

Family Name	Connolly
Given Name	Wendy
Person ID	1286350
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Connolly
Given Name	Wendy
Person ID	1286350
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>With respect to the Green Belt the proposed site in Bamford fails to comply with the PfE Objectives 7 and 8, and also 6 out of the 7 Site Selection Criteria. It is not consistent with sustainable development and NPPF Chapter13.</p> <p>I consider that there is no justification to develop the site. The plans have not been positively prepared and are not consistent with national policy.</p> <p>I do not believe that there is a shortage of housing within the Rochdale Borough that can justify the building on Green Belt. The very purpose of Green Belt land is to prevent urban sprawl which is exactly what building on this site will create. This land is PROTECTED.</p> <p>It is my understanding that any potential developers must prove that there are no other options and that there are exceptional circumstances to justify building on this PROTECTED land. They have to prove that there are no other options. The fact is that there are many brown field sites that are available across the Borough and these have not been included in the PfE plans. It seems that the developers are not keen to develop these brown field sites due to the expense involved in clearing them prior to building. They are keen to build on the Green Belt which does not involve the cost of clearing and is therefore more lucrative. Many of the existing brown field sites in the Rochdale Borough are not only eyesores but potentially hazardous and it would be much more beneficial to develop these than to sacrifice the PROTECTED Green Belt. It also appears as we emerge from the pandemic that other brown field sites are becoming available. It is my belief that the sheer number of brown field sites available both now and in the foreseeable future strengthens the argument that there can be NO justifiable reason to build on the Green Belt.</p> <p>It also surely makes sense to prioritise developing on brown field sites that are close to existing transport hubs thus reducing the necessity to increase traffic flow in the Bamford area.</p>

With respect to traffic the site fails to comply with PfE Objective 7. It is not consistent with adapting to climate change, moving to a low carbon economy and NPPF Chapter 2, paragraphs 8 and 9. The site is not justified and not consistent with national policy.

The site is some distance away from public transport hubs. It is 6km from the nearest Metro station and 5 km from the nearest railway station. It is therefore obvious that residents of the proposed houses will use cars as their transport of choice/convenience. This will result in an increase in CO2 emissions - this is not sustainable. The building of 450 executive homes would create at best guess at least 900 additional vehicles using the local roads. There is already an air quality management zone next to St. Michaels Primary School at the junction of Bury and Rochdale Old Road and Queens Park Road. This is a mere 150 metres from the proposed site. This pollution will only get worse if the development proceeds. Many children walk and cycle to this school and to Bamford Academy on Belgium Street, off Norden Road - indeed they are encouraged to do so! This increase in traffic and pollution will adversely affect the health of these children and other pedestrians. Along with the increase in pollution there will be the increase in the risk of physical injury from accidents due to the increased traffic load. As a dog walker I regularly cross Norden Road to access Jowkin Lane and the Green Belt. I have personally experienced the negative impact on my breathing when crossing at peak times when cars are stationary at the traffic lights but still producing exhaust fumes. I have also witnessed 2 individuals having breathing difficulties and coughing whilst attempting to cross the road. When I questioned these individuals they stated that it was the traffic fumes that were causing their problems.

The existing roads cannot accommodate the inevitable increase of an estimated 900 cars. The proposed one-way system on Norden Road and War Office Road will make the congestion and air pollution far worse on War Office Road. In addition, I can foresee this creating a "rat run" along Spencer Lane (OL11 5PE) for motorists wanting to reduce their journey. Spencer Lane has a significant proportion of elderly residents whose safety would be put at risk by the inevitable increase in through traffic. In icy conditions in the winter months, I regularly witness residents from Spencer Lane walking along the road in preference to the slippery pavements. There is a real potential for accidents if Spencer Lane becomes a "rat run".

With respect to schools the site fails to comply with PfE Objective 9 and is not consistent with NPPF Chapter 9 paragraph 95 and therefore is not justified and not consistent with national policy. There is no mention of additional schools being proposed for the area. It is essential that there are sufficient school places available to accommodate children from the proposed development and it is my understanding that the existing schools are full to their capacity.

There is a history of flooding on the site. The site therefore fails to comply with PfE Objective 2 and is not justified, not effective and not consistent with national policy. Every year the site suffers significant flooding which I have experienced first-hand whilst dog walking and I have many photos from different years which illustrate this. Some years the flooding is severe and Jowkin Lane literally becomes a river. The assessment of the site does not fit with what actually happens "on the ground". The soil is heavy clay and areas when not actually flooded are often water logged. There are many natural springs in the area. Adjacent roads such as "Clay Lane" and "The Springs" are so named for a reason! The proposed development on the site will result in large areas being covered in concrete, hindering the soaking away of flood water. In addition, hedges and trees will have to be removed in order to facilitate the development - these currently help to soak up the water. All these actions will only increase the prospect of more severe flooding in the area and its surroundings.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

With respect to leisure the site fails to comply with PfE Objectives 7, 8 and 10 and is not consistent with Chapter 8 of NPPF. The site is not justified and not consistent with national policy.

Removing the Green Belt protection from the site will put at risk the existing Football, Cricket and Tennis facilities. It will leave these clubs vulnerable to future development and a loss of valuable leisure facilities.

In addition, the site is the only ACCESSIBLE local green space and is well used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders. In one week alone in March 2021 (during the pandemic) over 2,000 people used the pathways running across the site. If it is removed the nearest alternative green space is Ashworth Valley which is too far away for many elderly residents and young children to access. The loss of this local green space could have a profound effect on the mental and physical health of the existing residents and result in a significant increase in the cost of subsequent health care.

Given all of the above points I truly believe that allocation of this site should be removed from PfE. The key reason for my objections to the proposed development is that the site is publicly accessible Green Belt land which is protected by National Planning Policy.

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 19 Bamford/Norden from the PfE