

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Young
<b>Given Name</b>	Michael
<b>Person ID</b>	1285710
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Young
<b>Given Name</b>	Michael
<b>Person ID</b>	1285710
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 1 Valuing Important Landscapes
<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>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	NA
<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>	Tameside council hasn't consulted with total disregard for residents. The policy goes against everything within the national planning policy framework and doesn't identify any brownfield areas. Just destroying greenbelt for non affordable housing.
<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>	Use brownfield protect greenbelt for our future generations
<b>Family Name</b>	Young
<b>Given Name</b>	Michael
<b>Person ID</b>	1285710
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 2 Green Infrastructure Network
<b>Type</b>	Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Family Name</b>	Young
<b>Given Name</b>	Michael
<b>Person ID</b>	1285710
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 3 River Valleys and Waterways
<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>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Family Name</b>	Young
<b>Given Name</b>	Michael
<b>Person ID</b>	1285710
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 4 Lowland Wetlands and Mosslands
<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>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Family Name</b>	Young
<b>Given Name</b>	Michael
<b>Person ID</b>	1285710

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Title</b>	JP-G 5 Uplands
<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>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Family Name</b>	Young
<b>Given Name</b>	Michael
<b>Person ID</b>	1285710
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 6 Urban Green Space
<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>	NA
<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>	These natural green spaces will be destroyed by these proposals
<b>Family Name</b>	Young
<b>Given Name</b>	Michael
<b>Person ID</b>	1285710
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 7 Trees and Woodland
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Family Name</b>	Young
<b>Given Name</b>	Michael
<b>Person ID</b>	1285710
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 8 Standards for Greener Places
<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>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Family Name</b>	Young
<b>Given Name</b>	Michael
<b>Person ID</b>	1285710
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 9 A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
<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>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Family Name</b>	Young
<b>Given Name</b>	Michael
<b>Person ID</b>	1285710
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 10 Green Belt
<b>Type</b>	Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Family Name</b>	Young
<b>Given Name</b>	Michael
<b>Person ID</b>	1285710
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 11 Safeguarded Land
<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>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Family Name</b>	Young
<b>Given Name</b>	Michael
<b>Person ID</b>	1285710
<b>Title</b>	JPA 31: Godley Green Garden Village
<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>	NA
<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</b>	The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. This development will cause Urban sprawl linking Gee cross to Hattersley. This area is Greenbelt with Wildlife and is used by persons use for recreational use. Tameside council hasn't

**to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.**

considered reasonable alternatives to using "Greenbelt" there are brown field sites within the borough which haven't been considered as part of the proposal.

Former two trees site Denton including unkept playing fields that TMBC no longer maintain for leisure use, Land off Mottram road Hattersley former council housing estate to name a couple of areas. Land at former school sites in Ashton Under Lyne and Droylsden. The council advised it has consulted but none of residents spoken to in Gee cross have received postal information that the council says it has sent to residents. The council have not co-operated or consulted with local residents and have just ploughed on with a total disregard to persons views. These proposals go against all previous Unitary development plans and the sites importance. The infrastructure on transport and traffic has also been totally disregarded. Local trains are currently at maximum limits with two carriages to trains. Platforms aren't long enough to support further carriages being added and network rail have no plans to extend platforms. The roads are already congested and it can take 15 mins to undertake a journey from Gee cross to Hyde centre at peak times.

This council has recently rejected planning applications for alterations to properties on this land stating that:

1. Development will result in possible harm to the openness of the greenbelt. No very special circumstances exist that would outweigh the harm to greenbelt. Therefore the development fails to accord with policies OL1 and OL2 of the Tameside UDP and paragraph 145 of the national planning policy framework.

2. The proposal also fails to demonstrate that development would not have an adverse impact on existing mature trees that could be affected by development. The proposal therefore fails to comply with policy N5 and N10 of the Tameside MBC UDP.

This development proposal for Godley green fails to comply with the duty and legality for the very same reasons the council refused planning for domestic extensions to same location.

Green Belt serves 5 purposes:

- (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- (c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- (d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

This development proposal has not taken into account any of these five purposes.

The proposal results in encroachment into the countryside and hasn't considered the regeneration of derelict /urban land and is harmful to the green belt and should not be approved. The proposals are contrary to paragraphs 133, 134, 143 and 144 of the national planning policy framework and policies OL1 and OL2 of the UDP.

Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

The national planning policy framework states that "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>This proposed development does clearly not constitute" very special circumstances" as brownfield sites in the borough have been disregarded and overlooked.</p> <p>This proposal should be rejected and Tameside council advised to look at brownfield sites within the borough protecting this greenbelt for future generations.</p> <p>Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity not propose to destroy by building houses, adding to traffic congestion and over burdening already over stretched local services and public transport.</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>This area should remain as greenbelt.</p> <p>Alternative Brownfield sites which are available in the borough should be used.</p> <p>Better design and planning of affordable multi occupation homes and flats should be considered instead of three bedroom detached homes.</p> <p>The recreational and wildlife benefits of this area needs to be maintained.</p>
<p><b>Family Name</b></p>	<p>Young</p>
<p><b>Given Name</b></p>	<p>Michael</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1285710</p>
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>JPA 32: South of Hyde</p>
<p><b>Type</b></p>	<p>Web</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>NA</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>The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. This area is Greenbelt with Wildlife and is used by persons for recreational use. Tameside council hasn"t considered reasonable alternatives to using "Greenbelt" there are brown field sites within the borough which haven"t been considered as part of the proposal.</p> <p>Former two trees site Denton including unkept playing fields that TMBC no longer maintain for leisure use, Land off Mottram road Hattersley former council housing estate to name a couple of areas. Land at former school sites in Ashton Under lyne and Droylsden.</p> <p>The council advised it has consulted but none of residents spoken to in Gee cross have received postal information that the council says it has sent to residents.</p>

The council have not co-operated or consulted with local residents and have just ploughed on with a total disregard to persons views.

What consultation documents and proof of consultation showing residents have read, understood and agreed to these proposals have been provided?

These proposals go against all previous Unitary development plans and the sites importance .

The proposals will not provide affordable homes.

If the council wanted to build affordable homes they would use the brownfield sites previously mentioned.

The infrastructure on transport and traffic has also been totally disregarded. Local trains are currently at maximum limits with two carriages to trains. Platform aren't long enough to support further carriages being added and network rail have no plans to extend platforms. The roads are already congested and it can take 15 mins to undertake a journey from Gee cross to Hyde centre at peak times.

This council has recently rejected planning applications for alterations to properties on this land stating that:

1. Development will result in possible harm to the openness of the greenbelt. No very special circumstances exist that would outweigh the harm to greenbelt. Therefore the development fails to accord with policies OL1 and OL2 of the Tameside UDP and paragraph 145 of the national planning policy framework.

2. The proposal also fails to demonstrate that development would not have an adverse impact on existing mature trees that could be affected by development. The proposal therefore fails to comply with policy N5 and N10 of the Tameside MBC UDP.

This development proposal f fails to comply with the duty and legallity for the very same reasons the council refused planning for domestic extensions to same locations.

Green Belt serves 5 purposes:

- (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- (c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- (d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

This development proposal has not taken into account any of these five purposes.

The proposal results in encroachment into the countryside and hasn't considered the regeneration of derelict /urban land and is harmful to the green belt and should not be approved. The proposals are contrary to paragraphs 133, 134, 143 and 144 of the national planning policy framework and policies OL1 and OL2 of the UDP.

Inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.

The national planning policy framework states that "Very special circumstances" will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations"

This proposed development does clearly not constitute" very special circumstances" as brownfield sites in the borough have been disregarded and overlooked.

	<p>This proposal should be rejected and Tameside council advised to look at brownfield sites within the borough protecting this greenbelt for future generations.</p> <p>Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity not propose to destroy by building houses, adding to traffic congestion and over burdening already over stretched local services and public transport.</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>This area should remain as greenbelt.</p> <p>Alternative Brownfield sites which are available in the borough should be used.</p> <p>Better design and planning of affordable multi occupation homes and flats should be considered instead of three bedroom detached.</p>