

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Brown
Given Name	Matthew
Person ID	1286916
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Brown
Given Name	Matthew
Person ID	1286916
Title	Our Vision
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>The plan has not been proven to be legally compliant in its new guise of Places for Everyone, having undergone significant changes, or "not insignificant" as it is described.</p> <p>On area specific cases, there are also questions around legality in relation to NPPF greenbelt protection, climate change and carbon neutral policies. It also cannot be classed as a sound plan because of a number of factors, not least that the entire plan is based on outdated figures. The population growth figures provided by ONS are not the latest available, therefore not accurate, and not accurate by its very nature is unsound! This doesn't even touch on the effects of Brexit and Covid on these figures, or the shift in emphasis from our own government on climate protection, with the Prime Minister talking about "building back greener" and humanity reaching "a turning point on climate change." This plan does not go far enough to align with this ever increasing focus.</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.	The legality of the plan should be determined by a judicial review, and all of the latest figures, policies and current climate thinking should be re-imagined into an updated and accurately sound plan.
Family Name	Brown
Given Name	Matthew

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Person ID	1286916
Title	JPA 1.2: Simister and Bowlee (Northern Gateway)
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>Legality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Bury Council have failed to comply with their own Statement of Community Involvement throughout the planning and consultation stages of this plan, and so do not conform to the Duty to Cooperate. -Due to the location of the proposed area, surrounded by motorways and main roads, it already has illegal air quality levels, and this is before 70+ hectares of greenbelt is removed and the extra roads and cars are introduced. - There has been no proof of exceptional circumstances for the release of greenbelt as per the NPPF. In fact, the greenbelt areas in question still strongly fulfill the very reason for the NPPF. Exceptional circumstances relating to requirement can not be proven at the outset of the plan as the need for its release wouldn't be until all brownfield and underutilised sites are exhausted, and this wouldn't be until much later in the plan period (if at all), and so the early release while unnecessary would be against NPPF. - There is evidence of protected wildlife in the allocation, and desktop studies and short walkovers do not suffice to determine their presence. These reports, alongside others featured, should be carried out completely independently. <p>Soundness</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plan itself states that latest information must be used, so as well as up to date ONS data, Bury's Housing Development Needs Assessment 2020 should also be considered: https://www.bury.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=15866 - The site is said to fulfill 4 out of 10 of the site selection criteria as part of its inclusion of the Northern Gateway. <p>However, when looking at Simister and Bowlee in isolation, 2 of those 4 do not hit the criteria:</p> <p>Criteria 1 - The land is not previously developed and the majority of it is not accessed by public transport.</p> <p>Criteria 5 - The development would not lead to Urban regeneration as there is no part of the selected site that is currently urban.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The inclusion of Criteria 6 is particularly unsound. The infrastructure is major in this allocation as there isn't anything close to that required at the site, and yet there are no clear plans for it, no obligation on the part of the developer or vehicle for the enforcement of such before the plan is approved. - Relating to the infrastructure, the plan states that the "delivery of this allocation will require significant investment". The major impact of this site is expected to be at at M60 Junction 19 and M62 Junction 19, and on the local roads at the junctions on the A6045 Heywood Old Road. The work

	<p>required could mean this site is unusable, and the plan states that "required improvements" are "not yet known". There is no sound plan here, nor one that could ever be simple to implement. The junction in question is already regularly the focus of heavy congestion, and a cut through whenever there are incidents relating to the M60 or M62. These would be compounded by works and seriously increased by added junctions and more traffic.</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>Judicial review of the plan to determine its legality, and a fully accessible public consultation to follow that adheres to the Statement of Public Involvement,</p> <p>The plan also requires soundness scrutiny in line with all relevant latest policies and statistics (ONS, carbon neutral and climate etc), and further studies into viability. The plan for this allocation includes lots of desktop studies and an alarming lack of detail on points that could mean the allocation's delivery is completely nonviable.</p>