

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Fearon
<b>Given Name</b>	Helen
<b>Person ID</b>	1286705
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Fearon
<b>Given Name</b>	Helen
<b>Person ID</b>	1286705
<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>	No
<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 - I dont believe the housing need across Rochdale is unmet in the first instance, to justify building on this site whilst destroying protected green belt land?</p> <p>i was under the impression that Developers have to come up exceptional circumstances to build on green belt land by demonstrating they have examined all other reasonable options. These have not been examined. There are many other brownfield sites which have not been included along with so many more that will come available as the borough and the country lifts out from this pandemic, these should be used in priority to protected green belt. What about density on existing brownfield sites - that should be increased. You cannot justify under exceptional circumstance the building 450 "executive" houses on protected green belt land. I have read the PfE Objectives 7 and 8 and this site fails to comply and is not consistent with sustainable development and NPPF Chapter 13. The site is not justified and not consistent with national policy.</p>
<b>Family Name</b>	Fearon
<b>Given Name</b>	Helen
<b>Person ID</b>	1286705
<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

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<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 - I dont believe the housing need across Rochdale is unmet in the first instance, to justify building on this site whilst destroying protected green belt land?</p> <p>i was under the impression that Developers have to come up exceptional circumstances to build on green belt land by demonstrating they have examined all other reasonable options. These have not been examined. There are many other brownfield sites which have not been included along with so many more that will come available as the borough and the country lifts out from this pandemic, these should be used in priority to protected green belt. What about density on existing brownfield sites - that should be increased. You cannot justify under exceptional circumstance the building 450 "executive" houses on protected green belt land. I have read the PfE Objectives 7 and 8 and this site fails to comply and is not consistent with sustainable development and NPPF Chapter 13. The site is not justified and not consistent with national policy.</p>