

Family Name	Fieldhouse
Given Name	Steven
Person ID	1286793
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Fieldhouse
Given Name	Steven
Person ID	1286793
Title	JPA 21: Crimble Mill
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>First, I object on Allocation 21: Crimble Mill, not Allocation 22: Crimble Mill (you appear to have issues of a typographical nature?)</p> <p>I have been a resident of the Crimble Mill area for the last two decades, and have been a resident of Heywood, since my birth in the town, over fifty years ago.</p> <p>I strongly object to the development and the soundness of the proposals and I outline these below</p> <p>Soundness</p> <p>I am perplexed as to how you will grade the soundness of this proposal. It is inconsistent with so very many of the PfE Objectives. This proposed development goes against the soundness of the plan and seems to contradict itself so often, chiefly: -</p> <p>PfE Objectives 7 and 8 (greenbelt) and is inconsistent with sustainable development and NPPF Chapter 13.</p> <p>PfE Objective 7, traffic and is inconsistent with adapting to climate change/low carbon economy and NPPF Chapter 2 (para 8 and 9).</p> <p>PfE Objective 9, schools and is inconsistent with NPPF chapter 8 (para 95).</p> <p>PfE Objective 2, flooding and is inconsistent with NPPF Chapter 14.</p> <p>PfE Objective 10, pylons and is inconsistent with NPPF Chapter 8.</p> <p>PfE Objectives 7, 8 and 10, leisure and is inconsistent with NPPF Chapter 8.</p> <p>PfE Objective 2, local housing and is inconsistent with NPPF Chapter 2.</p> <p>PfE Objective 8, climate change and is inconsistent with NPPF Chapters 2, 9 and 14.</p> <p>PfE Objective 8, nature/wildlife and is inconsistent with NPPF Chapter 15.</p>

PfE Objective 2, building density and is inconsistent with NPPF Chapters 2, 11 and 13.

Access

The only access to the mill development that is tied to the remainder of the development is via a single track Bridle Way (PROW) on Crimble Lane from Bury Road.

The lane is narrow, very steep and unsuitable for vehicular access. Horses and Riders regularly utilise this PROW.

Rain water regularly rushes down it when we have bad weather.

Cars would be unable to access the mill using the Rochdale Road East end of Crimble Lane as the bridge is noted in the plan as a foot bridge.

This bridge is in a flood zone and floods when the river levels become too high after persistent rain.

Local housing need

Rochdale MBC currently has a Local Housing Need of over eight thousand.

With the available land for just under the same number.

The Local Authority has no unmet housing need to justify building the additional houses on greenbelt land across the borough.

There is no acute shortage of the types of houses of the proposed development required in the borough.

Greenbelt

The proposed area of land is green belt and is used and enjoyed by me, my friends and thousands of families, dog walkers and walking groups.

All Souls"has a Forest School area which backs on to the field and they teach the children about nature.

Since the pandemic the area has been used more by the local community as a place to escape and regain some mental health stability.

Reclassifying the existing parkland area of Queens Park does not balance out the statistics, and the loss to greenbelt is significant to Heywood.

The Local Authority needs to develop on the acres"worth of land that is brownfield.

Social Impact

The building of these houses will hugely impact local people.

My home in REDACTED TEXT shakes when large vehicles travel along REDACTED TEXT.

Years of building noise and disruption, pollution from the extra traffic, the loss of open spaces will take its toll on mental health.

The building of new houses may reduce the value of my home.

I should not be forced by the Local Authority to pursue a civil claim in the event my home becomes damaged because of even more building works.

School

All Souls Primary school children have suffered from nearly two years broken schooling because of the pandemic.

Should this unsound development go ahead, their learning will be further negatively impacted by the consistent noise.

The school is single form entry school with significant issues with parking problems.

If the school needs to increase to a two form entry school, traffic will increase and the risk to children"s safety will increase.

Local schools in the immediate vicinity are already full.

Doctors/Dentists

The proposal will place even more pressure on an already depleted resource of doctors and dentists.

Adding hundreds more people will inevitably mean more delays to treating people.

Transport

There are no solid nor sound plans with which to mitigate the increase in traffic across this part of the development. a bus service to Rochdale and Bury, this side of Heywood has poor transport links for anyone wishing to travel without a car. The nearest train station is in Castleton and to get to Manchester by bus involves walking a mile into Heywood Centre to catch one. The trams from Rochdale into Manchester take an hour and is not a viable method of transport from this area. Anyone wishing to work in Manchester and live in the new houses will need transport - probably a car, that will mean more traffic into our area.

Ground conditions

The proposed land contains mine shafts, and lies along geological fault lines and also includes flood zones.

Part of the upper field regularly floods and deposits water into the adjoining school grounds.

The River Roch frequently bursts the banks along the proposed development.

Building any homes on this land will result in a significant increase in CO2, right from the building works through to the daily use of the homes and transport to-and-from places of work/worship.

The Local Authority declared a Climate Emergency in July 2019 - building homes of this type seems counter-intuitive and again, is unsound.

I recognise that there is a need for additional revenue for the Local Authority as well as additional homes for people. The Local Authority should reassess its plans for destroying greenfield, by developing only brownfield sites.

Additionally, more diligence and openness needs to be investigated into the financial affairs and declaration of interests of all those involved in this proposal.

I do not believe that the proposal by Rochdale MBC is sound, on the above bases. I worry about the sustainability of the proposed development and the irrevocable negative impact, that this will have on the nature in the area as well as the people who use it.

Many thanks

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.

I am not qualified to provide you with the responses to this question. I believe that is the job of the local authority, their planners and also the applicable laws.

However, I can provide my opinion =

Go and build on brownfield land - we all know that it's more expensive for the developers, but the Local Authority will get what it wants eventually that is more revenue. Ask yourselves this question: in the long run, do you want to be the ones who are to blame for concreting over greenfield?

I hope whatever decisions you make, you are happy with and consider the impact to the generations to follow.