

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Forman
<b>Given Name</b>	Peter
<b>Person ID</b>	1286552
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Forman
<b>Given Name</b>	Peter
<b>Person ID</b>	1286552
<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>	NA
<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>There can be no justification for building 450 executive houses in this area, people occupying these properties would likely work outside of Rochdale, there are only three roads that cross the river, already they are gridlocked, surely planners would be seeking to increase public transport to this area if it went ahead, as this is unlikely the increased commute would cause congestion and also increase air pollution affecting people's health, it would make more sense to develop Brownfield sites nearer to transport hubs.</p> <p>The additional number of school age children can not be coped with in the area all the current schools are over subscribed, why no plans for this? In all probability many of children would have to be educated put of town (again increasing traffic congestion)</p> <p>HEALTH. Where are all these proposed inhabitants going to access healthcare?? There are no Health Centres in this area to cope with this demand.</p> <p>I also should point out that building and concreting will significantly increase the risk of flooding, we have already seen evidence of this on Norford way due to many of the original properties being over developed.</p> <p>This recent pandemic has shown the importance of exercise in maintaining people's mental health, if this plan goes ahead it will affect playing fields and green areas which many people use for recreational purpose</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</b>	I consider that the best option would be to remove JPA19 Bamford/Norden from the PFE

**of any legal compliance  
or soundness matters  
you have identified  
above.**