

Family Name	Bailey
Given Name	Lisa
Person ID	1287316
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Bailey
Given Name	Lisa
Person ID	1287316
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?	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>Greenbelt/Exceptional Circumstances and Local Housing Need:</p> <p>-According to Places for Everyone (PfE) Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council (RMBC) have a Local Housing Need (LHN) of 8,048 and land available for 7,997 houses. Therefore, RMBC have a very small unmet housing need of just 51 houses across the borough. I do not believe a shortfall of 51 across the borough satisfies the exceptional circumstances necessary to release a greenbelt site such as JPA 19 for a large scale, 450 house development.</p> <p>-There was concern over the numbers that were used in the Greater Manchester Spatial Framework 2016 (GMSF 2016) and these concerns have been borne out with the passing of time. GMSF 2016 identified a shortfall across Greater Manchester of 46k (181k existing supply compared to the local housing need identified as 227k see table 1). In PfE there is now a surplus of 13k existing supply (178k existing supply less LHN 165k, see table 2), given this surplus there are no exceptional circumstances to justify building on JPA 19.</p> <p>-PfE Para 7.14 states, "The population of the PfE plan area is projected to increase in population by 158,194". Yet PfE has allocations totaling 199k (see table 2). This amounts to 1.3 dwellings per person for the increased population (199 allocations/158 population growth). Further demonstrating there is no requirement for these increased allocations and no exceptional circumstances to justify releasing the green belt.</p> <p>-Para 7.14 goes on to say that the highest levels of population growth are projected to be Manchester and Salford followed by Rochdale (19,100) and Oldham (16,700). It is not clear where these numbers come from, but it would seem these projections are based on the PfE allocations i.e. are self-fulfilling. If the LHN was allocated in line with the existing supply, projected population growth would follow those allocations. I.e. the projected</p>

population growth in Rochdale does not provide an exceptional circumstance to justify releasing the greenbelt.

-PfE allocates 199k LHN across the 9 boroughs which is over and above the LHN identified of 165k. This is an over allocation of 34k or 21% of the LHN. Whilst PfE para 7.12 states

"Table 7.1 illustrates that, in numerical terms, the existing supply of potential housing sites identified in the districts" strategic housing land availability assessments and small sites is adequate to meet the overall identified need. However, meeting the numerical needs alone, is not enough. We must be able to demonstrate that its land supply has sufficient flexibility within it to demonstrate that it represents a deliverable, viable and robust land supply and will deliver a balanced and inclusive growth, thereby achieving the overall spatial strategy.

In light of this and the need to ensure the Green Belt boundary can endure beyond the plan period it has been necessary to identify additional new sites across the city-region, over and above those in the existing land supply. Having considered a number of spatial options, it has been concluded that it in order to achieve this, it has been necessary to remove some land from the Green Belt and to allocate this land within this Plan for residential development."

I note no such similar need was identified in GMSF 2016 the redistribution of the LHN amongst the boroughs was to match the LHN of 227k (see table 1). There is no exceptional circumstance that requires the allocations to exceed the LHN and therefore no exceptional circumstance to release the greenbelt to fulfil these inflated allocations.

-The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 141 states,

"Before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development."

I can foresee there may be exceptional circumstances to release small parts of the greenbelt where there is an unmet need for housing and all available brownfield and greenfield sites have been developed. By building in an oversupply, PfE attempts to "get-round "or sidesteps that safeguard.

Whilst the plan talks about brownfield first, I can see nothing that would legally oblige that approach. Often, for a developer a greenbelt site can be an easier build than brownfield sites. Having secured planning for sites that have been land-banked for years, developers will be keen to build on greenbelt sites such as JPA19. Additionally, the proposals to build executive homes on site JPA 19 will attract relatively high margins again encouraging developers to build on allocations such as this ahead of brownfield sites.

Site JPA19 should be removed and only revisited once all brownfield and greenfield sites had been developed. This would ensure, the safeguarding of the greenbelt would remain in place, there would be greater certainty on actual population growth and LHN and the exceptional circumstances of the site could be considered on its own merits. As opposed to the greenbelt of JPA19 being lost forever due to the inflated allocations of the PfE.

-The Ministry of Housing Communities & Local Government Guidance on Compulsory purchase process and The Crichel Down Rules para 12 states, "A compulsory purchase order should only be made where there is a compelling case in the public interest." Significant parts of the JPA 19 site are privately owned, the owners have indicated publicly that do not intend to sell the land to Peel Holdings who have put the site forward. For the reasons outlined above, using a compulsory purchase order (CPO) to acquire this land and release it from the greenbelt is not in the public interest.

The site does not comply with:

-PfE Objective 7 it will not minimise the need to travel and the removal of the greenbelt and replacing it with a housing development will increase air pollution.

-PfE Objective 8 it will reduce biodiversity and access to the natural environment. The land regularly floods and building on the land will increase surface water and risk of flooding.

-PfE Objective 10 this development will reduce access to the natural environment and green spaces and therefore reduce the health benefits such access confers.

-NPPF exceptional circumstances to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries.

-CPO compelling case in the public interest.

Nature and wildlife:

-The site provides an important corridor to Ashworth valley and supports a vast array of animal and bird species, including mammals: voles, shrews, bats, badgers, dormice, deer, foxes and hedgehogs. Birds: starlings, blackbirds, song thrush, mistle thrush, fieldfare, heron, kites, kestrel, peregrine falcon, sparrow hawk, owls, pheasant, crow species, jay, magpies, pigeons, collared doves, seagulls, brambling, nut hatch, blackcap, house sparrow, tree sparrow, dunnock, robin, coal tit, blue tit, great tit, marsh tit, long tailed tits, gold finch, green finch, siskin, bullfinch, linnet, redpoll, chaffinch, woodpecker.

-Development of this land would result in the removal of significant sections of hedgerow and mature trees. Removing the habitat for birds, mammals and insects will result in the decline of mammal, bird and insect populations in the area.

-Areas of the land are currently left fallow and wildflower meadows have developed. Development of this site would result in these fields being concreted over and a further loss of wildlife habitat.

-Removing the carbon sink that hedgerows and mature trees provide would lead to a reduction in air quality.

-As well as the environmental value this site has a high amenity value, it is flat and open and therefore accessible and safe to a wide section of the community including the elderly and women exercising/dog walking on their own.

-It is also used by various groups including horse riders, bike riders, ramblers, dog walkers.

-Whilst the revised plans for this site retain the much-used football pitches, tennis and cricket facilities, removing the greenbelt protection from these facilities would open them up for development at a later stage.

- The site was increasingly used as a wellbeing destination during the pandemic and usage levels have remained higher than pre-pandemic. Inclusion of the site will have a detrimental impact on the mental health and physical well-being of the local population.

The site does not meet:

-PfE Object 8 it will reduce green infrastructure and biodiversity. Reduce access to the natural environment. Reduce climate resilience and increase surface water and risk of flooding.

-NPPF Chapter 15 Conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

Traffic congestion and air pollution:

-The removal of the flora of the greenbelt will affect air quality, this be further exacerbated by the building of 450 house and the associated increase in traffic.

-The site is not accessible to either the Metro or local train stations without using a car. Therefore, there will be a significant increase in single use car journeys for commuting and exhaust emissions.

-Removal of the amenity to exercise both residents and their dogs will result in increased car journeys to alternative sites.

-There is significant congestion in the area at War Office Road and Norden Road at peak times. The existing roads will not accommodate the estimated additional 900 cars. The use of a one-way system has been mooted but this would result in the traffic joining Bury and Rochdale Old Road in one location rather than two. There will still be an increased volume of traffic on already congested roads which will negatively impact air quality.

The site fails to comply with:

-PfE Objective 7 it is not consistent with adapting to climate change, moving to a low carbon economy

Table 1 Source GMSF 16

Existing LHNshortfall/RedistributionLHN

supply (suplus) of LHN Increase/
(decrease)

Bolton 11,817 16,4134,596 16,800 387

Bury 5,786 12,2066,420 12,500 294

Manchester58,049 62,4054,356 55,300 (7,105)

Oldham 9,206 15,6066,400 13,700 (1,906)

Rochdale 10,192 11,3381,146 15,500 4,162

Salford 35,426 30,035 (5,391) 34,900 4,865

Stockport 8,146 20,212 12,066 19,300 (912)

Tameside 9,507 13,5784,071 13,600 22

Trafford 14,231 25,910 11,679 23,100 (2,810)

Wigan 19,077 19,497 420 22,500 3,003

Total 181,437 227,20045,763 227,200 0

LHN = Local Housing Need

Table 2 Source PfE p130

ExistingLHNShortfall/ PfELHN

supply (surplus) Allocations Increase/
(decrease)

Bolton 15,17612,528 (2,648)15,176 2,648

Bury 4,103 9,456 5,353 8,803 (653)

Manchester62,52756,432 (6,095)62,527 6,095

Oldham 10,95510,832 (123)13,131 2,299

Rochdale 7,997 8,048 5112,003 3,955

Salford 36,20321,184 (15,019)37,703 16,519

Tameside 6,92310,416 3,493 8,481 (1,935)

Trafford 16,46222,032 5,57021,289 (743)

Wigan 17,99613,952 (4,044)19,596 5,644

Total 178,342164,880 (13,462)198,709 33,829

Total PfE allocations over LHN =198,709-164,880 = 33,829

**Redacted modification
- Please set out the
modification(s) you**

The modification I consider necessary to make this section of the plan sound is removal of site JPA 19 Bamford/Norden from PfE.

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.