

<b>Family Name</b>	Smith
<b>Given Name</b>	Ryan
<b>Person ID</b>	1287481
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Smith
<b>Given Name</b>	Ryan
<b>Person ID</b>	1287481
<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>The plan is unsound for many reasons firstly, there are insufficient school places if the plan is to go ahead as there is no proposal for any additional schools and schools that are ready here are already full and cannot expand. Therefore, the site fails to comply with PFE objective nine and is not consistent with NPPF chapter 8 paragraph 95</p> <p>Furthermore, in 2019 Rochdale council declared a climate emergency, therefore building large executive homes on the greenbelt is inefficient in terms of carbon usage and emissions from vehicles. This means that the site does not support a low carbon future and instead promotes significant increase in admissions and air pollution as it will mean more carbon usage in the areas. This site fails to comply with PFE objective eight and is not consistent with NPPF chapters two, nine and 14</p> <p>The site is not justified and not consistent with national 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>	The modification we are seeking is for JPA 19 Bamford/Norden To be removed from the PFE.