

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Lloyd
<b>Given Name</b>	Barbara
<b>Person ID</b>	1287634
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Lloyd
<b>Given Name</b>	Barbara
<b>Person ID</b>	1287634
<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>	No
<b>Family Name</b>	Lloyd
<b>Given Name</b>	Barbara
<b>Person ID</b>	1287634
<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>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
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	No
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	No

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Lloyd
<b>Given Name</b>	Barbara
<b>Person ID</b>	1287634
<b>Title</b>	Our Spatial Strategy
<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>Family Name</b>	Lloyd
<b>Given Name</b>	Barbara
<b>Person ID</b>	1287634
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 7 North East Growth Corridor
<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>	My objections relate to an area that isn't featured on your map so hands off our green belt.
<b>Family Name</b>	Lloyd
<b>Given Name</b>	Barbara
<b>Person ID</b>	1287634
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 13 Strategic Green Infrastructure
<b>Type</b>	Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<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>	You are doing the opposite. Including a proposal to take green and blue places on the outer areas of Rochdale because a developer who wants to build houses wants to and it doesn't look like you care at all about protecting it and maintaining it as attractive and liveable.
<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>	Remove the use of green belt from your plans. It should not be legal or sound to include it particularly when it is a small remaining area that has already had considerable housing development.
<b>Family Name</b>	Lloyd
<b>Given Name</b>	Barbara
<b>Person ID</b>	1287634
<b>Title</b>	JP-Strat 14 A Sustainable and Integrated Transport Network
<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</b>	You are allowing plans for new build in areas where public transport and roads are overstretched. Additional housing in small areas swamps these facilities to saturation.

<b>to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	
<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>	Remove the proposal to build additional housing on green belt land in Norden and Bamford in the borough of Rochdale.
<b>Family Name</b>	Lloyd
<b>Given Name</b>	Barbara
<b>Person ID</b>	1287634
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 1 Valuing Important Landscapes
<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>	You refer to the city region. So it's ok to enhance urban city environments while taking those green and natural areas from the outer areas of Greater Manchester? Our environment doesn't matter?
<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>	Remove plans to build on green belt land in Norden and Bamford, Rochdale
<b>Family Name</b>	Lloyd

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Given Name</b>	Barbara
<b>Person ID</b>	1287634
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 2 Green Infrastructure Network
<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>	You are doing the opposite. Taking away green spaces on the false premis that housing is needed in this small area.
<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>	Remove plans to build on green belt land in Norden and Bamford, Rochdale
<b>Family Name</b>	Lloyd
<b>Given Name</b>	Barbara
<b>Person ID</b>	1287634
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 6 Urban Green Space
<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

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<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>	They are trying to make the case that sports pitches will be improved but there is no evidence that this will happen or clubs have the capacity to grow
<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>	Remove the proposal to build on green belt land on Norden and Bamford, Rochdale.
<b>Family Name</b>	Lloyd
<b>Given Name</b>	Barbara
<b>Person ID</b>	1287634
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 7 Trees and Woodland
<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>	The proposal for housing on this green let land removes the natural landscape close to Naden Brook and will disturb and destroy the existing flora and fauna of the current area and the flood plain.
<b>Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the</b>	Remove the proposal to build on green belt land on Norden and Bamford, Rochdale.

<b>plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.</b>	
<b>Family Name</b>	Lloyd
<b>Given Name</b>	Barbara
<b>Person ID</b>	1287634
<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>This proposal is not about public benefit, it is about commercial gain. Peel Holdings benefit from the profits and the Council benefit from increased Council Tax. The current residents' lives and the environment will be blighted by this proposal if it goes ahead. The local roads are overstretched now, they are the only way for Norden and Bamford residents to access Heywood and Bury and they are inadequate now. Over the last 35 years there has been extensive house building with new estates on every available tract of land, with increasingly cramped conditions without any public amenity or open green space. Conditions of the land have been ignored resulting in flooding, subsidence, deep piled houses having to be demolished and more. After public consultation and objections proposals have been removed from the plan for more housing only to be put back in later with the smoke screen of public benefit with additional access to open spaces supported by improved public transport, schools, doctors, shops when in fact houses are crammed in with no supporting infrastructure. And that's no surprise because there is no available space. I feel it's a smokescreen to say local existing sports facilities will be improved and even become of benefit across the borough to get the 450 houses built - on what basis will those clubs be able to sustain an increase in participation levels? They talk the talk but the motivation is greed, not public benefit. Face it, the cash cow that is Norden and Bamford has reached saturation. Leave it be before it falls into decline with roads, transport, parking, statutory health and education facilities all unable to cope with increasing demand and protect the remaining green belt land that we have. They are the heart and lungs of the environment and shame on everyone who looks to take them in the false name of progress when what we should be doing is protecting and conserving the ecology of the little natural environment that remains. Plans for a cemetery in the adjacent area were overturned and this latest plan has no merit at all.</p>
<b>Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to</b>	<p>The plans should be abandoned and completely removed from this section of the plan. I'm not even going to suggest scaled back in size. For all the reasons I have stated this proposal is completely unsound. It's a fantasy on paper that will not deliver the benefits it promises and which downplays the</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.</b>	detriment it will cause to the built and natural environment and the supporting infrastructure. It should not be legally compliant to build on green belt land and even if rules have been relaxed to allow it, it does not mean that it is right or the decision makers should be afraid to overturn such housing proposals and remove them from development strategies and plans - whoever it is that owns the land or puts forward the proposal - and do the right thing by protecting our green environment.
<b>Family Name</b>	Lloyd
<b>Given Name</b>	Barbara
<b>Person ID</b>	1287634
<b>Title</b>	Rochdale - Green Belt Additions
<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>	While adding new green belt areas it is wrong to take away existing areas that serve the same purpose now even though the developer is saying it won't merge the two towns of Rochdale and Bury. It's still an important part of the local community.
<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>	Remove the proposal to build on green belt land on Norden and Bamford, Rochdale.
<b>Family Name</b>	Lloyd
<b>Given Name</b>	Barbara
<b>Person ID</b>	1287634
<b>Title</b>	JP-G 10 Green Belt
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	Unsound



Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<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