

<p>Will the Places for Everyone (PfE) plan become a reality?</p>	<p><b>Can I believe that it will happen?</b></p> <p>Words like ‘potential’, ‘possible’, ‘could’, and ‘may’ appear throughout the documentation giving the impression that some things are a wish list, put there to whet your appetite and lead you to believe the Plan is a ‘dream come true’ and your life will be infinitely enhanced. Much like adverts on TV where a burger or fizzy drink ‘will’ change your life.</p> <p>Many of the proposals rest on funding and grants being secured from Government and with the agreement/support of other agencies and businesses.</p> <p>You have your own personal circumstance and day-to-day reality/experiences and you can use those to inform how you response to the consultation.</p> <p>If you have parental responsibilities then you should include those realities. ‘Can I really walk/cycle with my children to school and then get to work on time and in a decent state?’ ‘If there is a lot less local green space, how can I introduce and educate my youngsters about their environment – in the real world?’</p> <p>Will services be available for me, my family, parents, friends? Does your reality today match how you think it should be?</p>	
<p>Is PfE <b>Positively Prepared</b>?</p> <p>Does it represent <b>Sustainable Development</b>?</p>	<p><b>Does it</b> - meet the development needs of the area; align growth and infrastructure; improve the environment; mitigate climate change (including by making effective use of land in urban areas) and adapt to its effects.</p> <p><b>Does it</b> - as a minimum, provide for objectively assessed needs for housing and other uses, as well as any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas.</p> <p><b>Is it</b> - informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated?</p>	<p><b>Why has the number of houses jumped from the 2019 figure of 900 to 1,680?</b></p> <p>The document says “<i>more detailed masterplanning has demonstrated that the northern part of the allocation can accommodate an increased number of homes than that previously envisaged. The boundary to the northern part of the site has been changed to incorporate the garden centre site.</i>”</p> <p><b>This indicates that Rochdale Council and Redrow have decided they can squeeze more houses in. There is no rationale or detailed explanation for this.</b></p> <p><b>Up until this version of the plan was published, the All-in-One garden centre was not included in the plan area.</b></p> <p><b>Whilst this was suggested (by Redrow) as the main route into the northern section of the allocation, it has been sneaked in at the very last minute and doesn’t allow you time to fully consider the implications or be properly consulted about its inclusion.</b></p> <p><b>Does the local area ‘need’ 1,680 new houses?</b> (Will the population of the Slattocks/Stakehill/Chesham/ Cherrington and adjoining areas naturally grow by this much?) <b>Answer = No</b></p> <p><b>Natural population growth of 6.2% over the plan period suggests a figure of around 60 based on 900/1,000 homes in the area.</b></p> <p><b>Is the infrastructure in place ready for the growth?</b> (Water &amp; sewerage system; GP Surgeries; Hospitals; Nurseries; Primary/High Schools; Road Network).</p> <p><b>Answer = No.</b></p> <p><b>Whilst not regarded as a flood risk area according to national criteria, we’ve had several flooding events (Give examples of dates if you have them). Sewerage network is ‘very old’- collapses are likely. GP surgeries are overloaded and there are none nearby (Can you get a GP appointment quickly?). Schools are virtually full –</b></p>

even those being built now (Edgar Wood Academy, Bowlee) will immediately be at max capacity. (Temporary school built on Hopwood Hall College grounds to help cope)

Frequent motorway accidents/closures cause chaos on local roads (Broadway already very busy).

Is new railway station at Slattocks needed? **Existing trains between Castleton and Mills Hill will have to stop only 2-3mins after setting off. Who is the proposed station meant for – current residents or new homeowners? Many people will drive to the station, not walk/cycle.**

Local roads are not maintained to a good standard. **Proposed improvements relate to traffic control in/out of new development. Slattocks roundabout would have traffic lights. Up to 600+ cars/vehicles would join from Bentley Ave. An extra 200+ from the narrow Thornham New Road. 3,200+ at All-in-One. There have been deaths & serious accidents on Rochdale rd/Slattocks roundabout which are unlikely to have been prevented by the traffic control measures proposed. Getting work/school/supermarkets/hospitals etc will be more difficult.**

**Will the proposed development make the environment better?** (Loss of farmland; Open space; ‘Countryside’; Wildlife and Habitat; Air Quality). **Answer = No.**

**Will farmers have enough grazing land? Should we growing crops to lessen ‘food miles’? The current HGV driver crisis only makes this worse.**

**Wildlife will be pushed out, suffer or disappear altogether. A large area of their green field/habitat will be built on. There will be less Open Space. The proposed Green Belt addition behind Cardinal Langley School is already green fields – so just calling it Green Belt makes no difference. Public Footpaths will go through new housing estate.**

**Building 1,681 new homes and additional industrial units will add to the local carbon footprint. This will add to Climate Change not reduce or mitigate its effects.**

Rochdale Council has declared a Climate Emergency and yet proposes to build on Green Belt.

**Short-term, air quality is likely to get worse. Extra vehicles at new homes/businesses. Diesel/Petrol vehicles will remain in use for 10/20 years. Rail freight (so-called “heavy rail”) will continue to use diesel as investment in electrification has yet to be identified.**

		<p><b>Does it make effective use of land?</b> (Is there land that needs regeneration – Brownfield Land that was previously used).  <b>Answer = No.</b>  <b>PfE says the focus is on a ‘Core Growth Area’ and Main Town Centres and most of development will be in urban areas.</b> Stakehill is not one of these. The proposals fail to protect local communities/small hamlets/pockets of houses – they will be swamped by the scale of the proposed development.</p> <p><b>Have agreements been made with neighbouring Councils?</b> (Stockport pulled out of the PfE plan and have yet to decide if they can meet their own need for housing/industrial sites).  <b>Answer = No. If Stockport cannot meet their own need, then they will ask neighbouring Councils to help – but the PfE plan doesn’t mention this.</b></p>
<p><b>Is the Plan Justified?</b> – Is it an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence?</p>	<p><b>Are there</b> - any adverse impacts of doing the developments that would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.</p>	<p>Loss of Green Belt is a once and for all event. Once its gone, we won’t get it back.</p> <p>Government data says the number of <b>households in Rochdale Borough will rise by just over 7,000</b> between 2021 and 2037.</p> <p><b>Rochdale has a Strategic Housing Land supply for 7,997 homes</b> (This is just 51 homes less than the Government says Rochdale must find land for over 16 years – that’s 3 per year).  <b>But the PfE plan for Rochdale is to build 11,434 homes.</b></p> <p>Government data says <b>Rochdale’s population will increase by 19,073</b> between 2021 and 2037.</p> <p>The figures tell us that each home will be occupied by 2.73 people – but the PfE plan uses an occupancy rate of just over 1 person per house.</p> <p><b>Does this make sense?</b> Many of these extra homes would be on Green Belt land.</p> <p><i>[Currently in GM “there are 2.8 million people living in 1.2 million homes” - that’s 2.34 people per house] [“The Plan looks ahead 16 years to accommodate 164,880 new homes. This will be achieved by delivering the urban land supply (170,385) and 20,391 (2021/37 supply) new homes from new allocations”- An extra, so-called buffer, 16%].</i></p> <p><b>Government data says the population of Greater Manchester (excluding Stockport) will rise by 158,194.</b>  <b>Using these figures, the PfE plan will build 190,776 homes – more than one for each man, woman, and child!</b></p> <p><b>How is this extra 20% justified?</b> National policy suggests a buffer of between 5 to 10%.</p>

		<p><b>Without using Green Belt, Rochdale has enough land to build the homes it needs.</b> The PfE plan has no need to use Green Belt either. The need to reduce food miles because of the proposed loss of local agricultural land, the jobs &amp; businesses they support, and the effects of BREXIT are all factors that indicate that the PfE plan is unsound</p>
<p>Is the Plan <b>Effective</b>?</p>	<p><b>Is it</b> - deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground.</p>	<p><b>Are the right homes being planned for?</b>  On housing alone, the plan states that there are xxxxx people on waiting lists for homes. Most of these people cannot get a mortgage so will have to rent an 'affordable' property. The Plan aims to deliver 30,000 homes for social/affordable rent over the 16 years but admits 72,000 are on waiting lists. On many of the allocation sites, such a Stakehill, it states it <i>"includes higher value properties"</i> with a <i>"garden village approach"</i>. <b>Is this what is needed? Are £350,000 -500,000 homes affordable? Does it help young people/families get their own home?</b></p> <p><b>Will it protect what we already have?</b>  It tells us it will, but how can bulldozing Green Belt and green fields for new development instead of regenerating/redeveloping Brownfield land and losing part of our natural environment, make things better? Tell them that in your own words.</p> <p><b>So is the Plan Effective?</b>  <b>Answer = No</b>  It will not do what is needed</p>
<p>Is the Plan <b>'Consistent with national policy'</b>?</p>	<p>Enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p><b>Does it deliver 'economic, social, and environmental' benefits?</b>  <b>It may deliver some but it certainly damage others.</b></p> <p>The Governments rules (National Planning Policy Framework - NPPF) says new developments must <i>"Ensure that existing settlements and pockets of housing are taken fully into account through the master planning of the area"</i></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>