

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Burns
Given Name	Bernie
Person ID	1287304
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Burns
Given Name	Bernie
Person ID	1287304
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>My feelings are based upon the fact that the numbers used to calculate the scale of development which will use greenbelt/greenfield sites are over-estimates and any real housing need could be developed on brownfield sites.</p> <p>It is imperative that as a nation and indeed as a planet we maintain as much green space as possible. We should not be developing green space if this can be avoided, just for the sake of the profits of developers or to meet government targets which are out of date or over estimates.</p> <p>These developments are bound to lead to increased CO2 release, with increased traffic and industry. It seems that there is an almost evangelical race to be forever increasing the size of the economy which in the long term is simply unsustainable.</p> <p>With this there is assured to be a detrimental effect on those people living in the affected areas. You only need to look back at the last 18 months to see how important green spaces are for people and especially those where the green space is mature and established with all the flora and fauna that comes with a mature environment.</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>The government figures for the housing required in Greater Manchester need to be challenged in light of the turbulence of the last few years - Brexit/Covid being the two main issues.</p> <p>Once the numbers are agreed upon the plan needs to be re-assessed to ensure that brownfield sites are used first, and green spaces are used as an absolutely last resort. To facilitate this any brownfield sites should be developed first, and other potential brownfield sites monitored to see if they become available for use before any green space is developed and lost forever, with the inevitable impact on the environment and biodiversity of the area.</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Burns
Given Name	Bernie
Person ID	1287304
Title	Our Strategic Objectives
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.	I am only able to select one "Unsound" tick box from the first list of "Positively prepared", "Justified", "Consistent with national policy" i consider them all to be Unsound in the light of the plan, which i do not agree with in its present form i.e. using green spaces ahead of brownfield sites, the premise for which is based on over-estimated figures.
Family Name	Burns
Given Name	Bernie
Person ID	1287304
Title	Our Spatial Strategy
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	My feelings are based upon the fact that the numbers used to calculate the scale of development which will use greenbelt/greenfield sites are over-estimates and any real housing need could be developed on brownfield sites. It is imperative that as a nation and indeed as a planet we maintain as much green space as possible. We should not be developing green space if this can be avoided, just for the sake of the profits of developers or to meet government targets which are out of date or over estimates.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	<p>These developments are bound to lead to increased CO2 release, with increased traffic and industry. It seems that there is an almost evangelical race to be forever increasing the size of the economy which in the long term is simply unsustainable.</p> <p>With this there is assured to be a detrimental effect on those people living in the affected areas. You only need to look back at the last 18 months to see how important green spaces are for people and especially those where the green space is mature and established with all the flora and fauna that comes with a mature environment.</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>The government figures for the housing required in Greater Manchester need to be challenged in light of the turbulence of the last few years - Brexit/Covid being the two main issues.</p> <p>Once the numbers are agreed upon the plan needs to be re-assessed to ensure that brownfield sites are used first, and green spaces are used as an absolutely last resort. To facilitate this any brownfield sites should be developed first, and other potential brownfield sites monitored to see if they become available for use before any green space is developed and lost forever, with the inevitable impact on the environment and biodiversity of the area.</p>
Family Name	Burns
Given Name	Bernie
Person ID	1287304
Title	JP-Strat 10 Manchester Airport
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	Burns
Given Name	Bernie
Person ID	1287304
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>My feelings are based upon the fact that the numbers used to calculate the scale of development which will use greenbelt/greenfield sites are over-estimates and any real housing need could be developed on brownfield sites.</p> <p>It is imperative that as a nation and indeed as a planet we maintain as much green space as possible. We should not be developing green space if this can be avoided, just for the sake of the profits of developers or to meet government targets which are out of date or over estimates.</p> <p>These developments are bound to lead to increased CO2 release, with increased traffic and industry. It seems that there is an almost evangelical race to be forever increasing the size of the economy which in the long term is simply unsustainable.</p> <p>With this there is assured to be a detrimental effect on those people living in the affected areas. You only need to look back at the last 18 months to see how important green spaces are for people and especially those where the green space is mature and established with all the flora and fauna that comes with a mature environment.</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>The government figures for the housing required in Greater Manchester need to be challenged in light of the turbulence of the last few years - Brexit/Covid being the two main issues.</p> <p>Once the numbers are agreed upon the plan needs to be re-assessed to ensure that brownfield sites are used first, and green spaces are used as an absolutely last resort. To facilitate this any brownfield sites should be developed first, and other potential brownfield sites monitored to see if they become available for use before any green space is developed and lost forever, with the inevitable impact on the environment and biodiversity of the area.</p>
Family Name	Burns
Given Name	Bernie
Person ID	1287304
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
Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant,	<p>My feelings are based upon the fact that the numbers used to calculate the scale of development which will use greenbelt/greenfield sites are over-estimates and any real housing need could be developed on brownfield sites.</p>

<p>is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</p>	<p>It is imperative that as a nation and indeed as a planet we maintain as much green space as possible. We should not be developing green space if this can be avoided, just for the sake of the profits of developers or to meet government targets which are out of date or over estimates.</p> <p>These developments are bound to lead to increased CO2 release, with increased traffic and industry. It seems that there is an almost evangelical race to be forever increasing the size of the economy which in the long term is simply unsustainable.</p> <p>With this there is assured to be a detrimental effect on those people living in the affected areas. You only need to look back at the last 18 months to see how important green spaces are for people and especially those where the green space is mature and established with all the flora and fauna that comes with a mature environment.</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 government figures for the housing required in Greater Manchester need to be challenged in light of the turbulence of the last few years - Brexit/Covid being the two main issues.</p> <p>Once the numbers are agreed upon the plan needs to be re-assessed to ensure that brownfield sites are used first, and green spaces are used as an absolutely last resort. To facilitate this any brownfield sites should be developed first, and other potential brownfield sites monitored to see if they become available for use before any green space is developed and lost forever, with the inevitable impact on the environment and biodiversity of the area.</p>
<p>Family Name</p>	<p>Burns</p>
<p>Given Name</p>	<p>Bernie</p>
<p>Person ID</p>	<p>1287304</p>
<p>Title</p>	<p>JP-H 3 Type Size and Design of New Housing</p>
<p>Type</p>	<p>Web</p>
<p>Soundness - Positively prepared?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Justified?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Effective?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Compliance - Legally compliant?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>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>	<p>My feelings are based upon the fact that the numbers used to calculate the scale of development which will use greenbelt/greenfield sites are over-estimates and any real housing need could be developed on brownfield sites.</p> <p>It is imperative that as a nation and indeed as a planet we maintain as much green space as possible. We should not be developing green space if this can be avoided, just for the sake of the profits of developers or to meet government targets which are out of date or over estimates.</p> <p>These developments are bound to lead to increased CO2 release, with increased traffic and industry. It seems that there is an almost evangelical race to be forever increasing the size of the economy which in the long term is simply unsustainable.</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>With this there is assured to be a detrimental effect on those people living in the affected areas. You only need to look back at the last 18 months to see how important green spaces are for people and especially those where the green space is mature and established with all the flora and fauna that comes with a mature environment.</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 government figures for the housing required in Greater Manchester need to be challenged in light of the turbulence of the last few years - Brexit/Covid being the two main issues.</p> <p>Once the numbers are agreed upon the plan needs to be re-assessed to ensure that brownfield sites are used first, and green spaces are used as an absolutely last resort. To facilitate this any brownfield sites should be developed first, and other potential brownfield sites monitored to see if they become available for use before any green space is developed and lost forever, with the inevitable impact on the environment and biodiversity of the area.</p>
<p>Family Name</p>	Burns
<p>Given Name</p>	Bernie
<p>Person ID</p>	1287304
<p>Title</p>	JP-H 4 Density of New Housing
<p>Type</p>	Web
<p>Soundness - Positively prepared?</p>	Unsound
<p>Soundness - Justified?</p>	Unsound
<p>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</p>	Unsound
<p>Soundness - Effective?</p>	Unsound
<p>Compliance - Legally compliant?</p>	No
<p>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</p>	No
<p>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>	<p>My feelings are based upon the fact that the numbers used to calculate the scale of development which will use greenbelt/greenfield sites are over-estimates and any real housing need could be developed on brownfield sites.</p> <p>It is imperative that as a nation and indeed as a planet we maintain as much green space as possible. We should not be developing green space if this can be avoided, just for the sake of the profits of developers or to meet government targets which are out of date or over estimates.</p> <p>These developments are bound to lead to increased CO2 release, with increased traffic and industry. It seems that there is an almost evangelical race to be forever increasing the size of the economy which in the long term is simply unsustainable.</p> <p>With this there is assured to be a detrimental effect on those people living in the affected areas. You only need to look back at the last 18 months to see how important green spaces are for people and especially those where the green space is mature and established with all the flora and fauna that comes with a mature environment.</p>
<p>Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you</p>	<p>The government figures for the housing required in Greater Manchester need to be challenged in light of the turbulence of the last few years - Brexit/Covid being the two main issues.</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

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.	Once the numbers are agreed upon the plan needs to be re-assessed to ensure that brownfield sites are used first, and green spaces are used as an absolutely last resort. To facilitate this any brownfield sites should be developed first, and other potential brownfield sites monitored to see if they become available for use before any green space is developed and lost forever, with the inevitable impact on the environment and biodiversity of the area.
Family Name	Burns
Given Name	Bernie
Person ID	1287304
Title	JPA 3.2: Timperley Wedge
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>My feelings are based upon the fact that the numbers used to calculate the scale of development which will use greenbelt/greenfield sites are over-estimates and any real housing/development need could be developed on brownfield sites.</p> <p>It is imperative that as a nation and indeed as a planet we maintain as much green space as possible. We should not be developing green space if this can be avoided, just for the sake of the profits of developers or to meet government targets which are out of date or over estimates.</p> <p>These developments are bound to lead to increased CO2 release, with increased traffic and industry. It seems that there is an almost evangelical race to be forever increasing the size of the economy which in the long term is simply unsustainable.</p> <p>With this there is assured to be a detrimental effect on those people living in the affected areas. You only need to look back at the last 18 months to see how important green spaces are for people and especially those where the green space is mature and established with all the flora and fauna that comes with a mature environment.</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>The government figures for the housing/development required in Greater Manchester need to be challenged in light of the turbulence of the last few years - Brexit/Covid being the two main issues. Any reduction in the required volume can lead to a reduction in the use of green spaces.</p> <p>It's these very spaces that make much of the Greater Manchester area so attractive. Any development of this greenbelt or countryside would be akin to selling the family silver.</p> <p>The fact is that green belt land is a finite resource. Once it's developed it's gone forever. The greenbelt incorporating the Timperley Wedge and Davenport Green act as a buffer between Timperley, Halebarns and Wythenshawe, not to mention Manchester Airport itself. This prevents urban</p>

sprawl which would otherwise mean that this part of South Manchester would just be one unending, amalgamated suburb and it acts as a 'green lung' making for a healthier environment.

These green open spaces are a vital resource to everyone who lives in the area and are a home to an abundance of wildlife. There are sites of biological importance in the area which could be encroached upon, damaged or lost if these proposals were to be sanctioned.

We've already seen part of Davenport Green allocated for the building of the high speed rail HS2 and this will see the 'barrier' of the M56 breached and the loss of a significant part of Davenport Green Wood. The new proposals will see ingress to more of this area, reducing this buffer zone and inevitably leading to increased traffic congestion in the surrounding areas including all that goes with it such as

noise and pollution and the further loss of wildlife habitat.

Any development on green belt land agreed upon from these draft proposals should be reduced in scope. As it stands if the proposed developments were to go ahead it would lead to a significant change in the character of the area turning it from one which is quite rural to one which would be very suburbanised.

I understand that it's not an easy situation, balancing development needs with environmental needs but we have to ask ourselves whether we want to sacrifice our green belt in return for economic benefits. Should our main concern be about economics or should we say to ourselves that Manchester is not London, that we don't want it to turn into a similar sprawling metropolis and if this means that

this moderates growth then so be it? Manchester would still remain a world class city as we improve the existing infrastructure for the existing population and develop existing brownfield sites but with the added attraction of our green belt being kept intact. Perhaps it's time to say enough is enough and we improve what we have rather than adding to it. Quality before quantity.

The proposals do see a strip of green belt being maintained in the aforementioned areas but the fear is that if these proposals were to come to fruition it would mean that a precedent had been set, inevitably leading to further erosion of a very precious and finite resource.

One of the arguments surrounding the PFE plan is that it will actually make it easier for us to protect the remaining green belt but surely this would just set a precedent for future development of any remaining green belt? There must be limits to encroachment on the green spaces we already have but if this area is to be developed as proposed then this must be seen as a limit and the remaining green spaces

must be protected in perpetuity.

It's not difficult to see that, in some future review, more of this green belt might be sacrificed as the growth suggested by the PFE plan leads to a further need for similar development. It seems like an unsustainable cycle of growth leading to more growth where any open space is just seen as an economic resource to be exploited.

On the other hand brownfield sites are not a finite resource as green belt land is. Brownfield sites can effectively be 'recycled' as one development is replaced by another or as the sites fall into dereliction.

I am aware that the plans argue that for the developments needed that there are not enough brownfield sites but at the very least existing brownfield sites should be prioritised before green belt or countryside is sacrificed. This means that there should be no 'spades in the ground' on green belt land before all brownfield options have been exhausted and developed on (including ensuring that any disused or

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	derelict buildings or sites are fully utilised). This should also mean that, once any developments have been agreed, a review of available brownfield sites is undertaken regularly before any building is started on green belt sites scheduled for development. If this was done it might be possible to save some of the green belt land initially earmarked for the developments outlined in the current PFE plan or any future agreed plan.
Family Name	Burns
Given Name	Bernie
Person ID	1287304
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>My feelings are based upon the fact that the numbers used to calculate the scale of development which will use greenbelt/greenfield sites are over-estimates and any real housing need could be developed on brownfield sites.</p> <p>It is imperative that as a nation and indeed as a planet we maintain as much green space as possible. We should not be developing green space if this can be avoided, just for the sake of the profits of developers or to meet government targets which are out of date or over estimates.</p> <p>These developments are bound to lead to increased CO2 release, with increased traffic and industry. It seems that there is an almost evangelical race to be forever increasing the size of the economy which in the long term is simply unsustainable.</p> <p>With this there is assured to be a detrimental effect on those people living in the affected areas. You only need to look back at the last 18 months to see how important green spaces are for people and especially those where the green space is mature and established with all the flora and fauna that comes with a mature environment.</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>The government figures for the housing required in Greater Manchester need to be challenged in light of the turbulence of the last few years - Brexit/Covid being the two main issues. Any reduction in the required volume can lead to a reduction in the use of green spaces.</p> <p>It's these very spaces that make much of the Greater Manchester area so attractive. Any development of this greenbelt or countryside would be akin to selling the family silver.</p> <p>The fact is that green belt land is a finite resource. Once it's developed it's gone forever. The greenbelt incorporating the Timperley Wedge and Davenport Green act as a buffer between Timperley, Halebarns and Wythenshawe, not to mention Manchester Airport itself. This prevents urban sprawl which would otherwise mean that this part of South Manchester would</p>

just be one unending, amalgamated suburb and it acts as a 'green lung'making for a healthier environment.

These green open spaces are a vital resource to everyone who lives in the area and are a home to an abundance of wildlife. There are sites of biological importance in the area which could be encroached upon, damaged or lost if these proposals were to be sanctioned.

We've already seen part of Davenport Green allocated for the building of the high speed rail HS2 and this will see the 'barrier'of the M56 breached and the loss of a significant part of Davenport Green Wood. The new proposals will see ingress to more of this area, reducing this buffer zone and inevitably leading to increased traffic congestion in the surrounding areas including all that goes with it such as

noise and pollution and the further loss of wildlife habitat.

Any development on green belt land agreed upon from these draft proposals should be reduced in scope. As it stands if the proposed developments were to go ahead it would lead to a significant change in the character of the area turning it from one which is quite rural to one which would be very suburbanised.

I understand that it's not an easy situation, balancing development needs with environmental needs but we have to ask ourselves whether we want to sacrifice our green belt in return for economic benefits. Should our main concern be about economics or should we say to ourselves that Manchester is not London, that we don't want it to turn into a similar sprawling metropolis and if this means that

this moderates growth then so be it? Manchester would still remain a world class city as we improve the existing infrastructure for the existing population and develop existing brownfield sites but with the added attraction of our green belt being kept intact. Perhaps it's time to say enough is enough and we improve what we have rather than adding to it. Quality before quantity.

The proposals do see a strip of green belt being maintained in the aforementioned areas but the fear is that if these proposals were to come to fruition it would mean that a precedent had been set, inevitably leading to further erosion of a very precious and finite resource.

One of the arguments surrounding the PFE plan is that it will actually make it easier for us to protect the remaining green belt but surely this would just set a precedent for future development of any remaining green belt? There must be limits to encroachment on the green spaces we already have but if this area is to be developed as proposed then this must be seen as a limit and the remaining green spaces

must be protected in perpetuity.

It's not difficult to see that, in some future review, more of this green belt might be sacrificed as the growth suggested by the PFE plan leads to a further need for similar development. It seems like an unsustainable cycle of growth leading to more growth where any open space is just seen as an economic resource to be exploited.

On the other hand brownfield sites are not a finite resource as green belt land is. Brownfield sites can effectively be 'recycled'as one development is replaced by another or as the sites fall into dereliction.

I am aware that the plans argue that for the developments needed that there are not enough brownfield sites but at the very least existing brownfield sites should be prioritised before green belt or countryside is sacrificed. This means that there should be no 'spades in the ground'on green belt land before all brownfield options have been exhausted and developed on (including ensuring that any disused or

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	derelict buildings or sites are fully utilised). This should also mean that, once any developments have been agreed, a review of available brownfield sites is undertaken regularly before any building is started on green belt sites scheduled for development. If this was done it might be possible to save some of the green belt land initially earmarked for the developments outlined in the current PFE plan or any future agreed plan.
Family Name	Burns
Given Name	Bernie
Person ID	1287304
Title	JP-D1 Infrastructure Implementation
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>My feelings are based upon the fact that the numbers used to calculate the scale of development which will use greenbelt/greenfield sites are over-estimates and any real housing need could be developed on brownfield sites.</p> <p>It is imperative that as a nation and indeed as a planet we maintain as much green space as possible. We should not be developing green space if this can be avoided, just for the sake of the profits of developers or to meet government targets which are out of date or over estimates.</p> <p>These developments are bound to lead to increased CO2 release, with increased traffic and industry. It seems that there is an almost evangelical race to be forever increasing the size of the economy which in the long term is simply unsustainable.</p> <p>With this there is assured to be a detrimental effect on those people living in the affected areas. You only need to look back at the last 18 months to see how important green spaces are for people and especially those where the green space is mature and established with all the flora and fauna that comes with a mature environment.</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>The government figures for the housing required in Greater Manchester need to be challenged in light of the turbulence of the last few years - Brexit/Covid being the two main issues.</p> <p>Once the numbers are agreed upon the plan needs to be re-assessed to ensure that brownfield sites are used first, and green spaces are used as an absolutely last resort. To facilitate this any brownfield sites should be developed first, and other potential brownfield sites monitored to see if they become available for use before any green space is developed and lost forever, with the inevitable impact on the environment and biodiversity of the area.</p>
Family Name	Burns

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Given Name	Bernie
Person ID	1287304
Title	JP-D2 Developer Contributions
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>My feelings are based upon the fact that the numbers used to calculate the scale of development which will use greenbelt/greenfield sites are over-estimates and any real housing need could be developed on brownfield sites.</p> <p>It is imperative that as a nation and indeed as a planet we maintain as much green space as possible. We should not be developing green space if this can be avoided, just for the sake of the profits of developers or to meet government targets which are out of date or over estimates.</p> <p>These developments are bound to lead to increased CO2 release, with increased traffic and industry. It seems that there is an almost evangelical race to be forever increasing the size of the economy which in the long term is simply unsustainable.</p> <p>With this there is assured to be a detrimental effect on those people living in the affected areas. You only need to look back at the last 18 months to see how important green spaces are for people and especially those where the green space is mature and established with all the flora and fauna that comes with a mature environment.</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>The government figures for the housing required in Greater Manchester need to be challenged in light of the turbulence of the last few years - Brexit/Covid being the two main issues.</p> <p>Once the numbers are agreed upon the plan needs to be re-assessed to ensure that brownfield sites are used first, and green spaces are used as an absolutely last resort. To facilitate this any brownfield sites should be developed first, and other potential brownfield sites monitored to see if they become available for use before any green space is developed and lost forever, with the inevitable impact on the environment and biodiversity of the area.</p>
Family Name	Burns
Given Name	Bernie
Person ID	1287304
Title	Trafford - Green Belt Additions
Type	Web
GBA Trafford - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this	Trafford GBA43 Midlands Farm, Moss Lane

District your response relates to - then respond to the questions below	
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Sound
Soundness - Justified?	Sound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Sound
Soundness - Effective?	Sound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	Yes
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	Yes
Family Name	Burns
Given Name	Bernie
Person ID	1287304
Title	Supporting Evidence
Type	Web
Redacted comment on supporting documents - Please give details of why you consider any of the evidence not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	<p>My feelings are based upon the fact that the numbers used to calculate the scale of development which will use greenbelt/greenfield sites are over-estimates and any real housing need could be developed on brownfield sites.</p> <p>It is imperative that as a nation and indeed as a planet we maintain as much green space as possible. We should not be developing green space if this can be avoided, just for the sake of the profits of developers or to meet government targets which are out of date or over estimates.</p> <p>These developments are bound to lead to increased CO2 release, with increased traffic and industry. It seems that there is an almost evangelical race to be forever increasing the size of the economy which in the long term is simply unsustainable.</p> <p>With this there is assured to be a detrimental effect on those people living in the affected areas. You only need to look back at the last 18 months to see how important green spaces are for people and especially those where the green space is mature and established with all the flora and fauna that comes with a mature environment.</p> <p>The government figures for the housing required in Greater Manchester need to be challenged in light of the turbulence of the last few years - Brexit/Covid being the two main issues.</p> <p>Once the numbers are agreed upon the plan needs to be re-assessed to ensure that brownfield sites are used first, and green spaces are used as an absolutely last resort. To facilitate this any brownfield sites should be developed first, and other potential brownfield sites monitored to see if they become available for use before any green space is developed and lost forever, with the inevitable impact on the environment and biodiversity of the area.</p>