

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Ahmad
<b>Given Name</b>	Edward
<b>Person ID</b>	1287020
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Ahmad
<b>Given Name</b>	Edward
<b>Person ID</b>	1287020
<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>1) The plan wants to build on green belt which is against national policy (NPPF) Chapter 13 which requires developers to prove exceptional circumstances to do so. No such proof has been provided. There are considerable brown sites in the area and Greater Manchester which need to be used first-many are listed on the Rochdale gov site. The area is used by many for outdoor recreation and walks. Building these houses will remove this. It fails to comply with PfE Objectives 7 and 8 and 6 out of 7 Site Selection Criteria.</p> <p>2) The current Norden road will definitely not be able to cope with the additional 900 cars. The area is far from the Metro and local train stations and so residents will largely be using cars. The road already has significant traffic delays at rush hour. Air quality will also considerably decrease due to the extra traffic and removal of green belt. It therefore fails to comply with PfE Objective 7.</p> <p>3) 450 large houses means probably an extra 400 to 600 primary school children- re 2 new primary schools. No provision has been made in the plan for space and cost of building the 2 schools as the current schools in the area are already full.</p> <p>4) Parts of the site are subject to flooding, sometimes severe. I understand building on flood areas is against National Policy (NPPF chapter 14) and PfE Objective 2. Concreting over green belt will remove hedgerows and mature trees, therefore posing greater flood risk.</p>
<b>Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant</b>	JPA 19 Bamford/Norden to be removed from the PfE.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.</b>	
<b>Family Name</b>	Ahmad
<b>Given Name</b>	Edward
<b>Person ID</b>	1287020
<b>Title</b>	JPA 21: Crimble Mill
<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>1) The plan proposes to build on an area that Floods and this fact is confirmed in the policy states that it is of high risk of flooding. This is against National Policy. Protecting this site only increases the risk of flooding upstream or downstream. How long will be continue to do this and then wonder why there is more flooding This is against PfE objective 2 and not consistent with NPPF Chapter 14.</p> <p>2) The plan mention need for more school places as the local school is already full . 250 large houses probably means 150 to 200 primary school children -re a whole new school-not just a bit of extra space.</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>	JPA 21 Crimble Mill be removed from the PfE.
<b>Family Name</b>	Ahmad
<b>Given Name</b>	Edward
<b>Person ID</b>	1287020
<b>Title</b>	JPA 22: Land North of Smithy Bridge
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<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>1) The proposal is to build on greenfield site next to Hollingworth Lake. The area around the lake is a beautiful walking area with many walks leading off it. People come from surrounding areas to walk around this peaceful and beautiful green belt area. This along with 4 other proposals for the Rochdale area are removing a significant amount of the greenbelt in greater Rochdale. This is against National Policy (NPPF) Chapter 13 and fails to comply with PfE Objectives 7 and 8, and 6 out of the 7 Site Selection Criteria.</p> <p>2) The roads around the area already suffer from considerable congestion in rush hour and over the weekend as people come from far to walk around the Lake and surrounding hills. Traffic from 300 new homes is going to make this considerably worse. It will also significantly increase pollution in an area people come to relax and get fresh air. It fails to comply with PfE Objective and NPPF Chapter 2 (para 8) and 9.</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>	Remove JPA 22 from the PfE.
<b>Family Name</b>	Ahmad
<b>Given Name</b>	Edward
<b>Person ID</b>	1287020
<b>Title</b>	JPA 24: Roch Valley
<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</b>	The area is subject to flooding and has flooded a number of times over recent years. Building on this site and putting flood barriers for it only increases the risk of flooding upstream and downstream. Why, why do we continue to build on natural flood plains and then try to blame climate change for it. Let nature

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	have the resource it needs to cope with flooding. The site fails to comply with PfE objective 2 and is not consistent with NPPF Chapter 14.
<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>	JPA 24 to be removed from the PfE.
<b>Family Name</b>	Ahmad
<b>Given Name</b>	Edward
<b>Person ID</b>	1287020
<b>Title</b>	JPA 25: Trows Farm
<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>1) To build 550 new homes next to a motorway means a high pollution risk to resident and increases the traffic that will flow on the motorway and surrounding area. traffic to join the motorway is already a major issue, this will only make it worse.</p> <p>2) Removal off a farm and hence green belt is against National Policy NPPF Chapter 13 and against PfE objectives 7 and 8 and 6 out of 7 Site Selection Criteria.</p> <p>3) 550 new homes does not mean one primary school- definitely 2 if not 3 plus a huge increase in secondary school places. Considering that in greater Rochdale over 2000 new homes are being proposed this would mean at least 1 if not 2 secondary schools needed. No plans for this.</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</b>	Remove JPA 25 from the PfE

**you have identified  
above.**