

Family Name	Hill
Given Name	David
Person ID	1286556
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Hill
Given Name	David
Person ID	1286556
Title	JPA 22: Land North of Smithy Bridge
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>I believe the plans for JPA22 Land North of Smithy Bridge to be unsound for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Flooding -Areas of Littleborough and Smithy Bridge have experienced severe flooding. In 2015 Littleborough flooded with the current level of green space. It is well known that the green spaces soak up floodwater. Building 300 houses on Green Belt land will dramatically worsen this situation and expose properties in the Brown Lodge Drive and surrounding roads to flooding to a greater extent and the 2015 floods we saw will be a more regular occurrence. 2. Traffic - Most of the houses will have at least one car, possibly two. This will add at least 1000 vehicle movements per day to the roads just for this plan alone. This does not even take the other plans for Littleborough into account. When the M62 motorway is shut, much of the traffic is diverted through Littleborough via Hollingworth Road and Smithy Bridge Road causing Littleborough to be gridlocked. If these houses were to be built, the roads will be total mayhem, if emergency vehicles needed to get through they would have no chance. There are also the health risks associated with the increased traffic pollution. 3. Infrastructure - Littleborough and Smithy Bridge do not have the facilities such as Education, Health and Leisure centres to accommodate such a large increase in population. Local train stations struggle to meet the demands of the current population. 4. Need - There is no unmet housing need in Rochdale borough to justify building on greenbelt land. <p>More use should be made of existing brownfield sites closer to transport links</p> <p>The national planning policy framework states greenbelt serves five purposes:</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>(a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;</p> <p>(b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;</p> <p>(c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;</p> <p>(d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and</p> <p>(e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.</p> <p>Therefore, other reasonable options exist and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify building 300 executive houses on greenbelt and greenfield (protected open space) land.</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 modification I consider necessary is to remove JPA 22: Land North of Smithy Bridge to be removed from the PfE.</p>
<p>Family Name</p>	<p>Hill</p>
<p>Given Name</p>	<p>David</p>
<p>Person ID</p>	<p>1286556</p>
<p>Title</p>	<p>JPA 24: Roch Valley</p>
<p>Type</p>	<p>Web</p>
<p>Soundness - Positively prepared?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Justified?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Effective?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Compliance - Legally compliant?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>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>	<p>I believe the plans for JPA24 Roch Valley to be unsound for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Flooding -Areas of Littleborough and Smithy Bridge have experienced severe flooding. In 2015 Littleborough flooded with the current level of green space. It is well known that the green spaces soak up floodwater. Building 200 houses on Green Belt land will dramatically worsen this situation and expose properties in the Smithy Bridge Road and surrounding roads to flooding to a greater extent and the 2015 floods we saw will be a more regular occurrence. 2. Traffic - Most of the houses will have at least one car, possibly two. This will add at least 600 vehicle movements per day to the roads just for this plan alone. This does not even take the other plans for Littleborough into account. When the M62 motorway is shut, much of the traffic is diverted through Littleborough via Hollingworth Road and Smithy Bridge Road causing Littleborough to be gridlocked. If these houses were to be built, the roads

will be total mayhem, if emergency vehicles needed to get through they would have no chance. There are also the health risks associated with the increased traffic pollution.

3. Infrastructure - Littleborough and Smithy Bridge do not have the facilities such as Education, Health and Leisure centres to accommodate such a large increase in population. Local train stations struggle to meet the demands of the current population.

4. Need - There is no unmet housing need in Rochdale borough to justify building on greenbelt land.

More use should be made of existing brownfield sites closer to transport links

The national planning policy framework states greenbelt serves five purposes:

- (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- (c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- (d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and
- (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

Therefore, other reasonable options exist and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify building 200 executive houses on greenbelt and greenfield (protected open space) land.

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.

The modification I consider necessary is to remove JPA 24: Roch Valley to be removed from the PfE.