

<b>Family Name</b>	Davis
<b>Given Name</b>	Michael
<b>Person ID</b>	1286998
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Davis
<b>Given Name</b>	Michael
<b>Person ID</b>	1286998
<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 proposal ignores a basic principle of the National Planning Policy Framework: ""The *fundamental* aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open"" &amp; ""On protecting the Green Belt, the NPPF urges LPAs to maximise the use of suitable brownfield sites before considering changes to Green Belt boundaries.""</p> <p>[*The _only_ way in which this plan meets such recommendations is some spurious unspecified 'improvements to the playing field areas'.]</p> <p>2. The area is NOT short of 'executive houses' - Rochdale is seriously short of 'affordable housing' and these could be met by utilising brownfield sites within the Borough. I understand that Rochdale MBC have assessed a Housing Need of 8,048 houses but has land available for 7,997.</p> <p>3. The area lies on a clay base, and will require significant infrastructure to avoid flooding (my own property REDACTED TEXT from this area and heavy rain regularly overwhelms the surface water drainage from higher up and floods our premises which United Utilities seem unable to resolve). We are dependant on this area acting as a 'sink' - concreting over for 450 executive houses will cause significant problems in dealing with the surface water, and will require significant investigation on the ability to drain surface water towards the Roch and the Ashworth Valley.</p> <p>4. Norden Road, which will be the only access to this area, already has significant traffic problems during rush hours (it's the main artery between Norden and Bury / Manchester). The result of vehicles from 450 executive houses plus their children joining this traffic flow will have a drastic effect at peak hours. (Suggested one way systems will NOT resolve anything in this regard!)</p> <p>5. The area is a significant amenity for residents of Bamford &amp; South Norden, for walking, horse-riding, and nature-watching with access to Ashworth Valley. Concreting over half the area will deprive us and our children of this.</p>

	<p>The prospect of unspecified ""improvements to the playing areas"" also carries the threat that these will be so constrained that the public will find restrictive access even to these and, therefore. cannot be used in any way as a justification for the proposal.</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>Because it goes against the whole principle of NPPF definition of Green Belt policy - to prevent urban sprawl, the only action is to remove the proposals.</p>