

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Gillan
<b>Given Name</b>	Geoff
<b>Person ID</b>	1287504
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Gillan
<b>Given Name</b>	Geoff
<b>Person ID</b>	1287504
<b>Title</b>	Our Vision
<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>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	NA
<b>Family Name</b>	Gillan
<b>Given Name</b>	Geoff
<b>Person ID</b>	1287504
<b>Title</b>	Our Strategic Objectives
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Our strategic objectives - Considering the information provided for our strategic objectives, please tick which of these objectives your written comment refers to:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Meet our housing need</li> <li>2. Create neighbourhoods of choice</li> <li>3. Ensure a thriving and productive economy in the districts involved</li> <li>4. Maximise the potential arising from our national and international assets</li> <li>5. Reduce inequalities and improve prosperity</li> <li>6. Promote the sustainable movement of people, goods and information</li> <li>7. Ensure that districts involved are more resilient and carbon neutral</li> <li>8. Improve the quality of our natural environment and access to green spaces</li> <li>9. Ensure access to physical and social infrastructure</li> <li>10. Promote the health and wellbeing of communities</li> </ol>
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	NA

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No
<b>Family Name</b>	Gillan
<b>Given Name</b>	Geoff
<b>Person ID</b>	1287504
<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>	No
<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>There are many reasons why this development would be wrong for the immediate vicinity and local community of Bamford/Norden. This planned development is in such a well-loved, semi-rural area that taking away the amenities that it provides the local citizens, both young and old would be a tragedy that is entirely unnecessary. The paths and fields are used every day, week, month and year by local people who have access to this very popular and accessible land. To remove it from everyone takes away a much-needed space where people can ease their mental wellbeing and health. There are no other accessible paths that run close to the housing of the area, and people would have to go much further afield just to enjoy this necessary kind of open space.</p> <p>The actual layout of where the building has not been thought out, the plan says it would provide recreational facilities for the local community. but it's already there, with football pitches for the hundreds of youths that play there every day, the tennis clubs and cricket club which provides local sports facilities and of course as mentioned the outdoor semi-rural space for others, dog-walkers, bridle paths, public footpaths which all must remain in place. How can that be "replaced" with anything anywhere near as open or good as what is there? Building on this land by building unnecessary unaffordable homes is against SUSTAINABLE development and local social needs</p> <p>To quote government regulations, this site fails to comply with PfE Objectives 7, 8 and 10 and is not consistent with Chapter 8 of NPPF. This site is not justified and not consistent with national policy.</p> <p>The land itself, as all residents know is prone to flooding, where the water table is significantly high. When the new development of Claymere was built at the end of Clay lane, no new residents were told about the water table, and all the buildings were signed off as safe. In only a short time, subsidence caused many of the new buildings to shift, develop cracks and need new building work undertaken to become safe. The same applies to the whole region built on the clay that the area has underneath it. Any new building that builds over natural barriers such as trees and hedgerows will only exacerbate this and increase the risk of flooding. Once again, this site fails</p>

to comply with PfE Objective 2 and is not consistent with NPPF Chapter 14. This site is not justified, not deliverable not consistent with national policy.

We are told the infrastructure would be improved to accommodate these 450 houses, but again, where would it go? There is indeed a couple of potential roads/ lanes that could be improved upon that lead onto Norden road, but the roads at the back which lead to school lane and clay lane are entirely unfeasible to be used as the surrounding streets are not large enough to cope with the anticipated increase in traffic. Indeed, Norden road itself already has major traffic issues particularly during morning and evening times when people go to work and school. The likely increase in traffic over the years as residents grow older, and families increase in size and age would lead to an exponential increase in traffic and cars which the infrastructure cannot sustain. The talk of a one-way system is absolute nonsense and should be thrown away, as this would make matters even worse. The impact this will have to current residents will make Bamford/Norden a very unhappy society. No real thought has been given to the long term impact this will have on residents, both old and any potential new ones. Quality of life would suffer. Air quality, climate change and noise pollution would all be impacted. There are not enough shops to go to as it is. Society and long term happiness would be at risk. This site FAILS to comply with PfE Objective 7 and is not consistent with adapting to climate change, moving to a low carbon economy and NPPF Chapters 2 (para 8) and 9. This site is not justified and not consistent with national policy.

The planning talks about schools. There are some really good schools in the area, that are widely loved by almost all who go there. The current size of these schools cannot increase as many have already been improved over the years, and their intake has stabilised now to the size of current population. While a few have spaces currently this will not always be the case, and any plans for future schools in the area have not been properly thought through as there is no land big enough to accommodate the potential extra children new residential housing will bring. This site fails to comply with PfE Objective 9 and is not consistent with NPPF chapter 8 (para 95). This site is not justified and not consistent with national policy.

The plans for new housing do not bring affordable housing either. Rochdale council seems to want to increase the number of housing and residents to the town, but the town is already at a capacity where more affordable housing is required, not mid-range housing, and certainly not new housing for new residents. I would suggest that Roichdale should plan on being less of an area where the government try to rehouse people, but should respectfully suggest that southern english towns be used instead. There is already a disparity nationwide where the more new incomers come to Rochdale than comparable and more wealthy local authorities down south. We must continue to help newcomers and immigants but local people who want to remain in the area and have new families must also be a priority.

This is why curent brownfield sites should be used more to accomodate pepole, rather than use our beautiful countryside. Rochdale town centre itself has recently been improved. We must now attract newcomers to use the new facilities and transport links by using current empty brownfield sites within the town centre boundaries to attract these new residents, not further afield. Make Rochdale a town centre which bustles with current residents, where they want to shop, and work, and live life as it should be lived. The investment put into this new development needs to worth it, give a return on investment and priorities should be placed there, not in removing our essential green belt. I guess that these options have been looked into, but I'd like to see those plans more advanced and undertaken than deplete our rural areas anymore. To date i believe there are many brownfield sites which have been overlooked as it is difficult to repurpose some, but this really is a cheap way to look at things, and developers have a duty to consider these sites first.

	<p>There are no exceptional circumstances to justify building 450 executive detached houses on protected green belt land. This site fails to comply with PfE Objectives 7 and 8 and is not consistent with sustainable development and NPPF Chapter 13. Once again, this site is not justified and not consistent with national policy.</p>
<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 of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.</b></p>	<p>I consider that the only amendment to be made to this plan, is to remove JPA 19 Bamford/Norden PfE. The planning has ben unsound and only shows conseration to the profits that can be made from such a development, with NO consideration to the current community or the wider impact to lives and neighbouring infrastructure which would be detrimentally affected.</p>