

Family Name	Aylmer-Shanks
Given Name	James
Person ID	1287128
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Aylmer-Shanks
Given Name	James
Person ID	1287128
Title	JPA 22: Land North of Smithy Bridge
Type	Web
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 locality assessment has been undertaken using flows forecast from the GMVDM. Whilst this model is acceptable at a Greater Manchester level, the evidence supplied does not show how well the model is calibrated and validated for use in Rochdale or in Littleborough which is on the edge of Greater Manchester. Further evidence should be provided to show that the GMVDM is fit for purpose.</p> <p>The model results show that the Smithy Bridge Road / Wildhouse Lane junction operates over capacity. Mitigation was "considered" at this location due to the performance of the junction. In table 8 it states that the results were comparable at this location? There is no evidence to explain what this means, but no mitigation is taken forward. Why has no mitigation been put forward at this location.</p> <p>The likely biggest impact of this site is the relocation of the 300 space car park. There are no details on where this car park might be relocated and it is not included in the assessment. How can a sound evidence base be formed without testing the relocation of this car park?</p> <p>The "A58 residential relief road" is mentioned as a potential supporting measure. This route is also likely to be impact on Smithy Bridge Road but no evidence is provided. Do RBC have a supporting Transport Strategy to understand the impact on Smithy Bridge Road which is particular concern given it's proximity to Smithy Bridge Primary School and the sub-standard footways along Smithy Bridge Road between the Level Crossing and the Smithy Bridge Road / Wildhouse Lane mini-roundabout.</p>
Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the	<p>Background information on the locations of count data used to calibrate and validate the GMVDM should be shared.</p> <p>The impact of the change in location of the lake car park should be considered in the assessment.</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.	<p>RBC should consider the impact of the A58 residential relief road as part of the development of a transport strategy for the area.</p> <p>Further information should be provided to understand why mitigation is not provided at the Smithy Bridge Road / Wildhouse Lane mini-roundabout.</p>
Family Name	Aylmer-Shanks
Given Name	James
Person ID	1287128
Title	JPA 24: Roch Valley
Type	Web
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 locality assessment has been undertaken using flows forecast from the GMVDM. Whilst this model is acceptable at a Greater Manchester level, the evidence supplied does not show how well the model is calibrated and validated for use in Rochdale or in Littleborough which is on the edge of Greater Manchester. Further evidence should be provided to show that the GMVDM is fit for purpose.</p> <p>The model results show that the Smithy Bridge Road / Wildhouse Lane junction operates over capacity. Mitigation was "considered" at this location due to the performance of the junction. In table 8 it states that the results were comparable at this location? There is no evidence to explain what this means, but no mitigation is taken forward. Why has no mitigation been put forward at this location.</p> <p>The "A58 residential relief road" is mentioned as a potential supporting measure. This route is also likely to be impact on Smithy Bridge Road but no evidence is provided. Do RBC have a supporting Transport Strategy to understand the impact on Smithy Bridge Road which is particular concern given it"s proximity to Smithy Bridge Primary School and the sub-standard footways along Smithy Bridge Road between the Level Crossing and the Smithy Bridge Road / Wildhouse Lane mini-roundabout.</p>
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.	<p>Background information on the locations of count data used to calibrate and validate the GMVDM should be shared.</p> <p>The impact of the change in location of the lake car park should be considered in the assessment.</p> <p>RBC should consider the impact of the A58 residential relief road as part of the development of a transport strategy for the area.</p> <p>Further information should be provided to understand why mitigation is not provided at the Smithy Bridge Road / Wildhouse Lane mini-roundabout.</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Aylmer-Shanks
Given Name	James
Person ID	1287128
Title	Supporting Evidence
Type	Web
Redacted comment on supporting documents - Please give details of why you consider any of the evidence not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	<p>Details of the location of counts used in the calibration and validation of the GMVDM have not been provided. As the GMVDM is a Greater Manchester wide model there are likely to be areas in the model which are not as strong. The locality assessments should provide a breakdown of the local count data used in the model for that locality and the model calibration and validation results at those sites should be shared. With out this information the strength of the evidence cannot be verified.</p>