

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Aston
<b>Given Name</b>	Robert
<b>Person ID</b>	1286319
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Aston
<b>Given Name</b>	Robert
<b>Person ID</b>	1286319
<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>	NA
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	NA
<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>There are no exceptional circumstances to justify building 450 houses on this PROTECTED GREEN BELT land ( fails PfE obj. 7/8 and NPPF ch 13). There are numerous brown field sites sufficient to accommodate the town's needs. Further more the associated facilities required to support such a number of houses does not exist, and in many cases could never be provided. This is a unique opportunity to " tidy-up" the town and build/renovate areas of the town which are run down. the trouble is the Council prefer to use virgin land with builders, an easy option for both parties.</p> <p>Brownfield sites are accessible to transport links like the Metro and the train, this site is not and will result in an additional 500/1000 extra cars on already congested roads.</p> <p>The proposed "one-way" system will just divert the problem not answer it!</p> <p>The obvious additional traffic will inflict heavy Co2 emissions where young children pass on the way to St Michael's Primary school. Perhaps another court case in the pipe-line similar to the recent highly publicised London case.</p> <p>Again failure to comply with PfE obj. 7.</p> <p>This area has insufficient infrastructure : no extra places in schools, shortage of doctors/dentists and associated support.</p> <p>The area in question frequently floods, adding 450 houses will add to this problem. Concreting over greenbelt, cutting down trees/hedgerows etc will create further flooding.</p> <p>This land forms the lungs of Rochdale as well as providing numerous leisure facilities for the local community. Building high end houses provides nothing for the young wishing to get on the property ladder, retirement bungalows, or social housing.</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>A cynic may question the motives of the Council, is it just the high income from rates that they are after?</p> <p>The density of the brownfield sites could be increased and therefore allow Rochdale Council to meet its Climate Emergency declaration of 2019. This proposal fails on so many points as outlined in PfE chapters. (2,9 and14).</p> <p>In conclusion Rochdale Council needs 8000 houses yet it has land already for 7999.</p> <p>Why build an extra 4000 houses on greenbelt/greenfield sites.</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 I am seeking is for JPA 19 Bamford/Norden to be REMOVED from the PfE.</p>