

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Shorrocks
<b>Given Name</b>	Anne
<b>Person ID</b>	1286297
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Shorrocks
<b>Given Name</b>	Anne
<b>Person ID</b>	1286297
<b>Title</b>	JPA 19: Bamford / Norden
<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>	<p>I have read through JP Allocation 19 Bamford/Norden and believe that it is UNSOUND removed from Places for Everyone because it is UNSOUND, due to the following reasons:</p> <p>REDACTED TEXT who own 34% (11 hectares) of the proposed site have stated on record that they do not want to sell for development. It is their family business. Strange as it may seem, money isn't everything! This family have owned and farmed their land for three generations. In 2016 when the original plan (Greater Manchester Spatial Framework) was first published the REDACTED TEXT had no idea that their land had been submitted until they read about it in the local paper. Rochdale Council had never consulted with them. I find this kind of treatment to be cruel and distasteful.</p> <p>Can you imagine what this has done to the family? During this time REDACTED TEXT became ill and died. There is no doubt that the worry of their land being taken from them hastened his death. He left an elderly widow with only her son to support her.</p> <p>The Peel Group (Peel Land &amp; Property) who only own 24% (8 hectares) of the site is leading this proposed development They have continued to be very forceful in their approach to the family (through their agent). Perhaps a little bit of local history might enlighten the reader. REDACTED TEXT has connections with Bamford as it is known that his grandparents farmed in the village in the early part of the 20th century and he spent some of his childhood there. He has inherited the land in question through his family. REDACTED TEXT must know that his land is more or less worthless without the remaining 46%. He obviously wants to dispose of it and has waited for this moment in time to do so. It is a serious flood risk and contains a mish-mash of redundant water mains. The site has a history of coal mining. There are seven pylons on the site and overhead electric cables.</p>

	<p>At the first public meeting held in Bamford at the outset of the original GMSF, I read out a letter I had written to REDACTED TEXT on behalf of the residents of Bamford, asking him to reconsider disposing of his land for development. I suggested to him that as he had connections with Bamford then would he consider turning the land into a country park with trees and some landscaping for the benefit of the residents, and perhaps a children's play area well away from the main road. Needless to say I never received a reply. I would like to remind the reader that the site is the last bit of accessible land in Bamford. It has many Public Rights of Way all documented with Rochdale Council. You can imagine that through the Covid 19 lockdown the land was invaluable and people loved that they could get away for an hour from their prison-like existence to look at nature and all that it has to offer.</p> <p>I hope that the Planning Inspectors will be visiting the site before making their decision.</p>
<p><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></p>	<p>The site is unjustified, ineffective and is not compliant with NPPF policy, Bamford is already over-developed.</p> <p>There is no need for any more building or infilling</p> <p>The site is accessible and invaluable to residents for cycling, horse-riding, walking, rambling.</p> <p>The site is not near a railway station or tram stop. or likely to be.</p> <p>The Council see Bamford as a "cash cow" via the Council Tax.</p> <p>There are no exceptional circumstances to warrant building on this Green Belt land.</p> <p>Development will mean loss of wildlife habitats (deer, foxes, badgers, dormice and hedgehogs).</p> <p>The development will encroach on ancient woodland and a Conservation Area.</p> <p>A one way traffic system for Norden Road is a ridiculous idea. A local survey found that over 900 cars use Norden Road at peak times. The development of 450 houses would increase this number to an extra 7-800 cars.</p> <p>The planned number of houses would be located in between the football pitches, not what I would call good estate planning.</p> <p>There are enough brownfield sites available.</p> <p>There are enough houses being built in Rochdale to meet the Government's requirement.</p>