

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Cooper
<b>Given Name</b>	Adam
<b>Person ID</b>	1287487
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Cooper
<b>Given Name</b>	Adam
<b>Person ID</b>	1287487
<b>Title</b>	Our Vision
<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>	Development on greenbelt will not place Manchester and the forefront of action on climate change.
<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>	To prioritise development on brownfield plan and ensure plans are consistent with forecast housing need.
<b>Family Name</b>	Cooper
<b>Given Name</b>	Adam
<b>Person ID</b>	1287487
<b>Title</b>	Our Strategic Objectives
<b>Type</b>	Web

<b>Our strategic objectives - Considering the information provided for our strategic objectives, please tick which of these objectives your written comment refers to:</b>	8. Improve the quality of our natural environment and access to green spaces
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<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>	Prioritisation of development on greenbelt over available brownfield land based solely on affordability
<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>	Removal of all unnecessary developments on greenbelt land. Removal of greenbelt additions that are purely for optics (eg motorway embankments)
<b>Family Name</b>	Cooper
<b>Given Name</b>	Adam
<b>Person ID</b>	1287487
<b>Title</b>	JPA 32: South of Hyde
<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

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<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>Suggested development on the eastern parcel of the Bowlacre site will be out of character with the existing dwellings on Bowlacre and West Park.</p> <p>Dwellings on eastern side of Bowlacre road are already subject to flooding due to rainwater runoff from eastern parcel of Bowlacre site. Existing drainage infrastructure built as part of the grant of planning permission for 19 Bowlacre Road is not sufficient to prevent flooding and is not compliant with regulations.</p> <p>Existing public transport infrastructure is very poor, with no plans for extending metro link connections as there are in other areas of Tameside. Additional housing will lead to significantly increased traffic on Stockport Road heading to Bredbury, which is already highly congested and polluting.</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>	Removal of allocation or reduction in size of allocation to only include the western parcel of the Bowlacre site where the development will be in character with existing dwellings with better access to existing public transport on Stockport road.
<b>Family Name</b>	Cooper
<b>Given Name</b>	Adam
<b>Person ID</b>	1287487
<b>Title</b>	Tameside - Green Belt Additions
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>GBA Tameside - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this District your response relates to - then respond to the questions below</b>	<p>Tameside GBA31 Fox Platt, Mossley</p> <p>Tameside GBA32 Manor Farm Close, Waterloo, Ashton-under-Lyne</p> <p>Tameside GBA33 Ridge Hill Lane, Ridge Hill, Stalybridge</p> <p>Tameside GBA34 Cowbury Green, Long Row, Carrbrook, Stalybridge</p> <p>Tameside GBA35 Woodview, South View, Carrbrook, Stalybridge</p> <p>Tameside GBA36 Yew Tree Lane, Dukinfield</p> <p>Tameside GBA37 Broadbottom Road, Broadbottom</p> <p>Tameside GBA38 Ardenfield, Haughton Green, Denton</p> <p>Tameside GBA39 Cemetery Road, Denton</p> <p>Tameside GBA40 Hyde Road, Mottram</p> <p>Tameside GBA41 Ashworth Lane, Mottram</p> <p>Tameside GBA42 Horses Field, Danebank, Denton</p>
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<p><b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b></p>	<p>No</p>
<p><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>	<p>The majority of greenbelt submissions are purely to make the loss of greenbelt land appear lower than it actually is. These sites were never at risk of development and are not in need of protecting (eg motorway embankments). They are there purely so local leaders can quote figures to show that the loss of greenbelt land is significantly reduced compared to previous GMSF plans, which is shameful politicking.</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>Removal of sites not at real risk from development to give a genuine picture of loss of greenbelt land across GM and Tameside.</p>