

Family Name	Tuckley
Given Name	Carole
Person ID	1286779
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Tuckley
Given Name	Carole
Person ID	1286779
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?	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>We are in the midst of a very real climate emergency. Rochdale Council acknowledged this and declared a Climate Emergency in July 2019. Concerns have been raised nationally about the embedded emissions when building materials and buildings are made and new roads constructed. The area is publicly accessible green belt land which is highly valued by the community and is protected by national planning policy. My understanding is that developers must prove that there are exceptional circumstances for building on greenbelt land. This site does not comply with PfE Objective 2 and is not consistent with NPPF Chapter 2. The proposed development of "executive housing" does not meet any outstanding need across the borough. If there is any need it is for affordable sustainable housing for those on lower incomes. It is well known developers prefer this type of development (new build, "executive" and not on brownfield sites) to maximise profit. Profit is not an exceptional circumstance. We are now in an era when this attitude of profit before planet must cease. Rochdale MBC have a LHN of 8,048 and land available for 7,997 houses; a shortfall of 51. Rochdale MBC have not planned to build all their housing sites at the correct specified densities in the NPPF, therefore they are not making effective use of the available land: land within 400 and 800m of transport hubs could accommodate up to 500 more houses. In addition numerous brownfield sites are not included in the plan and these should be prioritised ahead of green belt land. There is therefore no justification for building an additional 4,006 houses on green belt / green field land across the borough.</p> <p>This site is one of the lowest densities in the PfE and the proposed 450 homes could easily be accommodated if the densities on those brownfield sites closer to existing infrastructure were planned to the correct densities. We have lived in the Norden for 20 years and have already seen a vast increase in traffic from other housing developments in the local area. As the development is not close to any train or metro stations even more traffic will</p>

be forced into the roads This development therefore does not comply with PfE Objective 7, is inconsistent with moving to a low carbon economy and Chapters 2 (para 8) and 9 of NPPF.

The pandemic has shown the value of open green spaces on our mental as well as physical health. The site is a valuable resource for walkers, cyclists and horse riders and was well used prior to the pandemic. It became more so during the pandemic and since. The removal of green belt protection from the Football, Cricket and Tennis clubs" is particularly troubling as it undoubtedly increases the probability these sites will be developed in the future.

The site is an important wildlife habitat in particular as it is home to protected species such as newts, voles, shrews, bats, badgers, dormice and hedgehogs amongst other species. 41% of UK wildlife species have declined since the 1970s. Urbanisation, pollution and climate change have all caused the nation"s plants and animals to dwindle, 26% of the UK"s mammals are at a very real risk of becoming extinct particularly the hedgehogs whose number have declined 95% since the 1950s. Development of this site to the detriment of other species is not justified. The proposed development meets no real housing need, It is aspirational housing at best, vanity housing at worst. It fails to comply with PfE Objective 8 and is not consistent with NPPF Chapter 15. This is greenbelt land and should be protected.

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.

This area should be removed from the PfE