

<b>Family Name</b>	Williams
<b>Given Name</b>	Rachel
<b>Person ID</b>	1287218
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Williams
<b>Given Name</b>	Rachel
<b>Person ID</b>	1287218
<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>The policy is unsound because it is not justified due to loss of the green belt in this community which will be devastating to people and the local wildlife, animals, habitats, green spaces and bio-diversity. This is an historical village community that is going to be destroyed by this proposal. One of the major issues is the flood plane in this area and the site fails to comply with PfE Objective 2 and is not consistent with NPPF Chapter 14. The site is not justified, not effective and not consistent with national policy. The deluge of rainfall water we are seeing more and more due to climate change is soaked up by this site. To build houses means there will be severe flooding due to concreting over open fields and destroying mature trees which soak up the water. The site is heavy clay and has natural springs running through it - hence local street names such as; Clay Lane and The Springs. The site fails to comply with Pfe Objective 9 and is not consistent with NPPF chapter 8 (para 95). Local roads, schools, dentists and doctors cannot cope with such an influx of people into the area. They are already at capacity. The policy has not been positively prepared and is not consistent with national Planning Policy because there aren't any unmet housing needs in Rochdale to justify building on protected green belt land. There must be proof of exceptional circumstances to do so which have not been proven by the demonstration that they have considered all other reasonable options. The lack of public transport hubs accessible to the area (trains or trams) means people will use their cars which will significantly increase the air pollution CO2 and the roads cannot cope with the increase of traffic. The new build "old peoples home" near to Bamford Precinct in the last couple of years saw significant traffic problems created by the site in rush hour, often meaning the roads were completely gridlocked. A new build on this scale and subsequent traffic would cause major traffic problems on already significantly congested roads. During the last 18 months of the pandemic, these opens spaces have been the saviour of many; being able to walk in the fields and exercise there has been one of the few positive things to keep everyone going. To build</p>

	<p>unnecessary houses and completely destroy the natural habitat of many creatures and wildlife and take away people"s ability to get out for fresh air in beautiful surroundings is going to have a severely damaging impact on the mental health of the entire community. Other reasonable options exist and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify building 450 executive detached houses on protected green belt land.</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 modification we are seeking is for JPA 19 Bamford/Norden to be REMOVED from the PfE.</p>