

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Saeed
Given Name	Afia
Person ID	1286542
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Saeed
Given Name	Afia
Person ID	1286542
Title	Our Vision
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	Yes
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.	Not enough consideration of local stakeholders. Meeting strategic goals can also be done while meeting the needs of locals.
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.	Closer integration of local citizens to help meet strategic needs while also being able to consider local needs. More transparent documentation. Documents are very long winded and difficult to navigate or even find on the websites. Not sure how anyone expects non native speakers and elderly people to voice their thoughts.
Family Name	Saeed
Given Name	Afia
Person ID	1286542
Title	JPA 19: Bamford / Norden
Type	Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	Yes
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.	<p>The allocated site is not justified, not positively prepared, and not consistent with national policy.</p> <p>Little to no consideration of health impact from green to brownfield site development. This site is vital to many locals, especially disabled and elderly people. It is vital to maintaining mental health, especially as the last publicly accessible local area of greenbelt. There needs to be a much more thorough impact assessment. There are no locals near me that feel that this development would enrich their lives or benefit them in anyway long or short term. If anything, it will deter people from the area as I would define Bamford"s character as residential areas but always with a green area at a walking distance. The assessment on social and health impacts in the document published by ARUP and from the Allocation Topic Paper from the GMCA is unacceptable.</p> <p>The transport links in that area will not be able to sustain so many families which will just feed into the existing problem of inefficient public transport further cementing the area to remain car reliant; with more families needing cars, more businesses will set up at car travelling distances feeding further into the need of cars and road infrastructure. Effective transport systems should be prioritised. The existing population needs better public transport anyway. Before a new residential area is developed, new transport infrastructure must be developed to encourage a more socially and environmentally sustainable area.</p> <p>Social infrastructures (e.g. schools, doctors surgeries) and flood infrastructures (to mitigate the severe change in drainage from rain) should be explicitly planned. Natural flood management structures are usually invested in but we have one for free which has been helping minimise flooding in my area. I need someone to guarantee that after the greenfield area is developed into a non-absorbent brownfield site, that there will not be a significant increase in surface run-off (especially in the already expected increase in rainfall over the years from global warming).</p> <p>Furthermore, exceptional circumstances must be proven for the development of greenfield land, and simply a "need for housing" is not appropriate, especially with reasonable brownfield sites being available, permanently damaging the character of the area, and removing natural flood management infrastructure.</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	<p>Remove JPA 19 Bamford/Norden from the PfE. Perform a more thorough social and health impact assessment for such a significant change that can not only define the very real issues that will impact local people but at the minimum provide acceptable mitigation measures for the loss of this cherished landscape. The issues highlighted by the opposition to the development need to be thoroughly considered and responded to.</p> <p>If the development is truly supposed to be sustainable, within the current decision-making, a greater weight should be given to the social needs of</p>

you have identified above.

citizens outside of economic needs, and such an impact assessment will give a much more valuable insight into the long term impact on the area.