

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Morris
Given Name	Christian
Person ID	1287300
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Morris
Given Name	Christian
Person ID	1287300
Title	Our Vision
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?	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.	The plan does not fulfil the PfE"s own objectives set out and is contrary to the NPPF.
Family Name	Morris
Given Name	Christian
Person ID	1287300
Title	JPA 19: Bamford / Norden
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?	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.

I am writing In response to the latest proposals regarding the PFE consultation and specifically the Bamford / Norden site and the proposal to steal publicly accessible greenbelt land from the local community on the pretence that this is for the benefit of everyone. I am dismayed at the entire process which if it wasn't so disgusting would be laughable.

The original spatial framework embarked on a "consultation" process which has totally ignored the concerns and issues raised by thousands of residents in the area and the latest "Places for everyone" has simply continued with exactly the same plan as before. Only Stockport has seen sense and dropped out of what was the spatial framework plan.

I have yet to meet a single person who is in favour of this development other than councillors (not of this ward) and developers.

One must ask why this development is still being put forward, and the answer is simple.....Profit!!

This cannot be an independent review and as such cannot be a legal process. This is all masterminded by those in a position to profit from the development.

450 executive detached homes on this site will generate millions of pounds in Profit for Peel Holdings the developer (the owner of which is a non resident tax exile situated in the Isle of Man) and further millions for the council in future revenues in rates bills.

Neither party have any interest in solving the housing shortage. They are only interested in low cost development and high profit returns which are contrary to the majority of the objectives set out in the PFE's own policy objectives.

Regeneration and redevelopment of brownfield sites with nearby transport links would be a far better plan which would not only improve the current town centre but would also satisfy the PFE's objectives and help to solve the shortage of housing.

The plan for this site is completely unsound and do not satisfy the PFE's own objectives so the site should be removed completely from the PFE development plan.

Specific reasons are set out as follows:

1. This is the only remaining greenbelt area left in Bamford which will strip away any previous access to greenbelt land within walking distance for the whole of the Bamford population. This particular area has seen a huge increase in the level of use during lockdown due to restrictions imposed due to Covid 19. This area has been vital for the health and well being of local residents. Destroying this greenbelt land is contrary to the PFE's own objectives 7, 8 & 10 and is not consistent with chapter 8 of the NPPF.

2. Developers have not adequately explored the development of brownfield and more centrally located sites to justify the release of greenbelt. This is purely profit led and contradicts the PFE's own objectives 7 & 8 and NPPF chapter 13.

3. Transport - There is no alternative provision for effective public transport and therefore the level of traffic on the roads in the local area will increase substantially.

a) The proposed site shows access to the 450 house development on both Norden Road and also on Furbarn Road. Furbarn Road is a single track country lane unsuitable for any increase to vehicle traffic. Stables are located within 200 yards of the proposed entrance on to Furbarn Road and horses from there and various other stables around the Ashworth valley area use this road regularly. In addition, this road is also used by cyclists, pedestrians of all ages and farm vehicles. Providing access to this road is totally unsuitable and dangerous as the volume of traffic will increase substantially

as motorists will use this exit as a cut through Ashworth Valley to circumvent the inevitable traffic congestion caused on Norden Road.

b) Executive properties will lead to at least 2 cars per dwelling if not more. The number of cars currently on drives in the local area of Bamford Way and Norford Way regularly have 4 or 5 cars located on their drives so an increase to traffic of 900 cars is an extremely conservative estimate. Notwithstanding the permanent disruption to the everyday lives of residents which are already hampered by long queues in mornings and evenings, the increase in volume of traffic will lead to heavier congestion throughout the Bamford area, along Norden and Bury Road, which in turn will lead to increase in carbon emissions and increase in pollution in the local area.

c) I understand the proposal to resolve the traffic issue is to make Norden Road a one way system. Has the council or planning not thought what a detrimental impact this will have on all the local residents if this was implemented?? This is simply a ridiculous "half baked" idea. This will substantially increase back up of traffic along Bury Road in both directions and where will all this excess traffic go to??? Simply the next junction from Norden Road which is approximately 150 yards further on at the junction of Queens Park Road and St. Michaels school. Not only does this pose increased pollution problems due to all the additional traffic, but it also poses a danger to local school children trying to get to school. There have already been several accidents along here over recent years involving motorists and children.

Clearly parts 3a) to 3c) above do nothing to satisfy the requirements of PFEs objective 7 and does nothing to assist in reducing carbon emissions which will have detrimental effect on the local area and local residents alike.

4. Schools, Doctors, Dentists and local amenities - There are already insufficient places in schools for the local population with parents needing to travel out of the local area to take children to school. 450 houses is only going to make this situation worse leading to overdemand for places and increasing traffic and associated pollution problems. In addition there is already substantial waiting times to gain access to local medical or dental attention. Most surgeries are closed to new patients and for existing residents waiting times are in the region of weeks before access can be gained to see local GPs. Dentists are even more over subscribed. There is no provision in the plan to provide access to essential services and as such this is contrary to the PFE's objective 9 and is not in line with NPPF chapter 8 paragraph 95.

5. Impact on the environment - a) In recent years due to changes in climate, the site has already been subject to flooding, not only directly in the area, but also the surge in run off water in to the river systems has caused substantial level of flooding further downstream. The removal of green belt land which acts as a huge sponge to slow down water run off will substantially increase flooding further downstream. This is of no concern to the council and developers as it would not be seen directly to be part of their problem as long as they were seen to put in drains to the local area. However, the development of the site does not comply with the PFE's own objective 2 and is also not consistent with NPPF chapter 14.

b) The area supports a vast array of local wildlife including bats, newts, badgers and deer, all of which are regularly seen by visitors to the area in the fields and along the lanes. Destruction of their habitat will lead to the loss of this wildlife. Obviously not good for the wildlife directly but also access to wildlife and human interaction is an important part of human generations living in harmony with the environment. It is therefore hard to see how the development of this site can comply with PFE objective 6. The need for housing - Statistics show that Rochdale housing demand is for 8048 places with land available for 7997 houses already. There is therefore no need to build 450 detached executive homes which will do little to solve the

requirement which is for affordable homes. The development of this site will therefore do nothing to solve the housing shortage and is purely profit lead. This is not consistent with the PFE's own objective 2 nor is it compliant with NPPF chapter 2.

7. Electricity Pylons - part of the reason we moved to the area was to move away from existing electricity pylons as my son contracted acute lymphoblastic Leukaemia which is know to be linked to electricity pylons. The site sits directly underneath national grid electricity pylons which poses a direct risk to human health. This is therefore contrary to the PFE's own objective 10 and again is against NPPF chapter 8.

8. As mentioned in previous sections the site does little to solve the housing shortage as the real need is for affordable housing. There is no lack of executive properties as can be seen as regularly advertised in the property pages or online property marketing websites such as Zoopla. At are probably £500k starting price tag, this will do little to solve the problem. Sites closer to transport hubs on brownfield sites or by redeveloping and regenerating urban areas to increase housing density could easily solve the problem to housing shortages rather than releasing greenbelt for profit. Not only would this alleviate many of the problems which would be created if the Norden/ Bamford site were to be developed it would also assist in the PFE actually meeting some of its objectives such as PFE 2 and be in line with NPPF chapters 2, 11 & 13.

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 Norden / Bamford Site - Rochdale JPA 19 should be removed completely from the proposed PFE plans. It is not justified, not compliant with PFE's own objectives and is not consistent national policy. It should therefore be removed from this consultation.