

Family Name	Wright
Given Name	Peter
Person ID	1286766
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Wright
Given Name	Peter
Person ID	1286766
Title	Our Vision
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 proposes development on greenbelt land that is legally assigned not to be developed unless there are "special circumstances".</p> <p>The suggested vision of local politicians to build thousands of executive homes to upwardly socially engineer a town without any factual justification or need does not constitute a legal argument for the plan.</p> <p>The Duty to Cooperate has failed on three consultation processes where the overriding percentage of objections to the plan were ignored and dismissed.</p> <p>The plan wholly relies on the legal sale of land by individuals for development, for potential large CPO processes which may all fail and therefore render the plan redundant at the very first stage.</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 of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.	A logical, informed, factual and evidenced document which provides an independently legally researched and confirmed clarification on the term "special circumstance" used to justify the destruction of protected greenbelt land.
Family Name	Wright
Given Name	Peter
Person ID	1286766
Title	Our Strategic Objectives
Type	Web

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<p>Our strategic objectives - Considering the information provided for our strategic objectives, please tick which of these objectives your written comment refers to:</p>	<p>1. Meet our housing need 8. Improve the quality of our natural environment and access to green spaces 10. Promote the health and wellbeing of communities</p>
<p>Soundness - Positively prepared?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Justified?</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Soundness - Effective?</p>	<p>NA</p>
<p>Compliance - Legally compliant?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Family Name</p>	<p>Wright</p>
<p>Given Name</p>	<p>Peter</p>
<p>Person ID</p>	<p>1286766</p>
<p>Title</p>	<p>JPA 2: Stakehill</p>
<p>Type</p>	<p>Web</p>
<p>Soundness - Positively prepared?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Justified?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Effective?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Compliance - Legally compliant?</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>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>	<p>JPA2 Stakehill proposes a "special circumstance" to build 1680 high quality executive homes on existing legally protected greenbelt agricultural land to socially engineer the profile of an area rather than meet the needs of the population.</p> <p>The Local Authority Council Leader has quoted they are unable to affect the size of the site allocation or its development profile because they are subject to eye-watering financial legal challenges for "failure to deliver" the site to Redrow Homes having "promised" the site to them in 2014. Those written undisclosed promises, for greenbelt land, constitutes an illegal commercial strategy using the promise of land owned by private individuals as the basis for pre-development costs and strategic documents to sell an unsound plan.</p> <p>The proposed development of protected greenbelt land at JPA2 Stakehill is in contravention of National Planning Policies</p> <p>The North site allocation is 1000 executive homes with a single access and entry point onto an already gridlocked A-road artery between Rochdale and</p>

Manchester. Using highway design regulations and software it would be illegal to suggest and promote a 1500 vehicle single exit point onto a dangerously rated main road.

A plan proposal to "extend" the local village Primary School would require a four-fold increase in it's size to meet the school place requirement for 1000 new homes. The school is a VA school and the Governing Body have not been approached nor advised of any need for extra places and as they are not controlled by the Local Authority are mindful to resist any expansion plans and to remain a village school. The plan, nor the LA or the assigned developer do not consider the views of the school nor any alternatives.

To evidence the unsound nature of the plan, the three elected local councillors for the Stakehill development area which includes the mayor of the Rochdale Borough all voted against the plan in opposition to their own majority led Council. Their statements concluded that the Stakehill development plan was unnecessary, unjustified, unworkable, unsustainable and unsupported by the vast majority of the local population.

The first of four and most important reason for greenbelt designation of land is the need to prevent urban sprawl. JPA2 proposes exactly the opposite which would create a joining-up of two large residential areas of two towns. This aspect of the plan provides no reason or justification and ignores the subject with unsupported bland general lengthy wording written to confuse rather than justify.

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 section of the plan is not deliverable nor able to be legally compliant in any aspect of the size or design.

The proposed development of protected greenbelt land is in contravention of National Planning Policies and therefore JPA2 Stakehill should be removed in its entirety from the PfE plan.