

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Green
<b>Given Name</b>	Geoffrey
<b>Person ID</b>	1287208
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Green
<b>Given Name</b>	Geoffrey
<b>Person ID</b>	1287208
<b>Title</b>	JPA 2: Stakehill
<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>Unsound because:-</p> <p>There are substantial differences between GMSF and Pfe</p> <p>Insufficient consideration has been given to the consequences of building 1,680 dwellings on the site and discharging all its traffic onto Rochdale/Manchester Rd.</p> <p>Until the link with car ownership is broken, traffic will increase onto an already busy road both morning and evening with the potential for gridlock caused by between 1,600 and 3,00 additional cars each way in the rush hours.</p> <p>The suggestion of a station at Slattocks is in my opinion pie-in-the-sky. The suggested locations at the golf club end of the development would make walking impractical and there would need to be a park-and-ride scheme with consequent parking areas found.</p> <p>The development would despoil the visual amenity and an area of valuable agricultural land forever. The replacement green belt behind Cardinal Langley is irrelevant as this is already open agricultural land.</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>The development should be removed from the Pfe as Rochdale already has adequate provision for housing up to 2037 using brownfield sites and those already allocated.</p> <p>Removing it would prevent - if the new planning proposals are adopted - automatically approved developer-led projects steamrolling over the wishes of the local community.</p>