

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

Family Name	Clegg
Given Name	Angela
Person ID	1287113
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Clegg
Given Name	Angela
Person ID	1287113
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>Fails to comply with PfE objective 7 and not consistent with adapting to climate change, moving to a low carbon economy and NPPF chapters 2 (para 8) and 9.</p> <p>Traffic is already a massive issue in the area and the existing roads will not accommodate extra vehicles. The roads are extremely busy on a day to day basis and are a standstill whenever there is an issue with the M62 motorway as it is used as a diversion route. This will also have a detrimental affect to the current residents with the added pollution from the extra traffic.</p> <p>Hollingworth Lake is a tourist attraction and the number of vehicles that visit already cause issues due to lack of parking places. Removing any of the car parks will push cars to park elsewhere on surrounding estates (parking permit areas) or have a negative effect on the number of visitors and this will then impact the local economy.</p> <p>Fails to comply with pfe objective 9, and not consistent with NPPF chapter 8 para 95). There are not sufficient school places for local residents currently. Additional demand on places will mean local children will have to travel out of area for schooling this adding further to the traffic problems.</p> <p>Fails to comply with PfE objective 2 and not consistent with NPPF chapter 14. Littleborough already has a flooding issue and this will be exacerbated with housing currently being built at the flood plain on New Road. This area north of Smithy Bridge also has issues with flooding this will mean floodwaters will have to find another route and cause flooding to other properties. As a victim of the Boxing day 2015 floods, this is a real concern.</p> <p>The houses proposed will not be affordable housing for the local residents and will further price out local younger residents and less well off residents from being able to purchase a home in their home-town. These houses are aimed at attracting higher paid commuters from Manchester.</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>Fails to comply with PfE objectives 7 and 8, and 6 out of the 7 site selection criteria. Not consistent with sustainable development and NPPF chapt 13. Ther is no unmet housing need across rochdale to justify building on protected greenbelt land.</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>The modification I am seeking is for JPA 22 land north of Smithy bridge to be removed from the PfE</p>
<p>Family Name</p>	<p>Clegg</p>
<p>Given Name</p>	<p>Angela</p>
<p>Person ID</p>	<p>1287113</p>
<p>Title</p>	<p>JPA 24: Roch Valley</p>
<p>Type</p>	<p>Web</p>
<p>Soundness - Positively prepared?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Justified?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Soundness - Effective?</p>	<p>Unsound</p>
<p>Compliance - Legally compliant?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>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>	<p>Fails to comply with PfE objective 7 and not consistent with adapting to climate change, moving to a low carbon economy and NPPF chapters 2 (para 8) and 9.</p> <p>Traffic is already a massive issue in the area and the existing roads will not accommodate extra vehicles. The roads are extremely busy on a day to day basis and are a standstill whenever there is an issue with the M62 motorway as it is used as a diversion route. This will also have a detrimental affect to the current residents with the added pollution from the extra traffic.</p> <p>Hollingworth Lake is a tourist attraction and the number of vehicles that visit already cause issues due to lack of parking places. Removing any of the car parks will push cars to park elsewhere on surrounding estates (parking permit areas) or have a negative effect on the number of visitors and this will then impact the local economy.</p> <p>Fails to comply with pfe objective 9, and not consistent with NPPF chapter 8 para 95). There are not sufficient school places for local residents currently. Additional demand on places will mean local children will have to travel out of area for schooling this adding further to the traffic problems.</p> <p>Fails to comply with PfE objective 2 and not consistent with NPPF chapter 14. Littleborough already has a flooding issue and this will be exacerbated with housing currently being built at the flood plain on New Road. This area north of Smithy Bridge also has issues with flooding this will mean floodwaters</p>

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

	<p>will have to find another route and cause flooding to other properties. As a victim of the Boxing day 2015 floods, this is a real concern.</p> <p>The houses proposed will not be affordable housing for the local residents and will further price out local younger residents and less well off residents from being able to purchase a home in their home-town. These houses are aimed at attracting higher paid commuters from Manchester.</p> <p>Fails to comply with PfE objectives 7 and 8, and 6 out of the 7 site selection criteria. Not consistent with sustainable development and NPPF chapt 13. Ther is no unmet housing need across rochdale to justify building on protected greenbelt land</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>The modification I am seeking is for JPA 24 Roch valley to be removed from the PfE</p>