

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Backer
Given Name	Leanne
Person ID	1287058
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Backer
Given Name	Leanne
Person ID	1287058
Title	JPA 22: Land North of Smithy Bridge
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	Yes
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	Yes
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 case of Greenbelt</p> <p>The plan is not justified, or positively prepared and not consistent with national policy, as demonstrated below;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The housing needs across Rochdale are not met and therefore it is unjustifiable to be building on protected land - Only in exceptional circumstances can developers build on protected greenbelt, when all other options are exhausted, this is not the case with this plan, there are enough brownfield sites in Rochdale to meet nearly all of the housing needs. Most brownfield sites are not included, these should be used in priority over protected green belt. -Brownfield sites which already have builds on, with transport infrastructure to support them should be increased. -The site fails to comply with PfE Objectives 7 and 8, and 6 out of the 7 Site Selection Criteria. The site is not consistent with sustainable development and NPPF Chapter 13. <p>The national planning policy framework states greenbelt serves five purposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; (b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; (c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; (d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and (e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly demonstrating there are other reasonable options and no exceptional circumstances to justify building 510 executive houses on greenbelt and greenfield.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>The case of Traffic, the site does not comply with PfE Objective 7, is not consistent with a view to tackle climate change, moving to a low carbon economy and NPPF Chapters 2 (para 8) and 9.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hollingworth Lake welcomes visitors in their hundreds everyday, the traffic is already at capacity due to to this, anymore could ruin the experince of visitors and residents. This could prevent people visiting, people come for the countryside not traffic jams with toxic fumes. The site is not accessible to public transport to the Metro (4km away, with no direct bus link) -local train stations barely meet rush hour demands, which will turn more people to the use of cars, increasing CO2 levels, the opposite of what is needed in the current climate, it is not sustainable. - The existing roads can not handle another 1000 additional cars, which the traffic assessments have forcast, though this seems very much under the reality. -There is no justification for this site nor is it consistent with national policy. <p>The case of Flooding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Failure to comply with PfE Objective 2, nor is it consistent with NPPF Chapter 14. - The assessment of flood risk for the site is not realistic, the site has flooding. - Building on greenbelt/ green field land within Littleborough & Smithy Bridge could contribute to more floods. 2015 saw horrendous flooding in Littleborough, and this was with the greenbelt acting as a sponge, building on greenbelt removes the vital protection the land provides. -The existing fields and trees soak up excess rainfall and flood waters, without them there would be a significant risk of more severe an frequent flooding, repeating the 2015 floods, becoming not a "one off" but a yearly battle, if not more with climate change. It would be disasterous to not be aware of flood risks. The climate is changing, we need to be going in the right direction, we need greenbelt and greenfield to soak up water, not more tarmac, which will do nothing to slow the flow. -The site is not justified, not effective and not consistent with national policy.
Family Name	Backer
Given Name	Leanne
Person ID	1287058
Title	JPA 24: Roch Valley
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	Yes
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	Yes
Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not	The case of Traffic, the site does not comply with PfE Objective 7, is not consistent with a view to tackle climate change, moving to a low carbon economy and NPPF Chapters 2 (para 8) and 9.

to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

- Hollingworth Lake welcomes visitors in their hundreds everyday, the traffic is already at capacity due to to this, anymore could ruin the experince of visitors and residents. This could prevent people visiting, people come for the countryside not traffic jams with toxic fumes. The site is not accessible to public transport to the Metro (4km away, with no direct bus link)

-local train stations barely meet rush hour demands, which will turn more people to the use of cars, increasing CO2 levels, the opposite of what is needed in the current climate, it is not sustainable.

- The existing roads can not handle another 1000 additional cars, which the traffic assessments have forecast, though this seems very much under the reality.

-There is no justification for this site nor is it consistent with national policy.

The case of Greenbelt

The plan is not justified, or positively prepared and not consistent with national policy, as demonstrated below;

- The housing needs across Rochdale are not unmet and therefore it is unjustifiable to be building on protected land

- Only in exceptional circumstances can developers build on protected greenbelt, when all other options are exhausted, this is not the case with this plan, there are enough brownfield sites in Rochdale to meet nearly all of the housing need. Most brownfield sites are not included, these should be used in priority over protected green belt.

-Brownfield sites which already have sites on with transport infrastructure to support them should be increased.

-The site fails to comply with PfE Objectives 7 and 8, and 6 out of the 7 Site Selection Criteria. The site is not consistent with sustainable development and NPPF Chapter 13.

The national planning policy framework states greenbelt serves five purposes:

(a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;

(b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;

(c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;

(d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and

(e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

- Clealy demonstrating there are other reasonable options and no exceptional circumstances to justify building 510 executive houses on greenbelt and greenfield.

The case of Schools:

-Failure to comply with PfE Objective 9 and is not consistent with NPPF chapter 8 (para 95).

- It is crucial there are enough school places available to meet the local needs, including sufficient choice. The new primary school on Calderbrook Road is for two form entry, the current one is two and a half form entry, meaning the area is losing primary places.

-No justification for this site, nor is it consistent with national policy.