

<b>Family Name</b>	Bailey
<b>Given Name</b>	Peter
<b>Person ID</b>	1287220
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Bailey
<b>Given Name</b>	Peter
<b>Person ID</b>	1287220
<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>	Yes
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	Yes
<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>1. Publicly available documents state that the Rochdale Metropolitan Borough already has enough development land for all but 51 of the 8048 homes it's projected to need between now and 2037. This means that the green belt land in Bamford/ Norden is not required and any shortfall can easily be made up by increasing housing densities on brownfield sites located nearer to transport hubs which the Bamford/ Norden site is located nowhere near - part of PfE objectives 2 &amp; 6 are to "Focus new homes within 800m of public transport hubs".</p> <p>There are no exceptional circumstances to justify building on this green belt land and it's also affordable housing that's required; not executive style homes - the site is therefore not justified and not consistent with national policy, namely NPPF Chapters 2, 11 &amp; 13.</p> <p>2. The site is situated several kilometers from the nearest Metrolink/ train station and therefore PfE objective 7 will not be met; primarily to "Locate and design development to reduce car dependency", as a lot of the new residents would choose to travel by car instead of using public transport to get to the transport hubs or would just use their cars for the full journey (as existing residents do now). This would clearly result in a considerable increase in CO2 emissions which is not consistent with adapting to climate change, moving to a low carbon economy and NPPF Chapters 2 (para 8), 9 and 14. The site is therefore not justified and not consistent with national policy.</p> <p>3. The building of 450 executive style houses on the site would no doubt result in an additional 900+ vehicles ending up on the roads. There is no allowance in the plans to improve the existing road infrastructure bar attempting to improve the efficiency of the traffic lights at the junction of Norden Road and Bury and Rochdale Old Road to the south of the site. Norden Road is already very busy during peak times so there is no way it would be able to cope with the massive increase in traffic this development</p>

would bring - If it is not possible to construct a new main road leading to Bury and Rochdale Old Road from the opposite side of the site to Norden Road then this development should NOT go ahead.

There has also been worrying talk of possibly turning Norden Road and War Office Road into a crazy one way system?! How is that meant to maintain or enhance the local area? It would result in considerably worse air quality for the residents living on War Office Road (due to traffic queueing all the way up from the new traffic lights that would be installed at its junction with Bury and Rochdale Old Road) and no doubt increase traffic on the surrounding roads and probably on Edenfield Road stretching from Norden village to Rochdale football ground as people tried to avoid having to queue down War Office Road. It would also mean anyone living in the area between Norden Road, War Office Road and Bury and Rochdale Old Road would effectively be living in the middle of a massive roundabout!... who would want that! This is hardly sounding like an aspirational place to live is it? I believe the above goes against PfE Objective 2 which is to "Create neighbourhoods of choice" and NPPF 12 - Achieving well-designed places. The site is therefore not justified and not consistent with national policy.

4. As I understand it all the schools in the local area are full and it is already very difficult to get an appointment with a GP. There is no proposal for additional schools or a Doctor's surgery or Dentist to accommodate the need arising from this development therefore it does not meet PfE objective 9 to "Ensure new development is properly served by physical and social infrastructure including schools, health, social care, sports and recreation facilities" and objective 10 to "Ensure new development is properly served by health care services that meet the needs of communities" and is not consistent with NPPF chapter 8 (para 95). The site is not justified and not consistent with national policy.

5. The Bamford/ Norden site has experienced varying degrees of flooding during heavy rainfall over the years and during Christmas 2015 this resulted in Norden Road next to the site having to be closed for a period of time to protect the houses opposite. Although a couple of ponds have been incorporated into the plans for the proposed development it is questionable as to whether these will offset the increased flooding risk from concreting over the fields and removing mature hedgerows. This goes against PfE objective 8 to "Promote the role of green space in climate resilience and reducing flood risk" and is not consistent with NPPF Chapter 14. The site is not justified and not consistent with national policy.

6. There are two rows of large electricity pylons running across the Bamford/ Norden site which international studies have shown increase the risks to children living within 50m of them suffering adverse health effects (namely an increase in Leukemia). This does not sit well with PfE objective 10 to "Promote the health and wellbeing of communities" and is not consistent with NPPF Chapter 8. Also, if that were not enough, we're talking about large executive style houses costing circa £500k here, who would want to pay half a million pounds to live right next to some great big ugly pylons that could potentially be harmful to your family's health? Because of the above the site is therefore not justified and not consistent with national policy.

7. The Bamford/ Norden site is already home to football, tennis and cricket clubs which the proposed plans say will be enhanced. However, if planning is approved then the site will lose its green belt status and then there would be a considerable risk that the land these clubs occupy could be built on in the future. The site is also home to a great deal of wildlife including protected species such as newts, bats and badgers and it is well used by the local community. In my opinion depriving future generations of this site would go against PfE Objective 8 to "Improve the quality of our natural environment and access to green spaces" and is not consistent with Chapters 8 & 15 of the NPPF. The site is not justified and not consistent with national policy.

<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>JPA 19: Bamford/ Norden should be removed from the Places for Everyone (PfE) plan as the projected homes required between now and 2037 can easily be accommodated on brownfield sites which exist and are in the plan already (by increasing housing densities) or will be available in the near future due to changes in land use brought about by the Covid-19 Pandemic. These brownfield sites should be prioritised for building homes on over protected green belt land which is well used and valued by the local community.</p> <p>This site is publicly accessible green belt land, which is protected by national planning policy.</p>
--	--