

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Rawlinson
Given Name	Linsey
Person ID	1286780
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Rawlinson
Given Name	Linsey
Person ID	1286780
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?	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>Health - The plans do not include any local investment in the existing health care structure in order to expand this to meet the needs of 1000s of new homes/residents. This contravenes the safety element and is irresponsible developing.</p> <p>Rochdale had their local hospital beds decimated in 2002-2012. Rochdale now left with minimal 22 inpatient beds at Rochdale Infirmary; and only an Urgent Care Centre, which already has extended waiting times. For an Accident and Emergency Department Rochdale residents are expected to travel to the neighbouring towns. These same towns are planned to receive 1000s of new family homes with multiple residents.</p> <p>Rochdale residents also already have to travel to either Oldham or North Manchester for maternity services, of which these are already stretched to capacity. How will these health provisions manage with 1000s more houses being built? The houses are aimed at families who will be using the maternity services which do not exist in Rochdale. Each proposed new development around Bury, Rochdale, Oldham, Heywood and Middleton will be accessing the same healthcare provisions.</p> <p>No further investment in emergency ambulance services. The ambulance services are already travelling around GM from Rochdale to Stockport, getting stuck at A and Es as they are at capacity and already extremely stretched with long waits for 999 calls.</p> <p>No investment in GP surgeries. I feel that this is irresponsible developing condemning the residents of Rochdale to poor healthcare provision, impacting upon lives.</p> <p>No children's inpatient services, the closest paediatric beds are NMGH or Oldham, then Manchester.</p> <p>GM is only arguably, managing/struggling now with the number of residents.</p>

No increase in Dental provision is planned locally. (Contravening Objective 3 and 5)

Schools - Local schools are presently struggling to accommodate the numbers of young people in Rochdale now, never mind with 1000s of extra homes. There are children travelling from Littleborough to the other side of the Town in order to access a High School.

Greenbelt - The building upon the fields at Crimble/Bamford is not justified in point PfE Objective 7. There has been no demonstration of sustainable development, no evidence of sourcing brownfield sites. There will be a huge increase in pollution from traffic and CO2 emissions.

The local area of Crimble should be made an historical area. The access roads are not suitable for access for 400+ houses on the fields at Crimble from the Rochdale Road East End nor the northern end onto the A58..

The plans for the conversion of the Mill at Crimble are so sketchy that it can only be presumed that the conversion is not truly intended to be going to go ahead. There are detailed plans of number of houses on the fields but no details of number of apartments which the Mill will house. From speaking to local Councillors (who voted the plans through) they cannot tell me how many apartments are proposed to be in the Mill building. Nor how it will be safely accessed by emergency services.

Crimble Lane from the North is a privately owned road with right of way from north to south, in vehicles, only officially legally allowed by residents of Crimble hamlet.

The use of the north part of Crimble Lane for the proposed development, contravenes the Historic Environment Assessment by Salford University reports 2020 which states that the Lane to the north should not be changed in anyway. The residents of Crimble Cottages should not be exposed to increased traffic, pollution and inconvenience due to changes of the Mill/greenbelt fields. The Cottages were built prior to the Mill being built and the effects of any changes to the locality should consider these residents. The north side of Crimble Lane could not cope with the increased amount of traffic to the Mill for potential residents, Any vehicles accessing the site during the renovation stage would not be able to access the Mill from this north side. Nor could any emergency vehicles access the site from the north. The corner near Lower Crimble is far too narrow to get an ambulance round. In the past long wheel-base taxis have become wedged, ambulances, fire engines etc, vehicles being lost looking for the mill have needed to be dragged backwards up the hill by rescuing agricultural vehicles. The north of Crimble Lane close to the barn has land boundaries making the lane only approx. the width of a car to allow passage along the Lane, There are very minimal passing places along Crimble Lane with some of the upright stones being of listed nature.

Walkers and horses use the footpath and bridleway on Crimble Lane and due to the steep incline/decline, blind corners on the Lane would be hazardous if large numbers of vehicles would begin to pass.

There would be queues along the whole Lane with nowhere to turn around.

Previous planning developments for the Crimble Restaurant to increase their function room capacity were historically declined due to the Lane capacity.

The frequent farm traffic at the north end of Crimble Lane both mechanical and farm animals ie herding of cows. This would cause complete blockage of the lane at the north end during rush hours of traffic from the new complex.

This Lane is only single track width and there are very limited passing places. The surface of the Lane should not be changed as this is first and foremost a bridleway going back to the 1600s. Is steep in incline with the rough surface preventing horses slipping when descending.

The layout of the road is not suitable, there are blind corners, no lighting and a bridleway where caution must be used to pass along during daytime hours and is extremely hazardous in the dark. This Lane is not suitable for 100s of cars to pass through.

The upright stone sides to the Lane are listed stones as per The Historical Environmental report Report No 2020/82 which further notes that the majority of the hedgerows are also protected along the north aspect of Crimble Lane and should not be changed as this would alter the whole character of the valley.

There is a corner on Crimble Lane close to the Cottages at Lower Crimble where larger vehicles cannot pass around. Larger vehicles using Crimble Lane accidentally are frequently getting stuck at this area and needing to call agricultural vehicles to drag them back up the hill, causing even more damage to the Lane. The vehicles then need to use the private driveway of the cottage to turn around. If this privately owned area was gated off, the width of the Lane left would make it impassible for even smaller cars.

Emergency vehicles ie fire engines and ambulances have in the past got stuck on this corner and access can only be achieved in an emergency up the hill.

Unsure how the access to the Mill development from the north, is being proposed to be used when the Council in an email themselves describe it as an unadopted, privately owned road, with access to the public in vehicles only legal for approx 200 meters from the very northern side.

There needs to be consideration to the already residents of Crimble. This is a tiny historical hamlet of cottages which were in existence prior to the building of Crimble Mill. The residents have a legal right of way from the Bury Road A58 down to the exit onto Rochdale Road East. The bridge which is being proposed to be a footbridge is a legal right of way to the Crimble residents. If any of the proposed developments were to go ahead the legal access along Crimble Lane would need to be carefully considered.

The historical environment report also notes that the front of the Mill should not be used for vehicular access due to being category 3 flooding area. (Contravening your Objective 2.)

The local proposed development in Bamford would also impact upon this area and potentially make it a thoroughfare cut through road from Bamford to the motorway.

Crimble fields are underpinned by mineshafts. Reports that a local farmer in the 80s lost some cows through the field due to mineshafts.

Crimble fields are on a flood plain this can be evidenced most days and with heavy rainfall the fields are completely flooded. (contravening Objective 3)

For a small village such as Bamford, the roads are not suitable for such a huge influx of new housing with approx increase in 1000s cars each morning and evening passing through. The roads are already gridlocked in rush hours. increasing pollution. No increase in public transport is planned. (Contravening Objective 7)

Concerns regarding the validity of the legal process of the planning getting to the stage of which it is at.

Other areas in the UK are investing in maintaining green spaces and planting new trees. Rochdale Council seem to be obsessed with building on greenbelt rather than using brownfield sites.

The whole economy has changed post-Covid, there are many more offices sites and brownfield sites which could be used rather than building on Greenbelt.

Taken as a whole this plan means that there will be new building from Hopwood 900+ houses, Mutual Mill 200+, Crimble fields 250+, Crimble Mill

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>unsure of number as there are no definite numbers! plans too sketchy Councillors mention 150, Bamford 450+, Castleton 1000. How can a small area absorb these influxes and still have functioning safe facilities, road networks and health provision.</p> <p>(All aspects of the development appear to completely contravene the Objectives from 1-10)</p> <p>I would be very interested to know what the actual housing need is in Rochdale. My understanding is that the calculated need is 550 houses per year for Rochdale. there are housing developments going on all the time with numerous at the present time and this is before the PFE begins!</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>Rights of way through Crimble need to be carefully considered..</p> <p>Why does justification or modifications need to occur. This is worded as though the plans will not be altered or scrapped but that it will happen whatever just by the changing of certain elements!</p>
Family Name	Rawlinson
Given Name	Linsey
Person ID	1286780
Title	Our Strategic Objectives
Type	Web
Our strategic objectives - Considering the information provided for our strategic objectives, please tick which of these objectives your written comment refers to:	<p>1. Meet our housing need</p> <p>2. Create neighbourhoods of choice</p> <p>5. Reduce inequalities and improve prosperity</p> <p>7. Ensure that districts involved are more resilient and carbon neutral</p> <p>8. Improve the quality of our natural environment and access to green spaces</p> <p>9. Ensure access to physical and social infrastructure</p> <p>10. Promote the health and wellbeing of communities</p>
Soundness - Positively prepared?	NA
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
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	<p>The proposals are not accessible to individuals without internet, or people with disabilities as the plans were only available to read in the public libraries.</p> <p>Concerns regarding the validity of the process to have reached this point.</p> <p>The plans put up in public were difficult to access.</p> <p>Plans difficult to access for individuals throughout the pandemic.</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	It feels that there is a reason Stockport withdrew themselves from the plans. The Greenbelt boundaries have already been changed prior to the public consultation. Making parks greenbelts. Arguably these spaces would never have been built on anyway. Manipulation of the greenbelt acreage.
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 Plan needs to re-start at the beginning post Covid and reconsider the areas where brown field sites are now available. Begin the process from the beginning with full public consultation.
Family Name	Rawlinson
Given Name	Linsey
Person ID	1286780
Title	Our Spatial Strategy
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
Family Name	Rawlinson
Given Name	Linsey
Person ID	1286780
Title	JP-Strat 1 Core Growth Area
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
Family Name	Rawlinson

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Given Name	Linsey
Person ID	1286780
Title	JP-Strat 2 City Centre
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
Family Name	Rawlinson
Given Name	Linsey
Person ID	1286780
Title	JP-Strat 12 Main Town Centres
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
Family Name	Rawlinson
Given Name	Linsey
Person ID	1286780
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

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
Family Name	Rawlinson
Given Name	Linsey
Person ID	1286780
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>Crimble element</p> <p>From the plans of the proposed development within Crimble. I am in favour of the Mill being developed as at the present time it is an eyesore in the beautiful surrounds of Crimble. It is a noise pollutant and an environmental pollutant as it stands and is like a reclamation yard. The building is of historic interest but is sadly being left to decay.</p> <p>The plans for the Mill do not state the number of houses within the Mill site. One plan states that the Mill will be accessed only via a pedestrian bridge from the South side of Crimble Lane across the river. At the present time this is a vehicle access bridge. The Cottages of the residents have right of way through the Mill yard and across the present vehicle bridge. If the right of way was to be taken, then the residents should be compensated. If a vehicle bridge is instated, then it is impractical for 250 plus another possible 150 houses to use the north side of Crimble Lane. The access to the Mill as proposed from the North side off Bury Road, is single track, bridleway, of steep incline and so it would be problematic for a smoother surface to be applied to the Lane surface bearing in mind the use of Bridleway. The Lane is owned privately in strips with landowners.</p> <p>In reference to the Report conducted by Salford University 2020 Historic Environment Assessment, this report states that most of the hedgerows along Crimble Lane are of environment and historical significance and should not be changed due to changing the character of the valley and locality.</p> <p>The residents of Crimble Cottages should not be exposed to increased traffic, pollution and inconvenience due to changes of the Mill. The Cottages were built prior to the Mill being built and the effects of any changes to the locality should consider these residents. The north side of Crimble Lane could not cope with the increased amount of traffic to the Mill of residents, Any vehicles accessing the site during the renovation stage would not be able to access the Mill from this side. Nor could any emergency vehicles access the site from the north. The corner near Lower Crimble is far too narrow to get an ambulance round. In the past long wheel-base taxis have become wedged, ambulances, fire engines etc, vehicles being lost looking for the mill have needed to be dragged backwards up the hill with agricultural vehicles. The north of Crimble Lane close to the barn has land boundaries making the lane</p>

only approx. the width of a car to allow passage along the Lane, There are very minimal passing places along Crimble Lane with some of the upright stones being of listed nature.

Walkers and horses use the footpath and bridleway on Crimble Lane and due to the blind corners on the Lane would be hazardous if large numbers of vehicles would begin to pass.

There is frequent farm traffic at the north end of Crimble Lane both mechanical and farm animals ie herding of cows. This would cause complete blockage of the lane at the north end during rush hours of traffic from the new complex.

Conflict of interests of local Councillor with relative who is involved within the planning development proposed for Crimble. This has consisted of him voting for the proposal in breach of Council Conflict of Interest Policy.

There is also the proposed development on the Jowkin Lane of hundreds of houses to be built there. This would encourage the increased traffic to also try to cut down Crimble Lane towards the motorway.

Local wildlife, there is a wealth of wildlife living with the valley and the fields, deer, bats, badgers, foxes, toads, and kingfishers. In other areas there are schemes to re-green areas but in this locality it appears the policy is to destroy greenbelts.

The Heywood access intended to the south is onto a road with a high number of road traffic accidents. Already turning left is difficult with cars hurtling along towards Heywood. There is also a blind junction here when there are cars parked along the turning area.

I was told by the Local Councillor Peter Rush that the development would directly mirror the development in Birtle. How could this happen when the access roads into Birtle were already double width roads.

Crimble Lane is owned by various Landowners from the farmers at the top owning strips to the old Estate of Colonel Hartley owning large portions which I believe was then bequeathed to various Charities.

Locality

No further investment in healthcare. No expansion planned for the Hospitals who are servicing the health needs of the communities in Rochdale and additionally, the localities who are also expanding into vast amounts of housing in Greenbelts, Bury, Oldham and Middleton. Rochdale Infirmary was scaled down and lost its A and E service in 2011 along with maternity care. These calculations were skewed and were calculated on years of low birth rates. These maternity units are now overflowing with waiting times for mothers to progress through to the delivery suites. A huge influx in housing within all these surrounding areas these hospitals serve, would again put pressure onto the same Units who are already struggling both with shortages of staffing and inpatient beds. These same hospitals are consistently running on alert and divert with high waiting times in A and E and also in shortages of bed occupancy within the Trust.

No additional or expansion of GP surgeries. Due to the Covid pandemic it has become increasingly difficult to obtain a health appointment and this is before the 1000s of new homes within the areas.

No investment in local Dentist services.

No investment in the ambulance service which covers both emergency and non-emergency care. There is already high demand on the ambulance service in responding to 999 calls and on numerous occasions in recent times this service has been in crisis. This was impacted upon when the hospitals locally were reduced and an increased demand put onto the ambulance service to move patients around more to find a speciality bed, or even a bed for in patient care. More and more ambulances are parked up outside the overcrowded A and E departments waiting to handover

patients. With such an increase in housing, this situation will only become more precarious.

No investment in infrastructure locally. Roads are already gridlocked, no investment in the local public transport.

High Schools within the Borough have in recent years been oversubscribed. I am aware of cases of Young people from Littleborough being allocated schooling in high schools miles away from home at the other side of the town. There is some apparent investment in high schools and expansion in primary schools planned but is this enough place for the proposed influx of new families?

Increase in pollution from the increase in vehicles.

Why does Greenbelt have to be sacrificed?

How many houses are actually needed to be built in Rochdale? How many other developments are happening at the same time. I believe that the local areas are building above the Government stipulations needed.