

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Arnott
<b>Given Name</b>	Dave
<b>Person ID</b>	1287241
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Arnott
<b>Given Name</b>	Dave
<b>Person ID</b>	1287241
<b>Title</b>	JPA 12: Beal Valley
<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>	Drainage issues have not been addressed. The proposal flies in the face of a brownfield first policy. Green belt should be removed from the plan.
<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>	Development on Greenbelt should be removed from the plan. Adopt a brownfield first approach.
<b>Family Name</b>	Arnott
<b>Given Name</b>	Dave
<b>Person ID</b>	1287241
<b>Title</b>	JPA 14: Broadbent Moss
<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>	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>	Insufficient consideration has been given to infrastructure provision. Healthcare, education, transport and leisure have not been significantly addressed in this proposal. Not only will this adversely affect the immediate area, but also put a further strain on already stretched services locally, and in nearby Royton.
<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>	Development on Greenbelt should be removed from the plan. Adopt a brownfield first approach.
<b>Family Name</b>	Arnott
<b>Given Name</b>	Dave
<b>Person ID</b>	1287241
<b>Title</b>	JPA 16: Cowlshaw
<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</b>	Planning for access on this proposal is poor. Combined with other developments, there will be a material impact on highways and transport links.

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

**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.**

Development on Greenbelt should be removed from the plan. Adopt a brownfield first approach.