

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Buckley
Given Name	Joanne
Person ID	1287327
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Buckley
Given Name	Joanne
Person ID	1287327
Title	Our Vision
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 plan uses 2014 data to predict housing need and ignores the impact of Brexit and Covid-19. Housing need must be re-assessed using the latest (2018) ONS population predictions and take into account the effect of Covid-19 on work patterns.</p> <p>There are no partners or industries identified for employment provision. Major partners for employment provision should be identified.</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>It is questionable whether PfE and the GMSF can effectively be treated as the same plan. Legality must be decided in court before 'Places for Everyone' can proceed any further. It is assumed that a transition between a spatial framework (GMSF) and a Joint Development plan (PfE) is acceptable without a significant re-write. While the GMSF may have been established as legally compliant (complies with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning regulations) and could therefore possibly proceed to final public consultation and submission under Regulation 19 (this current stage) PfE legality is not established. If there is any substantial difference in scope between the GMSF and PfE it cannot be assumed that Regulation 18 is Automatically satisfied for PfE. Para 1.23 states 'The changes made between GMSF 2020 and PfE 2021 are not insignificant in numerical terms, indeed all sections of the plan have seen some form of change.' So, is 'not insignificant' the same as 'substantial', if it is, the plan is not legal. This can only be established by a proper judicial review. So until proven otherwise the plan must be considered illegal and not put to Government.</p>
Family Name	Buckley
Given Name	Joanne
Person ID	1287327

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Title	Our Strategic Objectives
Type	Web
Our strategic objectives - Considering the information provided for our strategic objectives, please tick which of these objectives your written comment refers to:	1. Meet our housing need 3. Ensure a thriving and productive economy in the districts involved 6. Promote the sustainable movement of people, goods and information 10. Promote the health and wellbeing of communities
Soundness - Positively prepared?	NA
Soundness - Justified?	NA
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	No
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
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.	It is assumed that a transition between a spatial framework (GMSF) and a Joint Development plan (PfE) is acceptable without a significant re-write. While the GMSF may have been established as legally compliant (complies with Regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning regulations) and could therefore possibly proceed to final public consultation and submission under Regulation 19 (this current stage) PfE legality is not established.
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.	The current stage PfE legality is not established and needs to be in order for it to be valid.
Family Name	Buckley
Given Name	Joanne
Person ID	1287327
Title	JPA 2: Stakehill
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?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
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 Governments rules (National Planning Policy Framework - NPPF) says new developments must "Ensure that existing settlements and pockets of housing are taken fully into account through the master planning of the area".</p> <p>Around Slattocks/Stakehill the scale of development will dwarf what"s already here , tripling houses, devastating farmland and wildlife, and totally change the "village"feel.</p> <p>Many people in the area are not aware of the proposed housing developments and Rochdale Council has not informed the public about the current planning policies.</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 do not believe that existing settlements and pockets of housing have been taken fully into account through the master planning of the area.</p> <p>No public consultations have been organised to notify people living in the area, of the proposed changes.</p> <p>The section "Prepared the plan in accordance with the latest Local Development Scheme (LDS) for the nine Local Authorities participating in PfE, which informs the public about the current planning policies for the local authority" has not been implemented or imposed.</p>
Family Name	Buckley
Given Name	Joanne
Person ID	1287327
Title	Rochdale - Green Belt Additions
Type	Web
GBA Rochdale - Tick which Green Belt addition/s within this District your response relates to - then respond to the questions below	Rochdale GBA19 Land to west of Stakehill Business Park
Soundness - Positively prepared?	Unsound
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	Unsound
Soundness - Effective?	Unsound
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
Redacted reasons - Please give us details	Land is an increasingly precious resource with competing demands for housing, commercial buildings, transport, carbon sequestration, food

<p>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>	<p>production, rural jobs, energy production, water storage, water absorption and recreation. I do not believe that building more warehouses, that could stand empty for years, is the right way forward.</p>
<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>	<p>Opportunities for alternative energy production from green field and Green Belt sites must be found instead of concreting over these areas. This does not fall in line with Government guidelines.</p>