

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Brown
<b>Given Name</b>	Jonathan
<b>Person ID</b>	1286903
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Brown
<b>Given Name</b>	Jonathan
<b>Person ID</b>	1286903
<b>Title</b>	JPA 26: Land at Hazelhurst Farm
<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>We strongly object to the proposals (JPA 26) to convert the green belt at Hazelhurst Farm into residential dwellings.</p> <p>This is for a multitude of reasons, as listed below. In the event that our objection to these plans is not sustained, we will be legally challenging the proposals by all means possible.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Building 400 dwellings on green belt land directly contradicts the manifesto put forward by our elected government to "Reach Net Zero by 2050, with investment in clean energy solutions and green infrastructure to reduce carbon emissions and pollution."</li> <li>Building 400 dwellings will contribute significantly local to CO2 emissions, from both the initial construction and the subsequent emissions by residents. It will also abolish the green belt land which absorbs carbon dioxide (i.e. it is currently a carbon negative site).</li> <li>2. Nobody has expressed a strong claim reasoning why 400 dwellings need to be built, other than greed and profit making by private business. There is no shortage of residential accommodation in this local area.</li> <li>3. The policy attached to JPA 26 states that vehicular access should "not have an unacceptable impact on the quality of existing residential areas" - however, building 400 houses in this location will have MAJOR impact on the quality of existing residential areas. The surrounding roads already have an excessive number of potholes and a shortage of car parking facilities; building a further 400 houses will categorically make this problem worse. The council is already unable to adequately fund the necessary repair work to roads, so it is inconceivable that they will be able to manage once there is additional wear and tear caused by extra residents.</li> <li>4. The policy attached to JPA 26 states that the development must "protect the quality of watercourses through and around the site" - this area has multiple streams and ponds in the vicinity, which are known to host wildlife</li> </ol>

and also periodically flood. Building on this green belt site will be detrimental to wildlife, and contribute to further water run off and impair drainage, making the flooding worse.

5. The policy attached to JPA 26 states that the development must "support an overall increase in its nature conservation value" - there is zero way in which building 400 dwellings will cause an overall increase in its nature conservation value.

6. The policy attached to JPA 26 states that the development must "provide mitigation to address noise pollution from nearby roads" - this development will add more cars to the already congested roads around this site, contributing much more to the noise and environmental pollution in this area. Despite significant investment and attempts to improve the flow of traffic at the Worsley interchange, M60 junction 13, there is still major delays and congestion every day in this area. Building 400 dwellings in such close proximity, will only make this problem worse, and provides no mitigation for the current residents of this area.

7. An additional 400 dwellings potentially means an additional 800 vehicles on the surrounding roads and 400 gas boilers; this means more harmful emissions for the local residents. This region is already among the worst in Europe for levels of pollution, which is proven to be detrimental to health of adults and children alike. We should be retaining our green spaces, improving our air quality to help to narrow the North-South divide in health inequalities.

8. This area of green belt is directly adjacent to areas of biological importance (historical woodland) - building so many houses, with so many new residents, in such close proximity, will be detrimental to the health of wildlife and the woodland itself.

9. There is already a lack of public transport available to people in Worsley, as it is not well served by the regional tram or train network. Building more houses in this location will only make this problem worse. More buses on the road to serve them is NOT an appropriate solution.

10. General infrastructure - this is a green belt site, which previous generations have maintained as such and we should be doing the same. There are no provisions in the vicinity for additional shops, schools, leisure areas, green space, hospitals, recreation, sewage drainage etc. Doctors in the area are oversubscribed, with no funding or ability to recruit/employ more doctors. Building residential dwellings on green belt only makes all of these problem worse.

**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.**

1. 400 dwellings should not be constructed if we are to have any hope of making this country carbon neutral - we should be retaining as much green belt as possible, at all costs! Green belt absorbs carbon dioxide, improves air quality, health and wellbeing and will provide a much better future for all the residents of the local area, the country, and the whole world, if it remains as green belt, rather than being converted to unnecessary residential dwellings.

2. This site, JPA 26, should be removed from the Greater Manchester plan (places for everyone), permanently, or it will face significant legal challenge.

3. Greater Manchester has countless brown field sites with potential for development and regeneration. Developing these run-down central areas, where there are better transport links, access roads and amenities, with dwellings based on green infrastructure and innovation, will make Manchester a desirable place to live for everyone, while also recruiting talent to the North West that will put us in a great position to lead the Green revolution. These brown field sites should be exhausted before ANY green belt sites are even considered for development.

4. Ultimately, these plans erode trust in the "green belt" process, and provide insufficient jobs for local people, merely consuming quality green belt sites for unnecessary dwellings that should be being built on brownfield sites.