

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Yarwood
Given Name	Laura
Person ID	1286478
Title	JPA 26: Land at Hazelhurst Farm
Type	E-Mail
Include files	PFE1286478_Redacted.pdf
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Redacted general comment - Please add any comments not addressed above	<p>Re: Submission of Representations in relation to the Places for Everyone Joint Development Plan Publication Draft 2021 (PfE2021)</p> <p>I refer to the PfE2021 and in particular the Green Belt land at Hazelhurst Farm (reference JPA 26) identified as housing allocation for around 400 houses (the proposed development).</p> <p>REDACTED TEXT and wish to raise the following in relation to the proposed development:</p> <p>1. 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 acknowledges that members of the public may access the stops on the A580 for the Leigh-Salford-Manchester rapid transit service to access employment and leisure opportunities in Manchester City Centre. However, it does not acknowledge that members of the public may choose not to use public transport. The PfE2021 fails to adequately take into account the impact of the proposed development on the transport networks in the area. The area around the proposed development suffers from heavy traffic congestion due to, amongst other things, its close proximity to two major roads:</p> <p>a. The A580 which is a major commuter route for traffic to and from Manchester City Centre; a connector road for traffic to join the M61 towards Preston and a connector road for traffic to access the neighbourhoods alongside the A580 (for example, Mosley Common, Boothstown, Ellenbrooke, Roe Green, Hazelhurst, Swinton and Pendleton).</p> <p>b. The M60 which is a major motorway in the North West of England. The local junction (13) is frequently subjected to gridlocked traffic during the week due to both the commuter traffic in and around Greater Manchester as well as heavy goods vehicles connecting to the South of England via the M56 and M6. The area is also subject to gridlocked traffic on a weekly basis due to visitors accessing amenities at the Trafford Centre, Old Trafford Football ground and RHS Bridgewater.</p> <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.</p> <p>Furthermore, access points to the proposed development can only be through one of the existing cul-de-sac roads off Hazelhurst Road. Hazelhurst Road is already deeply congested with commuter traffic and many residents have to park their vehicles on the street due to a lack of private parking facilities. This is not consistent with the national policy; I refer to paragraph 112(c) of the Framework.</p> <p>2. Increased air and noise pollution: the PfE2021 in relation to the proposed development is not consistent with national policy. I refer</p>

to paragraphs 93, 104(d) and 105 of the Framework. Due to the close proximity of the A580 and M60 and the existing heavy traffic congestion, our area has a high level of air pollution and regular noise pollution (day and night from traffic passing on the M60). The Green Belt land in our area acts as a much-needed buffer for the air and noise pollution. In substantially reducing the Green Belt area at Hazelhurst Farm, the PfE2021 does not consider and support the delivery of local strategies to improve the health for all sections of the community. The PfE2021 only seeks to address the needs of the new residents of the proposed development.

3. 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 will be enhanced to sustain the increase in population due to the proposed development. For example, there is only one local Co op on Worsley Road with no onsite parking so cars often park on nearby roads when using the local shop. Nearby meeting places and open spaces in Worsley Woods, Roe Green Common and Worsley Common experienced a high proportion of visitors from outside the area during the global pandemic which resulted in strain on the transport network in the area. Other local services such as access to local GPs and Dentists also need to be considered as these are already stretched and can be difficult to access.

4. 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:

a. An assessment has not been undertaken which clearly shows that the open space is surplus to requirements. The open space is not surplus to requirements.

b. It has not been demonstrated to 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.

c. The proposed development is not for alternative sports and recreation provision.

5. Destruction of the Green Belt: the PfE2021 in relation to the proposed development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraph 137 of the framework. The PfE2021 does not recognise the importance of the site of the proposed development to prevent urban sprawl. I refer to paragraphs 140 and 141 of the framework. The PfE2021 does not meet the threshold for exceptional circumstances which justify the alteration of the boundaries of the Green Belt at the site of the proposed development. I refer to paragraph 145 of the framework. Even if the Green Belt were reduced in size, the PfE2021 does not explain how the local planning authority have planned for positive use of the remaining Green Belt. I refer to paragraphs 147 and 149 of the framework. The proposed development set out in the PfE2021 is an inappropriate site for development.

6. Negative impact on local wildlife: 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. A variety of local wildlife (birds, foxes, hedgehogs and squirrels) use the site of the proposed development. The site forms several local functions: a home for wildlife, an area where locals can practice physical and

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>emotional well-being activities and I understand that it is also an area of food production with the farmer growing wheat.</p> <p>7. Increased flooding risk: the PfE2021 in relation to the proposed development is not consistent with national policy. I refer to paragraphs 159-169 of the framework. The area around the site of the proposed development is prone to flooding. I note that the council acknowledges the risk of surface water flooding. On occasions when we have had severe surface water flooding in the area, roads have been closed by the police (which implies that there is a potential risk of harm to the public). Road closures in turn increase the traffic congestion problems we are facing on a regular basis.</p> <p>Please note I wish to be given the opportunity to participate in the Examination in Public and be kept informed of the progress of PfE2021.</p>
Family Name	Yarwood
Given Name	Laura
Person ID	1286478
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286478_Redacted.pdf PFELauraYarwood_Email_Redacted.pdf
Family Name	Yarwood
Given Name	Laura
Person ID	1286478
Title	Our Vision
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286478_Redacted.pdf
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	Yarwood
Given Name	Laura
Person ID	1286478
Title	Our Strategic Objectives
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286478_Redacted.pdf
Our strategic objectives - Considering the information provided for our strategic objectives, please tick which of	<p>2. Create neighbourhoods of choice</p> <p>3. Ensure a thriving and productive economy in the districts involved</p> <p>6. Promote the sustainable movement of people, goods and information</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

these objectives your written comment refers to:	7. Ensure that districts involved are more resilient and carbon neutral 8. Improve the quality of our natural environment and access to green spaces 9. Ensure access to physical and social infrastructure 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	Yarwood
Given Name	Laura
Person ID	1286478
Title	JP-G 1 Valuing Important Landscapes
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286478_Redacted.pdf
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	Yarwood
Given Name	Laura
Person ID	1286478
Title	JP-G 2 Green Infrastructure Network
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286478_Redacted.pdf
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

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Yarwood
Given Name	Laura
Person ID	1286478
Title	JP-G 6 Urban Green Space
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286478_Redacted.pdf
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	Yarwood
Given Name	Laura
Person ID	1286478
Title	JP-G 7 Trees and Woodland
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286478_Redacted.pdf
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	Yarwood
Given Name	Laura
Person ID	1286478
Title	JP-G 8 Standards for Greener Places
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286478_Redacted.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Family Name	Yarwood
Given Name	Laura
Person ID	1286478
Title	JP-G 10 Green Belt
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286478_Redacted.pdf
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	Yarwood
Given Name	Laura
Person ID	1286478
Title	JP-G 11 Safeguarded Land
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286478_Redacted.pdf
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	Yarwood
Given Name	Laura
Person ID	1286478
Title	JPA 26: Land at Hazelhurst Farm
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286478_Redacted.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

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.	See attached letter