

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Family Name</b>  | Smith   |
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Ken   |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287297   |
| <b>Title</b>  | Stakeholder Submission  |
| <b>Type</b>   | Web   |
| <b>Family Name</b>  | Smith   |
| <b>Given Name</b>   | Ken   |
| <b>Person ID</b>  | 1287297   |
| <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>Loss of Green Belt land</p> <p>*The inclusion of this site is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (Chapter 13). No exceptional circumstances have been shown for its inclusion, whilst many brownfield sites have not been included or, possibly even considered.</p> <p>*The site does not comply with specific objectives of Places for Everyone (7 and 8) and the site selection criteria set out in the strategy. Certainly, the development of this site would not "deliver benefits to the local community" set out in Criteria 7, by removing an important recreational and open land facility in a district of Rochdale which has seen large scale development in recent years.</p> <p>Traffic</p> <p>The site is not consistent with national planning policy:-</p> <p>*The existing highways will not accommodate the additional traffic which would be generated by the development of this site. The proposed solution (involving Norden Road and War Office Road) would not resolve the resulting situation but would only create more problems in terms of congestion, air pollution and highway safety. I would question whether this proposal has been properly assessed, given that the two roads are completely different in terms of how they could cope with large volumes of traffic. One only needs to look at all the existing individual access points from properties on War Office Road, besides those from adjoining roads, to see a potential problem.</p> <p>Flooding</p> <p>In my opinion, the flood risk for this site has not been thoroughly assessed. The site is traversed by natural springs and is subject to some degree of flooding every year. Despite drainage solutions that would be put in place, the development of the site is likely to make the situation worse. Open fields,</p> |

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

|   |  |
|---|--|
|   | trees and hedgerows will be replaced by buildings, roads and other hard surfaces which will give rise to a significant flood risk. |
| <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> | The allocation JPA19: Bamford/Norden be removed from the Places for Everyone proposals.  |