

Family Name	Bound
Given Name	Bill
Person ID	1287185
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Bound
Given Name	Bill
Person ID	1287185
Title	JPA 36: Pocket Nook
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.	<p>JPA 36: Pocket Nook is not legally compliant as it does not consider the landowner's position. JPA 36: Pocket Nook should have been removed when the landowner first informed Wigan Council in 2013 and many times since, that the land was not for sale. Wigan Council have continued to ignore this and keep putting this area of land into the plans. This shows one more example of the incompetence of the Council to follow the facts and is tantamount to coercion and bullying.</p> <p>The land is top grade farming land and provides crops every year. It is also home to red leg partridge, lap wings and field hares. The land has been farmed by three generations of Adamson's family.</p> <p>Andy Burnham, MP at the time, of a public meeting in Leigh library stated that there would be no compulsory purchase of land for housing if people don't want to sell other arrangements would have to be made.</p> <p>Wigan are also ignoring their commitments to being a supporter of green issues by allowing houses to be built on land with abundant wildlife such as Great Crested Newts and being part of a network of wildlife corridors, which Wigan seem to think are unimportant.</p> <p>The plans do not consider the impact on the immediate surrounding roads, schools and medical needs i.e. doctors surgery's. Lowton has very few facilities to cope with such an influx of houses and people. Some of the houses would be adjacent to the East Lancashire Road (A580) and would be subject to the traffic noise and pollution. The traffic from the development of JPA 36: Pocket Nook, 600 to 1200 possibly 1800 cars, would be added to the already congested Newton Road and Lane Head Junction. The Lane Head area is already one of the busiest in Greater Manchester. No thought seems to have been given to the decrease in the air quality in Lowton. It should be a priority to investigate the levels of air pollution in the area and</p>

	<p>its effect on people"s health and life expectancy and their need for increased medical provision.</p> <p>Please remove these plans and rethink where to build. The Government Inspector told Wigan council to only build 1000 houses in Golborne and Lowton to date 1300 have been given permission. A significant number of houses have now been built in the Lowton area very near the proposed JPA 36: Pocket Nook development. What"s the use of having Government Inspections if the Council just ignores them?</p> <p>Andy Burnham at the 2013 inspection meeting stated that Lowton could not take the 3000 houses Wigan had planned for the area, and the Government Inspector agreed.</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>The JPA 36: Pocket Nook plan should be modified as it does not consider the views of the landowners or green issues.</p> <p>There are many places in Wigan that are not good farming land, for instance land between Golborne and Abram untouched for years. The use of brownfield land does not seem to have been considered as it would not need to build on productive farmland and wildlife areas.</p> <p>As stated elsewhere, Wigan has allowed more houses to be built than the 1000 in the Golborne and Lowton area as the Government Inspector told the Council. These plans should be scrapped.</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Bowater
Given Name	Steven
Person ID	1287616
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Bowater
Given Name	Steven
Person ID	1287616
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.	<p>Policy JP-H 1 states A minimum of 164,880 net additional dwellings will be delivered over this same period. It is expected that the population will increase by 170,000 over this same period. This means that the P4E strategy is aiming to build 1 house per person. Given that the average household is 2.4 people per household, this would only require an additional 94,000 dwellings. Therefore there appears to be no justification to build an additional 94,000 dwellings.</p>
Family Name	Bowater
Given Name	Steven
Person ID	1287616
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

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.	A major problem with new housing is that a large %age is bought up by overseas investors The P4E strategy aims to deliver 50,000 affordable housing, but unable to see how to
Family Name	Bowater
Given Name	Steven
Person ID	1287616
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
Family Name	Bowater
Given Name	Steven
Person ID	1287616
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	The destruction of Carrington Moss will lead to a net loss of bio-diversity, with a major

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	
Family Name	Bowater
Given Name	Steven
Person ID	1287616
Title	JPA 33 New Carrington
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.	<p>On 28th November 2018, Trafford Council declared a Climate Emergency. Council resolved that the impacts of global temperature rise above 1.5°C are so severe that governments at all levels must work together and "make this agenda their top priority Peat Management.</p> <p>Protecting moss peat land is vital in tackling climate change.</p> <p>The labelling of Carrington Moss as Underdeveloped is a vague term.</p> <p>Developing this with housing will completely destroy the potential to store carbon in the peat, and the need to travel to work, and other facilities, further increasing carbon emissions.</p> <p>Developing Carrington Moss should be by further restoring the ancient moss land, not building on it.</p> <p>Therefore, this proposal to build on Carrington Moss is in direct contravention of Trafford Council's Climate Emergency Declaration.</p> <p>See https://democratic.trafford.gov.uk/documents/s37185/Appendix%201%20Trafford%</p>