

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Spellacy
<b>Given Name</b>	Lynne
<b>Person ID</b>	1287320
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Spellacy
<b>Given Name</b>	Lynne
<b>Person ID</b>	1287320
<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>This site does not comply with PfE Objectives 7, 8 and 6 out of the 7 Site collection criteria. It is not consistent with sustainable development. There is NO unmet housing need that justifies building this site on valuable greenbelt land and in any case Brownfield sites should be used as a priority instead. Where is the proof that exceptional circumstances exist to enable building to take place on this protected Greenbelt land?</p> <p>Failure to comply with PfE objective 7 and not consistent to adapting to climate change where we are supposed to be moving to a low carbon economy. Everyone will have to use cars which will increase CO2 and is not sustainable. The air quality management zone which is near to a local primary school will become worse if this site is built to the detriment of the health of all our local citizens especially our young children. Both air quality and congestion on Norden Road will be impacted hugely, negatively affecting the quality of life for local people.</p> <p>Existing schools are already full and there has been no proposal to alleviate this in spite of the proposal to build all the extra houses.</p> <p>This is an area of natural beauty for the benefit of all local people as wild as wildlife in the area, and building on top of protected green belt will mean concreting over open fields which will also impact on the flooding that takes place every year as the site is clay heavy and has natural springs. This could significantly impact on the flood risk as the fields, trees and shrubs will be removed therefore not able to soak away the flood waters. This is not justified, effective or consistent with national policy surely???</p> <p>Please save this outstanding beautiful local land and keep it as it is, for the good of climate change, air quality, traffic and most of all for local residents of Rochdale to enjoy the beautiful greenbelt land which has been here for thousands of years and should be here for the next thousand!</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>I believe that JPA 19: Bamford/Norden should be removed from the PfE due to my comments above.</p> <p>This proposal and plan is WRONG, WRONG, WRONG, not only due to the valid points above but also because it is not morally or ethically the right decision for our local area or any of our local residents and should not be going ahead!</p>
--	---