

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Williams
Given Name	George Trevor Steven
Person ID	1286857
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Williams
Given Name	George Trevor Steven
Person ID	1286857
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?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	No
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 plan for Bamford (JPA19) has not been widely publicized, and upon hearing about it, I wrote to my MP (copy of letter in section below) who responded agreeing with my statements and criticisms. Subsequent to the letter, and having discussed the plan with numerous residents of Bamford, I have discovered that there has been no mention of how the sewage and drainage system on Norden Road would cope with the extra inflow. REDACTED TEXT I have seen an extraordinary increase in traffic due mainly to increased building during that period. Much of this building work has made use of the existing drainage on Norden Road, which has resulted in flooding REDACTED TEXT in periods of excessive rainfall. This was worsened by draining the fields surrounding Bamford Mews to create football fields. Subsequent to this, Norden Road frequently floods opposite the precinct, each time also flooding REDACTED TEXT. This problem has been formally acknowledged by United Utilities, and can only get worse with building on the fields referred to above.</p> <p>As far as I am able to establish there is a universal rejection to further development in Bamford, particularly on green-belt sites that are used and enjoyed by the community. Indeed there is a unanimous view amongst the residents that the scheme has been cynically proposed by a Rochdale Labour Council purely on the basis that it would generate in excess of one million pounds revenue in Council Tax without any consideration for the disasterous results to this conservative voting area</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	<p>"REDACTED TEXT 16 September 2021 Mr C Clarkson MP House of Commons London</p>

of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.

SW1A 0AA

Dear Mr Clarkson

Re: - Housing Development Plans for Bamford

Following on from my brief telephone conversation on Monday with REDACTED TEXT, I wish to express my concern about two related matters concerning the Housing Crisis.

Firstly, hardly a day goes by without the media making mention of Britain's housing crisis, but there is never an explanation as to the reasons for the crisis. From such information as I have been able to gather housing demand is governed primarily by population size, which in turn is governed by three main causes: - Longevity, birth rate and net migration.

Looking into these three causes in order, it is obvious that population size has been seriously influenced by the increased lifespan of British citizens which, from 1940 to 2014, has increased by almost 20 years from: for men 60.6 to 78.5 and for women from 66.7 to 83.3. Although further increases are expected in life-expectancy, they will not be as dramatic and are more suspect in that extended life span is increasingly dependent on NHS and medical support, rather than natural lifespan. The current birth rate for women born in the UK is between 1.65 and 1.70. It doesn't take a statistician to calculate that on its own this represents a dramatic fall in UK population.

Cont'd

-2-

The only remaining factor to population growth is net immigration, with particular emphasis on England. Whilst the other countries within the UK are relatively underpopulated, England for its population size is more densely populated than every other country in the world, excluding Bangladesh and South Korea, and must surely be aiming to control overall population.

Global warming is without doubt the single common issue taking the world's attention, and yet surprisingly the biggest contributing factor is rarely raised as the area requiring attention - over-population. In the year 1800 there were one billion people on the planet compared with approaching eight billion today. Furthermore, each person alive today will be consuming a massive amount of the earth's resources compared with the person alive two hundred years ago! Population control in England should now be a matter of urgency, but instead there are proposals for what amounts to a colossal expansion. In Greater Manchester alone, plans are about to be imminently approved on October 10th for an additional 201,000 houses to be built in the next 15 years or so. Extrapolated, pro-rata to population across the whole of England that would represent an additional four million houses to be built or say an additional twelve to sixteen million people. Such building would create more problems than it would solve!

Looking to my personal concern, I am appalled that there are proposals to build 450 three and four bedroomed houses on the Bamford green belt.

My alarm is firstly, that from my discussions with local residents, there is little or no knowledge of what is proposed. From the poor-quality maps displayed on the village green notice board and received from leaflets by the "Save Bamford Green Belt" action group, it would appear that the plan is to utilise the football fields and cricket club grounds for the development area, thus denuding the area of its only open space community area. From what I have been able to glean from the footballing fraternity there appear to be mixed messages that the football fields could be saved in the belief that the whole required playing area will be replaced elsewhere with the incentive (bribe) of a new club house and cafe!

Cont'd

-3-

Rochdale has a Labour Council which no doubt will have very little regard for the residents of Conservative Bamford. Instead, they will, no doubt, be rubbing their hands because of the Council Tax income arising from such a development! Assuming therefore that the development is approved, there is the question of how to mitigate, no; eliminate, the consequences of 450 houses, 900 cars and 1800 people, all additional to the area? In the absence of any specific detail, there are rumours abounding of a road being driven across the village green (which is commonly believed to have been bequeathed to the people of Bamford for their enjoyment) and also, that Norden road and War Office road, are being made one-way systems. Who knows what extra capacity has been planned to service the extra population with school places, doctor, and dentist facilities etc, and for what?

My wife and I have investigated and seen the development, and lack of development, located side by side along the canals leading out of the city in areas not so well known to most of the public.

Together with the more well-known areas of dereliction this immediately raised several thoughts which require answers and not just in relation to the Bamford greenbelt: -

- Although there is unquestioned demand for apartments for young, single people in the city centre, why does Greater Manchester wish to build executive three and four-bedroom houses in Bamford, when we know that such properties are already hard to sell, even with the prevailing unprecedentedly low interest rates?
- Is there an assumption that these executive houses will be more for senior management (with two, three or four children), who will be employed largely in the city centre? And if so, why is it necessary in this environmentally sensitive age to build properties requiring a minimum 10-mile commute when development land and empty buildings are available much closer to the city?
- Cont'd

-4-

- Brown field sites and neglected empty properties will already have the basic infrastructure for development in terms of roads, sewers, gas, electricity, and water.
- Surely this would save the massive infrastructure cost of development required on a green belt site.
- Surely, if there were more homes located closer to the city there would not only be less congestion in Heywood and roads into Manchester, but also less pollution and much less time commuting for people employed in the city?
- There is obviously not enough attention and energy being given to ways of developing redundant buildings and brown field sites.
- Surely, for those residents already occupying redeveloped brown field sites and redundant mills etc. converted to dwellings, it would massively enhance their environment and increase the worth of their property if their neighbourhood wasn't blighted with unsightly dereliction.

Greater Manchester has a population of 2.8 million people. Assuming that each of the 201,000 proposed houses has an average of four residents (man, wife and two children), that would represent an increase of almost 30% in the next 15 Years or so. Do the members of Manchester Council know something we don't know?

At this late hour, what can be done?

Yours Sincerely

REDACTED TEXT"