

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Arden
<b>Given Name</b>	Paul
<b>Person ID</b>	1286814
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Arden
<b>Given Name</b>	Paul
<b>Person ID</b>	1286814
<b>Title</b>	Our Vision
<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>	I feel the PfE is being pushed along in the old framework for GMFS and a full review or fully starting again is required as I feel you are using old information based on old assumptions and stats.
<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>	A full judicial review is required with more attention paid to who is fronting the individual plans and why.
<b>Family Name</b>	Arden
<b>Given Name</b>	Paul
<b>Person ID</b>	1286814
<b>Title</b>	Our Strategic Objectives
<b>Type</b>	Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<p><b>Our strategic objectives - Considering the information provided for our strategic objectives, please tick which of these objectives your written comment refers to:</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Meet our housing need</li> <li>2. Create neighbourhoods of choice</li> <li>3. Ensure a thriving and productive economy in the districts involved</li> <li>4. Maximise the potential arising from our national and international assets</li> <li>5. Reduce inequalities and improve prosperity</li> <li>6. Promote the sustainable movement of people, goods and information</li> <li>7. Ensure that districts involved are more resilient and carbon neutral</li> <li>8. Improve the quality of our natural environment and access to green spaces</li> <li>9. Ensure access to physical and social infrastructure</li> <li>10. Promote the health and wellbeing of communities</li> </ol>
<p><b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b></p>	<p>Sound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Justified?</b></p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p><b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b></p>	<p>NA</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>As above, I feel there is a substantial difference between GMFS and PfE. There for it must be decided under judicial review.</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>Judicial Review          Use up to date ONS information          Call in to question the failure in precious plans as we seem be planning for the same to happened again</p>
<p><b>Family Name</b></p>	<p>Arden</p>
<p><b>Given Name</b></p>	<p>Paul</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1286814</p>
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>Our Spatial Strategy</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>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<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>Family Name</b>	Arden
<b>Given Name</b>	Paul
<b>Person ID</b>	1286814
<b>Title</b>	JPA 21: Crimble Mill
<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 have huge concerns in relation to -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The fact 2018 ONS data has not been used.</li> <li>- The fact greenbelt is being used to subsidise the refurb costs of the mill.</li> <li>- The lack of any details on the actual mill given it's the catalyst for it.</li> <li>- Direct impact on the neighbouring school.</li> <li>- The fact we have space infrastructure in Heywood as it is, let alone another 1000 people</li> <li>- Present public transport in Heywood is shameful.</li> <li>- Access is totally unsuitable and the Mill doesn't exist on your own plans.</li> <li>- Massive flood zone ignorance. Being made worse by building further up the borough.</li> <li>- Fault line and Cole mine sites, The land has once been deemed unsuitable for planning based on this..... what's changed?.</li> <li>- The fact a member of the town planning boards son is a director of the development company!</li> </ul>
<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</b>	<p>A full review is needed of all the above areas.</p> <p>Why is the greenbelt being used as a bargaining tool for the mill? The mill has been purchased with full knowledge of the state of repair. If it needs to be brought back to life on its own grounds this should be funded by the buyer and not subsidised via our green belt.</p> <p>Brown belt has a large on of costs, Greenbelt costs the community for life.</p>

**you have identified  
above.**