

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

| | |
|---|--|
| Family Name | Bishop |
| Given Name | Susan |
| Person ID | 1286416 |
| Title | Stakeholder Submission |
| Type | Web |
| Family Name | Bishop |
| Given Name | Susan |
| Person ID | 1286416 |
| 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>GREEN BELT</p> <p>The site does not comply with the PFE objectives in paras 7 and 8 and fails to accord with 6 out of 7 of the requirements for site selection.</p> <p>It fails the Justification and Positively prepared criteria because of the following</p> <p>There is no unmet housing need in Rochdale to justify building on Green Belt Land</p> <p>To build on greenbelt it must be shown that all other reasonable options have been considered - there are many brown field sites which are not included and more will become available after the pandemic and these will provide enough land to meet most of the housing need in Rochdale</p> <p>NPPF says Greenbelt serves 5 purposes -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To stop the sprawl of large built up areas To stop neighbouring towns merging To prevent the countryside from encroachment To preserve the character of historic towns and villages To encourage regeneration of towns by recycling derelict and other urban land. <p>There is therefore no exceptional reasons as far as I can see why executive houses should be built on this site as other viable options clearly exist</p> <p>TRAFFIC</p> <p>This site site does not comply with objective 7 of the plan. It is not consistent with adapting to the changing climate and makes no consideration to moving to a low carbon economy or reaching the criteria in chapters 2 and 9 of the NPPF.</p> |

This area already suffers increased traffic volumes due to its proximity to Hollingworth Lake Country Park which attracts hundreds of visitors. Additionally traffic disruption on the M62 brings additionally volumes of traffic.

The site is not Justified and neither is it compliant with National Policy

The site is not near the Metro link station being 4km away with no direct bus link!

The local stations struggle to meet demands at rush hour so many will use their cars resulting in a significant rise in CO2 pollution

Existing roads cannot accommodate the levels of anticipated traffic possibly amounting to some 5000 + extra traffic movements a day. |Traffic assessments that have been carried out are hugely optimistic.

SCHOOLS

There are not enough school places available particularly at primary level. A new school at Calderbrook which is some distance away is 2 form entry and the local one 2 1/2 form entry so places are being lost not gained.

It is of first and foremost important that there are enough school places to meet local needs .

Therefore the site is not Justified and is not consistent with national policy.

FLOODING

The site does not comply with the Places for Everyone objective at Para 2 and is not compliant with NPPF Ch 14. It is not effective justified or consistent with national policy

The flood risk assessment does not reflect reality. There is a degree of flooding sometimes over spilling onto neighbouring land.

So any building on greenbelt land is going to increase flooding in the area and the "once in a lifetime" floods of 2015 are going to become more the norm than this assessment would lead you to believe. Bricks, concrete and tarmac do not absorb water!! Building and removing trees on open fields that naturally absorb flood water is to enhance the flood risk for the whole village

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.

Remove JPA 22 from the plan

Family Name

Bishop

Given Name

Susan

Person ID

1286416

Title

JPA 24: Roch Valley

Type

Web

Soundness - Positively prepared?

Unsound

Soundness - Justified?

Unsound

Soundness - Consistent with national policy?

Unsound

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

| | |
|---|--|
| 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 site does not comply with PFE objectives 7&8 and neither does it comply with 6 out of 7 of the selection criteria. It is not consistent with sustainable development and NPPF Ch 13</p> <p>The reasons are clearly set out in JPA 22 above and as the sites are in the same area the same objections apply exactly.</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. | Remove JA 24 from the plan |