

<b>Family Name</b>	Bruce
<b>Given Name</b>	Neil
<b>Person ID</b>	1287192
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Bruce
<b>Given Name</b>	Neil
<b>Person ID</b>	1287192
<b>Title</b>	JPA 35: North of Mosley Common
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	NA
<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>I would like to raise concern with regards the proposed Developments and associated reduction of Green Belt land in and around the Tyldesley / Boothestown</p> <p>My areas of concern are focussed on :-</p> <p>1) Scale of Development</p> <p>I feel as though the scale of the proposed development together with the size of the existing developments (especially the Garret Hall Site) is disproportionate when compared to the current level of Housing in the area. It's just too much Development concentrated on one area.</p> <p>The proposed and existing plans constitute an increase in land used for housing of approximately 30 to 50% across the aforementioned areas, and greatly reduces the Greenbelt.</p> <p>2) Loss Of Local Identity / History</p> <p>I feel that these development plans will obliterate the historic identities of each of these distinct areas by creating one big sprawling mass of housing, something that greenbelt land is there to prevent. In addition to that you have allowed developers to inadequately protect historic buildings, causing them to be lost forever, first Worsley Old Hall, then more recently and coincidentally Garrett Hall Farm.....these should have been afforded greater protection!!!</p> <p>3) Environmental Impact</p> <p>It is impossible to remove this amount of greenbelt land without having an adverse effect on the Environment and I would be very interested to see findings of an independent Environmental Impact Assessment.</p> <p>4) Infrastructure.</p> <p>Roads.</p>

The roads around the aforementioned areas are already packed at peak times and the majority of people I know struggle to get to the main transit routes in the morning due to traffic.

REDACTED TEXT which is a Rat Run from Mort Lane to Sale Lane.....its a 20mph and cars regularly race down it at peak time at speeds in excess of 50mph, in fact last year a car went through my front garden, my neighbours garden, then came to rest on the boundary of my next door but 2 neighbours fence line.....taking out trees, concrete posts, base panels along the way. It's a death waiting to happen and the council need to address this, especially if this development is approved.

Also people I work with in Astley, struggle to get from the M61 in the morning due to large volumes of traffic at peak times, the existing and very large Garret Hall Site and this Proposed "Enormous" site from behind St.Johns School up to Mort Lane will only compound these issues. Traffic will be at a standstill.

#### Schools

The current Infant / junior schools in the area are very good indeed, despite the fact that they are already coming under strain due to the increasing numbers within the area, (Garret Hall has already had to move from a two class intake to a three class intake for some of their year groups), and building all these new estates will only act to compound these problems. In addition no one will want these schools to grow into super schools where there children are lost within the masses.

Also parents who are within the current catchment of these schools shouldn't lose the right to send their children to their preferred school due to new estates being built and pushing them out of the historic catchment area. The fact that there is a "and / or " caveat regarding the provision of schools / school places within the proposal does not fill me with confidence as unless developers are forced to add amenity they seem to somehow always manage to avoid their obligations.

Also please learn from what you have messed up on at Garret Hall site, you have allowed houses to be built right up to the schools play ground, you need to allow a strip of land around the school site (St.Johns) so that they can expand to deal with the increased demand, without a reduction in space for the children, its just common sense!!!

#### Doctors / Dentists

I could not be happier with the current level of access I have to the local doctors, something I am happy to have as a family man with three small children, this would bound to be affected with the building of another 1100 houses to the area. (this on top of the already large development at Garrett Hall and those in Astley adjacent to the East Lancs will only add pressure to the existing healthcare infrastructure.

Last time I was at the Dentist they were not taking on new patients.....I would think this would be a matter of concern.

#### Transport

Whilst a supporter and advocate of the guided bus way it seems to me that it has turned into a "Trojan Horse" and a way to justify increased Development along its route (something that was denied during its planning). First Garrett Hall greenbelt site then this!!!

The busway during "normal" times has tended to be over crowded at peak times and people exiting Manchester often struggle to get a place on the bus when coming home at rush hour, so more houses will lead to more strains of the travel infrastructure. I noticed another get out claws for the developer

	<p>Trains from Atherton to Manchester are already standing room only at peak times so any increase in demand will just compound this current problem.</p> <p>A580 – Always backed up at peak times and would be adversely affected by this St.Johns – Mort Lane Development.</p> <p>Summary</p> <p>In general I consider the scale of the developments to be too great in proportion to the existing housing stock, it's just too big a proposal for a relatively small area and I would urge you to reconsider the proposed developments and the reduction in Green Belt.</p>
<p><b>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.</b></p>	<p>Whilst I do not agree with the proposal, I would highlight things to consider as part of your review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- A reduction in the scale of the development, the area is just too large and disproportionate to the surrounding area. There will be significant Traffic issues.</li><li>- Enforce more ridged obligations on the developer to provide extra guided bus stop / new school as well as health center. They need to fund this, not the council.</li><li>-Don't let the developer look after any historic buildings within the site, their track record on preserving them is dreadful. Insist a third party maintain and look after any that fall within this and any other planned development area.</li><li>- Traffic stopping up order / calming measures on Heathfield Drive should be considered, as its only a matter of time before there is a fatality. Its a 20mph road and some cars exceed 50mph whilst using it as a rat run. (been some significant crashes already)</li></ul> <p>One of the new access point to the proposed development would be off Mort Lane and this would inevitably lead to increased volumes of traffic on Heathfield Drive. Other roads affected by the scheme may also need to be assessed. It needs stopping up at the Mort Lane end of Heathfield Drive.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Leave a piece of land round any affected schools, to allow for expansion. Garrett Hall once surrounded by fields for dairy cows is now boxed in with no additional space for expansion.....it should be common sense to leave a strip of land around existing schools. This should be adopted on all development sites as part of the planning consent.</li></ul>