place to live both for health reasons and environmental reasons.

Green belt should be protected so the wildlife and open space we walk in and play football on can be saved for future generations to enjoy in Altrincham and Wythenshawe. It should not be changed for urban sprawl which is what green belt is protecting these areas from.

Sadly in reality the houses in the Timperley wedge will be bought by investors and sold at a premium. There is a lot of affordable housing in the area with 2 council estates across the road and the largest affordable housing Estate possibly in Europe 5 mins drive away.

**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.**

Green belt land should only be considered if in the future when all other development on Brownfield sites are completed and the Authority has to consider this option as very special circumstances. I expect the Green belt areas will be the first areas developed and then the other areas possibly won't be, especially if large areas of office space development also become available as these are far easier to develop than brownfield sites which are not as desirable to developers of course. I think this request is a reasonable one if Traffords housing development team can not reduce this