

<b>Family Name</b>	Friel
<b>Given Name</b>	Desi
<b>Person ID</b>	1286186
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Friel
<b>Given Name</b>	Desi
<b>Person ID</b>	1286186
<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>	The site is not compliant with PfE objectives 7 and 8. We have National Policies in place with which JPA19:Bamford/Norden do not comply. The need to consider the impact on climate change and air quality; ( see NPPF Chapters 2 (paragraph 8) and 9), appears to have been completely ignored and is not compliant with National Policy. The natural environment and the massive local amenity value of the existing site will be permanently degraded and is not compliant to NPPF Chapter 9. Local services, including schooling, medical care, and transport are already stretched to the limit and the plan does not provide for any necessary additional services contrary to PfE Chapter 7 and NPPF Chapters 2 and 9. This specific plan does not comply with National directives in respect of "affordable" housing . Rochdale has ample housing and the target area for this expansion already has a large number of properties for sale. Once again, the plan does not comply with PfE chapter 2 nor with NPPF chapter 7. Alternative sites (brownfield for example), do not appear to have been sufficiently explored and therefore do not feature to the degree necessary to comply with PfE Objective 2 and NPPF chapters 2, 11 and 13.
<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>	It is staggering that we appear to be functioning within two completely different sets of rules and guidelines; each one contradicting the other. Thoughtless planning which is an embarrassment to those responsible, needs to be put under the spotlight and amended to a point of coherence. Where it is evident that National Policy is being ignored (please see above), and that rational guidelines are either distorted or subverted, we have a duty of care to ensure that policies (both local and national), do not become a contradictory laughing stock and that we do not stand accused of flouting the rules for the financial gain of private developers. In short, the site is not justified and is definitely not consistent with National policy. If this development is allowed to proceed, it will do so with a willful disregard to common sense and established democratic process.