

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Pockney
Given Name	Anthony
Person ID	1286254
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Pockney
Given Name	Anthony
Person ID	1286254
Title	Our Vision
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
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>The vision is based on an unsound housing need for the Borough. The estimates are too high. Furthermore, given the COVID pandemic, needs have changed and should be reassessed in the borough, Greater Manchester area and country.</p> <p>The vision is based on the destruction of the greenbelt (albeit balanced by some devious reclassification of parkland to greenbelt. This would appear to be unnecessary if i/ the housing need is reassessed ii/ a brownfield first policy is strictly adopted. The Government is trying to amend planning law at this time to reinforce Brownfield first adoption.</p> <p>The vision does not adequately utilise rail and bus corridors to places of work, and therefore will create further traffic on roads, congestion and pollution, contrary to carbon neutral principles.</p> <p>The vision envisages housing to be built in areas of flood risk, or when change of use will create further risk of flooding due to water run off.</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>Modifications include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reassess actual housing need in UK, Greater Manchester, Borough and ward 2. Adopt Brownfield first across the whole plan before any Green belt is touched 3. Assess direct and indirect flood risk 4. Build rail and tram infrastructure ahead of housing to avoid creating pollution and congestion
Family Name	Pockney
Given Name	Anthony

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Person ID	1286254
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?	NA
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 have already set out about my reasons for objection to the overall vision, in terms of housing need, use of greenbelt, lack of joined up infrastructure, impact on the environment.</p> <p>This development appears to be a land grab by greedy developers to raid greenbelt land and to build premium homes and maximise profit.</p> <p>The development does not comply with a brownfield first strategy and will build non-essential homes. They are the wrong type of home in the wrong place.</p> <p>There is no tram or train infrastructure in the area, so car use will be essential. This is inconsistent with climate policy and will create pollution and congestion onto already busy roads.</p> <p>The land is subject to flooding. Building work in past years has already created a flood problem to some of the properties on Norden Road though displacement of water. This will only increase as huge areas of water absorption are removed and replaced by concrete and tarmac. Jowkin Lane also regularly has a small stream down it. This will only get worse.</p> <p>The sports fields on the site, will lose greenbelt designation, removing future protection and allowing building for a future phase.</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.	The Bamford / Norden development should be removed from the plan
Family Name	Pockney
Given Name	Anthony
Person ID	1286254
Title	JPA 21: Crimble Mill
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>It is a great shame that Crimble Mill has not been maintained. I would welcome a compliant plan to restore the mill, to give it life through residential and hospitality offerings and to tidy a beautiful river valley for the residents and visitors to the area.</p> <p>However, this plan is unsound.</p> <p>I have already set out about my reasons for objection to the overall vision, in terms of housing need, use of greenbelt, lack of joined up infrastructure, impact on the environment.</p> <p>Specifically, the Crimble site is unsuitable as proposed for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access to the site for construction and for future residents and visitors to the site cannot be via the single track bridleway to the north of Crimble Mill (access to Bamford). The lane is too narrow, it has a bend that is impossible for larger traffic, and has no room for passing. REDACTED TEXT we have already suffered over the years, articulated lorries becoming stuck and having to be recovered, cars and vehicles being stuck in snow and icy weather, emergency vehicles not being able to access residents. In addition the traffic will result in loss of a well used bridleway and walking path rendering it too dangerous for non-driving users. The lane cannot be widened to resolve these issues 2. The mill and surrounding yard are prone to flooding, from water ingress from the lodges at the rear of the property and from waters bursting the banks of the river. The river flooding impact is highly likely to be worse if the Crimble fields are build on with nowhere for the surface water to go than down into the river. This will back up the water into the mill, onto the bridges and the access road 3. The bridge is considered to be unsound for use by heavier and denser traffic. Crimble residents have guaranteed access across this bridge in our deeds which must be maintained. The bridge is required for alternative emergency access by emergency services to the properties. If the mill is to go ahead, it is the only logical access point for the site. Of course the road will need significant development to make it viable 4. If the mill development is considered unsound or financially unjustifiable, then the Crimble greenbelt development must not go ahead, as is can be, at best a reciprocal deal with developers for the whole Crimble development. 5. If the development were to go ahead and access granted to the north of Crimble Lane our privacy and seclusion would be significantly impaired and our homes impacted with noise, pollution and subject to danger from overuse. <p>The Crimble greenbelt development is unsound as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is unnecessary given actual housing need 2. It is not a brownfield first development 3. It is in an area impacted by flooding, and additional development will impact the flooding 4. It is in an area with mines and likely to be subject to subsidence

	5. There is no public transport access to tram and rail and will therefore encourage more car travel creating pollution and impacting the environment
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 Mill development should be reassessed as a standalone project, with access via the Heywood end of Crimble Lane, and access restricted to the lane to the north, but access guaranteed for Lower Crimble residents The Crimble Greenbelt development should be removed from the plan.