

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Elliott
Given Name	Claire
Company / Organisation	Save Tameside Greenbelt
Person ID	1286403
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286403_StrategicPlanning.pdf PFE1286403_SpeciesList.pdf
Family Name	Elliott
Given Name	Claire
Company / Organisation	Save Tameside Greenbelt
Person ID	1286403
Title	JPA 30: Ashton Moss West
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286403_SpeciesList.pdf PFE1286403_StrategicPlanning.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
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.	greenbelt is sacrosanct
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.	site should be removed as it is greenbelt and exceptional circumstances have not been made
Family Name	Elliott

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Given Name	Claire
Company / Organisation	Save Tameside Greenbelt
Person ID	1286403
Title	JPA 31: Godley Green Garden Village
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286403_StrategicPlanning.pdf PFE1286403_SpeciesList.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
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>Is the plan positively prepared?</p> <p>We believe the plan is not positively prepared as Tameside area"s calculated need was for the older generation, most of the houses being built, especially for the this site is for executive type 3-5 bed houses. We also believe that Tameside"s housing need has been calculated too high! We also question the use of out of date ONS figures, we ask that up to date ONS figures be used to determine housing need. It has also been stated that the figures given to greater Manchester for their housing need should be used as a guide and not set in stone. Given the fact that Greenbelt is sacrosanct the numbers should have been brought down accordingly. Tameside Council also announced a climate emergency in 2019 , removing greenbelt we believe would add to that climate emergency and INCREASE the carbon footprint of the borough.</p> <p>Schools</p> <p>There is all ready a real lack of school places in the area , especially in the local high schools. NO contingency has been put in place regarding where these local children would go to school. In fact a council representative said they were "looking" in to it, when last asked in June 2021!! That in itself shows real disregard to the infrastructure problems of this site alone and should have been addressed BEFORE NOW!</p> <p>Only a primary school in year 8 of the plan is being proposed!</p> <p>Many local high schools in the area are either at capacity or oversubscribed. The High school that is located at the Godley Green site is Called Alder Community High School. The School was built after the high school in Hattersley was knocked down and the people of Hattersley were assured a place. This is now at present not the case and many have commented that they have to travel to high schools further afield as they can no longer get a place. So where local people could once walk to school, they now have to either use public transport or jump in the car!</p> <p>On contacting the head teacher from Alder High School , it seems they are very much out of the loop in regards to Godley Green Garden Village! Nothing has been put in place for increased capacity or where the expected increase in school children will in fact go . The following response was received for the head teacher at Alder High Community School</p>

11th March 2021

"We don't know yet the impact on school places if the project goes ahead, apart from the fact that we are not able to increase our numbers beyond our current plans in our existing buildings. Our school received far more first choices for September 2021 than we have places for (our current plan is 180 but with a "bulge" year of 210 in September 2021. I am sorry I don't know anything more about the plans for the Garden Village in relation to school places. I hope that helps."

Head teacher of Alder Community High School

There is a real risk that if this development was built, that children's education would suffer as a result. There is a very limited choice to where children in the area can go to school at present and that would be made even worse with the building of Godley Green.

How far will our children have to travel? whilst increasing their carbon footprint, because the local school they could walk to is too full! It is really apparent that local schools are struggling with increased pupil numbers.

Also what impact would this development have on noise levels and dust to the area and pupils of this school. This is a development that could be going on for the next 30 years! do we seriously expect children to be able to study and go about their day with a huge development being built on their doorstep.

Trains

This site is served quite closely with two train stations, that in itself looks ideal! Unfortunately quite the opposite is the case. The line itself is restricted on quite a few fronts. Here is why it would NOT be ideal to put a garden village in the mix!

Single line constraints - limited train services

Platform lengths - Cannot accommodate trains with longer carriages

Storage - no capacity to store extra carriages.

On contacting a representative from Northern Rail he confirmed the above

"I can confirm that unfortunately it is not possible to operate more trains along the Hadfield/Glossop - Manchester Piccadilly route due to infrastructure constraints on the single track section between Glossop/Hadfield and Dinting plus the section between Guide Bridge and Manchester Piccadilly. It is also not currently possible to operate longer trains due to platform lengths along the route but we will continue to monitor volume of passengers using the trains and any approvals for development close to stations along the route"

I was also directed by Tameside Council to the Greater Manchester's South East Rail Corridor Study 2020 Continuous Modular Strategic Planning which stated its study aims were to address the Strategic Question "What interventions are required to meet future growth forecasts on the Hadfield/Glossop corridor by 2024, 2033 and 2043?". The available capacity has been analysed in light of the future forecast demand scenarios, and a series of potential interventions have been identified which together will enable funders to make decisions about planning the network in years to come. A couple of pieces of note :

"As part of this Study it was decided not to develop cost plans for the interventions required to meet 2043 forecast demand. Instead, the strategic recommendation is to revisit this study with a more accurate view of demand and the expected outputs of large-scale projects like HS2 and NPR, as well as the outputs of the other local CMSP modules. As part of revisiting this Study, it's advised that any potential interventions that could be employed at the high-risk stations (Gorton and Guide Bridge) to reduce trespass incidents should be investigated following the requirements of the Safety Baseline. It is worth reiterating that the Study only covers a limited geographical scope. The integration of the increased number of services

required along the South East Corridor into the wider network should be a consideration for future study, especially at Manchester Piccadilly station"

At the end of the study it also states that there is no additional storage for extra carriages.

"Autumn 2019 update Since the completion of the analysis performed for the Study, Northern Rail has highlighted that there is a lack of capacity to stable Class 331 units in the Manchester area. The operation of 4-car services (assumed in the baseline of the Study) in the short term therefore becomes impossible along the South East Corridor"

Our group has seen many people complain they struggle to get places on the trains and sometimes trains have passed through Hattersley Station without stopping because they are full. People also mention the lack of a disabled access to the Godley Train station. As said earlier this looks good on paper, but this study has not even taken in the impact of the Godley Garden Village Proposal and how it would affect travel and is not the IDEAL solution it is deemed to be. An inadequate train service will push more people onto the roads.

Traffic

Traffic is a contentious issue around Hyde, specifically the Mottram Bypass and the traffic issues everyone has around the area. Most people don't believe the bypass will arrive and if it will have any real impact. There is also the risk of both developments being built at the same time and being within half a mile of each other, could totally grid lock the entirety of Hyde and surrounding areas for years to come.

Most of these houses are likely to be expensive houses and most households are likely to have two cars. That would be approx 4700 extra cars on the road. Not all will be travelling to Manchester and the constraints of local roads, especially through Gee Cross and Hyde are not designed for this massive boost in cars. As far as I've seen no traffic data has been forthcoming!

This will increase the likelihood of accidents and also see an increase of pollution.

The area of Godley Green is quite hilly and open, Very cold in the winter months and again pushes people to use their cars opposed to using their bikes - which the plan devotes a lot of credence to! (laughable - given where people will have to work) and potentially not wanting to walk to the local train station given the undulation of the area and the weather at times.

Flooding

This site is situated directly below Werneth Low, which sees a significant amount of rainfall and which flows down to the Godley Green site. Building on protected greenbelt means concreting over open fields, removing established hedgerows and trees. All which act as a natural sponge to negate the risk of flooding further down. Areas in quite close locality have seen problems in regarding flooding. A sink hole opened up in one of the roads nearby and we can only envisage that getting worse if this development was to go ahead!

Leisure

Godley Green already provides a great place for people to exercise outdoors in a multitude of disciplines. We regularly see bike riders, walkers, families, dog walkers, ramblers and horse riders to name a few! Whilst the site is not greatly opened up in terms of footpaths, it is used on a daily basis by all of the above in great numbers in all weather. People value the openness and tranquility the area gives. The site also is greatly used by equestrians. There are many livery yards housing approx 150 horses which provide a rural economy for surrounding businesses locally and nationwide. There is a real shortage of stabling in the area and would be a real worry where these horses would go. A riding school has also operated for over 30 years on the site

and provides lessons and hacks out for adults and children. It provides an outdoor environment for children and adults to volunteer and work and provides much needed holiday clubs in the school holidays. People from all walks of life visit the riding school and they receive visitors from the local area, nationwide and visitors from abroad too.

Brownfield Sites

When the GMSF First came out in October 2016 it was announced that we had Brownfield sites in Tameside that equated to 8000 homes, sites that may become brown field sites in the next 20 years - 2000 homes and windfall sites that could equate to 1000 homes. This equated to 11,000 homes. (No mention at that time to duty to co operate) At the time the housing need figure for Tameside was 13,600 - which was later lowered and is now 11,067.

The latest SHELAA data according to the Godley Green Website now only lists 6,923 Brownfield sites including windfall sites - no mention of sites that may become available, especially due to Covid , Brexit and the decline of the high street. Why the discrepancies?

later it emerged that 3000 of Tameside"s housing quota was due to go to other area"s of GM with higher housing need. Tameside are trying to ignore the duty to co operate , whether we are in places for everyone or not.

Firstly it appears the figures are being tweaked to suit a greenbelt first approach. Secondly with nearly 7000 brownfield sites and 3000 duty to co operate sites and brexit and covid likely to gift more brownfield sites over the next 17 years, tell me again why do we need to use our precious greenbelt. Surely if a brownfield approach comes first , then this question should be asked in 16 years time and not now!!

What work has been done to ensure duty to co operate is being used to its full potential. Has Duty to Co operate just been restricted to Greater Manchester or has work been done to ask neighbouring authorities e.g Preston , Warrington, Macclesfield to also "help out".

Biodiversity

Godley green has an abundance of biodiversity. To think that could be improved is laughable and if it can be improved it should be as part of the greenbelt not as a housing estate. There are over 50 recorded priority or protected species on the site and is home to Bats, Swallows, Great crested newts, badgers and deer to just name a few. The site is also within 10km of the south pennine moors special area of conservation and special protection area (european sites); the proposed site would be affected due to increased recreation use

Garden Village Principles

Godley green is situated between 3 housing estates, it is the antithesis of what a garden village is supposed to be. It would be a glorified housing estate with a splattering of employment dotted around the site. It would not be surrounded by its own greenbelt and in fact lead to the loss of it. The Vision has been marketed as community led, the community has been well and truly ignored as the majority that know about this development are against it! Our current petition stands at 4250 signatures. Garden Villages should not be urban sprawl yet on Godley green marketing material they write "Tameside Council is promoting Godley Green Garden Village as unique extension of its built area"

Infrastructure

As well as the above infrastructure constraints of the site. It is important to mention the lack of doctors, dentists and other health services that are struggling in the area at present. People struggle to find dentists and doctors appointments . There is a distinct lack of GP"s and dentists, its not as easy as placing a doctor"s dentist"s surgery "on site" if there is potentially no staff to fill them! At present there is also a shortage of HGV drivers which is

	<p>affecting bin collections and other services. Hospitals in the area are struggling with finding beds and sending ambulances out to the demand. United Utilities have sent letters out saying we have to conserve water as reservoir levels are very low... are we building more reservoirs in this plan?</p> <p>Consultation</p> <p>Has been very poor , especially at the start of the GMSF in 2016. it has been internet led with very little interaction with the older generation who may not use the internet. Back in 2016 i contacted Tameside Council about why they were not advertising the details of the GMSF on their own council page or social media pages. I received the following reply "It is a Greater Manchester wide plan and as such is being advertised mainly on the combined authority website" Once posts did start to appear they were non informative , just a link saying GMSF... people did not know what the GMSF was , so why should they click on it. I suggested posts about individual sites and what was planned for them.... but fell on deaf ears, it was really like they did not want anyone to know! No signs have been put on any area"s affected, detailing what is planned there! except in this last phase! No leaflets have been sent out to the surrounding residents for the GMSF OR PFE.</p> <p>Can the proposals be achieved within the plans timescale?</p> <p>NO , Tameside council has so far failed to meet milestones ALREADY with homes england and more than one land owner has refused to sell. This could bring complications of the site having to use CPO powers. It has also been stated that this development would start in 2028 which would over run the 17 year plan</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>We believe that this site should be removed as exceptional circumstances have not been shown! We also believe the loss of greenbelt is premature to say the very least. In light of covid and brexit we have potentially started to see the collapse of the high street and the rise of internet shopping. This will no doubt lead to a rise in brownfield sites and then we can have truly brownfield first approach! As soon as greenbelt is released it will become prime pickings and brownfield sites will be ignored and potentially not needed in the time frame. That would be a crime!</p> <p>ALL greenbelt allocations should be removed from the PFE! A Brownfield first approach should be utilised and everything done to protect the greenbelt as it is now. Lets not forget the reason we have greenbelt in the first place, it shouldn't be swapped and changed to suit as that defeats the very purpose of it! Our recommendation is that Godley green should be removed from the PFE and kept as greenbelt!</p>
Family Name	Elliott
Given Name	Claire
Company / Organisation	Save Tameside Greenbelt
Person ID	1286403
Title	JPA 32: South of Hyde
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1286403_SpeciesList.pdf PFE1286403_StrategicPlanning.pdf
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound

<p>Compliance - Legally compliant?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>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>	<p>greenbelt is sacrosanct</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>site should be removed as it is greenbelt and exceptional circumstances have not been made.</p>