

**Respondent ID**

0052

---

**Full Name**

Abby Turner

**If you are responding on behalf of a business, charity or other organisation, please state who you are responding on behalf of.**

---

**SPATIAL VISION**

**The plan sets out a spatial vision for Tameside that hopes to support in the vision and priorities within the Council's Corporate Plan. The proposed vision for the plan is set out below.**

**Tameside in 2042 will be:**

- **Homes: A place where people are proud to live, with a range of attractive and affordable homes that meet local needs.**
- **Jobs: A place with a strong local economy where businesses choose to remain, invest and grow, and where residents can learn and earn.**
- **Centres: A place with a range of strong, vibrant and diverse centres which serve their local communities and where people want to spend time.**
- **Travel: A well-connected place, where active travel is the first and natural choice, with high quality public transport connections, where people can travel safely and conveniently to destinations both within and beyond the borough.**
- **Places: A place where our cultural and built heritage are cherished, and where good design creates sustainable, safe, inclusive and accessible places.**
- **Environment: A greener place with a thriving natural environment and clean air, where communities and infrastructure are sustainable and climate resilient.**
- **People: A place where children are given the best start in life, are able to exceed expectations and where everyone is able to live a healthy, happy and active life within thriving supportive communities, supported by the services they need.**

**To what extent do you agree with the Homes, Spaces, Places Vision for Tameside?**

Disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

While the vision outlines positive aspirations for housing and the environment, I disagree with its current direction because Tameside Council is not making full use of brownfield sites before considering development on greenbelt or greenfield land. Building on green sites undermines the commitment to creating a "greener place" and threatens the natural environment, which is vital for both biodiversity and community wellbeing.

There is a significant opportunity to prioritise and regenerate brownfield land, which would support sustainable growth, protect green spaces, and bring disused or neglected urban areas back into productive use. Until there is a clear and demonstrable effort to maximise brownfield development, I cannot support a vision that may risk irreversible damage to our green spaces—spaces that are increasingly important in addressing climate change, supporting mental health, and fostering local pride.

**If you think there should be alternative wording for the Vision, please detail your proposed wording below.**

Tameside Council disregards community comments and drives full steam ahead following ££ rather than what has been voiced by constituents. TMBC are going to plough on to achieve irreparable damage to our valuable and vital green spaces

---

**STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES**

**To what extent do you agree with the Homes, Spaces, Places strategic objectives?**

**Homes: To ensure that new housing provides a range of suitable and affordable homes to meet residents' needs, whilst making efficient use of land.**

Strongly disagree

**Jobs: To enable all residents to share in the benefits of economic growth**

Strongly disagree

**Centres: To support the borough's centres to thrive, be vibrant and attractive and safe spaces where people choose to spend time.**

Strongly disagree

**Travel: To enable everyone to travel safely, conveniently and reduce congestion.**

Strongly disagree

**Places: To deliver development that makes a positive contribution to the character, heritage and identity of Tameside.**

Strongly disagree

**Environment: To ensure that new development responds positively to climate change and ecologically sensitive locations.**

Strongly disagree

**People: To reduce health inequalities, improve health outcomes and enable the provision of services and infrastructure to support new and existing communities.**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for the choices you provided above.**

While the vision may appear positive in principle, I strongly disagree with it in practice. The approach being taken by Tameside Council overlooks fundamental concerns around infrastructure, community capacity, and public trust.

Key issues include:

- **Green space loss:** The plan prioritises development on greenfield land while brownfield opportunities remain underutilised. This is inconsistent with stated environmental goals and undermines public confidence in sustainable planning.
- **Overstretched services:** Schools and GP surgeries are already struggling to meet current demand. No detailed strategy has been provided to address the additional pressure new developments will place on these critical services.
- **Flooding risk:** Developing on green spaces reduces natural drainage and increases the flood risk in several already vulnerable areas, counter to climate adaptation goals.
- **Transport failings:** The local rail network is unreliable and under-resourced. The plan makes no serious proposals to address existing transport challenges, particularly for those commuting outside the borough.
- **Commuter impact and clean air:** Tameside's own Census data shows a high proportion of residents travel outside the borough for work. This contributes to congestion and poor air quality, in direct contradiction to the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan, a key commitment of the GM Mayor.

- **Public objection ignored:** The people of Tameside have already voiced strong objections to plans that risk greenbelt destruction and ignore local infrastructure concerns. Yet, these objections have not meaningfully shaped the current proposals.
- **Barriers to engagement:** The design of this feedback form is difficult and restrictive, presenting yet another example of how Tameside MBC appears to be limiting public engagement rather than enabling it. This raises serious questions: Does this process align with the council's own Equality and Diversity Policy, which commits to "ensuring everyone has a voice and can influence decisions that affect their lives"? The form's inaccessibility stands in contrast to those values and contributes to ongoing distrust in local planning processes.

In summary, the vision lacks the infrastructure, transparency, and community inclusion necessary to be credible. It does not reflect the needs, feedback, or realities of Tameside residents.

**If you think there should be alternative strategic objectives to those suggested, please detail these below.**

A complete overhaul! - As per comments above, which will be included here should TMBC not link previous responses in their strategy feedback analysis. While the vision may appear positive in principle, I strongly disagree with it in practice. The approach being taken by Tameside Council overlooks fundamental concerns around infrastructure, community capacity, and public trust.

Key issues include:

- **Green space loss:** The plan prioritises development on greenfield land while brownfield opportunities remain underutilised. This is inconsistent with stated environmental goals and undermines public confidence in sustainable planning.
- **Overstretched services:** Schools and GP surgeries are already struggling to meet current demand. No detailed strategy has been provided to address the additional pressure new developments will place on these critical services.
- **Flooding risk:** Developing on green spaces reduces natural drainage and increases the flood risk in several already vulnerable areas, counter to climate adaptation goals.
- **Transport failings:** The local rail network is unreliable and under-resourced. The plan makes no serious proposals to address existing transport challenges, particularly for those commuting outside the borough.
- **Commuter impact and clean air:** Tameside's own Census data shows a high proportion of residents travel outside the borough for work. This contributes to congestion and poor air quality, in direct contradiction to the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan, a key commitment of the GM Mayor.

- **Public objection ignored:** The people of Tameside have already voiced strong objections to plans that risk greenbelt destruction and ignore local infrastructure concerns. Yet, these objections have not meaningfully shaped the current proposals.
- **Barriers to engagement:** The design of this feedback form is difficult and restrictive, presenting yet another example of how Tameside MBC appears to be limiting public engagement rather than enabling it. This raises serious questions: Does this process align with the council's own Equality and Diversity Policy, which commits to "ensuring everyone has a voice and can influence decisions that affect their lives"? The form's inaccessibility stands in contrast to those values and contributes to ongoing distrust in local planning processes.

In summary, the vision lacks the infrastructure, transparency, and community inclusion necessary to be credible. It does not reflect the needs, feedback, or realities of Tameside residents.

---

## SPATIAL FRAMEWORK

### **To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP S1: Overall Spatial Strategy?**

Disagree

#### **Please give a reason for your answer.**

I disagree with Policy HSP S1 because it lacks a genuinely sustainable, inclusive, and evidence-based approach to spatial planning in Tameside.

Key reasons include:

- **Overreliance on greenfield and greenbelt land:** The strategy prioritises new housing developments in areas that should be protected for environmental, ecological, and community health reasons. There is no convincing evidence that all viable brownfield sites have been exhausted, despite national and regional planning priorities that promote brownfield-first development.
- **Infrastructure and service planning is insufficient:** The policy does not provide a credible, detailed plan to address the current strain on education, health, and transport services, which will only be made worse by further population growth. Without upfront infrastructure investment, new development risks being poorly supported and damaging to existing communities.
- **Transport and connectivity assumptions are unrealistic:** The strategy assumes future residents will adopt "active travel" and public transport, but does not outline concrete investment or improvements to make this possible—particularly given the borough's failing rail network and poor bus connectivity.

- Ignoring local commuting patterns and air quality: According to Tameside's own Census data, a high number of residents commute outside the borough for work. This will increase pressure on roads and worsen air pollution, undermining both local wellbeing and Greater Manchester's Clean Air Plan.
- Community voices not being heard: This strategy follows years of local objections to green space loss and poor planning transparency. The design and accessibility of this consultation also raises questions about how seriously community engagement is being taken. It does not align with Tameside Council's own commitments to inclusive decision-making as outlined in its Equality and Diversity Policy.

In short, Policy HSP S1 does not adequately protect the environment, plan for infrastructure, or reflect the lived experience and views of Tameside residents.

**If you think there are any reasonable alternatives to Policy approach HSP S1, please detail these below.**

As per previous comments. I disagree with Policy HSP S1 because it lacks a genuinely sustainable, inclusive, and evidence-based approach to spatial planning in Tameside.

Key reasons include:

- Overreliance on greenfield and greenbelt land: The strategy prioritises new housing developments in areas that should be protected for environmental, ecological, and community health reasons. There is no convincing evidence that all viable brownfield sites have been exhausted, despite national and regional planning priorities that promote brownfield-first development.
- Infrastructure and service planning is insufficient: The policy does not provide a credible, detailed plan to address the current strain on education, health, and transport services, which will only be made worse by further population growth. Without upfront infrastructure investment, new development risks being poorly supported and damaging to existing communities.
- Transport and connectivity assumptions are unrealistic: The strategy assumes future residents will adopt "active travel" and public transport, but does not outline concrete investment or improvements to make this possible—particularly given the borough's failing rail network and poor bus connectivity.
- Ignoring local commuting patterns and air quality: According to Tameside's own Census data, a high number of residents commute outside the borough for work. This will increase pressure on roads and worsen air pollution, undermining both local wellbeing and Greater Manchester's Clean Air Plan.

- Community voices not being heard: This strategy follows years of local objections to green space loss and poor planning transparency. The design and accessibility of this consultation also raises questions about how seriously community engagement is being taken. It does not align with Tameside Council's own commitments to inclusive decision-making as outlined in its Equality and Diversity Policy.

In short, Policy HSP S1 does not adequately protect the environment, plan for infrastructure, or reflect the lived experience and views of Tameside residents.

### **To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP S2: Neighbourhood Spatial Policies?**

Strongly disagree

#### **Please give a reason for your answer.**

I disagree with Policy HSP S2 because the proposed Neighbourhood Spatial Policies appear to be top-down in approach, lacking genuine community input and failing to respond to the specific infrastructure pressures faced in different areas of Tameside.

The way this policy and consultation have been presented echoes a broader approach by TMBC that limits inclusion, restricts access to information, and discourages community voices from being heard—particularly those who may not have the time, confidence, or capacity to navigate such a complex and inaccessible process.

Neighbourhood spatial planning should empower communities, not bypass them. Until there is clear evidence of bottom-up engagement, better transparency, and a stronger focus on protecting local infrastructure and green space, I cannot support this policy.

Each neighbourhood has its own identity, needs, and challenges—yet this policy does not reflect sufficient flexibility or local responsiveness. Instead, it applies broad-brush housing and development targets without addressing key issues.

#### **If you think there are any reasonable alternatives to Policy approach HSP S2, please detail these below.**

Listen to community members

#### **If you have any further comments on the Spatial Framework, please provide them below.**

Listen to community members

---

## CENTRES

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP C1: Network, Hierarchy and Designation of Centres?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP C2: Primary Shopping Areas?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP C3: Local Shopping Areas and Parades?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP C4: Development Involving Retail and Leisure Uses?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP C5: Markets?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP C6: Healthier Food Environments**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**If you have any further comments on the Centres chapter of the plan, please provide them below.**

---

ENVIRONMENT

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP E1: Renewable Energy Opportunities?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP E2: Critical Drainage and Water Demand?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP E3: Biodiversity?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**If you have any further comments on the Environment chapter of the plan, please provide them below.**

---

## HOMES

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP H1: Housing Type, Mix, Tenure and Affordability?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP H2: Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO)?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP H3: Gypsy, Traveller and Travelling Show-People?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP H4: Back Land and Garden Development?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**If you have any further comments on the Homes chapter of the plan, please provide them below.**

---

## **JOBS**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP J1: Existing Employment Areas?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP J2: New Employment Development?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP J3: Assessing the Loss of Employment Land or Accommodation?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP J4: The Visitor Economy?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**If you have any further comments on the Jobs chapter of the plan, please provide them below.**

---

## **PEOPLE**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PE1: Development and Healthier Environments?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PE2: Publicly Accessible Green Spaces?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PE3: Green Space Standards?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PE4: Strategic Recreation and Countryside Access?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PE5: Outdoor Sport and Recreational Facilities?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PE6: Peak District National Park?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**If you have any further comments on the People chapter of the plan, please provide them below.**

---

## **TRAVEL**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP T1: General Approach?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP T2: Trunk Road Developments?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP T3: Rail Infrastructure?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP T4: Rapid Transit?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP T5: Facilities for Buses?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP T6: Walking, Wheeling and Cycling?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP T7: Freight Movement and Deliveries?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP T8: Parking?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP T9: EV Charging Infrastructure?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**If you have any further comments on the Travel chapter of the plan, please provide them below.**

---

## **PLACES**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PL1: Archaeology and Scheduled Monuments?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PL2: Listed Buildings - Alternative Uses, Additions, Demolition and Development Within Their Setting?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PL3: Conservation Areas - Managing Development Within or Adjoining?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PL4: Historic Parks and Gardens - Managing Development?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PL5: Designated Heritage Assets - Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy Generation?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PL6: Designated Heritage Assets and Enabling Development?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PL7: Non-Designated Heritage Assets?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PL8: Landscapes, Townscape and Urban Form?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PL9: Design and Amenity?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PL10: Design of All Types of New Residential Development?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PL11: Design of Residential Additions, Alterations and Extensions?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PL12: Design of Employment Sites?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PL13: Design within Centres, Retail and Leisure Developments?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PL14: Design of Commercial Frontages?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PL15: Outdoor Sports, Recreation and Play Space?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PL16: Design and Enhancement of the Waterside?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer.**

**To what extent do you agree with Policy approach HSP PL17: Design of Public Realm and Urban Spaces?**

Strongly disagree

**Please give a reason for your answer. If there are any amendments or alternative policy approaches you would like to propose, please detail these in your response.**

**If you have any further comments on the Places chapter of the plan, please provide them below.**

---

## **POLICIES MAP AND INTEGRATED ASSESSMENT**

**A policies map has been published which shows the areas of land that relate to specific policies in this plan at this stage in the process. Future versions of Homes, Spaces, Places will have specific allocations and further designations of land linked to policies. An updated policies map will be produced at that time to identify these.**

**If you have any comments on the Policies Map, please provide these below.**

Where is the link here, to connect responses to the Map within this response opportunity? Again, another barrier to allow people to provide informed feedback. A calculated approach by TMBC to discourage responses

**An Integrated Assessment Report has been produced to accompany this plan. The Integrated Assessment identifies the potential sustainability impacts of implementing the Homes, Spaces, Places Plan.**

**Do you consider that the Integrated Assessment has adequately assessed the potential environmental, social, and economic impacts of the proposed policy approaches and strategies within the Plan?**

**Are there any sections of the Integrated Assessment that require further explanation or clarification?**

Where is the link here, to connect responses to the Assessment within this response opportunity? Again, another barrier to allow people to provide informed feedback. A calculated approach by TMBC to discourage responses