

Objection 1

Dear Bury Council Property Department,

Re: FORMAL OBJECTION: Section 123(2A) Local Government Act 1972 – Proposed Disposal of Land at Milton Road Fields.

I am emailing you with respect to the choice of the proposed disposal of Milton Road Fields to facilitate its proposed use as a pupil referral unit to be run by Oak Learning Partnership. Under Section 123 of the Local Government Act, the council is legally required to listen to formal objections.

My honest opinion is that I believe the Council has yet again failed to do its due diligence and genuinely believe that this site is not suitable to house the PRU.

Milton Road Fields was awarded funding by The Lancashire Wildlife Trust for improvement and enhancement of biodiversity on the site. The field is used by the community and was assigned as a community project by Bury Council. Access to green space around this field is limited and as such this area provides for existing leisure use which incidentally is the same reason given by the Council for not choosing one of the other proposed PRU sites.

The area has significantly more one-bedroom flats than the Bury Average which means residents have limited green space/gardens of their own. Due to its open perspective, it is considered as a safer environment than some of the other local spaces which are impacted by anti-social behaviour and drugs and alcohol.

The area is very close to a primary school and sheltered housing for our older residents.

The proposed location is in the middle of a residential area with an Index of Multiple Deprivation of 1. The LSOA for this area is ranked as the second most deprived in Bury and is ranked 200 out of 33,755 neighbourhoods in England where 1 is the most deprived. You can check this out for yourself using the following link:

<https://deprivation.communities.gov.uk/about-your-neighbourhood/E01005004?postcode=M263WD>

Please see the attached screenshots.

This area has suffered so much deprivation and lack of infrastructure to address the issues that it has recently been awarded Pride in Place funding, something reserved for areas with an IMD of 1 and poor Community Needs Index (CNI).

Not only is this area deprived it has a very significant rating for crime being 99% more deprived than 33,755 neighbourhoods in England (see attached). This area is particularly prone to crimes relating to drugs and has had several recent investigations into cuckooing. There is also evidence of regional gang activity in this area.

As you can see from the attached Google maps screen shot, the proposed site is in the middle of a residential area (gold outline) with very limited access to public transport (only one bus).

I have been told that this site was identified after six other sites were discounted. I am struggling to understand how any of the other sites identified were less suitable than this proposed site. In an email response from the Council, they told me that:

“In December 2024, the Council made a formal commitment to the Academy Chain Oak Learning Partnership, to provide a permanent combined Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) facility by the end of 2028. This was a condition of academisation.”

Quite frankly that is a failure on the part of the Council especially since the proposed site on Milton Road Fields was not even included in the original plans for locating the PRU. The Council should have ensured that a suitable site was located before committing to anything in terms of academisation, which they clearly failed to do.

My conclusion is that this site was simply selected because it was believed that it would incur less objections than other areas. There is a feeling amongst many Radcliffe residents that the Council does not appear to afford Radcliffe residents the same consideration in terms of open consultation that it does residents in other areas. In fact, there has been no consultation from the Council with either residents or elected representatives for the area about the choice of this site.

I cannot stress enough that I simply believe this is the wrong location for a Pupil Referral unit. Yet again, it feels like concerns of Radcliffe residents are being ignored and that yet again Radcliffe residents are having their right to access to green space removed.

I urge the Council to reconsider their choice of this field and to move forward with future proposals on the choice of sites in a more open fashion listening to the opinions of residents and elected members before choosing any site.

Please can you send me acknowledgement of receipt of this email.

Objection 2

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to submit a formal objection under Section 123(2A) of the Local Government Act 1972 regarding the proposed disposal of Milton Road Fields, Radcliffe. I object on the grounds that this land is a vital community asset previously designated for community projects. Its loss will disproportionately harm local health and wellbeing, particularly for nearby residents in high-density flats with no private gardens.

The fields are a safe, highly visible environment used by local school children and sheltered housing residents. While a PRU facility is needed in the borough, the Council must protect this scarce green infrastructure and explore alternative sites.

Despite the benefits the fields provide us local residents, I would also implore you to look into the crime rates of this area. The adjacent property to the fields has been one of consistent anti-social behaviour since I moved to the area in June 2024, which has often led to police and fire presence due to fighting, drug activity and uncontrolled bonfires. This is not a safe area for vulnerable children to be relocated.

As a neighbouring resident of Milton Meadows, I was not consulted regarding any potential planning permission, or informed of this projects undertaking.

Objection 3

I am writing to submit a formal objection under Section 123(2A) of the Local Government Act 1972 regarding the proposed disposal of Milton Road Fields, Radcliffe. I object on the grounds that this land is a vital community asset previously designated for community projects. Its loss will disproportionately harm local health and wellbeing, particularly for nearby residents in high-density flats with no private gardens.

The fields are a safe, highly visible environment used by local school children and sheltered housing residents. While a PRU facility is needed in the borough, the Council must protect this scarce green infrastructure and explore alternative sites.

Objection 4

I am writing to submit a formal objection under Section 123(2A) of the Local Government Act 1972 regarding the proposed disposal of Milton Road Fields, Radcliffe. I object on the grounds that this land is a vital community asset previously designated for community projects. Its loss will disproportionately harm local health and wellbeing, particularly for nearby residents in high-density flats with no private gardens.

The fields are a safe, highly visible environment used by local school children and sheltered housing residents. While a PRU facility is needed in the borough, the Council must protect this scarce green infrastructure and explore alternative sites

Objection 5

Ref sec 123 of Local Gov Act (2a) and Local Go. act 1972

I am writing to submit a formal objection under Section 123(2A) of the Local Government Act 1972 regarding the proposed disposal of Milton Road Fields, Radcliffe.

I object on the grounds that this land is a vital community asset previously designated for community projects. Its loss will disproportionately harm local health and wellbeing, particularly for nearby residents in high-density flats with no private gardens.

The fields are a safe, highly visible environment used by local school children and sheltered housing residents. While a PRU facility is needed in the borough, the Council must protect this scarce green infrastructure and explore alternative sites

Objection 6

Good morning.

Can I please register my formal objection to the proposed Pupil Referral Unit being located on green space on Milton Road. This space is the green heart of our estate.

Objection 7

I am writing to submit a formal objection under Section 123(2A) of the Local Government Act 1972 regarding the proposed disposal of Milton Road Fields, Radcliffe. I object on the grounds that this land is a vital community asset previously designated for community projects. Its loss will disproportionately harm local health and wellbeing, particularly for nearby residents in high-density flats with no private gardens.

The fields are a safe, highly visible environment used by local school children and sheltered housing residents. While a PRU facility is needed in the borough, the Council must protect this scarce green infrastructure and explore alternative sites.

Objection 8

To : Chief Executive, Bury Council

Director of Property / Land & Property

Council Solicitor

Re: Milton Road Field, Radcliffe – Supplementary objection to proposed disposal under Section 123(2A) Local Government Act 1972

I submit this supplementary objection to the proposed disposal of Milton Road Field, Radcliffe. This representation is made in addition to, and does not replace, withdraw or supersede my previous written Section 123 objection. I request that both representations are retained on the Council's disposal file and provided to the appropriate decision-maker for consideration.

This supplementary objection draws attention to significant evidence contained within a Bury Council letter dated 10 October 2023, concerning the Council's authorisation of the Growing Radcliffe Together community and environmental project on Milton Road Field.

1. Bury Council's own evidence demonstrates the public value of the land

On 10 October 2023, Bury Council formally granted permission for Growing Radcliffe Together to undertake works on Milton Road Field including:

1. native wildflower planting to improve biodiversity;
2. tree planting;
3. an access path through the field, creating a walking route between greenspaces;
4. measures intended to prevent vehicle access and reduce fly-tipping;
5. wildlife and community information signage; and
6. continued use of the land for the project and for a minimum of three years following completion.

The Council's letter expressly stated that the project would provide: "wildlife benefit, increased usage, increased learning and natural surveillance to this site."

This is important contemporaneous evidence from the landowner itself that the site was being actively treated as a community, environmental, biodiversity, recreational and learning asset.

2. The Council should explain the change in its approach

The Council's current statutory notice describes the land as public open space and confirms that it is being disposed of pursuant to Section 123(1) and (2A) of the Local Government Act 1972.

There is therefore a legitimate question as to what has changed between the Council's 2023 decision to facilitate environmental and community improvements to the site and its current proposal to dispose of it.

I ask the Council to confirm:

1. when the Growing Radcliffe Together project was deemed complete;
 2. whether the three-year period referred to in the Council's 10 October 2023 letter has expired;
 3. whether the Council subsequently varied, terminated or otherwise amended the permission granted in that letter;
 4. whether any commitments, conditions or obligations arising from that project remain outstanding; and
 5. what consideration was given to the continuing public, environmental and community benefits of the site before it was identified for disposal.
3. This evidence should be expressly considered as part of the Section 123 process

The current statutory notice confirms that the land "consists or forms part of an open space" for the purposes of Section 123(2A).

The 2023 Council letter is therefore directly relevant to the question of the site's existing public use and value.

I request that this evidence is expressly considered alongside my original objection when the Council considers representations concerning the proposed disposal.

Bury Council's own previous decision-making records demonstrate that objections to the disposal of public open space are considered as part of the disposal process.

4. The permanent loss of the site's existing benefits requires proper consideration

The proposed disposal would potentially result in the permanent loss of the benefits which the Council itself identified in 2023, including:

1. biodiversity improvements;
2. wildlife benefits;
3. community use;
4. walking connectivity;
5. learning opportunities;
6. natural surveillance; and
7. measures designed to reduce fly-tipping and unauthorised vehicle access.

Those matters should form part of the Council's consideration of whether disposal of this particular parcel of public open space is justified.

5. Alternative sites should be demonstrably considered

If disposal is proposed to facilitate the Ash Grove Alternative Provision Academy, I ask the Council to demonstrate that reasonable alternative sites have been properly considered and to explain why the permanent loss of this particular public open space is considered necessary and justified.

I fully recognise the importance of providing appropriate alternative educational provision. However, that objective should be considered alongside the established community and environmental value of the land rather than treated as automatically determining the disposal question.

For the avoidance of doubt, this is a supplementary representation and must be read together with my previous Section 123 objection.

I respectfully request that:

1. my original Section 123 objection remains fully recorded and unaffected;
2. this supplementary objection is added to the same disposal file;
3. both representations are provided to the appropriate decision-maker;
4. the 10 October 2023 Bury Council letter is expressly considered;
5. the Council confirms the status and completion date of the Growing Radcliffe Together project and the associated three-year period referred to in its letter;
6. the Council explains what consideration was given to the continuing community and environmental benefits of the site before proposing its disposal; and

7. the Council does not determine to proceed with disposal without first properly considering my original and supplementary objections in accordance with the statutory Section 123 process.

The October 2023 correspondence is particularly significant because it provides Bury Council's own contemporaneous evidence of the community, environmental, biodiversity, recreational and learning value which it attributed to Milton Road Field.

Any decision now to dispose of the land should therefore transparently explain what has changed since 2023 and how the permanent loss of those identified public benefits has been weighed against the case for disposal.

Please acknowledge receipt of this additional information and confirm that it will be considered.

Objection 9

RE: Formal Objection to the Proposed Disposal of Public Open Space at Milton Road, Radcliffe (Milton Meadows)

I am writing in my official capacity as a local representative to register a formal and strenuous objection to the council's declared intention to dispose of the public open space situated on the north side of Milton Road, Radcliffe (known locally as Milton Meadows).

While I recognise the statutory obligation to locate provision for educational services, disposing of this specific asset for development presents severe infrastructural, environmental, and structural risks that run contrary to the long-term interests of the Radcliffe community.

I urge the council to reject the disposal of this land based on the following critical material considerations:

1. Severe Ground Instability & High Mining Risk

Official records from the Mining Remediation Authority confirm that the entire footprint of Milton Meadows sits squarely within a Development High Risk Area. This designation indicates the presence of historical shallow coal mining workings, potential mine entries, and geological vulnerabilities. Introducing a heavy, institutional multi-story facility onto this specific parcel introduces profound structural and public safety concerns. Ground remediation—such as extensive deep-grouting—will not only be extraordinarily costly to the taxpayer but risks destabilising adjacent residential properties on Milton Road, Westminster Avenue, and Wordsworth Avenue.

1. Loss of Asset of Community Value and Biodiversity Loss

Milton Meadows is not redundant wasteland; it is a highly valued, actively used green lung within a heavily built-up urban area. Significant volunteer hours and ecological planning have gone into enhancing this space, including historical partnerships with organisations like the Lancashire Wildlife Trust. Disposing of this land directly contradicts the council's own climate emergency declarations and biodiversity net-gain targets by destroying a local habitat corridor and removing crucial natural drainage that protects local homes from surface water runoff.

3. Placement of an Institutional Facility in the Heart of a Vulnerable Residential Community

The suggested location is entirely surrounded by homes. Placing a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) in the middle of an established residential area raises serious concerns regarding increased traffic and parking pressures, safeguarding and community safety, noise and disturbance, and immense pressure on already stretched local infrastructure. Crucially, we must evaluate the cumulative impact on a neighbourhood that has already experienced significant social and economic challenges.

This area is not simply “deprived”—it is objectively among the most disadvantaged communities in Bury. We are not opposed to supporting children and young people who require alternative educational provision. Those young people absolutely deserve high-quality facilities, appropriate support, and environments that meet their needs. However, Milton Road Fields is fundamentally the wrong site.

4. Failure of Social Equity and Economic Parity

Residents of Radcliffe increasingly feel that their concerns are routinely ignored, while essential community assets are repeatedly placed at risk. The removal of access to vital green space from one of the most deprived neighbourhoods in the borough is explicitly incompatible with the Council's stated commitment to achieving social and economic parity across Bury. If parity means anything, it must mean that residents living in deprived communities are entitled to the exact same protection of green space, health, wellbeing, safety, and quality of life as residents living elsewhere in the borough.

I therefore formally call on Bury Council to execute the following steps immediately:

- * Withdraw the Proposal: Withdraw any proposal to locate a Pupil Referral Unit on Milton Road Fields.
- * Protect the Asset: Protect Milton Road Fields as a permanent community green space.
- * Consult the Public: Consult meaningfully with local residents before considering any future development affecting this site.
- * Identify Alternative Sites: Identify alternative locations for any proposed PRU that do not result in the loss of vital community open space in a highly deprived neighbourhood.

I look forward to receiving formal acknowledgment of this objection and being kept informed of any upcoming cabinet or committee reviews regarding this site.

Objection 10

I am writing to submit a formal objection under Section 123(2A) of the Local Government Act 1972 regarding the proposed disposal of Milton Road Fields, Radcliffe. I object on the grounds that this land is a vital community asset previously designated for community projects. Its loss will disproportionately harm local health and wellbeing, particularly for nearby residents in high-density flats with no private gardens.

The fields are a safe, highly visible environment used by local school children and sheltered housing residents. While a PRU facility is needed in the borough, the Council must protect this scarce green infrastructure and explore alternative sites.

Objection 11

I am writing to submit a formal objection under Section 123(2A) of the Local Government Act 1972 regarding the proposed disposal of Milton Road Fields, Radcliffe. I object on the grounds that this land is a vital community asset previously designated for community projects. Its loss will disproportionately harm local health and wellbeing, particularly for nearby residents in high-density flats with no private gardens.

The fields are a safe, highly visible environment used by local school children and sheltered housing residents. While a PRU facility is needed in the borough, the Council must protect this scarce green infrastructure and explore alternative sites

Objection 12

Objection to the soundness of the Publication Local Plan in relation to Green Infrastructure and Protected Open Space

I object to the Publication Bury Local Plan insofar as its policies and supporting evidence could permit or facilitate the loss or development of Milton Road Fields / Milton Road Open Space, Radcliffe, including the area locally referred to as Milton Meadows.

This representation concerns the soundness and evidential basis of the Local Plan. It is not an objection to a planning application: no planning application for the proposed Pupil Referral Unit has been submitted.

The issue for examination is whether the Local Plan provides a sufficiently robust, justified and effective policy framework to protect this established open-space and Green Infrastructure asset while accommodating identified public-service needs.

1. Conflict with Policy LP-GI1 – Green Infrastructure

The Publication Local Plan identifies LP-GI1 – Green Infrastructure as a strategic policy. The policy states that the Council will seek to protect and enhance a network of multi-functional green and blue infrastructure. It states that the Council will resist development which could negatively affect the functionality of the Green Infrastructure network unless specified criteria are satisfied.

Of relevance, LP-GI1 requires that development affecting the network must:

- * not sever or cause fragmentation of the Green Infrastructure network;
- * be limited and form part of, and be essential to, the provision and improvement of public services and utilities, where that criterion is relied upon;
- * provide positive benefits for the network's integrity, connectivity, role and multi-functionality; and
- * incorporate sufficient mitigation or compensation for loss or damage to the network.

The Council's own justification states that its Strategic Green Infrastructure network is shown on the Policies Map and expressly includes areas of outdoor open space, sport and recreation.

Accordingly, if Milton Road Fields falls within the mapped Strategic Green Infrastructure designation, the Council must demonstrate how any proposed development of the site satisfies all relevant elements of LP-GI1, rather than treating the land simply as available development land.

2. The site is established open space – Policy LP-OS1 : – Protected open space, sport and recreation as a strategic policy.

“The Council will seek to retain an adequate supply of good-quality and accessible open-space, sport and recreational assets”. It states that development resulting in the loss of such assets will not be allowed unless it can clearly be demonstrated that:

1. the site is surplus to current and future community requirements, taking account of its value and potential to address identified deficiencies;
2. equivalent or better replacement provision is made; or
3. the development is alternative sports/recreational provision whose benefits clearly outweigh the loss.

A proposed PRU is not alternative sports or recreational provision. Nor can replacement landscaping or biodiversity measures automatically constitute equivalent replacement open-space provision.

The central question is therefore whether the Council has robustly demonstrated that Milton Road Fields is genuinely surplus to current and future community requirements.

The Local Plan itself acknowledges identified deficiencies in the quantity, quality and accessibility of open space across the Borough.

3. The Council's earlier Green Space Audit recorded Milton Road Open Space (RP/RD028/00), Radcliffe, as 1.477 hectares of informal recreation space assessed as "Good". This is historical evidence rather than a substitute for the Council's current assessment, but it demonstrates that the site has an established recreational function and should not be characterised simply as undeveloped or incidental land.

The Publication Plan now relies upon the Bury Open Space Assessment 2026 as the relevant evidence base for LP-OS1.

The Council should therefore demonstrate transparently:

- * how Milton Road Fields is assessed in the 2026 evidence base;
- * its current quantity, quality, accessibility and community value;
- * whether there is a local quantitative or qualitative deficiency;
- * whether the site is genuinely surplus to current and future requirements; and
- * how any loss is consistent with the Local Plan's objective of retaining an adequate supply of accessible open space.

4. No adequate justification for selecting this site has been demonstrated. If the Council considers that land at Milton Road Fields is required for public-service infrastructure, the evidence must demonstrate why development on this particular open-space/GI asset is necessary.

The Council should therefore publish evidence demonstrating:

- * the specific need which the proposed facility is intended to meet;
- * why Milton Road Fields is required to meet that need;
- * why other reasonable sites were considered;
- * what reasonable alternatives were assessed and why they were rejected;
- * the comparative impact of those alternatives on open space, Green Infrastructure, accessibility, health and the environment; and
- * why the loss of this particular asset represents an appropriate planning strategy.

This is directly relevant to the "justified" soundness test because Bury's own transitional arrangements confirm that the Plan will be examined against the December 2023 NPPF, including the requirement that the strategy takes account of reasonable alternatives and is based on proportionate evidence.

5. The Council's own LP-GI1 justification recognises that Green Infrastructure is multi-functional, providing environmental, health and wellbeing, ecological, climate-resilience and landscape benefits. Consequently, the value of Milton Road Fields cannot properly be assessed solely by its acreage or by whether another piece of grassland could be provided elsewhere.

Any assessment should consider the cumulative loss of:

- * recreational and informal open-space function;
- * access to green space;
- * health and wellbeing benefits;
- * ecological connectivity;

- * landscape and visual amenity;
- * permeability and climate resilience; and
- * the site's contribution to the wider Green Infrastructure network.

6. Biodiversity Net Gain is not a substitute for open-space or Green Infrastructure protection. Any future biodiversity net gain associated with development should not be treated as equivalent compensation for the loss of an established public open-space and Green Infrastructure asset.

Biodiversity, recreation, public access, landscape, health and Green Infrastructure functions are not interchangeable. LP-GI1 itself requires consideration of the integrity, connectivity, role and multi-functionality of the network and separately requires mitigation or compensation for loss or damage.

7. The Plan must be capable of applying its own policies consistently and there is a significant potential inconsistency between:

- * the Plan's strategic objective of conserving and enhancing Green Infrastructure;
- * LP-GI1's requirement to resist development that negatively affects the functionality of the network;
- * LP-OS1's protection of existing open-space assets; and
- * any parallel Council strategy that would facilitate the permanent development of Milton Road Fields.

The Examination should therefore consider whether the Local Plan is internally coherent, justified and effective in protecting the assets which its own policies identify as important.

8. Soundness : for the purposes of Regulation 19 examination, I consider the Plan potentially unsound in this respect because it has not adequately demonstrated:

Positively prepared: that the need for public-service infrastructure has been balanced against the identified need to retain accessible open space and Green Infrastructure.

Justified: that the approach is supported by proportionate evidence and takes account of reasonable alternative locations.

Effective: that the Plan's stated protection of Green Infrastructure and open space can operate effectively where development of an established asset is being contemplated.

Consistent with national policy: that the approach properly reflects the national policy requirement for robust evidence concerning open-space provision and the protection of existing open-space assets.

I respectfully request that the Council and, if necessary, the appointed Planning Inspector:

1. Confirm the precise status of Milton Road Fields on the Publication Policies Map, including whether and to what extent it forms part of the Strategic Green Infrastructure network and/or protected open-space designation.
2. Require the Council to provide the current evidence supporting any contention that the site is surplus to current and future community requirements.
3. Require publication of the relevant assessment of the site's quantity, quality, accessibility, recreational, environmental and community functions.
4. Require a transparent assessment of reasonable alternative locations for the proposed public-service use.
5. Require the Council to demonstrate how any development of the site would satisfy the requirements of LP-GI1 and LP-OS1.

6. Require the Plan to be modified if the evidence does not demonstrate that the proposed approach is justified, effective and consistent with its own strategic policies.

Conclusion

Milton Road Fields should not be treated simply as an available parcel of land.

The Council's Publication Local Plan places strategic importance on Green Infrastructure and explicitly seeks to retain an adequate supply of accessible open space. Its own policies require strong evidence before such land can be lost.

The fact that the proposed PRU is a public-service facility does not, by itself, resolve the requirements of LP-GI1 or LP-OS1. The Council must still demonstrate necessity, appropriate site selection, compliance with the Green Infrastructure tests and, critically, that the open-space asset is genuinely surplus or otherwise satisfies the policy's requirements.

I therefore ask that the Inspector carefully examine the evidential basis for any approach that would facilitate development of Milton Road Fields and, where the necessary evidence is absent, require appropriate modification to the Local Plan.

Objection 13

To whom it may concern,

I am writing to formally object to the disposal of the land on Milton Road, Radcliffe.

My son and I frequently use this field to play, look for insects, and watch the wide variety of birds that visit the area. Many other local families also enjoy and rely on this green space. It is disappointing that this land is being considered for sale and potential redevelopment into housing, flats, or HMOs.

Please reconsider this decision and preserve this valuable space for our estate.

Objection 14

I am writing to submit a formal objection under Section 123(2A) of the Local Government Act 1972 regarding the proposed disposal of Milton Road Fields, Radcliffe. I object on the grounds that this land is a vital community asset previously designated for community projects. Its loss will disproportionately harm local health and wellbeing, particularly for nearby residents in high-density flats with no private gardens.

The fields are a safe, highly visible environment used by local school children and sheltered housing residents. While a PRU facility is needed in the borough, the Council must protect this scarce green infrastructure and explore alternative sites

Objection 15

FORMAL STATUTORY OBJECTION

Section 123(2A) Local Government Act 1972

Proposed Disposal of Open Space Land at Milton Road Fields (Milton Meadows), Radcliffe

To: Property Services / Cabinet Local Authority Members

Bury Council, Town Hall, Knowsley Street, Bury, BL9 0SW

Email: Property@bury.gov.uk<<mailto:Property@bury.gov.uk>>

Date: 2nd September 2026

Dear Sir / Madam,

I am writing to submit my formal statutory objection regarding Bury Council's advertised intention to dispose of the public open space land on the north side of Milton Road, Radcliffe (Milton Road Fields / Milton Meadows).

I strongly object to the release and disposal of this land under Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 on the following grounds:

- * **Loss of Vital Green Infrastructure:** This land is a highly valued community asset and wildlife oasis. It was previously designated by the Council as a community project and is actively looked after by local volunteers.
- * **Harm to Local Health and Wellbeing:** This estate has a higher-than-average density of high-rise and one-bedroom flats. For many residents living here without a private garden, Milton Road Fields is their only accessible link to outdoor recreation, mental health support, and green space.
- * **Community Safety:** Due to its open aspect and clear visibility, these fields provide a safe outdoor environment relied upon by vulnerable local residents, including young children from the nearby primary school and elderly residents from local sheltered housing.
- * **Failure to Explore Alternatives:** While the borough requires a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU), Milton Road Fields is entirely the wrong location. The Council has a duty to protect scarce green space and must thoroughly evaluate alternative brownfield or non-open space sites.

I request that Bury Council immediately withdraws the proposal to dispose of this land and maintains its protection as permanent public open space. I expect the Council Cabinet to fully consider this statutory objection with an open mind, as required by law, before making any further decisions.

Please record my objection formally.

Objection 16

I am writing to submit a formal objection under Section 123(2A) of the Local Government Act 1972 regarding the proposed disposal of Milton Road Fields, Radcliffe. I object on the grounds that this land is a vital community asset previously designated for community projects. Its loss will disproportionately harm local health and wellbeing, particularly for nearby residents in high-density flats with no private gardens.

Milton Road Fields are located directly within the MSOA and has been assessed as an area of within the Index of Multiple Deprivation and Community needs. It is imperative that we retain this asset for the use of residents and local communities.

The fields are a safe, highly visible environment used by local school children and sheltered housing residents. While a PRU facility is needed in the borough, the Council must protect this scarce green infrastructure and explore alternative sites.

Objection 17

To whom it may concern.

I am writing to submit a formal objection under Section 123(2A) of the Local Government Act 1972 regarding the proposed disposal of Milton Road Fields, Radcliffe.

I object on the grounds that this land is a vital community asset previously designated for community projects.

Its loss will disproportionately harm local health and wellbeing, particularly for nearby residents in high-density flats with no private gardens.

The fields are a safe, highly visible environment used by local school children and sheltered housing residents. While a PRU facility is needed in the borough, the Council must protect this scarce green infrastructure and explore alternative sites, surely a large area of land will soon be available when the demolition of Pioneer Mills is completed, this maybe a more suitable location.

Objection 18

Hello

I am writing to submit a formal objection under Section 123(2A) of the Local Government Act 1972 regarding the proposed disposal of Milton Road Fields, Radcliffe. I object on the grounds that this land is a vital community asset previously designated for community projects. Its loss will disproportionately harm local health and wellbeing, particularly for nearby residents in high-density flats with no private gardens.

The fields are a safe, highly visible environment used by local school children and sheltered housing residents. While a PRU facility is needed in the borough, the Council must protect this scarce green infrastructure and explore alternative sites

While our town needs education facilities, destroying our vital local green space is entirely the wrong choice. This field is our community hub, our wildlife oasis, and the only green space for many residents living in nearby flats without gardens.

Kind regards

Shirley

Shirley Barlow

Objection 19

CRITICAL: Structural, Statutory, and Highways Failures Regarding Proposed Milton Road Fields PRU Development

CRITICAL: Structural, Statutory, and Highways Failures Regarding Proposed Milton Road Fields PRU Development

Dear Judi,

Thank you for your continued support of Radcliffe residents and for launching the official petition against the proposed Pupil Referral Unit (PRU) on Milton Road Fields.

As a long-term resident living directly opposite the site, I am writing to provide you with a definitive breakdown of the specific Material Planning Considerations and Statutory Regulations that this proposed development violates. These failures provide the legal grounds required to block this project entirely at the planning and regulatory stages.

1. Highways and Access Failures (Severe Breach of Safety Specifications)

* Sub-Standard Carriageway Width: Milton Road measures only 4.9 metres in width. Under standard highways design guidance, this width is the absolute minimum requirement for minor residential cul-de-sacs with low traffic volumes. It is structurally and legally incapable of handling institutional, commercial, or educational traffic.

* National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Paragraph 115: The NPPF dictates that development should be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be "severe."

* Obstruction of Statutory Emergency Access: With a road width of only 4.9m, a single vehicle parked on the carriageway reduces the remaining passable space to under 2.5m. This directly prevents standard fire appliances and ambulances from reaching existing residential properties, posing a direct threat to public safety.

2. Geotechnical Ground Instability & Hydrology Risks

* Sub-Soil Shifting and Structural Subsidence: This land has a well-documented history of underground water accumulation and structural sinkage (underwater sinkage risks). Driving heavy construction machinery and introducing permanent heavy structures will cause severe sub-soil compaction.

* Damage to Adjacent Foundations: This water displacement directly threatens the shallow foundations of my home and the three adjacent properties, presenting a severe risk of residential subsidence and structural cracking.

* Footpath & Root Damage: Visible evidence of ground instability is already present outside my property, where protected tree roots have buckled and cracked the public footpath. Heavy vehicular vibration will worsen this damage and breach British Standard BS5837 (Trees in relation to design, demolition, and construction).

3. Statutory Safeguarding and Human Rights Violations

* Human Rights Act 1998 (Article 8): As a vulnerable tenant of 16 years with diagnosed PTSD, severe anxiety, and clinical depression, placing a high-occupancy institutional unit directly opposite my front window—whilst I am already managing a severe, documented neighbor dispute—directly violates my Right to Respect for Private and Family Life and Home. The council cannot demonstrate that this site choice is proportionate or safe under their statutory safeguarding duties.

How this Development Can Be Legally Stopped (Highest Authorities)

If the council attempts to abuse its executive powers to ignore these specifications, we can escalate this past them using three distinct legal mechanisms:

1. The Planning Inspectorate (The "Call-In" Power): Because Bury Council is acting as both the applicant and the judge, we can formally petition the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government to "call in" the application. The National Planning Inspectorate can completely strip Bury Council of its decision-making power and reject the build based on the severe highways and infrastructure failures.

2. High Court Injunction (Judicial Review): If the Planning Committee votes to approve this build by deliberately ignoring mandatory safety metrics or environmental surveys, the resident action group can launch a Judicial Review. The High Court has the power to rule the council's decision unlawful and grant an immediate injunction to stop all diggers.

3. Statutory Objection from Greater Manchester Fire & Rescue Service: As a mandatory consultee, the fire service can legally object to the site layout if it is proven that the 4.9m road width will trap emergency vehicles and block access to our homes.

Please could you ensure that the Highways Authority, Environmental Health, and Building Control are formally notified of these infrastructure failures immediately, and that these points are logged as core arguments within your campaign?

Thank you for fighting for our community, it's greatly appreciated.

Objection 20

Dear Property Services Team,

RE: Notice of Proposed Disposal of Land at Milton Road, Radcliffe (Local Government Act 1972, Section 123)

I am writing as a local resident to register my formal objection to Bury Council's proposal to dispose of the open space land at Milton Road (Milton Meadows), Radcliffe, for the development of a Pupil Referral Unit (PRU).

While I support the provision of dedicated educational facilities for children requiring alternative provision, I strongly oppose the selection of Milton Meadows for this project. I request that the Council rejects this disposal and instead explores alternative, brownfield, or underutilised commercial sites within the borough.

My objections are based on the following grounds:

Loss of Vital Community Green Space: Milton Meadows is a well-used, highly valued asset for the Radcliffe community. It provides an essential open space for recreation, dog walking, and community events. Stripping the neighbourhood of this green lung directly contradicts efforts to maintain community well-being and health.

Ecological and Environmental Impact: The field is home to established biodiversity and wildlife. Developing this greenfield site will permanently destroy local habitats and goes against broader environmental sustainability targets.

Traffic, Infrastructure, and Access Constraints: The surrounding residential streets, including Milton Road and Westminster Avenue, are narrow and already experience traffic congestion. Introducing a school facility will severely worsen traffic flow, create parking hazards, and compromise road safety for local residents and children.

Availability of Alternative Sites: Radcliffe has several brownfield and vacant plots that are far better suited for structural development. Greenfield public open space should only ever be considered as an absolute last resort.

I urge the Council to take these community concerns seriously, halt the disposal of this cherished public land, and safeguard Milton Meadows for future generations.

Please acknowledge receipt of this formal objection and keep me informed of the outcome of the Section 123 consultation process.