

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Eames
<b>Given Name</b>	Sharon
<b>Person ID</b>	1287473
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Eames
<b>Given Name</b>	Sharon
<b>Person ID</b>	1287473
<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 proposals relate to green belt which is protected and should not be built on.</p> <p>The land provides sports amenities which are very well used and would be a great loss to local communities and others in the wider regions.</p> <p>In addition so sports facilities the area provides valuable, scenic walking, dog exercising/training and general recreational facilities essential to the area.</p> <p>The area supports a variety of insect, bird and animal wildlife which would not be able to survive in an urban environment.</p> <p>The site is not justified and not consistent with national policy. The assessment of the flood risk for the site does not fit with reality. The site has some degree of flooding every year, sometimes severe. Removal of such a large area of grassland in favour of mainly tarmac, brick and concrete would greatly reduce the natural soak-away effect during heavy or persistent rain and increase existing flood risks.</p> <p>The removal of such a valuable recreational facility would lead to accumulations of children/youths on the streets endangering themselves to traffic and inevitably creating a nuisance.</p> <p>The Bamford Cricket and Tennis Clubs lie within the green belt zone and would become vulnerable to future developments should the greenbelt status be lost.</p> <p>Such a development would greatly exacerbate what is already a severe traffic problem during rush-hour periods. It would necessitate road access onto Bagslate Moor/Norden Road with large numbers of vehicles accessing already busy roads, increasing delays, pollution and risk of accidents.</p> <p>The site is nowhere near metro or train stations which will necessitate car usage for many journeys.</p>

Making Norden road one way would not reduce the problem it would simply create more vehicles in the tail-back as the bottleneck is created by the traffic lights at the junction with Rochdale Road and again a Queens Park Road.

The more cars in a two-lane tail back would also greatly increase the atmospheric pollution suffered by pedestrians in particular.

The site is crossed by two sets of pylons/electrical cables which have been shown to give rise to a risk of causing Leukaemia in young children.

Such a development would create a huge additional demand for school places and there is no proposal for additional schools near this site and existing schools are already full.

Housing needs in Rochdale and probably in most towns are for inexpensive, affordable properties, not "executive" houses.

Housing development should not occur on green belt land unless exceptional circumstance apply and all other options have been considered and been shown to be unsuitable. There is plenty of brownfield land in Rochdale closer to transport hubs, which could be used instead and would satisfy the greater need for affordable housing.

As other reasonable options exist and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify building 450 executive detached houses on protected green belt land.

This site is publicly accessible land protected by national planning policy and it should not be built on.

Any decision to build these "executive houses" on this green belt land would be purely based on the higher profitability of such a development in relation to affordable properties on the existing brownfield sites. It should not be allowed.

**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.**

The modification we are seeking is that JPA19 Bamford/Norden should be removed from the PfE.