

<b>Family Name</b>	Nightingale
<b>Given Name</b>	Peter
<b>Person ID</b>	1286763
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Nightingale
<b>Given Name</b>	Peter
<b>Person ID</b>	1286763
<b>Title</b>	JPA 24: Roch Valley
<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>	I believe this policy to be unsound and unjustified and not consistent with national policy in that it would allow the development of a large green field site which is made up of meadows and pasture land and this is not consistent with the policy of using brown field sites first in preference to green field sites. There are a number of brown field sites within the town area of Rochdale which could meet most of the housing needs without needing to build on green field sites, which once built on will never be restored with the consequential detrimental impact on the environment. The land is a green space between Littleborough and Rochdale and currently supports a variety of wildlife and absorbs rainfall which prevents flooding down river. The roads in this area are already congested and trains and buses crowded at peak times. Air pollution is already above recommended levels and would rise with an increase in traffic. The nearest Metro is 4Km away and difficult to get to. There is no provision to increase public services or schools which are already under pressure. Currently we are being asked to reduce water usage due to low water levels in the reservoirs.
<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>	I would ask that this area of land be REMOVED from the Plan because for the reasons set out above it does not comply with national requirements to preserve green field spaces and make more use of brown field spaces and does not comply with the requirements of the Places for Everyone document.