

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Family Name | Martin |
| Given Name | Steven |
| Person ID | 1287335 |
| Title | Stakeholder Submission |
| Type | Web |
| Family Name | Martin |
| Given Name | Steven |
| Person ID | 1287335 |
| Title | JPA 2: Stakehill |
| Type | Web |
| Soundness - Positively prepared? | Unsound |
| Soundness - Justified? | Unsound |
| Soundness - Consistent with national policy? | Unsound |
| Soundness - Effective? | Unsound |
| Compliance - Legally compliant? | No |
| Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate? | No |
| 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 am doubtful whether the GMSF and the PfE can be considered as the same plan. It assumes that it can be legally accepted as such without making a significant rewrite. It thereby assumes that as GMSF was compliant under Reg 18 Town & Country planning regs then so is PfE.</p> <p>However the numerical additions are significant and as such substantial enough to demand that a full re write is done ad a fresh application should be made to pass Reg 18. It thus makes the current plan illegal and should not be put before the Government.</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>The plan predicts housing need based on data supplied in 2014. This was already out of date and should been re-assessed using the latest (2018) ONS population predictions.</p> <p>Even these figures should only be considered when the effects of Brexit and Covid are taken into account</p> <p>There is significant concern about the consistency and validity of the calculations of housing need and supply as calculated using the Government's standard methodology over the plan period. It appears that a very high buffer has been added to provide flexibility.</p> <p>The numbers in the first proposal were 500 new homes so why has this now jumped to 1680?</p> <p>The Council has adopted a buffer of 16% as against a national policy of between %5 - 10%.</p> <p>The plan also uses an occupancy rate of just over one person per household as opposed to the predicted figure of 2.73</p> <p>There is also significant uncertainty about housing needs, patterns of work and economic growth in the future following the Covid pandemic, Brexit and the urgent need to adapt to climate change. The PfE plan</p> |

itself states: ' it is recognised that the country is still in a state of flux'.

The prediction over the plans period would be that a natural growth in the area would result in approx. 60 new builds.

1680 new homes would treble the size of this community dwarfing it in one fell swoop, yet the National Planning Policy Framework states, ' existing settlements and pockets of housing are taken fully into account through the master planning of the area'

Rochdale Council has claimed there is a Climate Emergency yet they now plan to build on greenbelt land and introduce more vehicles into the area. The existing traffic through the village is already overloaded and when there is the re direction of traffic from the nearby M62, which is regular, then it is nothing but gridlocked.

The state of the road itself is poor and three sites, Thorham Lane, the slip road onto the roundabout and opposite Hopwood college consistently flood. There will only be increased fumes and a raising of the areas carbon footprint.

Throughout the last 18 months this area of field and footpaths has been a lifeline to many within Slattocks and from surrounding areas as they continued to cope with the stresses brought about by the Covis pandemic. It has brought people out to share the countryside and the health and wellbeing that it has provided cannot be underestimated.

As the Governments Minister for Housing and development recently stated, Green belt should only be used in exceptional circumstances. I do not see any exceptional circumstances in this proposal and all applications should be made to use brownfield sites first. A planning and policy review should be carried out every set period to re asses strategies rather than take everything out in on major overhaul