Family Name	Burke
Given Name	Terence
Person ID	1285855
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Туре	Web
Family Name	Burke
Given Name	Terence
Person ID	1285855
Title	JPA 27: Land East of Boothstown
Туре	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 realise that any City, Salford included, cannot have green spaces, this is no longer acceptable and they must be built on, especially when they are worth as much as this lot. However these proposed executive houses do not provide for affordable housing as indicated in the application. Our son is 24 and lived in Boothstown all his life. He wants to live in Boothstown but cannot due to a lack of affordable housing. This development will make this even harder for our young people to continue in the place that they call home. The term places for everyone is meaningless to our children as they do not not have $\ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ \ $

mis-leading to say the least. As an example how can you retain an existing playing field when you are building houses on it!!! point 13 of the development proposals. Include a new neighbourhood equipped area of play, we already have a playground in Boothstown, what I think they ,mean is let us get our □1m per year council tax take for this development and we will spend □10k actually putting some new play equipment in it, funded by the developer of course NOT Salford Council. We get the □1m every year you get the □10k once and that is it. Happy days. What could you possibly be objecting to. Point 4 again states that it wants to utilise the brook as a central landscape feature, again it already is a central landscape feature and has been for centuries, I cannot believe someone has been paid to write this utter twaddle. Next on to noise pollution, environmental air pollution, reduction in amenity, all being computer modelled to show that it is all fine, Point 9 states it wants to avoid harm to protected species, however this proposal has no issues with causing harm to the existing residents of Boothstown, through greater noise levels, air pollution, lack of open space and playing fields that we currently have. Perhaps we need to explore what it takes to become a protected species!!!. Also it's good to hear in point 17 that the new residents will have homes that protect them from the noise pollution from nearby roads, but not so good news for existing residents but at least it is helpful to know that Salford Council have admitted that existing Boothstown residents suffer from noise pollution and I am really looking forward to what they are proposing to help us with this, oh wait a minute, it appears they want to build 300 more noise producing homes, no doubt the computer will say its fine, nothing to worry about so to speak. Only IN Salford, very appropriate slogan for them

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 only modification is not to go ahead with it, it builds on green belt land. It was designated green belt for a reason. If it has to be built on then affordable homes should be built to provide for the children of local residents who have grown up in Boothstown. This is their home, it is where they want to be, instead of waffling on about sustainable communities, Salford has a very rare opportunity to show it values its people above the council tax rake that it is going to get from approving this project. Show us that we matter, allowing local people to stay in their community. Then I would agree with the slogan places for everyone, because Salford council will have proven that this is the case.

However we all know that this is NOT going to happen, this development will be approved at lower density levels on green belt land despite the compelling case for rejection on many grounds, sustainability issues, environmental issues, issues you would not get away with anywhere else because as the blurb states in its closing sentences and I quote "This site to the east of Boothstown offers one of a small number of opportunities within Greater Manchester to deliver very high value housing in an extremely attractive environment benefiting not only from an established premium housing market but also a location immediately next to the new RHS Garden Bridgewater which is due to open in 2021. It is essential that the development maximises the opportunities presented by this location, and delivers the highest quality living environment. A lower density of development than would normally be required under Policy JP-H 4 "Density of New Housing" will be acceptable on this site.

So there you have it, green belt legislation being ignored, Policy that the rest of us have to live with being ignored, our health and well being being ignored, our traffic stress and being made to act illegally to access public roads being ignored, all because this site is one of the last big sites that will make the developer, land owner and of course lest we forget Salford City Council millions of pounds.

And finally as we all know, money gets things done, especially IN Salford!!!, look forward to welcoming the poshos.