

<b>Family Name</b>	Hargreaves
<b>Given Name</b>	Julie
<b>Person ID</b>	1286586
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Hargreaves
<b>Given Name</b>	Julie
<b>Person ID</b>	1286586
<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>	<p>Flooding in the area - the site has flooding every year sometimes severe. This also affects the surrounding area backing onto the new development as I know from experience that the sewers are already unfit for purpose. Whenever there is a severe storm, which are becoming more frequent, the man hole covers on Greenvale/Norford Way area have been lifted up and this causes the raw sewage to overflow into gardens and the road. On top of this the water board discharges excess water every ten minutes from the old reservoir which has also been built on.</p> <p>Wildlife - The site being next to Ashworth Valley has numerous species which I have seen in the fields including deer, foxes, rabbits, bats, hedgehogs, pheasants, bees nesting in the trees, woodpeckers, squirrels. The site also has two separate lines of pylons running through it and have been proved to be a cause of Leukaemia to children living within 50m of the lines.</p> <p>Traffic - The site is not in an accessible distant to either the Metro or local train station which means that more cars (450 plus) will be using the already crowded roads in the area. The allocation does not promote sustainable transport and will significantly increase single journeys and therefore CO2 emissions. There is already an air quality site within 150m of the site which will become much worse if this site is developed. Building large executive homes on protected green belt land is inefficient in terms of carbon usage and emissions from vehicles.</p> <p>Leisure - The site area is well used daily by walkers, cyclists and riders and destroying this is against sustainable development and local social needs. The football, cricket and tennis clubs will significantly have the likelihood of their sites being used for development in the future as the green belt protection will be removed.</p> <p>Schools - As there are no proposals to build additional schools in the area, there will not be sufficient school places available to meet local needs. The</p>

	<p>schools are already full and therefore the site fails to comply with PfE Objective 9 and is not consistent with NPPF chapter 8 (para 95).</p> <p>Leisure - The site area is well used daily by walkers, cyclists and riders and destroying this is against sustainable development and local social needs. The football, cricket and tennis clubs will significantly have the likelihood of their sites being used for development in the future as the green belt protection will be removed.</p> <p>Building - In Rochdale there is no unmet housing need across Rochdale to justify building on this site which is protected green belt land. Many brownfield sites are not included as other reasonable options and more will become available. These should be used in priority to protected green belt land. Therefore other reasonable options do exist and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify building 450 executive homes on protected green belt land. The sites inclusion means it will be built on in priority to brownfield sites due to its higher profitability. The site is one of the lowest densities in PfE and the 450 homes could be accommodated by increasing densities on brownfield sites which are nearer to existing infrastructure including the all important Metro/rail links.</p> <p>Taking all this into consideration I believe that the site fails to comply with PfE Objectives 2,7,8,9,10,11,13 &amp;14.</p> <p>The site is also not consistent with NPPF chapters 2 &amp; 2 (para 8), 8 &amp; 8 (para 95), 9, 11, 13, 14 &amp; 15.</p> <p>The 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>The modification necessary is for JPA 19 Bamford/Norden to be removed from the PfE as the site is not justified or consistent with national policy.</p>