

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

| | |
|---|--|
| Family Name | Taylor |
| Given Name | John |
| Company / Organisation | Heywood, Middleton and Rochdale Conservative Cllrs |
| Person ID | 1286674 |
| Title | Stakeholder Submission |
| Type | Web |
| Family Name | Taylor |
| Given Name | John |
| Company / Organisation | Heywood, Middleton and Rochdale Conservative Cllrs |
| Person ID | 1286674 |
| 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>This policy is unsound as it fails to comply with the Places for Everyone objectives, there is no established need and it greatly increases environmental damage and thus contributes to global warming and climate change.</p> <p>Objective 1 Not met. Housing need can be met without the release of any greenbelt land.</p> <p>Objective 2 Not met. Greenbelt sites are not neighbourhoods of choice for development. Brown field sites have not been prioritized, they are not in Town Centre locations and they are not central to transport links.</p> <p>Objective 3 Not met. Building on greenbelt sites will not add to a thriving economy. In fact the opposite is the case, by their very nature many are in locations that would force increased transport to work adding to the carbon footprint. A loss of greenbelt will detract from the overall attractiveness of the area resulting in less visitors and a reduced local economy.</p> <p>Objective 5 Not met. Greenbelt sites have inferior transport links when compared with the Town Centre or sites in close proximity to arterial routes and motorways. Building in these locations will not enhance employment opportunities or reduce the number of wards in the top ten list of deprivation.</p> <p>Objective 6 Not met. Brownfield sites close to established transport routes are ideally placed for development. Building within 800m of a sporadic rail link does not</p> |

qualify as close proximity of a transport hub. Derelict and failing town centre locations must be prioritized.

Objective 7

Not met. The target of becoming carbon neutral is highly important and very challenging. We must maximize opportunities to reduce carbon emissions. Additional building on the greenbelt in outlying locations will be counter productive. It will add to carbon emissions, light pollution and noise pollution whilst simultaneously reducing the clean air we all desire.

Objective 8

Not met. This policy if enacted will result in the unnecessary destruction of our green spaces. Established habitats for wildlife will be destroyed and wildlife will be lost or displaced.

Objective 9

Not met. These greenbelt policies cannot provide sustainable infrastructure. Opportunities for sustainable development close to existing infrastructure are being ignored.

Objective 10

Not met. Residents will be disadvantaged with a lack of localized health care. Location and topography reduce the likelihood of active travel targets being met. Thus, opportunities for emissions reduction are ignored.

Additional Evidence of Unsoundness

These policies fail to meet many of the ten objectives within the Places for Everyone framework rendering it totally inappropriate and completely unjustified. Greenbelt locations are publically accessed protected green spaces. All developments must be based on need and environmental factors. The NPPF states building on greenbelt can only occur in exceptional circumstances. The policy to build on greenbelt is far from exceptional - it is totally unnecessary. Examination of the projected growth indicators suggests there is no established need to build on the greenbelt. Furthermore, windfall sites have not been factored into the equation. Calculations did not take into account the impact of brexit or the effects of the pandemic. Both have significantly influenced net migration both nationally and locally.

Consultation is now outdated and ought to be repeated, many of those directly affected were unable to take part and make their voices heard when it was initially conducted. It took place prior to brexit and prior to the pandemic. Need and demand has changed and those factors must be taken into consideration.

The loss of more green space will result in:

- An increased deterioration of air quality.
- An increased level of noise pollution.
- An increased level of light pollution.
- An increased level of carbon release.
- An increased level of transport congestion.
- An increased level of demand on stretched services such as hospitals and doctors.
- A decrease in green spaces.
- Deterioration in the tourist offer.
- Deterioration in the quality of life for residents in all surrounding villages.

Public transport is limited and cannot compare with existing infrastructure in the town centre where development ought to be focused. Manchester city centre provides an excellent example of how the regeneration of urban areas can result in state of the art and highly desirable living spaces. Of course

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>Rochdale isn't a direct comparison to the city centre but with the new Hilton Hotel under construction it provides realistic opportunities for housing provision for the local community. With many vacant properties and swathes of derelict land there is an abundance of development options.</p> <p>The recently vacated Wheatsheaf shopping centre provides a perfect example of a windfall site now presented for development. Historical data can be used to predict future windfall sites and they too ought to be factored into the numbers. Otherwise, we will end up with many derelict sites along with the destruction of our greenbelt and green field locations.</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. | delete this policy |
| Family Name | Taylor |
| Given Name | John |
| Company / Organisation | Heywood, Middleton and Rochdale Conservative Cllrs |
| Person ID | 1286674 |
| Title | JPA 20: Castleton Sidings |
| 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>This policy is unsound as it fails to comply with the Places for Everyone objectives, there is no established need and it greatly increases environmental damage and thus contributes to global warming and climate change.</p> <p>Objective 1 Not met. Housing need can be met without the release of any greenbelt land.</p> <p>Objective 2 Not met. Greenbelt sites are not neighbourhoods of choice for development. Brown field sites have not been prioritized, they are not in Town Centre locations and they are not central to transport links.</p> <p>Objective 3 Not met. Building on greenbelt sites will not add to a thriving economy. In fact the opposite is the case, by their very nature many are in locations that would force increased transport to work adding to the carbon footprint. A</p> |

loss of greenbelt will detract from the overall attractiveness of the area resulting in less visitors and a reduced local economy.

Objective 5

Not met. Greenbelt sites have inferior transport links when compared with the Town Centre or sites in close proximity to arterial routes and motorways. Building in these locations will not enhance employment opportunities or reduce the number of wards in the top ten list of deprivation.

Objective 6

Not met. Brownfield sites close to established transport routes are ideally placed for development. Building within 800m of a sporadic rail link does not qualify as close proximity of a transport hub. Derelict and failing town centre locations must be prioritized.

Objective 7

Not met. The target of becoming carbon neutral is highly important and very challenging. We must maximize opportunities to reduce carbon emissions. Additional building on the greenbelt in outlying locations will be counter productive. It will add to carbon emissions, light pollution and noise pollution whilst simultaneously reducing the clean air we all desire.

Objective 8

Not met. This policy if enacted will result in the unnecessary destruction of our green spaces. Established habitats for wildlife will be destroyed and wildlife will be lost or displaced.

Objective 9

Not met. These greenbelt policies cannot provide sustainable infrastructure. Opportunities for sustainable development close to existing infrastructure are being ignored.

Objective 10

Not met. Residents will be disadvantaged with a lack of localized health care. Location and topography reduce the likelihood of active travel targets being met. Thus, opportunities for emissions reduction are ignored.

Additional Evidence of Unsoundness

These policies fail to meet many of the ten objectives within the Places for Everyone framework rendering it totally inappropriate and completely unjustified. Greenbelt locations are publically accessed protected green spaces. All developments must be based on need and environmental factors. The NPPF states building on greenbelt can only occur in exceptional circumstances. The policy to build on greenbelt is far from exceptional - it is totally unnecessary. Examination of the projected growth indicators suggests there is no established need to build on the greenbelt. Furthermore, windfall sites have not been factored into the equation. Calculations did not take into account the impact of brexit or the effects of the pandemic. Both have significantly influenced net migration both nationally and locally.

Consultation is now outdated and ought to be repeated, many of those directly affected were unable to take part and make their voices heard when it was initially conducted. It took place prior to brexit and prior to the pandemic. Need and demand has changed and those factors must be taken into consideration.

The loss of more green space will result in:

- An increased deterioration of air quality.
- An increased level of noise pollution.
- An increased level of light pollution.
- An increased level of carbon release.
- An increased level of transport congestion.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>-An increased level of demand on stretched services such as hospitals and doctors.</p> <p>-A decrease in green spaces.</p> <p>-Deterioration in the tourist offer.</p> <p>-Deterioration in the quality of life for residents in all surrounding villages.</p> <p>Public transport is limited and cannot compare with existing infrastructure in the town centre where development ought to be focused. Manchester city centre provides an excellent example of how the regeneration of urban areas can result in state of the art and highly desirable living spaces. Of course Rochdale isn't a direct comparison to the city centre but with the new Hilton Hotel under construction it provides realistic opportunities for housing provision for the local community. With many vacant properties and swathes of derelict land there is an abundance of development options.</p> <p>The recently vacated Wheatsheaf shopping centre provides a perfect example of a windfall site now presented for development. Historical data can be used to predict future windfall sites and they too ought to be factored into the numbers. Otherwise, we will end up with many derelict sites along with the destruction of our greenbelt and green field locations.</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. | Delete this policy |
| Family Name | Taylor |
| Given Name | John |
| Company / Organisation | Heywood, Middleton and Rochdale Conservative Cllrs |
| Person ID | 1286674 |
| Title | JPA 21: Crimble Mill |
| 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 | <p>This policy is unsound as it fails to comply with the Places for Everyone objectives, there is no established need and it greatly increases environmental damage and thus contributes to global warming and climate change.</p> <p>Objective 1</p> <p>Not met. Housing need can be met without the release of any greenbelt land.</p> |

comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

Objective 2

Not met. Greenbelt sites are not neighbourhoods of choice for development. Brown field sites have not been prioritized, they are not in Town Centre locations and they are not central to transport links.

Objective 3

Not met. Building on greenbelt sites will not add to a thriving economy. In fact the opposite is the case, by their very nature many are in locations that would force increased transport to work adding to the carbon footprint. A loss of greenbelt will detract from the overall attractiveness of the area resulting in less visitors and a reduced local economy.

Objective 5

Not met. Greenbelt sites have inferior transport links when compared with the Town Centre or sites in close proximity to arterial routes and motorways. Building in these locations will not enhance employment opportunities or reduce the number of wards in the top ten list of deprivation.

Objective 6

Not met. Brownfield sites close to established transport routes are ideally placed for development. Building within 800m of a sporadic rail link does not qualify as close proximity of a transport hub. Derelict and failing town centre locations must be prioritized.

Objective 7

Not met. The target of becoming carbon neutral is highly important and very challenging. We must maximize opportunities to reduce carbon emissions. Additional building on the greenbelt in outlying locations will be counter productive. It will add to carbon emissions, light pollution and noise pollution whilst simultaneously reducing the clean air we all desire.

Objective 8

Not met. This policy if enacted will result in the unnecessary destruction of our green spaces. Established habitats for wildlife will be destroyed and wildlife will be lost or displaced.

Objective 9

Not met. These greenbelt policies cannot provide sustainable infrastructure. Opportunities for sustainable development close to existing infrastructure are being ignored.

Objective 10

Not met. Residents will be disadvantaged with a lack of localized health care. Location and topography reduce the likelihood of active travel targets being met. Thus, opportunities for emissions reduction are ignored.

Additional Evidence of Unsoundness

These policies fail to meet many of the ten objectives within the Places for Everyone framework rendering it totally inappropriate and completely unjustified. Greenbelt locations are publically accessed protected green spaces. All developments must be based on need and environmental factors. The NPPF states building on greenbelt can only occur in exceptional circumstances. The policy to build on greenbelt is far from exceptional - it is totally unnecessary. Examination of the projected growth indicators suggests there is no established need to build on the greenbelt. Furthermore, windfall sites have not been factored into the equation. Calculations did not take into account the impact of brexit or the effects of the pandemic. Both have significantly influenced net migration both nationally and locally.

Consultation is now outdated and ought to be repeated, many of those directly affected were unable to take part and make their voices heard when it was initially conducted. It took place prior to brexit and prior to the

pandemic. Need and demand has changed and those factors must be taken into consideration.

The loss of more green space will result in:

- An increased deterioration of air quality.
- An increased level of noise pollution.
- An increased level of light pollution.
- An increased level of carbon release.
- An increased level of transport congestion.
- An increased level of demand on stretched services such as hospitals and doctors.
- A decrease in green spaces.
- Deterioration in the tourist offer.
- Deterioration in the quality of life for residents in all surrounding villages.

Public transport is limited and cannot compare with existing infrastructure in the town centre where development ought to be focused. Manchester city centre provides an excellent example of how the regeneration of urban areas can result in state of the art and highly desirable living spaces. Of course Rochdale isn't a direct comparison to the city centre but with the new Hilton Hotel under construction it provides realistic opportunities for housing provision for the local community. With many vacant properties and swathes of derelict land there is an abundance of development options.

The recently vacated Wheatsheaf shopping centre provides a perfect example of a windfall site now presented for development. Historical data can be used to predict future windfall sites and they too ought to be factored into the numbers. Otherwise, we will end up with many derelict sites along with the destruction of our greenbelt and green field locations.

| | |
|---|--|
| 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. | Delete this policy |
| Family Name | Taylor |
| Given Name | John |
| Company / Organisation | Heywood, Middleton and Rochdale Conservative Cllrs |
| Person ID | 1286674 |
| 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>This policy is unsound as it fails to comply with the Places for Everyone objectives, there is no established need and it greatly increases environmental damage and thus contributes to global warming and climate change.</p> <p>Objective 1 Not met. Housing need can be met without the release of any greenbelt land.</p> <p>Objective 2 Not met. Greenbelt sites are not neighbourhoods of choice for development. Brown field sites have not been prioritized, they are not in Town Centre locations and they are not central to transport links.</p> <p>Objective 3 Not met. Building on greenbelt sites will not add to a thriving economy. In fact the opposite is the case, by their very nature many are in locations that would force increased transport to work adding to the carbon footprint. A loss of greenbelt will detract from the overall attractiveness of the area resulting in less visitors and a reduced local economy.</p> <p>Objective 5 Not met. Greenbelt sites have inferior transport links when compared with the Town Centre or sites in close proximity to arterial routes and motorways. Building in these locations will not enhance employment opportunities or reduce the number of wards in the top ten list of deprivation.</p> <p>Objective 6 Not met. Brownfield sites close to established transport routes are ideally placed for development. Building within 800m of a sporadic rail link does not qualify as close proximity of a transport hub. Derelict and failing town centre locations must be prioritized.</p> <p>Objective 7 Not met. The target of becoming carbon neutral is highly important and very challenging. We must maximize opportunities to reduce carbon emissions. Additional building on the greenbelt in outlying locations will be counter productive. It will add to carbon emissions, light pollution and noise pollution whilst simultaneously reducing the clean air we all desire.</p> <p>Objective 8 Not met. This policy if enacted will result in the unnecessary destruction of our green spaces. Established habitats for wildlife will be destroyed and wildlife will be lost or displaced.</p> <p>Objective 9 Not met. These greenbelt policies cannot provide sustainable infrastructure. Opportunities for sustainable development close to existing infrastructure are being ignored.</p> <p>Objective 10 Not met. Residents will be disadvantaged with a lack of localized health care. Location and topography reduce the likelihood of active travel targets being met. Thus, opportunities for emissions reduction are ignored.</p> <p>Additional Evidence of Unsoundness</p> <p>These policies fail to meet many of the ten objectives within the Places for Everyone framework rendering it totally inappropriate and completely unjustified. Greenbelt locations are publically accessed protected green</p> |

spaces. All developments must be based on need and environmental factors. The NPPF states building on greenbelt can only occur in exceptional circumstances. The policy to build on greenbelt is far from exceptional - it is totally unnecessary. Examination of the projected growth indicators suggests there is no established need to build on the greenbelt. Furthermore, windfall sites have not been factored into the equation. Calculations did not take into account the impact of brexit or the effects of the pandemic. Both have significantly influenced net migration both nationally and locally.

Consultation is now outdated and ought to be repeated, many of those directly affected were unable to take part and make their voices heard when it was initially conducted. It took place prior to brexit and prior to the pandemic. Need and demand has changed and those factors must be taken into consideration.

The loss of more green space will result in:

- An increased deterioration of air quality.
- An increased level of noise pollution.
- An increased level of light pollution.
- An increased level of carbon release.
- An increased level of transport congestion.
- An increased level of demand on stretched services such as hospitals and doctors.
- A decrease in green spaces.
- Deterioration in the tourist offer.
- Deterioration in the quality of life for residents in all surrounding villages.

Public transport is limited and cannot compare with existing infrastructure in the town centre where development ought to be focused. Manchester city centre provides an excellent example of how the regeneration of urban areas can result in state of the art and highly desirable living spaces. Of course Rochdale isn't a direct comparison to the city centre but with the new Hilton Hotel under construction it provides realistic opportunities for housing provision for the local community. With many vacant properties and swathes of derelict land there is an abundance of development options.

The recently vacated Wheatsheaf shopping centre provides a perfect example of a windfall site now presented for development. Historical data can be used to predict future windfall sites and they too ought to be factored into the numbers. Otherwise, we will end up with many derelict sites along with the destruction of our greenbelt and green field locations.

| | |
|--|---|
| <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>Delete this policy</p> |
| <p>Family Name</p> | <p>Taylor</p> |
| <p>Given Name</p> | <p>John</p> |
| <p>Company / Organisation</p> | <p>Heywood, Middleton and Rochdale Conservative Cllrs</p> |
| <p>Person ID</p> | <p>1286674</p> |

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

| | |
|---|---|
| Title | JPA 23: Newhey Quarry |
| 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>This policy is unsound as it fails to comply with the Places for Everyone objectives, there is no established need and it greatly increases environmental damage and thus contributes to global warming and climate change.</p> <p>Objective 1 Not met. Housing need can be met without the release of any greenbelt land.</p> <p>Objective 2 Not met. Greenbelt sites are not neighbourhoods of choice for development. Brown field sites have not been prioritized, they are not in Town Centre locations and they are not central to transport links.</p> <p>Objective 3 Not met. Building on greenbelt sites will not add to a thriving economy. In fact the opposite is the case, by their very nature many are in locations that would force increased transport to work adding to the carbon footprint. A loss of greenbelt will detract from the overall attractiveness of the area resulting in less visitors and a reduced local economy.</p> <p>Objective 5 Not met. Greenbelt sites have inferior transport links when compared with the Town Centre or sites in close proximity to arterial routes and motorways. Building in these locations will not enhance employment opportunities or reduce the number of wards in the top ten list of deprivation.</p> <p>Objective 6 Not met. Brownfield sites close to established transport routes are ideally placed for development. Building within 800m of a sporadic rail link does not qualify as close proximity of a transport hub. Derelict and failing town centre locations must be prioritized.</p> <p>Objective 7 Not met. The target of becoming carbon neutral is highly important and very challenging. We must maximize opportunities to reduce carbon emissions. Additional building on the greenbelt in outlying locations will be counterproductive. It will add to carbon emissions, light pollution and noise pollution whilst simultaneously reducing the clean air we all desire.</p> <p>Objective 8 Not met. This policy if enacted will result in the unnecessary destruction of our green spaces. Established habitats for wildlife will be destroyed and wildlife will be lost or displaced.</p> <p>Objective 9</p> |

Not met. These greenbelt policies cannot provide sustainable infrastructure. Opportunities for sustainable development close to existing infrastructure are being ignored.

Objective 10

Not met. Residents will be disadvantaged with a lack of localized health care. Location and topography reduce the likelihood of active travel targets being met. Thus, opportunities for emissions reduction are ignored.

Additional Evidence of Unsoundness

These policies fail to meet many of the ten objectives within the Places for Everyone framework rendering it totally inappropriate and completely unjustified. Greenbelt locations are publically accessed protected green spaces. All developments must be based on need and environmental factors. The NPPF states building on greenbelt can only occur in exceptional circumstances. The policy to build on greenbelt is far from exceptional - it is totally unnecessary. Examination of the projected growth indicators suggests there is no established need to build on the greenbelt. Furthermore, windfall sites have not been factored into the equation. Calculations did not take into account the impact of brexit or the effects of the pandemic. Both have significantly influenced net migration both nationally and locally.

Consultation is now outdated and ought to be repeated, many of those directly affected were unable to take part and make their voices heard when it was initially conducted. It took place prior to brexit and prior to the pandemic. Need and demand has changed and those factors must be taken into consideration.

The loss of more green space will result in:

- An increased deterioration of air quality.
- An increased level of noise pollution.
- An increased level of light pollution.
- An increased level of carbon release.
- An increased level of transport congestion.
- An increased level of demand on stretched services such as hospitals and doctors.
- A decrease in green spaces.
- Deterioration in the tourist offer.
- Deterioration in the quality of life for residents in all surrounding villages.

Public transport is limited and cannot compare with existing infrastructure in the town centre where development ought to be focused. Manchester city centre provides an excellent example of how the regeneration of urban areas can result in state of the art and highly desirable living spaces. Of course Rochdale isn't a direct comparison to the city centre but with the new Hilton Hotel under construction it provides realistic opportunities for housing provision for the local community. With many vacant properties and swathes of derelict land there is an abundance of development options.

The recently vacated Wheatsheaf shopping centre provides a perfect example of a windfall site now presented for development. Historical data can be used to predict future windfall sites and they too ought to be factored into the numbers. Otherwise, we will end up with many derelict sites along with the destruction of our greenbelt and green field locations.

Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant

Delete this policy

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

| | |
|---|--|
| and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above. | |
| Family Name | Taylor |
| Given Name | John |
| Company / Organisation | Heywood, Middleton and Rochdale Conservative Cllrs |
| Person ID | 1286674 |
| Title | JPA 24: Roch Valley |
| 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>This policy is unsound as it fails to comply with the Places for Everyone objectives, there is no established need and it greatly increases environmental damage and thus contributes to global warming and climate change.</p> <p>Objective 1 Not met. Housing need can be met without the release of any greenbelt land.</p> <p>Objective 2 Not met. Greenbelt sites are not neighbourhoods of choice for development. Brown field sites have not been prioritized, they are not in Town Centre locations and they are not central to transport links.</p> <p>Objective 3 Not met. Building on greenbelt sites will not add to a thriving economy. In fact the opposite is the case, by their very nature many are in locations that would force increased transport to work adding to the carbon footprint. A loss of greenbelt will detract from the overall attractiveness of the area resulting in less visitors and a reduced local economy.</p> <p>Objective 5 Not met. Greenbelt sites have inferior transport links when compared with the Town Centre or sites in close proximity to arterial routes and motorways. Building in these locations will not enhance employment opportunities or reduce the number of wards in the top ten list of deprivation.</p> <p>Objective 6 Not met. Brownfield sites close to established transport routes are ideally placed for development. Building within 800m of a sporadic rail link does not qualify as close proximity of a transport hub. Derelict and failing town centre locations must be prioritized.</p> <p>Objective 7 Not met. The target of becoming carbon neutral is highly important and very challenging. We must maximize opportunities to reduce carbon emissions.</p> |

Additional building on the greenbelt in outlying locations will be counter productive. It will add to carbon emissions, light pollution and noise pollution whilst simultaneously reducing the clean air we all desire.

Objective 8

Not met. This policy if enacted will result in the unnecessary destruction of our green spaces. Established habitats for wildlife will be destroyed and wildlife will be lost or displaced.

Objective 9

Not met. These greenbelt policies cannot provide sustainable infrastructure. Opportunities for sustainable development close to existing infrastructure are being ignored.

Objective 10

Not met. Residents will be disadvantaged with a lack of localized health care. Location and topography reduce the likelihood of active travel targets being met. Thus, opportunities for emissions reduction are ignored.

Additional Evidence of Unsoundness

These policies fail to meet many of the ten objectives within the Places for Everyone framework rendering it totally inappropriate and completely unjustified. Greenbelt locations are publically accessed protected green spaces. All developments must be based on need and environmental factors. The NPPF states building on greenbelt can only occur in exceptional circumstances. The policy to build on greenbelt is far from exceptional - it is totally unnecessary. Examination of the projected growth indicators suggests there is no established need to build on the greenbelt. Furthermore, windfall sites have not been factored into the equation. Calculations did not take into account the impact of brexit or the effects of the pandemic. Both have significantly influenced net migration both nationally and locally.

Consultation is now outdated and ought to be repeated, many of those directly affected were unable to take part and make their voices heard when it was initially conducted. It took place prior to brexit and prior to the pandemic. Need and demand has changed and those factors must be taken into consideration.

The loss of more green space will result in:

- An increased deterioration of air quality.
- An increased level of noise pollution.
- An increased level of light pollution.
- An increased level of carbon release.
- An increased level of transport congestion.
- An increased level of demand on stretched services such as hospitals and doctors.
- A decrease in green spaces.
- Deterioration in the tourist offer.
- Deterioration in the quality of life for residents in all surrounding villages.

Public transport is limited and cannot compare with existing infrastructure in the town centre where development ought to be focused. Manchester city centre provides an excellent example of how the regeneration of urban areas can result in state of the art and highly desirable living spaces. Of course Rochdale isn't a direct comparison to the city centre but with the new Hilton Hotel under construction it provides realistic opportunities for housing provision for the local community. With many vacant properties and swathes of derelict land there is an abundance of development options.

The recently vacated Wheatsheaf shopping centre provides a perfect example of a windfall site now presented for development. Historical data can be used

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

| | |
|---|---|
| | to predict future windfall sites and they too ought to be factored into the numbers. Otherwise, we will end up with many derelict sites along with the destruction of our greenbelt and green field locations. |
| 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. | Delete this policy |
| Family Name | Taylor |
| Given Name | John |
| Company / Organisation | Heywood, Middleton and Rochdale Conservative Cllrs |
| Person ID | 1286674 |
| Title | JPA 25: Trows Farm |
| 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>This policy is unsound as it fails to comply with the Places for Everyone objectives, there is no established need and it greatly increases environmental damage and thus contributes to global warming and climate change.</p> <p>Objective 1 Not met. Housing need can be met without the release of any greenbelt land.</p> <p>Objective 2 Not met. Greenbelt sites are not neighbourhoods of choice for development. Brown field sites have not been prioritized, they are not in Town Centre locations and they are not central to transport links.</p> <p>Objective 3 Not met. Building on greenbelt sites will not add to a thriving economy. In fact the opposite is the case, by their very nature many are in locations that would force increased transport to work adding to the carbon footprint. A loss of greenbelt will detract from the overall attractiveness of the area resulting in less visitors and a reduced local economy.</p> <p>Objective 5 Not met. Greenbelt sites have inferior transport links when compared with the Town Centre or sites in close proximity to arterial routes and motorways. Building in these locations will not enhance employment opportunities or reduce the number of wards in the top ten list of deprivation.</p> |

Objective 6

Not met. Brownfield sites close to established transport routes are ideally placed for development. Building within 800m of a sporadic rail link does not qualify as close proximity of a transport hub. Derelict and failing town centre locations must be prioritized.

Objective 7

Not met. The target of becoming carbon neutral is highly important and very challenging. We must maximize opportunities to reduce carbon emissions. Additional building on the greenbelt in outlying locations will be counter productive. It will add to carbon emissions, light pollution and noise pollution whilst simultaneously reducing the clean air we all desire.

Objective 8

Not met. This policy if enacted will result in the unnecessary destruction of our green spaces. Established habitats for wildlife will be destroyed and wildlife will be lost or displaced.

Objective 9

Not met. These greenbelt policies cannot provide sustainable infrastructure. Opportunities for sustainable development close to existing infrastructure are being ignored.

Objective 10

Not met. Residents will be disadvantaged with a lack of localized health care. Location and topography reduce the likelihood of active travel targets being met. Thus, opportunities for emissions reduction are ignored.

Additional Evidence of Unsoundness

These policies fail to meet many of the ten objectives within the Places for Everyone framework rendering it totally inappropriate and completely unjustified. Greenbelt locations are publically accessed protected green spaces. All developments must be based on need and environmental factors. The NPPF states building on greenbelt can only occur in exceptional circumstances. The policy to build on greenbelt is far from exceptional - it is totally unnecessary. Examination of the projected growth indicators suggests there is no established need to build on the greenbelt. Furthermore, windfall sites have not been factored into the equation. Calculations did not take into account the impact of brexit or the effects of the pandemic. Both have significantly influenced net migration both nationally and locally.

Consultation is now outdated and ought to be repeated, many of those directly affected were unable to take part and make their voices heard when it was initially conducted. It took place prior to brexit and prior to the pandemic. Need and demand has changed and those factors must be taken into consideration.

The loss of more green space will result in:

- An increased deterioration of air quality.
- An increased level of noise pollution.
- An increased level of light pollution.
- An increased level of carbon release.
- An increased level of transport congestion.
- An increased level of demand on stretched services such as hospitals and doctors.
- A decrease in green spaces.
- Deterioration in the tourist offer.
- Deterioration in the quality of life for residents in all surrounding villages.

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Public transport is limited and cannot compare with existing infrastructure in the town centre where development ought to be focused. Manchester city centre provides an excellent example of how the regeneration of urban areas can result in state of the art and highly desirable living spaces. Of course Rochdale isn't a direct comparison to the city centre but with the new Hilton Hotel under construction it provides realistic opportunities for housing provision for the local community. With many vacant properties and swathes of derelict land there is an abundance of development options.</p> <p>The recently vacated Wheatsheaf shopping centre provides a perfect example of a windfall site now presented for development. Historical data can be used to predict future windfall sites and they too ought to be factored into the numbers. Otherwise, we will end up with many derelict sites along with the destruction of our greenbelt and green field locations.</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>Delete this policy</p> |