

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Morten
Given Name	David
Person ID	1287322
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Include files	PFEDMorten_Email.pdf PFE1287322_Rep_Criterion7_Redacted.pdf PFE1287322_Objection_SouthofHyde_Redacted.pdf
Family Name	Morten
Given Name	David
Person ID	1287322
Title	JPA 32: South of Hyde
Type	Web
Include files	PFE1287322_Rep_Criterion7_Redacted.pdf PFE1287322_Objection_SouthofHyde_Redacted.pdf
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>The National Planning Policy Framework sets out the Government's policies for planning in England. Policies within Places for Everyone must not conflict with these policies.</p> <p>The proposed development does not conform to the principle of the green belt policy as the development extends to the Woodley boundary and consequently fails to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. (See Land Parcel SP09)</p> <p>The development also fails to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one and fails to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.</p> <p>Apethorn Lane and the Grade II* Apethorn Farm date back to the early 1500s and a housing development of this scale would be totally out of character with the semi-rural nature of the lane and would not conserve and enhance the historic environment and heritage assets.</p> <p>In addition I feel that the green belt pasture that adjoins the SBI at Pole Bank and is included within the allocation forms an intrinsic part of the ecosystem linking with the Tame Valley Nature Reserve and forms a continuous green wildlife corridor with Werneth Low Country Park.</p> <p>The 15 metre protection strip proposed is totally inadequate and will have a massive negative effect on the local wildlife.</p> <p>I am concerned about the effect that this development will have on the road infrastructure and traffic flow should it go ahead. The A560 and A627 junction</p>

at the top of Apethorn Lane is already gridlocked in all directions at peak times; an additional 440 houses will place an unacceptable burden on the limited road capacity.

The two proposed access road junctions to the sites are being described as mitigation to the traffic flow issues on the A560 when in fact they would do the exact opposite because they are the problem, not the solution.

The suggested mitigations to address the traffic flow capacity is flawed and will not stand up to the tests of soundness.

No provision has been made to increase school and health care, again an unacceptable burden on limited and overstretched capacity.

The belief that developer contribution will be a solution is also flawed and will not stand up to the tests of soundness.

To remove this site from the green belt before an outline plan (never mind a masterplan) has been presented is both reckless and unnecessary.

Tameside council have failed to pursue a policy of Brownfield first and have chosen to do the exact opposite by selecting this Greenbelt site before other alternatives have been explored, including land in the ownership of the council.

The negative synergy of this proposal is great and I hope that it is rejected and alternative sites are sought to replace the allocation shortfall preferably on brownfield sites and infilling abandoned and derelict sites.

Many of these sites would be small scale but I think this would be more acceptable to existing Tameside residents, distribute traffic flow more favourably and not overwhelm towns at the edges of the authority with destructively large new developments.