

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Arden
Given Name	Janice
Person ID	1287197
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Arden
Given Name	Janice
Person ID	1287197
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?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
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>Brownfield sites of which there are an increasing number, should be used for development first. There is no justification for using green belt land and no exceptional circumstances, which justify the building of 450 executive homes on this protected green belt land.</p> <p>The site doesn't comply with Pfa objective 7 and 8. This is also inconsistent with sustainable development and NPPF chapter 13.</p> <p>The site is not close to our stations, metro, buses, making the already congested roads even more so. Creating more air pollution by use of hundreds more cars.</p> <p>The site contains footballs, cricket and tennis clubs. This increases the likelihood of those sites being developed in future, if green belt protection is removed.</p> <p>I believe RMBC require just over 8,000 houses and have land available for almost 8,000.</p> <p>They have no unmet housing needs, to justify building another 4000 on green belt land across the borough.</p> <p>There is no shortage of large detached property in Rochdale, indeed the shortage is for affordable homes. This looks like building on green belt land purely for the profit!</p> <p>The site fails to comply with pfe objective 2 and is not consistent with NPPF chapter 2.</p> <p>The site doesn't support a low carbon future, with the extra omissions created by extra cars on the roads. This is not consistent with national policy, to cut omissions.</p> <p>There are so many reasons why this development should not go ahead but the last one I note. Schools are already struggling to offer places for local needs, I have not seen any suggestion of new schools to accommodate the</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>inevitable rise in pupils. I believe this fails to comply with pfe objective 9 and is not consistent with NPPF chapter 8. Again not consistent with national policy.</p>
<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.</p>	<p>The modification needed is for JPA 19 Bamford/Norden to be removed from the Pfe.</p>