

Family Name	Crook
Given Name	Graham
Person ID	1286192
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Crook
Given Name	Graham
Person ID	1286192
Title	JPA 35: North of Mosley Common
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
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>I understood the 'North of Mosley Common' site had been removed, following hundreds of objections to it, when it was in the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework. Therefore, I cannot understand why it is still included in the latest proposals. It is still, and always will be unsuitable, for the following reasons:</p> <p>The proposal is to build 1100 houses on our greenbelt land. Green areas are green for a reason. They provide cleaner air, and are a haven for wildlife. Once they've gone, they cannot be brought back. I think brown sites and renovation of derelict areas would be more appropriate for development.</p> <p>I believe the priority, in terms of house-building, is 'affordable' housing, as there are thousands of people on the waiting list. Houses built in this area are not 'affordable' houses, purely because the land is expensive. What we would get with this proposal, in essence, is 1100 more expensive properties, inaccessible to people who need social housing.</p> <p>Several hundred houses have already been built in this area, which I had no prior knowledge of. The existing infrastructure couldn't cope with the demand, before these houses were built. Further development will only make matters worse, impacting on the already stretched Surgeries, Dentists, Schools, and shops. There is no proposal to improve or expand any of these services.</p> <p>The roads in this area are gridlocked by commuter traffic in peak periods, not least because there is only one access point to the M60 motorway in Worsley. Given that most houses now have two cars, another 1100 houses would, potentially, put another 2000 cars on the road in the Mosley Common/Boothstown/ Worsley area. The new development would be accessed from Mort Lane, on which traffic is already very heavy, and Wellington Drive, which currently only serves a quiet estate. The A580 (East</p>

Lancs) junction at Mosley Common, which is already assessed as operating at over capacity, will be further stressed by this extra traffic.

The Guided Busway is being used as a key justification for this proposed housing development. I know from personal experience, as an everyday user of this service, that it is already over-subscribed. The buses are full of standing passengers in peak periods, even before 7 am. There is currently no spare capacity on this busway.

The area around Mort Lane, Tyldesley, has, historically, often been subject to flooding. I fear that developing this area will only exacerbate the problem.

I have lived on REDACTED TEXT, since it was developed in 1998. One of the reasons why we moved here, is for the improved air quality it affords us, as it is semi-rural. My house overlooks open farmland. These benefits will be lost if this development goes ahead. CO2 levels will rise astronomically in this area. The Government says it wants to reduce CO2 levels, to combat global warming. This is also one of the aims of Greater Manchester's Clean Air Plan. However, the Authorities conveniently overlook this, when it suits them to do something which increases CO2 levels.

I am also concerned that very few people seem to know about this proposal. I received a letter, but only because I made some comments about a previous proposal. My neighbours don't seem to know about it. I understand a couple of posters were put up on lamp and signposts in the neighbourhood, which is insufficient.

Additionally, not everyone has access to the internet, to make their objections to these proposals. I would suggest that provision is made for people to express their views in other ways, for example by letter.

I think this is an ill-thought out proposal, borne purely out of a desire to satisfy a perceived need, with little, if any consideration for the residents, and the devastating impact it would have on this area. I firmly believe that the proposal to build houses 'North of Mosley Common', in our green spaces, should be removed from the rJPA35 proposal.

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.

Nothing about the plan to build 1100 houses in the 'North of Mosley Common' area could be modified, to make the proposal sound. It should be removed from the plans in it's entirety.