

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Aunins
Given Name	Janet
Person ID	1286446
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Include files	PFEJanetAunins_Email_Redacted.pdf
Family Name	Aunins
Given Name	Janet
Person ID	1286446
Title	JP-H 1 Scale Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	NA
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
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.	In the light of current climate and nature emergencies, no Green Belt land should be allocated for building, no felling or destruction of existing trees, maximum emphasis on retaining existing green spaces and creating new ones.
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.	There needs to be stringent regulation to require that all residential building applications must involve eco-friendly systems, such as solar panels, heat pumps, etc., have a specified (high) level of green space left untouched and incorporate wildlife-friendly features, such as Hedgehog Highways and the like, and this should be mandatory before any planning permission is even considered.
Family Name	Aunins
Given Name	Janet
Person ID	1286446
Title	JP-G 1 Valuing Important Landscapes
Type	Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

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?	NA
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.	I note from the so-called "survey" references to this area being unimportant as far as wildlife is concerned. Whoever did this survey clearly did not do a very good job as nothing could be further from the truth. There are Great crested newts and Bats living here - which are both protected species, meaning that they, their breeding and nesting sites and resting places are fully protected under the law (Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981; Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010; and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017). In addition to this legislation, the Government has now amended the Environment Bill to include a legally-binding target to halt nature's decline by 2030. Destroying this area for wildlife is directly contrary to that concept, and there should be no new building allowed on any Green Belt land.
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.	My understanding, from what I have read, is that this survey was prepared for Peel Land and Property (North) Limited, which has a vested interest in this land being avowed as unimportant, or barren of wildlife, as it stands to make a great deal of money building houses there. Any survey to assess this aspect needs to be totally independent and commissioned by the GMCA, not a house builder, to have any credibility.
Family Name	Aunins
Given Name	Janet
Person ID	1286446
Title	JP-G 2 Green Infrastructure Network
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA

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.	The West of Gibfield site is perfect for a nature reserve similar to Pennington Flash. It has sufficient varied habitats - woodland, scrubland, fields and ponds - to support a whole host of wildlife. The wildlife is already there and more would come if this site were developed as a discrete nature reserve. As at Pennington, it would benefit not only wildlife but also provide a natural, pleasant, educational and restorative place for the people of Atherton and surrounding areas to enjoy, exercise and forget for a while the cares and pressures of modern life. The covid pandemic has starkly highlighted the importance of having success to green spaces and the natural world on mental and physical health and lowering stress levels, and I can attest to the validity of this on a personal level. Atherton is rapidly losing its green spaces, and the quality of life of its inhabitants will be the worse for that.
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.	We are in the throes of a global emergency and need to take action at local level if we are going to avoid the worst impacts of the climate and nature emergencies. Yes, we need to prioritise the creation of new natural green spaces, like parks and woods, but doing this is useless if we remove existing established ones like the West of Gibfield site. This site is perfect for a nature reserve similar to Pennington Flash. It has sufficient varied habitats - woodland, scrubland, fields and ponds - to support a whole host of wildlife. The wildlife is already there and more would come if this site were developed as a discrete nature reserve. As at Pennington, it would benefit not only wildlife but also provide a natural, pleasant, educational and restorative place for the people of Atherton and surrounding areas to enjoy, exercise and forget for a while the cares and pressures of modern life. The covid pandemic has starkly highlighted the importance of having success to green spaces and the natural world on mental and physical health and lowering stress levels, and I can attest to the validity of this on a personal level. Atherton is rapidly losing its green spaces, and the quality of life of its inhabitants will be the worse for that. Therefore the site at West of Gibfield should be designated a nature reserve and no building or such development be allowed.
Family Name	Aunins
Given Name	Janet
Person ID	1286446
Title	JP-G 3 River Valleys and Waterways
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	NA
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
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	Building and development is being undertaken in too close proximity to the waterways and, therefore, corridors and buffer zones for wildlife are compromised and unworkable.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	
Family Name	Aunins
Given Name	Janet
Person ID	1286446
Title	JP-G 4 Lowland Wetlands and Mosslands
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
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.	The West of Gibfield site is perfect for a nature reserve similar to Pennington Flash. It has sufficient varied habitats - woodland, scrubland, fields, ponds and wetlands - to support a whole host of wildlife. The wildlife is already there and more would come if this site were developed as a discrete nature reserve.
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.	Develop the West of Gibfield site as a dedicated nature reserve for wildlife with no building or housing permitted.
Family Name	Aunins
Given Name	Janet
Person ID	1286446
Title	JP-G 6 Urban Green Space
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	NA
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
Family Name	Aunins
Given Name	Janet
Person ID	1286446
Title	JPA 37: West of Gibfield
Type	Web
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?	NA
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>I note from the so-called "survey" references to this area being unimportant as far as wildlife is concerned. Whoever did this survey clearly did not do a very good job as nothing could be further from the truth. There are Great crested newts and Bats living here - which are both protected species, meaning that they, their breeding and nesting sites and resting places are fully protected under the law (Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981; Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010; and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017). In addition to this legislation, the Government has now amended the Environment Bill to include a legally-binding target to halt nature's decline by 2030. Destroying this area for wildlife is directly contrary to that concept and, therefore, this proposal should be scrapped. In its current form, the plan does not provide enough green space/habitat for the diverse species that live here. Where will all these creatures go if the area in which they live, feed and breed is destroyed by building yet more houses? A corridor is useless. They are being squeezed into smaller and smaller areas which are fragmented; therefore, they cannot find mates or sufficient food; therefore, they will die out. What right have we, a so-called nation of animal lovers, to destroy their homes just to make more for us, when there are alternatives? With so many species in sharp decline, endangered or on the verge of extinction, this needless destruction of habitat cannot be justified.</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>My understanding is that this survey was prepared for Peel Land and Property (North) Limited, which has a vested interest in this land being avowed as unimportant, or barren of wildlife, as it stands to make a great deal of money building houses there. Any survey to assess this aspect needs to be totally independent and commissioned by the GMCA, not a house builder, to have any validity.</p>

Redacted general comment - Please add any comments not addressed above

As the online consultation for Places for Everyone is so difficult to navigate and complete (and really does not ask the relevant questions to reflect residents' concerns), I write in respect of the proposal to build 500 houses and 45,500 square metres of industrial space in Atherton at the West of Gibfield site (Allocation 37) to voice my objections. I wish this letter to be treated as my response to the consultation and rejection of the proposals.

We are currently in the throes of a global emergency, and action is needed at local level if we are going to avoid the worst impacts of the climate and nature emergencies. There has been much talk of making Greater Manchester a greener and more pleasant place to live, but this proposal, I believe, makes a mockery of that idea. Yes, we need to prioritise the creation of new natural green spaces, like parks and woods, but doing this is to no avail if we remove and destroy existing well-established ones like the West of Gibfield site. There appears to be one tiny new green belt site proposed in Atherton, but this is much smaller than the West of Gibfield site which would be lost if this proposal goes ahead, resulting in a net loss of green space for Atherton which is already poor in this area in comparison with other localities.

The West of Gibfield site is perfect for a nature reserve similar to Pennington Flash. It has sufficient varied habitats – woodland, scrubland, fields, ponds and wetlands – to support a whole host of wildlife. The wildlife is already there, and more would come if this site were developed as a dedicated (and permanent) nature reserve. As at Pennington, it would benefit not only wildlife but also provide a natural, pleasant, educational and restorative place for the people of Atherton and surrounding areas to enjoy, exercise and forget for a while the cares and pressures of modern life. The covid pandemic has starkly highlighted the importance of having access to green spaces and the natural world as beneficial to mental and physical health and for lowering stress levels, and I can attest to the veracity of this on a personal level. Atherton is rapidly losing its few green spaces, and the quality of life of its inhabitants will be the worse for that. We cannot afford to lose any more and this is a perfect place and opportunity to redress the balance.

I note the “ecological survey” refers to this area as being “unimportant” as far as wildlife is concerned. Whoever did this survey clearly did not do a very good job as nothing could be further from the truth. There are Great Crested Newts (as mentioned) but also Bats living here – both of which are protected species, meaning that they, their breeding and nesting sites and resting places are fully protected under the law (Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended); Schedule 2 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010; and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017). In addition to this legislation, the Government has now amended the Environment Bill to include a legally-binding target to halt nature's decline by 2030. Destroying this area for wildlife is directly contrary to that concept.

There is strong public opposition to any new building projects being allowed on Green Belt land, and a conviction that brownfield sites and demolition of/changes of use to existing buildings – e.g. empty pubs, industrial and warehouse buildings, et cetera – could be utilised instead for housing needs. Places for Everyone is a good example of saying one thing (more green space) and doing the opposite (less green space).

My understanding, from what I have read, is that the aforementioned survey was prepared on behalf of Peel Land and Property (North) Limited, which has a vested interest in this land being avowed as unimportant, or barren of wildlife, as it stands to make a great deal of money from building houses there. Any survey to assess this aspect needs to be totally independent and should be commissioned by the GMCA, not a house builder, to have any validity. How long did the surveyor spend in the area, and in which season, to reach these (incorrect) conclusions? We live here 52 weeks of the year;

therefore, we see the creatures we share this space with and know who they are better than any surveyor only here for the short term could.

The scheme, as a whole, is named Places for Everyone – everyone, that is, unless you happen to be a Hedgehog, Roe Deer, Great Crested Newt, Bat, Buzzard, Sparrowhawk, Kestrel, Brown Hare, Barn Owl, Fox, Grey Squirrel, Lapwing (another species in sharp decline which breeds regularly on the fields in this area), Pheasant – to name but a handful – or, indeed, any of the thousands of song birds, insects and other wildlife that call this area home. I have personally seen all of the above species (with the exception of the Great Crested Newt, which has, so far, eluded me) from my garden (which backs on to this site), sometimes several of them in one day. For example, a few days ago, I was lucky enough to witness Buzzards gliding across the sky, hunting; a female Sparrowhawk landed in my garden to make a kill; a family of Pheasant with four youngsters visited the garden to feed, as did three Hedgehogs in the evening and the Bats that roost on the nearby farm (which has also been earmarked for development; how does that square with them being protected, as the barn in which they roost will be destroyed?). All this in one day, so this area is far from barren of wildlife; however, if this proposal goes ahead, sightings like these will be a thing of the past and the area really will become barren of wildlife.

Where will all these creatures go if the area in which they live, feed and breed is destroyed by building yet more houses? They are being squeezed into smaller and smaller areas which are fragmented; therefore, they cannot find mates or sufficient food; therefore, they will die out. What right have we, a nation of so-called animal lovers, to destroy their homes just to make more for us, when there are alternatives? With so many species in sharp decline, endangered or on the verge of extinction, how can Places for Everyone justify such needless destruction of habitat? Our so-called best-loved mammal, the Hedgehog, has decreased from 30 million to one million in my lifetime, and 60% of species monitored in the UK over the past 50 years are in decline. Fragmented “corridors” are insufficient for these animals to survive, let alone thrive, and birds of prey cannot hunt in a concrete jungle so they will leave (but go where?). Places for Everyone must include the other creatures we share the planet with, and the slogan of the RSPB – Give Nature a Home – should be at the very forefront of our thinking.

There are areas of established trees on this site east of Schofield Lane which are essential habitat and must be retained, certainly not felled to make way for housing. There is also a major gas pipeline, part of which runs between Schofield Lane and Wigan Road (so directly through this site) within yards of existing housing; so there should be no building in the vicinity of this pipeline (if only for safety and pipeline access reasons) and the land between it and the existing housing should be left as an undisturbed buffer zone, a habitat corridor to be used by wildlife in general and Hedgehogs in particular.

The consensus of local residents is that this land should be a designated nature reserve only, but, in the (very undesirable) alternative, there needs to be (at national as well as local level) robust regulation to require that all residential building applications must include eco-friendly systems, such as solar panels, heat pumps, insulation, et cetera, have a specified (very high) level of green space left intact with wildlife in mind, and incorporate wildlife-friendly features, such as Hedgehog Highways, Swift bricks, wildflower verges and the like – I understand that Barratt Homes have already started to do this in alliance with the RSPB – and these requirements should be mandatory before any planning permission will be considered.

I could also mention the problems of noise, pollution, excessive traffic and lack of schools, GPs and other amenities needed to support the extra influx of people, but I know lots of other residents will have made those arguments already and so there is no need for me to reiterate. My concern is for the beleaguered wildlife that will fade away because it has nowhere to go. Once

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>this green space and others like it are gone, they are gone forever, and the natural world that relies upon them will be gone forever, too. This cannot be allowed to happen. Future generations will be utterly bewildered, angry and unable to comprehend how and why it was allowed to happen on our watch.</p>
Family Name	Aunins
Given Name	Janet
Person ID	1286446
Title	Wigan - Green Belt Additions
Type	Web
GBA Wigan - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this District your response relates to - then respond to the questions below	Wigan GBA45 Pennington FC Pitches, Howe Bridge, Atherton
Soundness - Positively prepared?	NA
Soundness - Justified?	Sound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
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.	One tiny area in Atherton does not mitigate in any way the proposed loss of green belt land at West of Gibfield. This leaves an already impoverished Atherton (so far as green spaces are concerned) much worse off.
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.	Remove West of Gibfield as a site for development. Leave it as green belt and develop it as a nature reserve.