

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

| | |
|---|---|
| Family Name | Baron |
| Given Name | Richard |
| Person ID | 1286302 |
| Title | Stakeholder Submission |
| Type | Web |
| Family Name | Baron |
| Given Name | Richard |
| Person ID | 1286302 |
| 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>I do not believe that the stock of brownfield sites have been sufficiently reviewed and given due consideration for providing housing. It is unacceptable for greenbelt land to be used for this purpose when brownfield sites remain as derelict, untidy waste-grounds. I do not accept that exceptional circumstances exist for greenbelt land to be treated in this way.</p> <p>Secondly the infrastructure simply doesn't exist and the plan fails to provide solutions for both schools and roads. Our schools in Bamford / Norden are already full and the added housing proposal elsewhere in the borough will have similar impact elsewhere. Not all schools can expand and absorb additional pupils. It is therefore inconsistent with national policy and totally unjustified. The roads network is already congested and again the proposal does nothing to alleviate this problem: i.e. a one way system along Norden Road and some traffic lights! The extra traffic on the road created by 450 houses (say, 900 cars) will add to both pollution and congestion. How can that possibly be justified?</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>I would suggest a more thorough review of the brownfield areas is carried out with a view to making these areas the priority.</p> |