

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Cooper
<b>Given Name</b>	Vivienne
<b>Person ID</b>	1286490
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Cooper
<b>Given Name</b>	Vivienne
<b>Person ID</b>	1286490
<b>Title</b>	JPA 19: Bamford / Norden
<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>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>Using this site is not consistent with national policy as there are no unmet housing needs to justify using the green belt .</p> <p>There are many brown field sites available with better access .</p> <p>There are no exceptional circumstances to justify building on green belt</p> <p>There are insufficient schools , doctors community facilities .</p> <p>The land is liable to flooding .</p> <p>This land is protected by national planning policy .</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>	JPA 19 should be removed from the pfe.

<b>Family Name</b>	Cooper
<b>Given Name</b>	Wendy
<b>Company / Organisation</b>	Save Shaw's Greenbelt Group
<b>Person ID</b>	1287063
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Include files</b>	<a href="#">PFE1287063_MedianHousePrices.png</a> <a href="#">PFE1287063_HousingLandSupply_Redacted.pdf</a> <a href="#">PFE1287063_JPH4_Redacted.pdf</a>
<b>Family Name</b>	Cooper
<b>Given Name</b>	Wendy
<b>Company / Organisation</b>	Save Shaw's Greenbelt Group
<b>Person ID</b>	1287063
<b>Title</b>	Our Vision
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Include files</b>	<a href="#">PFE1287063_HousingLandSupply_Redacted.pdf</a> <a href="#">PFE1287063_JPH4_Redacted.pdf</a> <a href="#">PFE1287063_MedianHousePrices.png</a>
<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>	<p>Why is this Site not actually listed when it is being referred to in the plan's vision and no-where that we can comment on it! We have commented on it here.</p> <p>High Crompton Broad Location (Kingsway South)</p> <p>Whilst it is noted that the site itself is not proposed for allocation within the Plan, it is in relation to draft Policy JP-Strat 7 as a potential opportunity for further expansion of the and residential offer in the eastern most part of this key gateway allocation. The site is noted to have been included on the Key Diagram. However, the site will be retained Belt until such a time as is necessary. This is clearly unacceptable as the Plan is in effect to allocate the site without due assessment of its suitability, nor an assessment of real alternatives. The policy and key diagram are therefore ineffective, not positively prepared not consistent national policy, and both should be fully amended to remove the reference site from the Plan. The Plan should be duly amended to simply show the land as being within the Green Belt. Failure to do so will mean the Plan is not legally compliant, in circumstances where it will be proposing amendments to the boundary of the Green Belt outside of duty to be allocating a site without sufficient justification or assessment of alternatives, an approach put forward flies in the face of the need for a Plan led system.</p> <p>It is also unclear whether the site at High Crompton will be delivering development or above that set out within the policy and if so to what scale. PfE as drafted would appear indicate that the site will be released from the Green Belt within the Oldham Local Plan</p>

required, regardless of the fact it is not addressed in detail within the regional plan. The lack of clarity as to what would constitute it being necessary for release is also of concern and there is no certainty to residents as to the tests which would need to be met for the site to be released for release. This is unduly ambiguous and unreasonable. In reality, on the basis of the information currently available, the land should be retained within the Green Belt and reference to be made from the Plan.

It is therefore our view that as drafted policy JP-Strat 7 is unduly ambiguous and weighted unreasonably in favour of land release and not land protection. The policy is therefore considered to be unsound as it has not been sufficiently justified and is ineffective. To address this concern for soundness we would suggest that draft policy JP-Strat 7 be deleted, alongside Draft Allocation JPA1.1 and JPA 2. Further, that Draft Allocation JPA 1.2 be reviewed.

**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.**

High Crompton Broad Location (Kingsway South)

Whilst it is noted that the site itself is not proposed for allocation within the Plan, it is identified in relation to draft Policy JP-Strat 7 as a potential opportunity for further expansion of the residential offer in the eastern most part of this key gateway allocation. The site is noted to have been included on the Key Diagram. However, the site will be retained within the Green Belt until such a time as is necessary. This is clearly unacceptable as the Plan is in effect intended to allocate the site without due assessment of its suitability, nor an assessment of residential alternatives. The policy and key diagram are therefore ineffective, not positively prepared and not consistent with national policy, and both should be fully amended to remove the reference to the site from the Plan. The Plan should be duly amended to simply show the land as being retained within the Green Belt. Failure to do so will mean the Plan is not legally compliant, in circumstances where it will be proposing amendments to the boundary of the Green Belt outside of duty. To be allocating a site without sufficient justification or assessment of alternatives, and the approach put forward flies in the face of the need for a Plan led system.

It is also unclear whether the site at High Crompton will be delivering development of a scale above that set out within the policy and if so to what scale. PFE as drafted would appear to indicate that the site will be released from the Green Belt within the Oldham Local Plan. This is required, regardless of the fact it is not addressed in detail within the regional plan. The lack of clarity as to what would constitute it being necessary for release is also of concern and there is no certainty to residents as to the tests which would need to be met for the site to be released for release. This is unduly ambiguous and unreasonable. In reality, on the basis of the information currently available, the land should be retained within the Green Belt and reference to be made from the Plan.

It is therefore our view that as drafted policy JP-Strat 7 is unduly ambiguous and weighted unreasonably in favour of land release and not land protection. The policy is therefore considered to be unsound as it has not been sufficiently justified and is ineffective. To address this concern for soundness we would suggest that draft policy JP-Strat 7 be deleted, alongside Draft Allocation JPA1.1 and JPA 2. Further, that Draft Allocation JPA 1.2 be reviewed.

Within the detailed strategic objection to the Publication Plan, the local community have expressed concerns with the proposed release of Green Belt land. Residents consider that this release has not been sufficiently justified by the Greater Manchester Combined Authority, and that insufficient consideration has been given to increasing densities of development within the Green Belt areas, and supporting developers and landowners to secure efficient and effective use of brownfield land.

The GMCA have opted for an apparent Green Belt first strategy in meeting the needs of Greater Manchester over the plan period, contrary to the provisions set out within the Plan and this is simply unacceptable. In addition, and as set out above, the GMCA are proposing to release sites which provide a strategic function within the Green Belt and whose openness should be preserved.

We believe the proposed sites in Oldham do not demonstrate sustainable locations for development and raise significant development control concerns including access, health and sustainability which do not justify their allocation for development. We therefore ask that the sites be deleted from the Plan.

We would ask that officers within the GMCA pay due regard to the concerns of the local community and revisit their proposals for the release of Green Belt to meet the housing and economic needs of the local area.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Cooper
<b>Given Name</b>	Wendy
<b>Company / Organisation</b>	Save Shaw's Greenbelt Group
<b>Person ID</b>	1287063
<b>Title</b>	JPA 12: Beal Valley
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Include files</b>	<a href="#">PFE1287063_MedianHousePrices.png</a> <a href="#">PFE1287063_HousingLandSupply_Redacted.pdf</a> <a href="#">PFE1287063_JPH4_Redacted.pdf</a>
<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>	<p>- Homes: We have particular concern in relation to the identified housing need and the Plan appears to be seeking to overprovide for housing land. The Plan itself and the supporting documentation appear to be inconsistent in the identification of a housing need. The Plan fails to pay sufficient regard to reasonable alternatives and is seeking to be over flexible on land supply. The Plan is therefore deemed to be unsound, as whilst one can argue that the Plan has been positively prepared (in terms of its aspiration), it cannot be seen to be being prepared in a way that meets the needs of Greater Manchester over the plan period. The Plan should be modified to reduce the overall level of housing land required to meet the needs of Greater Manchester over the plan period.</p> <p>- Affordable housing: The Plan sets out a target for the delivery of affordable housing across the region, but the allocation and delivery of such homes to each authority Local Plan process. Such an approach may result in an inconsistent and incoherent application of 2 policy on the delivery of affordable homes across the Greater Manchester region, with some areas potentially seeking to deliver more than others. There is a danger that as drafted local authorities could fail to set out policies to secure the needs of those requiring affordable provision, and as such the Plan could be deemed to be unsound.</p> <p>We would therefore ask that the affordable housing policy within PfE be duly amended to meet the standard affordable housing requirement for new development across the Greater Manchester area, to ensure that housing needs are delivered to a consistent level across the Plan area.</p> <p>- Green Belt: The Plan sets out an area of Green Belt release to meet the perceived housing need across the nine authorities. However, insufficient consideration has been given to the allocation of alternative urban sites, including increased densities and better use of High Street and other brownfield land in advance of releasing land from within the Green Belt. The Plan is therefore unsound as there has been an insufficient assessment of reasonable alternatives. In order to address this issue the Plan should be modified to remove all proposed allocations that are currently designated on land falling within the Green Belt, with additional land identified for development within the main urban areas.</p> <p>- Case for Very Special Circumstances: The evidence base to support the case for Exceptional Circumstances to justify the release of Green Belt, is insufficiently robust and is in fact flawed. The Plan is therefore unsound as it is not currently based on a</p>

robust and justified evidence base. The Plan has also not sufficiently assessed reasonable alternatives in advance of seeking the release of land from the Green Belt contrary to the provisions of national policy.

- Evidence Base: As set out within the Regulations, development plans need to be based on a robust and justified evidence base. The Evidence Base as currently drafted is inconsistent, incoherent and does not support the case for a sound plan. The evidence needs to be revisited to (1) ensure consistency in approach, assessment and aspirations and (2) to ensure that the Plan being presented at Examination is based on up to date and accurate detail.

- Allocations: A significant number of the proposed site allocations are unjustified and not well located. Many of the sites will have detrimental impacts on the highway network, are at risk from flooding and not well located for access to services, facilities and public transport. Many others will have significant impact on the local environment of loss of vegetation, loss of habitat, air pollution, noise pollution, light pollution etc. The proposed allocations are therefore deemed to be unsustainable and unjustified and should not be being promoted. The proposed allocations should be reassessed in relation to their suitability for development, with those within the Green Belt, in unsustainable locations, at risk from flooding or poorly accessed to be removed from the Plan. In short, we are asking that the Plan deliver the right homes in the right places, and the deletion of inappropriate and undeliverable sites from the Plan.

- Covid-19: Insufficient consideration has been paid within the Plan to the long term impacts of Covid, both on the economy and on human behaviours. It is clear that Covid has had a significant impact on the national economy, and whilst we are in a period of recovery, the long term impacts on the high street are clear to see. The plan has failed to assess the impact of these changes on the need for additional housing and employment land, nor in relation to the potential provision of mixed-use

3 redevelopments in town centres, with appropriate densities to negate the need for Green Belt release. Whilst the GMCA argue that the impact of the pandemic is too early to fully understand, there are clear trends resultant that are already apparent, and which could have a determinative impact on development within Greater Manchester. The Plan is therefore unsound as it fails to adequately assess current circumstances and is once again not prepared on the basis of a sound and robust evidence base. To seek to address the issue of soundness, we would ask that more detailed assessment be undertaken of the impact of Covid-19 on Greater Manchester Streets and general housing and employment land requirements.

We have put in a FO

I request (in conjunction with Save Royton's Greenbelt) regarding the Local Plan for Oldham has 76 unlisted mills, some of which should be convertible to housing. We filed a request and the council refused to give us the information:

[https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/oldhams\\_mills\\_strategy](https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/oldhams_mills_strategy). By doing so, and to survey this land for GMSF/PfE I believe we have an argument that Oldham's GB is not compliant with NPPF #141 (which explicitly addresses the conditions for GB release). <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/13-protecting-green>

Copy of the letter is attached in the documents section.

This information we believe is vital to the decision making behind the plan. Without this information it is impossible to have an informed opinion on the use of Brownfield sites and their regeneration.

The Local Housing Need methodology increases Oldham's target by 44 homes per year due to the affordability adjustment (pg. 34-36 of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment). Over 16 years this amounts to roughly 700 homes. We believe that the affordability assumptions for the Oldham Borough are severely distorted, stemming mostly from Saddleworth.

	<p>It is evident that the building of affordable homes in the GB in other parts of Oldham the affordability problem in Saddleworth and this opens up a two-fold argument:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>oEffectively it is being argued by OMBC that affordability is an exceptional circumstance allocated houses. It is highly questionable that the affordability adjustment complies v #140. These houses are not being built to serve housing need, but rather to expand choice.</li> <li>oAllocating these homes outside the problem area means that the policy is not effective sound, because building these extra homes in Shaw and Royton will not resolve the a issue in Saddleworth.</li> </ul> <p>Validity and Legal Status of the Consultation Process</p> <p>Discrimination and Equality Act 2010</p> <p>The consultation process is flawed in the following ways. There has been a sistematic for broad community involvement. We requested that OMBC write to every household them of the consultation and we were advised by their head of planning that they had obligation to do so. We find this discriminatory as it excluded anyone without access internet which is where the consultation is being held.</p> <p>There has also been complete disregard for loss of community identity, things like Be the Bounds which is a walk that is carried out every 7 years around the boundaries of Crompton. This is a historical event and an event where the community of Shaw are Building all these houses would see this sort of community identity eradicated as the creating urban sprawl. We feel there has been no consideration about keeping each identity within Oldham.</p> <p>We also feel that there has been a disproportionate allocation of houses within Shaw &amp; within the Oldham Borough, without any regard for services and road infrastructure. nearer 4,000 houses planned within Shaw &amp; Crompton, calculating all the other plan applications not included in Places for Everyone.</p> <p>Build Back Better - What about climate change? This needs to be taken into consideration set out in these plans. It has not been considered.</p> <p>-</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>We would therefore ask that this allocation be deleted from the Plan and that the GMCA the potential for reasonable alternatives for development within the existing urban areas within town centres and other brownfield sites in line with the requirements of section paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Brownfield Housing Fund Allocation to be accessed.</p> <p>To be compliant with the Discrimination and Equality Act 2010, we would require OM least have written to every household in the Borough, informing residents of the process (This is well within the scope of the consultation and the capabilities of the Council who a quarterly newsletter which is distributed to every home in the Borough). There are adults in the UK (ONS Figures) that do not have access to the internet and this should been taken into consideration.</p> <p>The percentage of people with access to a computer or a device to be able to access consultation documents (this is further compounded by the size of the documents and download from the GMCA consultation site, being able to view these on a phone is n impossible) is higher in Oldham, simply because of the demographic of the area, par Shaw which has a high population of elderly residents.</p>
<p><b>Family Name</b></p>	<p>Cooper</p>
<p><b>Given Name</b></p>	<p>Wendy</p>
<p><b>Company / Organisation</b></p>	<p>Save Shaw's Greenbelt Group</p>
<p><b>Person ID</b></p>	<p>1287063</p>
<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p>JPA 14: Broadbent Moss</p>
<p><b>Type</b></p>	<p>Web</p>
<p><b>Include files</b></p>	<p><a href="#">PFE1287063_HousingLandSupply_Redacted.pdf</a></p>

[PFE1287063\\_JPH4\\_Redacted.pdf](#)  
[PFE1287063\\_MedianHousePrices.png](#)

<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>	<p>- Homes: We have particular concern in relation to the identified housing need and the Plan appears to be seeking to overprovide for housing land. The Plan itself and the supporting documentation appear to be inconsistent in the identification of a housing need. The Plan fails to pay sufficient regard to reasonable alternatives and is seeking to be over flexible in relation to land supply. The Plan is therefore deemed to be unsound, as whilst one can argue that the Plan has been positively prepared (in terms of its aspiration), it cannot be seen to be being positively prepared. The Plan should be modified to reduce the overall level of housing land required to meet the needs of Greater Manchester over the plan period.</p> <p>- Affordable housing: The Plan sets out a target for the delivery of affordable housing across the region, the allocation and delivery of such homes to each authority Local Plan process. Such an approach may result in an inconsistent and incoherent application of 2 policy on the delivery of affordable homes across the Greater Manchester region, with some areas potentially seeking local delivery of provision. There is a danger that as drafted local authorities could fail to set out policies to secure the needs of those requiring affordable provision, and as such the Plan could be deemed to be unsound.</p> <p>We would therefore ask that the affordable housing policy within PFE be duly amended to meet the standard affordable housing requirement for new development across the Greater Manchester region, to ensure that housing needs are delivered to a consistent level across the Plan area.</p> <p>- Green Belt: The Plan sets out an area of Green Belt release to meet the perceived housing need across the nine authorities. However, insufficient consideration has been given to the allocation of alternative urban sites, including increased densities and better use of High Street and other brownfield land in advance of releasing land from within the Green Belt. The Plan is therefore unsound as there has been insufficient assessment of reasonable alternatives. In order to address this issue the Plan should be modified to remove all proposed allocations that are currently designated on land falling within the Green Belt, with additional land identified for development within the main urban areas.</p> <p>- Case for Very Special Circumstances: The evidence base to support the case for Exceptional Circumstances to justify the release of Green Belt, is insufficiently robust and is in fact flawed. The Plan is therefore unsound as it is not currently based on a robust and justified evidence base. The Plan has also not sufficiently assessed reasonable alternatives in advance of seeking the release of land from the Green Belt, which is contrary to the provisions of national policy.</p> <p>- Evidence Base: As set out within the Regulations, development plans need to be based on a robust and justified evidence base. The Evidence Base as currently drafted is inconsistent, incoherent and does not support the case for a sound plan. The evidence base needs to be revisited to (1) ensure consistency in approach, (2) ensure that the Plan is based on a robust assessment and aspirations and (2) to ensure that the Plan being presented at</p>

Examination is based on up to date and accurate detail.

- Allocations: A significant number of the proposed site allocations are unjustified and not well located. Many of the sites will have detrimental impacts on the highway network, are at risk from flooding and not well located for access to services, facilities and public transport. Many others will have significant impact on the local environment of loss of vegetation, loss of habitat, air pollution, noise pollution, light pollution etc. The proposed allocations are therefore deemed to be unsustainable and unjustified and should not be being promoted. The proposed allocations should be reassessed in relation to their suitability for development, with those within the Green Belt, in unsustainable locations, at risk from flooding or poorly accessed to be removed from the Plan. In short, we are asking that the Plan deliver the right homes in the right places, and the deletion of inappropriate and undeliverable sites from the Plan.

- Covid-19: Insufficient consideration has been paid within the Plan to the long term impacts of Covid, both on the economy and on human behaviours. It is clear that Covid has had a significant impact on the national economy, and whilst we are in a period of recovery, the long term impacts on the high street are clear to see. The plan has failed to assess the impact of these changes on the need for additional housing and employment land, nor in relation to the potential provision of mixed-use

3 redevelopments in town centres, with appropriate densities to negate the need for Green Belt release. Whilst the GMCA argue that the impact of the pandemic is too early to fully understand, there are clear trends resultant that are already apparent, and which could have a determinative impact on development within Greater Manchester. The Plan is therefore unsound as it fails to adequately assess current circumstances and is once again not prepared on the basis of a sound and robust evidence base. To seek to address the issue of soundness, we would ask that more detailed assessment be undertaken of the impact of Covid-19 on Greater Manchester Streets and general housing and employment land requirements.

We have put in a FOI request (in conjunction with Save Royton's Greenbelt) regarding the Plan consultation. Oldham has 76 unlisted mills, some of which should be convertible to residential use. We filed an FOI and the council refused to give us the information:

[https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/oldhams\\_mills\\_strategy](https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/oldhams_mills_strategy). By doing so, and to survey this land for GMSF/PfE I believe we have an argument that Oldham's GB is not compliant with NPPF #141 (which explicitly addresses the conditions for GB release). <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/13-protecting-green-belt>

We believe a Brownfield First Approach has not been followed.

This information on Brownfield Sites, we believe is vital to the decision making behind the Plan. Without this information it is impossible to have an informed opinion on the use of Brownfield sites and their regeneration.

We believe the pollution and emissions issues have not been taken into consideration in relation to the damage to people's health. With disregard for Healthy Lungs.

The Local Housing Need methodology increases Oldham's target by 44 homes per year as a result of the affordability adjustment (pg. 34-36 of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment). Over 16 years this amounts to roughly 700 homes. We believe that the affordability adjustments for the Oldham Borough are severely distorted, stemming mostly from Saddleworth.

It is evident that the building of affordable homes in the GB in other parts of Oldham is being hindered by the affordability problem in Saddleworth and this opens up a two-fold argument:

o Effectively it is being argued by OMBC that affordability is an exceptional circumstance that allows for the allocation of houses. It is highly questionable that the affordability adjustment complies with NPPF #140. These houses are not being built to serve housing need, but rather to expand choice.



Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>oAllocating these homes outside the problem area means that the policy is not effect sound, because building these extra homes in Shaw and Royton will not resolve the a issue in Saddleworth.</p> <p>We also believe there is going to be a disregard for the housing needs of the resident &amp; Crompton, with the majority of houses being unaffordable for the wages people ear in the area. With not enough houses being also for the elderly which is the demograph &amp; Crompton. A lot of people are elderly. There are supporting documents attached.</p> <p>We have attached documents to support our response in the relevant section.</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>We would therefore ask that this allocation be deleted from the Plan and that the GMCA the potential for reasonable alternatives for development within the existing urban areas within town centres and other brownfield sites in line with the requirements of section paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p> <p>Brownfield Housing Fund Allocation to be accessed.</p> <p>To be compliant with the Discrimination and Equality Act 2010, we would require OM least have written to every household in the Borough, informing residents of the proces (This is well within the scope of the consultation and the capabilities of the Council wh a quarterly newsletter which is distributed to every home in the Borough). There are adults in the UK (ONS Figures) that do not have access to the internet and this shou been taken into consideration. The percentage of people with access to a computer o to be able to access the consultation documents (this is further compounded by the documents available for download from the GMCA consultation site, being able to vi on a phone is next to impossible) is higher in Oldham, simply because of the demog the area, particularly in Shaw which has a high population of elderly residents.</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Cooper
<b>Given Name</b>	Wendy
<b>Company / Organisation</b>	Save Shaw's Greenbelt Group
<b>Person ID</b>	1287063
<b>Title</b>	JPA 16: Cowlshaw
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Include files</b>	<p><a href="#">PFE1287063_MedianHousePrices.png</a>  <a href="#">PFE1287063_HousingLandSupply_Redacted.pdf</a>  <a href="#">PFE1287063_JPH4_Redacted.pdf</a></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
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<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</b></p>	<p>- Homes: We have particular concern in relation to the identified housing need and th the Plan appears to be seeking to overprovide for housing land. The Plan itself and the a supporting documentation appear to be inconsistent in the identification of a housing n fails to pay sufficient regard to reasonable alternatives and is seeking to be over flexible to land supply. The Plan is therefore deemed to be unsound, as whilst one can argue has been positively prepared (in terms of its aspiration), it cannot be seen to be being The Plan should be modified to reduce the overall level of housing land required to n needs of Greater Manchester over the plan period.</p>

**co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.**

- Affordable housing: The Plan sets out a target for the delivery of affordable housing the allocation and delivery of such homes to each authority Local Plan process. Such an may result in an inconsistent and incoherent application of 2 policy on the delivery of homes across the Greater Manchester region, with some areas potentially seeking local of provision. There is a danger that as drafted local authorities could fail to set out policies secure the needs of those requiring affordable provision, and as such the Plan could be to be unsound.

We would therefore ask that the affordable housing policy within PfE be duly amended standard affordable housing requirement for new development across the Greater Manchester area, to ensure that housing needs are delivered to a consistent level across the Plan

- Green Belt: The Plan sets out an area of Green Belt release to meet the perceived housing need across the nine authorities. However, insufficient consideration has been to the allocation of alternative urban sites, including increased densities and better use High Street and other brownfield land in advance of releasing land from within the Green Belt. The Plan is therefore unsound as there has been

insufficient assessment of reasonable alternatives. In order to address this issue the Plan should be modified to remove all proposed allocations that are currently designated on land falling within the Green Belt, with additional land identified for development within the main urban areas.

- Case for Very Special Circumstances: The evidence base to support the case for Exceptional Circumstances to justify the release of Green Belt, is insufficiently robust and is in fact flawed. The Plan is therefore unsound as it is not currently based on a robust and justified evidence base. The Plan has also not sufficiently assessed reasonable alternatives in advance of seeking the release of land from the Green Belt contrary to the provisions of national policy.

- Evidence Base: As set out within the Regulations, development plans need to be based on a robust and justified evidence base. The Evidence Base as currently drafted is inconsistent, incoherent and does not support the case for a sound plan. The evidence needs to be revisited to (1) ensure consistency in approach, assessment and aspirations and (2) to ensure that the Plan being presented at Examination is based on up to date and accurate detail.

- Allocations: A significant number of the proposed site allocations are unjustified and not well located. Many of the sites will have detrimental impacts on the highway network, are at risk from flooding and not well located for access to services, facilities and public transport. Many others will have significant impact on the local environment of loss of vegetation, loss of habitat, air pollution, noise pollution, light pollution etc. The proposed allocations are therefore deemed to be unsustainable and unjustified and should not be being promoted. The proposed allocations should be reassessed in relation to their suitability for development, with those within the Green Belt, in unsustainable locations, at risk from or poorly accessed to be removed from the Plan. In short, we are asking that the Plan ensure the delivery of the right homes in the right places, and the deletion of inappropriate and undeliverable sites from the Plan.

- Covid-19: Insufficient consideration has been paid within the Plan to the long term impacts of Covid, both on the economy and on human behaviours. It is clear that Covid has had a significant impact on the national economy, and whilst we are in a period of recovery the long term impacts on the high street are clear to see. The plan has failed to assess the impact of these changes on the need for additional housing and employment land, nor in relation to the potential provision of mixed-use

3 redevelopments in town centres, with appropriate densities to negate the need for Green Belt release. Whilst the GMCA argue that the impact of the pandemic is too early to fully understand, there are clear trends resultant that are already apparent,

and which could have a determinative impact on development within Greater Manchester. The Plan is therefore unsound as it fails to adequately assess current circumstances and is once again not prepared on the basis of a sound and robust evidence base. To seek to address the issue of soundness, we would ask that more detailed assessment be undertaken of the impact of Covid-19 on Greater Manchester Streets and general housing and employment land requirements.

We have put in a FOL request (in conjunction with Save Royton's Greenbelt) regarding Plan consultation Oldham has 76 unlisted mills, some of which should be convertible to residential use. We filed an FOI and the council refused to give us the information:

[https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/oldhams\\_mills\\_strategy](https://www.whatdotheyknow.com/request/oldhams_mills_strategy). By doing so, and to survey this land for GMSF/PfE I believe we have an argument that Oldham's GB is not compliant with NPPF #141 (which explicitly addresses the conditions for GB release). <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework/13-protecting-green-belt>

This information we believe is vital to the decision making behind the plan. Without this information it is impossible to have an informed opinion on the use of Brownfield sites and their regeneration.

The Local Housing Need methodology increases Oldham's target by 44 homes per year due to the affordability adjustment (pg. 34-36 of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment). Over 16 years this amounts to roughly 700 homes. We believe that the affordability adjustments for the Oldham Borough are severely distorted, stemming mostly from Saddleworth.

It is evident that the building of affordable homes in the GB in other parts of Oldham is not addressing the affordability problem in Saddleworth and this opens up a two-fold argument:

- oEffectively it is being argued by OMBC that affordability is an exceptional circumstance and that a small number of houses are allocated. It is highly questionable that the affordability adjustment complies with NPPF #140. These houses are not being built to serve housing need, but rather to expand choice.

- oAllocating these homes outside the problem area means that the policy is not effective and is not sound, because building these extra homes in Shaw and Royton will not resolve the affordability issue in Saddleworth.

**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.**

We would therefore ask that this allocation be deleted from the Plan and that the GMCA consider the potential for reasonable alternatives for development within the existing urban areas of Oldham, within town centres and other brownfield sites in line with the requirements of section 141 of paragraph 141 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Brownfield Housing Fund Allocation to be accessed.

To be compliant with the Discrimination and Equality Act 2010, we would require OMBC to at least have written to every household in the Borough, informing residents of the process. (This is well within the scope of the consultation and the capabilities of the Council which publishes a quarterly newsletter which is distributed to every home in the Borough). There are 10 million adults in the UK (ONS Figures) that do not have access to the internet and this should have been taken into consideration.

The percentage of people with access to a computer or a device to be able to access online consultation documents (this is further compounded by the size of the documents available for download from the GMCA consultation site, being able to view these on a phone is not possible) is higher in Oldham, simply because of the demographic of the area, particularly in Shaw which has a high population of elderly residents.