

Family Name	Critchley
Given Name	Richard
Person ID	1286163
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Critchley
Given Name	Richard
Person ID	1286163
Title	JPA 27: Land East of Boothstown
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.	The justification for allocating land East of Boothstown simply hasn't been made. Salford has an affordable housing crisis, not an expensive homes crisis. There is no justification for removing a large area from the greenbelt for unaffordable homes, especially in an area dominated by the most expensive and least affordable houses in the city. The allocation does not meet the needs of Salford or the local population by failing to provide diversity of housing type in an area dominated by large, detached houses. Most concerning is that the site is one of the most unsustainable locations, almost every journey would require car travel going against all national guidance and policy on sustainable development and contradicting the "climate crisis" announced by Salford City Council. It is simply impossible for residents at this location to walk to major areas of employment, colleges/universities, train stations, super markets, leisure facilities or any other basic service. People paying for large "aspirational" homes, just off the motorway will not be working in a local village shop and will not be walking and cycling for over an hour to access basic services.
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.	Remove this allocation from the plan and leave as greenbelt.
Family Name	Critchley

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Given Name	Richard
Person ID	1286163
Title	JPA 28: North of Irlam Station
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.	The justification for destroying grade 1 farmland, moss land and a major carbon sink has simply not been made. The site is made up of some of rarest and most precious land in Salford and Greater Manchester. It is unclear why this site has been chosen over others, The huge harm caused to the environment and farming is not outweighed by the provision of a few houses. Grade 1 farm land is very rare and limited and cannot be recreated. The houses proposed will not add to the diversity in the local housing market, will not enhance the local area, will not address local need and are not required to meet housing need with thin the city - the plan repeatedly confirms that Salford could meet it"s entire housing need on brownfield sites.
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.	Remove the allocation and leave the site within the greenbelt.
Family Name	Critchley
Given Name	Richard
Person ID	1286163
Title	JPA 29: Port Salford Extension
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

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.	The justification for removing this site from the greenbelt doesn't exist. Despite decades of false promises, no progress has been made on Port Salford and there is currently no timescale for delivering the scheme. Releasing land from the greenbelt for a second phase without any progress on the first seems reckless, poorly thought out and unjustified. It would leave a large area of land with no protection, vulnerable to speculative applications, which may have no link to a port. Should Port Salford not progress, it would be extremely difficult to return it to the greenbelt.
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 land should be retained within the greenbelt. If the port truly is important regional infrastructure, it does get built and does need to expand, the justification for removing further land from the greenbelt would likely be met. This would protect the land from inappropriate development and speculative applications whilst ensuring that land is retained for possible future port expansion.
Family Name	Critchley
Given Name	Richard
Person ID	1286163
Title	JPA 35: North of Mosley Common
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.	When allocating sites, proximity and access to town centres, services and employment is essential. The size of this allocation and the demand it would place on the area would far outweigh the areas capacity to employ, educate, serve and entertain the population, in other words, it will become another out of town, commuter suburb. Decades of learning about travel, peoples behaviour, planning and the environment has taught us this type of development is unsustainable and harmful to the environment. It will become highly car dependent, creating congestion, reducing air quality and increasing CO2 emissions, everything we have worked to combat. Whilst the proximity to the busway is useful, the policy does not propose a low car/car free development, which would suggest it has already accepted an unsustainable, highly polluting and environmentally damaging development.
Redacted modification - Please set out the	The allocation should specifically propose a low/no car development, served entirely by sustainable transport, walking and cycling. Bus way access would

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.

provide the basis for a truly forward thinking development. The allocation should also specifically support/fund investment in a train station at Mort Lane, a long held ambition of Salford, Little Hulton and local residents, which would truly make this a sustainable development and compliant with national and local policy.