

Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
Title	JP-J 1 Supporting Long Term Economic Growth
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?	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.	I live in Oldham. All previous attempts at town centre and employment regeneration have ended in failure. Just look at Foxdenton - that was supposed to provide thousands of quality jobs. It has failed spectacularly - hardly any jobs were created. Time to stop kidding ourselves. Job creation is not a reason to trash our environment and grab 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.	Thorough investigations into why past job creation schemes failed are required. Existing sites should be looked at for spare capacity first before we look at any other hair-brained schemes. Oldham Council has a poor record of delivering quality schemes. Millions has been wasted in consultations over the past decades. The current Labour controlled council is not to be trusted. They have form for forcing through schemes without proper consultation- look at the purchase of the Spindles shopping centre and the relocation of the market. This should have been consulted on before any purchase took place. Oldham Council are not to be trusted when it comes to planning applications either. Can you believe a link road has been approved at Knowls Lane where the diversion of a footpath does not comply with Public Sector Equality Duty under the Equality Act 2010? Well that is what exactly happened. Disabled access to be cut off from a Public Right of Way - it is UNLAWFUL! I HAVE NO TRUST IN OLDHAM MBC OR GMCA - PLEASE STOP THIS MADNESS NOW!
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Title	JP-J 2 Employment Sites and Premises
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?	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.	A full audit of existing sites is needed before this is taken an further.
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.	A full audit of existing sites and the success/failure of previous schemes needs to be undertaken. It is no good ploughing on with building additional facilities of existing sites remain empty or only partially filled - Foxdenton in Oldham is a prime example of a scheme that failed to live up to is promised potential.
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
Title	JP-J 4 Industry and Warehousing Development
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?	No

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

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.	Shaw has massive warehouse capacity but businesses are moving out of the area to be closer to motorway network and better transport links. Warehousing is set to be demolished for homes. What is the point in demolishing warehouse facilities then building more elsewhere?
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.	Needs a fully integrated approach - demolishing warehousing in one area only to build warehousing in another area is environmentally criminal. PfEis supposed to be an integrated approach but it isn't. Too many anomalies present in the proposal!
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
Title	JP-H 1 Scale Distribution and Phasing of New Housing Development
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?	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.	The number of homes required is flawed. Planning policy states that housing allocation should be based on LOCAL need. Allocations have been based on GM wide need, not down to a LOCAL level. New strategies such as mill conversions have been introduced which need to be taken into account.
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	Housing numbers should be revisited, particularly in light of Oldham's new strategy that mill conversions should be considered as potential housing schemes. This would release the Green Belt land from the PfE plans, that is due to be swallowed up by PfE. I am totally against PfE -it gives developers the ability to target our lovely green spaces instead of targeting brownfield land. Green Belt should be protected at all costs! There is NO NEED to build on Green Belt at all.

or soundness matters you have identified above.	
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
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?	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.	There should be no building on lowland wetland and moss areas. These are important areas that can help to combat flooding if left alone.
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 these from PfE
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
Title	JP-G 5 Uplands
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

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.	Uplands should be excluded if they are in the Green Belt - no excuses!
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 green belt from PfE completely!
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
Title	JP-G 9 A Net Enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity
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?	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.	These are only words! What does it actually mean in practice? Needs to have some specifics.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

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.	Should set out what formal protections you are proposing - what will and won't be allowed. We are about to lose Ancient Woodland at Knowls Lane because the developer and Oldham LPA didn't follow Government advice. Too late now! No trust in Oldham MBC or GMCA!
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
Title	JP-G 10 Green Belt
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?	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.	Green Belt should not be built on - remove all from PfE plans. Once it's gone - it's gone forever. It is only a finite resource. It was created to ensure brownfield sites were used first.
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.	All Green Belt land to be removed from development plans. Must be brownfield first!
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
Title	JP-G 11 Safeguarded Land

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

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?	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.	Other Protected Open Land served this purpose in Oldham but this has been under attack with OPOL sites now fair game for developers. I have no trust in my local council or GMCA
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.	Any new designations must have specific legal protection that cannot be taken away on a whim by LPAs.
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
Title	JP-P1 Sustainable Places
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?	No
Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the	Oldham needs social housing not executive homes. Thousands of people chased 16 social housing homes recently. That shows the level of demand.

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.	
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.	Concentrate on social housing in my Borough and leave executive homes to other areas.
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
Title	JP-P2 Heritage
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Sound
Soundness - Justified?	Sound
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.	Mills should be used to covert to homes. This would go a long way to alleviating the shortage of land to build homes and also a good use of recycling buildings and materials, reducing our carbon footprint.
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
Title	JP-P4 New Retail and Leisure Uses in Town Centres
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

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.	We must find new and creative ways of using our town centres but there MUST BE CONSULTATION with residents before any changes are proposed. In Oldham, changes regarding the town centre and our historic market are being forced upon us - this is a prime example where consultation only took place after the Spindles shopping centre was purchased behind the backs of residents. Proposals to relocate our historic market unveiled as part of a done deal. Residents were only consulted after the purchase. This is not how a council should behave!
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.	Full consultation should take place with residents BEFORE ANY MONEY IS SPENT on schemes. I have no confidence in Oldham MBC and GMCA to carry out proper consultations.
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
Title	JP-P6 Health
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?	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	Developments are already allowed where increase in infrastructure such as access to doctors/dentists/schools is not thought important. This is consistently raised as an objection against large developments but the LPA doesn't take any notice. How will PfE be any different?

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.	There has been ample opportunity for any commitment under access to healthcare to be demonstrated by my LPA. They have CHOSEN not to do so. I have no confidence in the LPA or GMCA. PfE may as well be a developer's charter. It doesn't help ordinary residents.
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
Title	JP-D1 Infrastructure Implementation
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?	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.	If the actions lie outside of the scope as you state above - then why are you including them in PfE?
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.	Scrap PfE as it cannot deliver what you want to achieve. I have no trust in my local council or GMCA.
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Title	JP-D2 Developer Contributions
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?	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.	Developers don't contribute now. For Knowls Lane the community gets nothing apart from years of disruption and building work. Not even an increase in local infrastructure- doctors, schools etc. It's a joke!
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.	Developers don't contribute now - how will PFE be any different? I have no trust in my local council or GMCA.
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
Title	Oldham - Green Belt Additions
Type	Web
GBA Oldham - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this District your response relates to - then respond to the questions below	Oldham GBA17 Land behind Denshaw Village Hall
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Sound
Soundness - Justified?	Sound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Sound
Soundness - Effective?	Sound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Compliance - Legally compliant?	Yes
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	Yes
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
Title	JP-H 2 Affordability of New Housing
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?	No
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
Title	Other Comments
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?	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.	RECLASSIFIED
Redacted modification - Please set out the	RECLASSIFIED

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.	
Family Name	Barker
Given Name	Jane
Person ID	1287331
Title	Other Comments
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?	No