

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Brammeier
<b>Given Name</b>	Nathan
<b>Person ID</b>	1287468
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Brammeier
<b>Given Name</b>	Nathan
<b>Person ID</b>	1287468
<b>Title</b>	Our Vision
<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>Family Name</b>	Brammeier
<b>Given Name</b>	Nathan
<b>Person ID</b>	1287468
<b>Title</b>	Our Strategic Objectives
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	NA
<b>Family Name</b>	Brammeier
<b>Given Name</b>	Nathan
<b>Person ID</b>	1287468
<b>Title</b>	JPA 19: Bamford / Norden
<b>Type</b>	Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<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>Greenbelt - the site doesn't comply with PFE objectives 7 and 8, and 6 out of the 7 Site selection criteria. It is not consistent with sustainable development</p> <p>There are more than sufficient brownfield and derelict sites across Rochdale that can be developed - a quick drive around and that is very easy to see (the Council is taking the easy option by choosing this site.</p> <p>Greenbelt should be protected - there are many walkers, locals and members of the public who use the greenbelt at present.</p> <p>Post pandemic the demographic of workers has clearly changed and it has become obvious that working from home is effective and productive; to that end numerous other sites will become vacant as businesses and organisations adapt to these changes and sites that are already built on can be adapted or demolished and affordable housing installed in place (the key here is the word AFFORDABLE - 450 new houses in Bamford and Rochdale two of the most affluent areas of Rochdale are not affordable to most members of the public, a cynic would think that the council has pound signs in its eyes eying up properties with higher Council tax bands to make more income....)</p> <p>Flooding - not compliant with PFE Objective 2</p> <p>Large parts of the land earmarked for flooding regularly have standing water own them and flood - a quick drive/walk past in the winter and autumn months this is abundantly clear. Building will result in the risk of flooding to already existing homes and businesses. If the land is built on where does the water go and can someone commit 100% and absolutely that there will be no flooding in the future? If there is flooding given the local residents are generally against these developments will the government and/or council agree to pick up the bill and cover any and all repair works for at least the next 200 years?</p> <p>The whole area is clay and has underground springs - hence it floods....</p> <p>Traffic - site doesn't comply with PFE objective 7</p> <p>I don't know where to start on this one. The road infrastructure is already saturated - and queuing to get out particularly during 08:00-10:00 and 15:00-18:00 on weekdays is horrendous</p> <p>There's pretty much no public transport in the area - no Metro/Tram, limited bus services and the train station is 3-4 miles away. Furthermore there is no parking at the train station and the line is not electrified so rail services are poor at the best of times.</p> <p>There are very few cycle lanes around the area so that isn't an option either 450 homes means (assuming 2 cars per home) almost 1000 more cars in the area - that is a significant increase in air pollution and traffic on already very busy roads</p> <p>Schools - not compliant with objective 9</p>

	<p>There is no senior school in the immediate vicinity and primary schools are already at capacity</p> <p>General amenities</p> <p>There are already not enough doctors or dentists in the area - our doctors surgery is 5 miles away in Milnrow as we wait times at the local surgeries are so horrendous. There are insufficient NHS dentists - I am fortunate that my NHS dentist is within a mile, my wife however is not so lucky and has to travel 6 miles to Whitworth for the dentist.</p> <p>There are insufficient other amenities - parks for children to play in, pharmacies, general stores, Newsagents, Post Offices, restaurants etc etc</p> <p>Wildlife - there is large amounts of wildlife in the area, deer are regularly seen roaming, badgers and foxes are present and there are otters along the waterways. Since the wind farm was put on Ashworth and scout moors the biodiversity wildlife wise has dropped - concreting over ever more land will not help local wildlife, nature and biodiversity</p>
<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></p>	<p>REMOVE Bamford/Norden - JPA19 from PfE, permanently. It is clear that the site does not meet the objectives or guidelines and if the plan goes ahead will have a serious detrimental effect on the local population, wildlife and the area in general.</p>