

Family Name	Gauge
Given Name	Suzanne
Person ID	1287263
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Gauge
Given Name	Suzanne
Person ID	1287263
Title	JPA 19: Bamford / Norden
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	Yes
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	Yes
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>The policy is unsound because it isn't justified nor is it consistent with national policy on adapting to climate change and moving to a low carbon economy. It fails to comply with PfE Objective 7. The proposed site will likely lead to an additional 900 cars on the local roads. There are no tram or rail links within walking distance. Norden Road and War Office Road are already highly congested, especially at peak traffic times. These plans will further exacerbate this. In addition to the traffic chaos that this development, if approved, will cause, the CO2 emissions will be significantly increased and in particular for locals living in the areas. This is wholly unacceptable, given the air quality management zone in place within 150 metres of the site and next to the local primary school.</p> <p>It is also not justified, nor is it consistent with national policy (it fails to comply with PfE Objective 9 and isn't consistent with NPPF Chapter 8 (para 95) as there is no proposal for additional schools to be constructed near to the site (existing schools are already at capacity), yet it is essential that there is adequate choice of school places available to meet local requirements.</p> <p>Finally, the site fails to comply with PfE Objectives 7 and 8, and 6 out of the 7 Site Selection Criteria and isn't consistent with sustainable development and the NPPF Chapter 13. The site isn't justified, positively prepared or consistent with national policy on Green Belt as firstly there is no unmet need across Rochdale to justify building on protected green belt land, secondly, I do not believe that the developers have fully examined all other reasonable options including brownfield sites where these 450 houses could be built, meaning that there are no exceptional circumstances in place here to justify proceeding with the construction of houses on protected green belt land. This land is used by many local people and families for recreational use for generations.</p> <p>Finally, the site fails to comply with PfE Objective 9 and isn't consistent with NPPF Chapter 14, with regards to flooding in the area. If you build on</p>

	<p>protected green belt, this will involve removing many established trees and covering over open spaces decreasing the soak away potential of the land and increasing the risk of flooding in a clay-based area which is already subject to a high degree of annual flooding.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The removal of JPA 19 Bamford/Norden from the PfE</p>