

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Appendices 0108/1/007/O	<p style="text-align: center;">The House Builders Federation</p> <p>Objects to inclusion of further land in the green belt as indicated in Appendix A, as UDP does not demonstrate the exceptional circumstances required to make changes to adopted green belt</p>
Objection	
Business & Industry 0008/1/009/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Countryside Agency</p> <p>Would welcome a separate policy which identifies the need to strengthen the rural economic base and addresses the issue of rural diversification.</p>
Omission	
Business & Industry 0117/1/003/O	<p style="text-align: center;">North West Tourist Board Agent : Paul Butler Associates</p> <p>UDP should include a policy to encourage caravan and camping sites in appropriate locations subject to them having no adverse environmental impacts. Plan contains no policy in relation to caravan and camp sites. Potential role in holiday sector.</p>
Omission	
Design 0008/1/012/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Countryside Agency</p> <p>Consider embracing wider definition of "quality of life" encouraged by "Planning Tomorrows Countryside" as there are economic and social dimensions to "high quality" development, as well as a building design dimension</p>
Objection	
General 0021/1/033/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Government Office for the North West</p> <p>References in various parts of the UDP to draft RPG will need to be updated once RPG has been issued</p>
Omission	
General 0606/1/003/S	<p style="text-align: center;">Saddleworth Conservation Action Group</p> <p>Supports inclusion of Oldham Biodiversity Action Plan in the UDP</p>
Support	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
General 0798/1/001/O	H M Prison Service Agent : Paul Dickinson and Associates
Omission	Plan should include a policy and allocation for a new prison in line with Circular 03/98
General 0815/1/006/O	Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL Agent : Cordingleys
Objection	Object to the use of Supplementary Planning Guidance to determine the details of planning policy as this does not allow interested parties to put forward formal objections to be considered by an independent Inspector on certain significant issues
Natural Resources 0665/1/006/O	Environment Agency
Omission	There should be Policy guidance in terms of what will be expected when developing adjacent to watercourses and canals in urban areas.
Natural Resources 0665/1/007/O	Environment Agency
Omission	A sites constraints section should be included.
Open Environment 0149/1/019/O	English Nature
Omission	Under Conservation Regulation 37, the Plan should contain a policy that encourages the management of features of the landscape which are important for wild flora and fauna
Recreation 0495/1/002/O	Sport England
Objection	The title of the chapter should be changed to Sport, Recreation and Open Space
Transport 0136/1/001/O	General Aviation Awareness Council
	Include a criteria-based policy to consider proposals for landing strips and

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	helipads, in accordance with national planning policy (PPG13, PPG24) and because General Aviation is a growing economic and leisure activity
Omission	
	Countryside Agency
Waste Management 0008/1/024/S	Supports the sustainable aims of this section.
Support	
Land at 2 Oldham Road, Uppermill	Mr F J T Tanner
0733/1/001/S	Supports that the site is excluded from the Green Belt
Support	
Park and ride in Green Belt	GMPTE
0026/1/002/O	Add policy in Open Environment chapter on development of Park and Ride sites in Green Belt in accordance with PPG13
Omission	
Rochdale Canal	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/009/O	Given international protection of the Rochdale Canal, Council should consider either policy on development adjacent to the canal and/or Supplementary Planning Guidance relating to this.
Omission	
Rochdale Canal, Huddersfield Narrow Canal	British Waterways
0422/1/001/O	Allocate key sites on the restored Rochdale and Huddersfield Narrow canals for a variety of uses and include specific policies to harness their potential for regeneration and high quality design in order to address economic potential of canals
Omission	
1.10	
	Countryside Agency
Introduction	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0008/1/016/O	The Council's vision for the Borough should be included in the UDP, together with an explanation of how it was derived, as the UDP's role is to bring together the needs and aspirations of the community as a whole including non-urban areas
Objection	
	West Pennine Bridleways Association
Introduction 0175/1/001/S	Support objective a. (supporting communities and social inclusion, for example by ensuring that new developments do not physically divide communities).
Support	
1.10 e., 1.11	
	North West Tourist Board Agent : Paul Butler Associates
Introduction 0117/1/007/O	Supports the UDP objectives, but e. should include 'for the benefit of residents and visitors'. Supports that the UDP must be carried out in conjunction with other plans, including the Tourism Strategy.
Objection	
1.12, 1.13	
	Countryside Agency
Introduction 0008/1/015/O	Doubt that reliance on liaison and the GM Strategic Framework will guarantee meeting the needs of rural and urban fringe areas. The Plan needs to explain how it makes provision for them.
Objection	
1.13	
	Peak District National Park
Introduction 0036/1/002/O	Propose additional wording making reference to the need to ensure that the UDP supports the Peak District National Park Authority in its policies to manage and protect the Park.
Objection	
	West Pennine Bridleways Association
Introduction	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0175/1/002/S	Support working with neighbouring areas and the Standing Conference of South Pennine Authorities.
Support	
1.2	Government Office for the North West
Introduction 0021/1/020/O	Require clarification of reference to "other material considerations".
Objection	
1.4	Countryside Agency
Introduction 0008/1/011/O	Sustainable development should be the over-arching principle guiding the Plan. This could be achieved by introducing a section stating what it means for Oldham and how it links to the spatial strategy.
Omission	
10.1	Sport England
Recreation 0495/1/003/O	The term "sport" has been omitted from this para.
Objection	
10.2	Sport England
Recreation 0495/1/010/O	The term sport as well as recreational should be mentioned in the first sentence.
Omission	
10.5	Sport England
Recreation 0495/1/012/O	This para. should make reference to the term sport as well as to recreation and open space.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
11.40-11.45	
	W A Tomlinson
Open Environment 0691/1/001/O	Change not likely to be on a large enough scale to replace loss of existing farms or retain landscape. Need a more relaxed approach in Plan to diversification to allow organic smallholdings, indoor farming or niche market activities to develop.
Objection Joint Case	
11.42	
	Energy Technology Support Unit (ETSU) Agent : Terence O'Rourke plc
Open Environment 0726/1/002/S	Supports the link made between the community forestry initiative and biomass energy schemes
Support	
13.50 - 13.67	
	Energy Technology Support Unit (ETSU) Agent : Terence O'Rourke plc
Natural Resources 0726/1/001/S	Support the discussion, policies and supporting text on Energy in the Plan, in particular policies NR3.1 and NR3.2
Support	
13.56	
	Uppermill Residents Association
Natural Resources 0007/1/016/O	Object to a. wind turbines as they cause noise and vibration, and are ugly. No location in Borough is remote enough to tolerate them. It would be more effective to reduce consumption of fossil fuels through energy saving measures.
Objection	
	Uppermill Residents Association
Natural Resources 0007/1/017/S	Support proposals to use waste to produce energy, and e. small hydro schemes.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Support	
	Dobcross Village Community
Natural Resources 0105/1/007/O	Targets for wind turbines are inappropriately high in the absence of more specific information, such as locations, and because of the likely impact on the landscape and environment
Objection Joint Case	
2.1	Countryside Agency
General Strategy 0008/1/017/O	Add a section setting out the characteristics of Oldham and identifying its needs, particularly its rural needs. Make reference to how urban fringe issues are dealt with. Relate the plan objectives more clearly to the General Strategy policies.
Objection	
2.2	Highways Agency
General Strategy 0006/1/013/O	The objective to reduce the need to travel and distance travelled should place more emphasis on the importance of choosing sustainable modes of travel.
Objection	
4.4	GMPTE
Transport 0026/1/011/S	Supports objectives of the transport policies, which closely reflect PPG13 and should lead to closer integration of land use planning and transportation
Support	
	Railtrack Property
Transport 0037/1/001/O	Add an objective around encouraging the transfer of goods from road to rail.
Omission	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
4.4 (b)	
Transport 0152/1/014/S	Oak Street Area Community Group
Support	Support an integrated public transport system.
4.5	
Transport 0021/1/021/O	Government Office for the North West
Objection	Typing error: insert "Developments" at end of PPG title
4.5 i.	
Transport 0036/1/006/O	Peak District National Park
Omission	It would be appropriate to include a statement of support for the South Pennines Integrated Transport Strategy (SPITS) proposals.
5.2	
Business & Industry 0005/1/002/O	Manchester Airport plc
Objection	The role of Manchester Airport should be recognised.
9.6	
Community/Education 0495/1/001/O	Sport England
Objection	Community Facilities should also include sport and recreation facilities
B1	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0038/1/007/O	Business and industrial allocations adjacent to canals must cross-refer to policies on habitat and species protection (OE2.3 and OE2.4) and, for those next to Rochdale Canal, to a new policy or SPG
Omission	
	Janet Bottomley
0130/1/001/O	Protect employment land in Saddleworth. Aims of the Business Industry section sound fine except that there are only 6 areas of PEZ land between Dobcross/Delph/Denshaw. PEZ land seriously eroded.
Objection Joint Case	
	Alice Hadfield
0163/1/001/O	No mention as to whether mills would be demolished and replaced with industrial units. Considers it very important that the mills are retained.
Omission	
	K Hanlon
0343/1/001/O	Consider redevelopment of industrial sites in the Borough rather than new build in the Saddleworth area, to protect the village environment
Objection Joint Case	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/019/S	None given.
Support	
B1.1	
B1.1.2 Albert Street, Hollinwood	Brookhouse Group Limited Agent : Alyn Nicholls & Associates
0001/1/002/O	Delete B1.1.2 from Proposals Map and from Policy B1.1 as the site is suitable for a wide range of uses.
Objection Joint Case	
B1.1.2 Albert Street, Hollinwood	J Beard

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0131/1/001/O	Site is the only remaining area of green land and should not therefore be allocated for Business and Industry.
Objection	
B1.1.2 Albert Street, Hollinwood	Jean Stretton
0143/1/001/O	Objects to extension of the industrial site, and to designation of the whole area for industrial use. Questions whether there is sufficient demand for industrial/PEZ land in Hollinwood/M60 area. 50% of the site should be preserved as open space.
Objection Joint Case	
B1.1.2 Albert Street, Hollinwood	Councillor Barrow
0144/1/001/O	No objection to area occupied by gasometer, back to Hollins Road, being redeveloped. Remainder, plus strip on opposite side of motorway, should be protected for recreational use and wildlife value. Unfair for Hollinwood to lose any more green sites.
Objection	
B1.1.2 Albert Street, Hollinwood	Mrs Joan Gipson
0154/1/001/O	Would like allocation to change from Business and Industry to Recreational Open Space as the site is already part greenfield and more open space is needed in Hollinwood.
Objection Joint Case	
B1.1.2 Albert Street, Hollinwood	Mr Allan Taylor
0155/1/001/O	Council should re establish the allotments and protect the site from development. It has been used as recreation for more than 50 years.
Objection	
B1.1.2 Albert Street, Hollinwood	Mr&Mrs T&M Sharples
0156/1/001/O	Change the allocation from Business and Industry to Recreational Open Space as the site includes one of the last green areas in Hollinwood and there are plenty of other sites for industry
Objection Joint Case	
B1.1.2 Albert Street, Hollinwood	Mrs C Taylor

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0158/1/001/O	Change allocation to Recreational Open Space as the site includes one of the last open green areas in Hollinwood and is needed to combat air pollution from the M60 rather than generate more pollution from industry and associated traffic
Objection	
B1.1.2 Albert Street, Hollinwood	Miss Janet Gipson
0159/1/001/O	Site should be reallocated to Recreational Open Space, e.g. allotments. Only sizable open land left in the area. Plenty of spare capacity for industry. Traffic from additional lorries and cars would make an already polluted area worse.
Objection	
Joint Case	
B1.1.2 Albert Street, Hollinwood	Friends of the Wood
0359/1/001/O	Redesignate land south of gasometer and east of Albert Street as Recreational Open Space. It is one of the last pieces of open land left near Hollinwood Junction since construction of the M60 and there is ample other land for development
Objection	
Joint Case	
B1.1.20 Highbarn Road	Oldham Labour Group
0181/1/004/O	This site should be re designated as a housing location.
Objection	
B1.1.21 British Gas Site, Higginshaw Lane, Royton	Lattice Property
0032/1/002/O	Remove Business and Industry designation from this site and incorporate all of objector's land in this area into PEZ16, to encourage early development of the site and provide more flexibility in acceptable uses.
Objection	
Joint Case	
B1.1.25 Land at Clarence Street, Royton	Howarth Brothers Properties Agent : Roger Hannah & Co
0223/1/001/O	Revert to allocation in current adopted UDP (PEZ07/I52). There is no good reason for the proposed change as the land forms part of the Moss Lane Industrial Estate.
Objection	
Joint Case	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
B1.1.31 Union Street West/Oldham Way, Oldham	GMPTE
0026/1/005/O	The section of rail line within the site should be de-allocated from business and office use and protected for public transport use until such time as relevant negotiations and feasibility studies about its future are concluded by GMPTA/E & Railtrack
Objection	
B1.1.31 Union Street West/Oldham Way, Oldham	Meridian Development Company Ltd
	Agent : Inside Out Design
0251/1/001/O	Change allocation to mixed use to enable high quality development on this prominent site (see also B1.1.33)
Objection Joint Case	
B1.1.32 Oldham Way/Mumps, Oldham	GMPTE
0026/1/006/O	The section of rail line within the site should be de-allocated from business and office use and protected for public transport use until such time as relevant negotiations and feasibility studies about its future are concluded by GMPTA/E & Railtrack
Objection	
B1.1.33 Primrose Street/Crossbank Street, Oldham	GMPTE
0026/1/007/O	The section of rail line within the site should be de-allocated from business and office use and protected for public transport use until such time as relevant negotiations and feasibility studies about its future are concluded by GMPTA/E & Railtrack
Objection	
B1.1.33 Primrose Street/Crossbank Street, Oldham	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/012/O	Would prefer to see B1, B2 commercial allocations and not B8 warehousing and distribution on these sites as they are adjacent to the Town Centre and should generate better quality jobs.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
B1.1.33 Primrose Street/Crossbank Street, Oldham	Anglo West Indian Sport and Social
0151/1/001/O	Primrose Bank is identified for business use. Would like to see it reserved for mixed use to allow community use. (Would like the site secured for a new build of the AWISSC)
Objection	
B1.1.33 Primrose Street/Crossbank Street, Oldham	Meridian Development Company Ltd
	Agent : Inside Out Design
0251/1/002/O	Change allocation to mixed use to enable high quality development of this prominent site (see also B1.1.31)
Objection Joint Case	
B1.1.34 Hebron Street, Royton	Oak Street Area Community Group
0152/1/006/O	Object to change of allocation from protected open land (in adopted Plan) to industrial use. Would add to disturbance and loss of habitat for species in decline. Species study should be done prior to decision about allocation.
Objection	
B1.1.34 Hebron Street, Royton	Messrs Halliwell & Douglas
	Agent : Chorlton Planning
0169/1/002/S	Support designation of this site for business and industry
Support	
B1.1.34 Hebron Street, Royton	Howarth Brothers Properties
	Agent : Roger Hannah & Co
0223/1/002/S	Support this allocation as there is a shortage of employment land in Royton and where development can take place without the constraints of existing industrial buildings
Support Joint Case	
B1.2.1 Southlink Business Park	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/011/O	Would prefer to see B1, B2 commercial allocations and not B8 warehousing and distribution on this site as it is adjacent to the Town Centre and should generate better quality jobs.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Land at Foxdenton Lane, Chadderton 0673/1/002/O	Mr J C Blakeman Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd Allocate land shown on (attached) plan, which is part of LR3, for business and industry. Insufficient land has been allocated for this purpose.
Omission	
Land west of Wellyhole Street, Lees/PEZ17 0133/1/001/O	Richardsons Commercial (Oldham) Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning Retain the site in PEZ17 but add business and industry designation as in the current Plan. Importance of industrial use has been recognised locally and on appeal. Industry on opposite site is well established and there is good road access.
Omission	
B1.1, B1.2	
B1.2.1 Southlink Business Park	GMPTE
0026/1/004/O	The section of rail line within the site should be de-allocated from business and office use and protected for public transport use until such time as relevant negotiations and feasibility studies about its future are concluded by GMPTA/E & Railtrack
Objection	
B1.2 5.12	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/027/O	Clarify meaning of paragraph, by referring to policy GS7 A. if appropriate
Objection	
B1.3	
	Saddleworth Parish Council Agent : Eagland Planning Associates
0040/1/003/O	Policy should require B1/B2 uses within mixed-use developments, the precise mix being determined by market demand/planning brief. Is need for employment land in Saddleworth, especially given the high demand for land for housing.
Objection Joint Case	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0045/1/007/O	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/007/O	Policy should not preclude inclusion of retail or tourism uses in mixed use development. Ref to Planning Briefs should be in supporting text. Ref to phasing should be omitted/reworded. Policy not specific enough on their role in mixed use dev's.
Objection	
0110/1/008/O	Paul Speak Properties Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0110/1/008/O	Policy should not preclude inclusion of retail or tourism uses in mixed use development. Ref to Planning Briefs should be in supporting text. Ref to phasing should be omitted/reworded. Policy not specific enough on their role in mixed use dev's.
Objection	
0165/1/001/O	Cllr Brian Lord
0165/1/001/O	Sites in Saddleworth which were formerly PEZs should not be changed to mixed use [applies to B1.3.01 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road and B1.3.02 Lumb Mill).
Objection	
0289/1/002/O	British Telecommunications Plc Agent : RPS Chapman Warren
0289/1/002/O	A wider range of uses should be allowed where there is no shortfall in land or space for industrial and business use and proposals will not have adverse impact on the amenity of surrounding properties
Objection	
B1.3.1 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road, Greenfield	Paul Speak Properties Ltd
0110/1/010/S	Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0110/1/010/S	It is a suitable and sustainable location for mixed use development
Support	
B1.3.1 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road, Greenfield	J Barrett (Haulage) Ltd
0256/1/001/S	Support mixed use allocation on this site, including tourism development

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Support Joint Case	
B1.3.1 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road, Greenfield	Brian Greenwood
0260/1/001/S	Support a mix of uses that fulfil the tourism potential and the local need for retail
Support	
B1.3.1 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road, Greenfield	London Law & Land
0294/1/001/S	Agent : Forge Architects Welcome the change in designation of this site from PEZ to mixed use as a way of unlocking the site's development potential and encouraging sustainable development.
Support	
B1.3.1 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road, Greenfield	Mrs Joan Frost
0295/1/002/O	Support in principle but the uses should be wider to include retail and tourism.
Objection	
B1.3.1 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road, Greenfield	J. H. Pellowe
0296/1/001/O	Support with reservations. Agree with need to transform ugly site but this must be done in harmony with local residents. Need provision for local shops and housing for local people at affordable prices.
Objection	
B1.3.1 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road, Greenfield	Mrs Brenda Jackson
0325/1/002/O	Supports allocation but at least 50% of housing should be affordable and school places should be provided.
Objection	
B1.3.1 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road, Greenfield	J. R. Taylor

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0344/1/002/O	Change allocation of the entire site from mixed use to industry and employment to retain the character of Greenfield as a diverse community and halt the slide of Saddleworth into "commuter-land"
Objection	
B1.3.1 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road, Greenfield	G.R. Bennett
0706/1/002/O	Support mixed use allocation and recommend that policy goes further to include development of site for tourism.
Objection	
B1.3.2 Lumb Mill, Delph	Bellway Homes Agent : Drivers Jonas
0104/1/002/O	Bellway consider that the policy should just set out general principles for mixed use development sites and that the detailed mix on each site, such as Lumb Mill, should be negotiated between the Council and the landowner, for sake of flexibility.
Objection Joint Case	
Waterside Mill, Greenfield	Tanner Brothers Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0267/1/002/O	Include the site as a mixed use allocation under this policy. The proposed allocation as a Primary Employment Zone (PEZ27) is less suitable than mixed use.
Omission	
B1.4	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/024/O	By stating that a particular issue will be a material consideration does not give sufficient certainty regarding what will or will not be permitted.
Objection	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/004/O	The impact of increased boat traffic on the nature conservation interest of the canals should be considered
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0045/1/006/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd</p> <p>Criterion e) should be removed or reworded. If Tourism Development Areas are to be referred to, they should be on proposals map. Criterion d) should be reworded so that it is broader and more inclusive.</p> <p>Objection</p>
0110/1/014/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Paul Speak Properties Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd</p> <p>Criterion e) should be removed or reworded. If Tourism Development Areas are to be referred to, they should be on proposals map. Criterion d) should be reworded so that it is broader and more inclusive.</p> <p>Objection</p>
0117/1/008/O	<p style="text-align: center;">North West Tourist Board Agent : Paul Butler Associates</p> <p>Strongly supports policy but would like the land use policies and proposals in the Oldham Tourism Strategy incorporated within the UDP</p> <p>Objection</p>
0119/1/017/S	<p style="text-align: center;">Oldham Town Centre Partnership</p> <p>Very supportive of tourism development, and see it as a major attraction for the town centre and hence a major employer.</p> <p>Support</p>
0132/1/001/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Arthur Greaves (Lees) Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning</p> <p>Expresses support for all Tourist Developments, but would like to see them shown on the proposals map.</p> <p>Objection</p>
0149/1/007/O	<p style="text-align: center;">English Nature</p> <p>All policies which refer to development/land use along Rochdale canal should cross reference to Designated Nature Conservation Site Policies.</p> <p>Objection</p>

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
B1.4 5.15	North West Tourist Board Agent : Paul Butler Associates
0117/1/002/O	Policy should encourage tourism uses within rural buildings within the Green Belt as long as this is not detrimental to the surrounding natural environment. Can be appropriate re-use of existing buildings with benefits to rural areas.
Objection	
B1.4 d.	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/005/S	Support tourism development especially para d) canal side developments that will lead to increased use of the Huddersfield Narrow Canal
Support	
B1.5	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/025/O	Title relates to "Business and Industrial Development" but policy only refers to industrial development.
Objection	
0045/1/005/O	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd The policy should be re written to allow for limited infilling and redevelopment of unallocated business and industrial sites.
Objection	
0266/1/001/O	The Clayton Action Group Policy B1.5 does not provide adequate protection of residential areas from large developments on unallocated sites. Stringent criteria should be added with regard to acceptable uses (not limited to industrial) and maximum size.
Objection Joint Case	
B1.6	Countryside Agency

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0008/1/008/S Support	Support working from home.
B1.7	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/020/S Support	None given.
B1.7 5.19	Highways Agency
0006/1/011/O Omission	Developments that have a material effect upon the trunk road network should also refer to Highways Agency requirements.
B1.7 a.	Railtrack Property
0037/1/003/O Omission	Recommend alteration to wording of policy to read 'can be connected to the rail network or, in exceptional cases, are easily accessible to trunk or primary roads'.
B2	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0113/1/004/O Objection	Clarify policy - refer only to protection of PEZ's in addition to land allocated under B1.1. Alter B2 to specifically refer to PEZ's and industrial land allocated under B1.1 only. Current wording unclear.
0113/1/005/O	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
	Amend or delete criteria related to policy. Should be more positive presumption in favour of development in line with Policy GS3. Fuller justification for amended policy required.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
B2.1	Keith Lowe
0013/1/002/O	Increase local needs retailing threshold from 300 to 400m2 in Primary Employment Zones as it is unduly restrictive.
Objection	
	Jean Stretton
0143/1/002/O	Whilst a wide range of uses is generally acceptable on PEZ sites, Waste Management should not be included, to protect areas such as Hollinwood in the southwest of the Borough from unpopular types of uses.
Objection Joint Case	
	National Grid Agent : Malcolm Judd and Partners
0145/1/001/O	Additional criterion should be added as follows: 'k. Essential development by existing utility providers', to allow utilities to carry out essential developments in Primary Employment Zones. Refers specifically to site within PEZ at Whitegate.
Objection Joint Case	
	Oak Street Area Community Group
0152/1/005/O	Objects to inclusion of waste facilities within PEZ's when located close to residential properties.
Objection	
	Siemens Real Estate Ltd Agent : Colliers Conrad Ritblat Erdman
0180/1/005/O	PEZ policy should be amended to include: retail uses, to reflect the employment opportunities they create, subject to Government guidance; and residential use as part of mixed use schemes, provided employment activity is not prejudiced.
Objection	
	Oxley Threads Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0261/1/002/O	The categories of uses in a PEZ should include hospital and medically related uses.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	These can generate employment opportunities. Under i) do not restrict the scale of leisure facilities to below 500m2. Restriction unjustified.
Objection Joint Case	
	Charles Topham and Sons Ltd
0268/1/001/S	Supports the identification of these existing employment areas as Primary Employment Zones and considers policy to be well worded.
Support	
	British Telecommunications Plc Agent : RPS Chapman Warren
0289/1/001/O	Proposals for residential development in PEZs should be considered where they abut residential areas, are accessible to local services and do not inhibit business activity
Objection	
B1.1.2 Albert Street, Hollinwood/PEZ4	Brookhouse Group Limited Agent : Alyn Nicholls & Associates
0001/1/001/O	Remove site allocated as B1.1.2 from PEZ4. Site is prominent and suitable for a range of uses - would assist regeneration of area. Proposals for development should be considered on own merits against general development policies.
Objection Joint Case	
PEZ10 Manchester Street/Westwood, Chadderton	Charles Topham and Sons Ltd
0268/1/002/S	The policy should ensure the site's ability to provide significant employment opportunities.
Support	
PEZ11 Busk, Chadderton	Copley Square Ltd. Agent : Whitehead and Co.
0137/1/001/O	Delete land at Chadderton Way/Featherstall Road South from PEZ11 and allocate for retail use or leave unallocated. Existing Wickes site enjoys open retail use and is in need of refurbishment - the PEZ allocation is unhelpful in this respect.
Objection	
PEZ16 Higginshaw/East Oldham	Williamsons

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0146/1/001/O	Agent : Brown Rural Partnership The Brook Street/Bottom o'th Moor area should be removed from PEZ16 and added to town centre - PEZ designation is restrictive . The redevelopment of Mumps will make it appropriate for a variety of uses including retail, leisure and housing
Objection Joint Case	
PEZ16 Higginsshaw/East Oldham	Q Developments Ltd Agent : Howard and Seddon Partnership
0150/1/001/O	Remove site at Queghan House, Stampstone Street from PEZ16 and reallocate for non food retail.Would be commercially viable, regenerate the site and make a positive contribution to the surrounding land.Close to town centre.Current use is obtrusive.
Objection	
PEZ17 Wellyhole Street, Lees	Brierstone Properties Ltd Agent : Drivers Jonas
0102/1/003/O	The PEZ designation is inappropriate and should be removed, and the site allocated for Phase 1 housing
Objection Joint Case	
PEZ17 Wellyhole Street, Lees	Richardsons Commercial (Oldham) Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning
0133/1/002/S	Supports inclusion of land west of Wellyhole Street within the PEZ
Support	
PEZ17 Wellyhole Street, Lees	R Grabowski
0140/1/001/O	Site is adjacent to housing and therefore unsuitable for industry.
Objection	
PEZ17 Wellyhole Street, Lees	D O Meara
0142/1/001/O	Object to the proposed designation of the site as a Primary Employment Zone. Would be better used as a local park or for housing, provided run-off from estate up the hill does not cause flooding
Objection	
PEZ17 Wellyhole Street, Lees	Fairclough Homes Ltd

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0269/1/001/O	Change allocation from PEZ to unallocated as the part occupied by industry creates noise and traffic detrimental to the area, which is residential and benefits from quality open space. Numerous more suitable industrial sites elsewhere in Borough.
Objection	
PEZ17 Wellyhole Street, Lees	Mrs E Connally
0348/1/001/O	Remove PEZ designation from this site and change it to housing as the site adjoins an existing housing development
Objection	
PEZ17 Wellyhole Street, Lees	Cllr Mrs C Dugdale
0350/1/001/O	Change the designation of this land, part of PEZ17, from PEZ to housing (objection submitted jointly by all 3 ward councillors)
Objection	
PEZ17 Wellyhole Street, Lees	Cllr J R Anchor
0351/1/001/O	Change designation of the parcel of land adjacent to the Leesbrook Park Estate, which is part of PEZ17, from PEZ to housing. Housing more suitable and in keeping with surrounding sites. Mound on Wellyhole St could overcome noise issues.
Objection	
PEZ17 Wellyhole Street, Lees	Cllr Mrs K Knox
0352/1/001/O	Change designation of the parcel adjacent to Leesbrook Park Estate, part of PEZ17, from PEZ to housing. Housing would be in keeping with development of adjacent sites. A landscaped mound could attenuate noise from industry.
Objection	
PEZ17 Wellyhole Street, Lees	Mr J McQuillan
0356/1/001/O	Change the designation of this land, which is part of PEZ17, from PEZ to residential use in keeping with other recent developments in the area. (Included a petition with 191 signatures)
Objection	
PEZ2 Failsworth Mill	Indo African Exports Ltd

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0134/1/001/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Agent : Chorlton Planning</p> Delete PEZ allocation or redesignate for mixed use with retail, leisure and housing. Adjacent to Failsworth District Centre which is being redeveloped and will generate commercial and leisure interest in area. PEZ could constrain future of site.
Objection	
PEZ21 Vernon Works, High Barn Street, Royton	Howarth Brothers Properties
0223/1/003/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Agent : Roger Hannah & Co</p> Allocate Mill/carpark for residential purposes. 5 storey textile mill approaching the end of its economic and useful life. Most of the floor space has been vacant for years. Site has residential property on two sides and a school on third.
Objection Joint Case	
PEZ22 Shaw	Oak Street Area Community Group
0152/1/007/O	Reappraise PEZ22 in the event that the company located between Linney Lane and Beal Lane vacate the premises, as policy B1.7 states that large scale freight generating development should have good access to trunk or primary roads
Objection	
PEZ22 Shaw	P & D Northern Steels Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning
0166/1/001/O	Extend the PEZ allocation into Local Green Gap 10 to allow local firm to expand as and when required.
Objection	
PEZ23 Friezland Lane, Greenfield	Robert Scott & Sons Agent : Chorlton Planning
0020/1/002/O	Extend the boundary of PEZ23 to incorporate land to the south of Oak View Mills. Could accommodate off-street parking which would alleviate existing traffic congestion and hazard around nearby junction..
Omission	
PEZ25 Chew Valley Road, Greenfield	North Manchester Construction Ltd. Agent : John Barnes - Architect
0147/1/001/O	Leave area of land owned by North Manchester Construction out of PEZ. Leave unallocated or include as mixed use. Much of the north east of the previous PEZ allocation has been changed to mixed use. This leaves doubt about the viability of remainder.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection Joint Case	
PEZ25 Chew Valley Road, Greenfield	Ainsworth Construction Agent : Chorlton Planning
0831/1/001/O	Seeks the reallocation of part of the PEZ for mixed use development to become part of the major redevelopment site to the north. Already in mixed use. Existing problems. In need of comprehensive redevelopment.
Objection	
PEZ27 Waterside Mill, Greenfield	Tanner Brothers Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0267/1/001/O	Remove PEZ designation, as site is more suitable for a mixed use allocation.
Objection	
PEZ28 Tamewater Mill, Dobcross	Adept Development & Management Ltd
0229/1/001/O	Boundary of the site should be extended into adjacent land (green belt and unallocated) to make development viable, and the allocation of the extended site changed to mixed use
Objection	
PEZ29 Delph New Road, Delph	Cllr C M Wheeler
0718/1/004/O	Objection to boundary change, specifically the removal of Bailey Mills from the PEZ as allocated in the adopted UDP
Omission	
PEZ29 Delph New Road, Delph	Mrs G Clark
0833/1/001/O	Remove allocation as consideration should be given to the amount of traffic through Delph.
Objection Joint Case	
PEZ30 Lumb Mill, Delph	Meridian Development Company Ltd Agent : Inside Out Design
0251/1/003/O	Would like the site of the old Lumb Mill (the Business Centre), which is part of PEZ30, to be allocated for mixed use, similar to the surrounding land (B1.3.2/H1.1.14) Premises have deteriorated since 1995. Would make site more viable.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection Joint Case	
PEZ32 Warth/Ellis Mills, Diggle	Arthur Greaves (Lees) Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning
0132/1/002/O	The land at Warth Mill should be re designated for a mix of uses appropriate to the Tourism Development Area due to its proximity to the countryside, national park and canal. PEZ restrictions prevent comprehensive and imaginative redevelopment.
Objection	
PEZ4 Hollinwood South (Mirror Group/Albert Street)	Lattice Property
0032/1/003/O	Give greater flexibility of uses in Policy B2.1, e.g. retail or leisure, to encourage early redevelopment of land whilst still providing an employment element, or exclude the Lattice Group site at Mersey Road North from PEZ4.
Objection Joint Case	
PEZ9 Fields New Road, Chadderton	Raven Avenue Residents
0148/1/001/O	Object to any further allocation to industry within the Chadderton Area because of traffic impact.
Objection	
PEZ9 Fields New Road, Chadderton	Oldham Labour Group
0181/1/005/O	Southern tip of this site should be de-allocated or redesignated to allow community facilities such as a health centre.
Objection	
PEZ9 Fields New Road, Chadderton	Chadderton & Hollinwood Medical Group Agent : G P I Corporation Ltd
0247/1/001/O	Exempt part of PEZ to allow development of purpose built medical facility. This site has been identified for relocation. Would entail development of medical centre/associated services.Difficult to find an area large enough in practice area.
Objection	
PEZ9 Fields New Road, Chadderton	Zetex plc
0265/1/001/O	Remove Gem Mill & Butler Garage from PEZ as adjacent property is recreational open space to east and residential to south and west. Retaining PEZ designation would

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	restrict future development prospects for the property if company decided to move.
Objection	
Saddleworth PEZs	Mr Richard Hindle
0129/1/001/O	General objection to the proposed (Bailey Mill, Lumb Mill) and actual (Print works, Walk Mill) loss of PEZ land in Saddleworth to housing, because villages could become dormitories and village life would suffer
Objection Joint Case	
Walk Mill, Dobcross	Dobcross Village Community
0105/1/002/O	Would like the site reinstated as Primary Employment Zone to preserve the remaining part of the mill as part of our industrial heritage and have it converted to small business/office units to provide local employment.
Objection Joint Case	
Werneth Ring Mills, Henley Street, Oldham	Oxley Threads Ltd
	Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0261/1/001/O	Werneth Ring Mills and adjoining land should be allocated as a PEZ. Reasons include:it would provide opportunities for redevelopment.Could be developed for wider range of uses than those permitted under B2.2. Large enough. Accessible.
Omission Joint Case	
B2.2	
	Highways Agency
0006/1/012/O	Additional consideration under c. should be negative impact on the efficient operation of the highway network
Omission	
	Bellway Homes Agent : Drivers Jonas
0104/1/003/O	Supports principle of this criteria based policy, but criteria (b) wording should be amended. Not always necessary to market a site for 6 months to discover that it is not commercially viable for employment use.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Joint Case	
0109/1/002/O	Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110) Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership Amend policy to express a presumption in favour of development, remove unnecessary requirements, and provide clarity and fuller justification
Objection Joint Case	
0261/1/003/O	Oxley Threads Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership Amend policy to express a presumption in favour of development, remove unnecessary requirements, and provide clarity and fuller justification
Objection Joint Case	
0289/1/003/O	British Telecommunications Plc Agent : RPS Chapman Warren On existing employment sites, redevelopment and change of use for other purposes, including housing, should be allowed subject to considerations of demand for employment land and impact on business activity
Objection	
B2.2 b.	
0102/1/002/O	Brierstone Properties Ltd Agent : Drivers Jonas Criteria relating to the length of time that a site should be marketed should be amended to become more flexible.
Objection Joint Case	
B2.3	
0021/1/026/O	Government Office for the North West Extension, alteration and infilling of existing business in Green Belt is contrary to PPG2.
Objection	
B2.3 5.26	
	Friezland Residents' Association

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0106/1/007/S	Supports making buildings in the Green Belt in the Friezland area, such as the Royal George Mills, available for employment uses rather than for new unsustainable housing development
Support	
C1	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/014/O	This section does not contain any provision for preserving and removing an historic building to another site.
Omission	
	Friezland Residents' Association
0106/1/006/O	Would like policy strengthened to conserve and regenerate industrial heritage as speculative developments threaten the character and heritage of the area.
Objection	
	North West Tourist Board Agent : Paul Butler Associates
0117/1/010/S	Supports policy to protect Oldham's historic buildings, areas and landscapes. Agree that they serve to enhance the attractiveness of the Borough to visitors and residents.
Support	
C1 12.10	
Royal George Mills, Greenfield	Friezland Residents' Association
0106/1/001/O	Conservation Area statements should be stronger to protect conservation areas such as the Royal George and to enhance the Green Belt
Objection	
C1.1	
	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/017/O	Policy should be rewritten to simplify its content and express its intentions more clearly.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
	Denshaw Community Association
0543/1/001/S	Maintenance of essential character is important to people and inappropriate development is not welcomed.
Support	
C1.10 12.49	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/041/O	Give correct title of PPG15
Omission	
C1.2	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/042/O	The words "preserve AND enhance" in para c. should be amended to "preserve OR enhance" in the policy on demolition of buildings in conservation areas, in accordance with PPG15
Objection	
	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/019/O	Policy should be reworded to more accurately reflect the content of national guidance.
Objection	
C1.3	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/039/O	Would suggest that the Policy set out circumstances in which, exceptionally, development proposals might be approved.
Objection	
	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/016/O	Policy should be deleted. Policy C1.3 duplicates the content of policies C1.1 and C1.2

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	and is therefore not required.
C1.4	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/018/O	Policy should be rewritten to be less onerous and reflect the need to conserve or enhance a Conservation Area and not just individual buildings.
Objection	
C1.6 12.28	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/013/S	Approves of policy on advertisements as long as it applies to any building in a Conservation Area as well as to listed buildings, and is enforced.
Support	
C1.7	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/040/O	Wording of policy (and para 12.30) on re-use of historic buildings should be amended to state "preserve OR (rather than AND) enhance" conservation areas in accordance with PPG15
Objection	
	Mr P. Whitehead
0693/1/004/O	Restrictions on old mills should be lifted in some situations. Buildings, such as Bailey Mill, which have come to the end of their life should be demolished and modern industrial/commercial units built in their place.
Omission	
CF1	Countryside Agency
0008/1/023/O	Chapter should promote community planning and the means of participation for example Village Design Statements.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Omission	
	Oak Street Area Community Group
0152/1/013/S	Support the development of community facilities for all ages.
Support	
	Dr David Atherton
0368/1/005/O	The shortage of doctors in Oldham has not been considered in the Plan - list sizes and premises in Greenfield already over capacity.
Omission	
	Parish of Leesfield
0474/1/002/O	The need to expand schools due to new housing estates should be kept under careful review.
Omission Joint Case	
Land at Royal Oldham Hospital	The Royal Oldham Hospital Agent : Chorlton Planning
0493/1/001/O	Include policies to allow for the development and expansion of the Hospital Services which are expected during the Plan period.
Omission	
CF1.1	
	Parish of Leesfield
0474/1/001/O	Policy should include identification of a suitable replacement site for St. Thomas C of E aided school.
Omission Joint Case	
CF1.1.2 Platting Road, Lydgate	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/011/S	Support for the proposal of a new playing field at Platting Road, Lydgate
Support	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
CF1.1.2 Platting Road, Lydgate	Murray Foster
0479/1/001/O	Do not object to playing fields per se, but to any associated buildings, equipment, car park and access road and to a possible expansion of the school buildings
Objection Joint Case	
CF1.1.2 Platting Road, Lydgate	Saddleworth Civic Trust
0828/1/009/O	Would like to see this land (allocated as playing fields) protected from further development by being designated for recreational use.
Objection	
CF1.2	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/034/O	The Policy should make clear which criteria must be met if planning permission is to be granted.
Objection	
CF1.2 d.	Oak Street Area Community Group
0152/1/008/S	Support the implementation of the 'Disability Act' which requires dropped kerbs and accessibility to public buildings
Support	
CF1.3	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/035/O	The Policy should be redrafted to make clear which criteria must be met if planning permission is to be granted.
Objection	
CF1.4	Government Office for the North West

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0021/1/036/O	The Policy should make clear which criteria must be met if planning permission is to be granted.
Objection	
	Sport England
0495/1/013/S	The Policy is in accordance with Planning Objective 13 of Sport England's Planning Policies for Sport document.
Support	
CF1.5	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/037/O	There is an inconsistency between the Policy and Justification which should be rectified.
Objection	
	Bellway Homes Agent : Drivers Jonas
0104/1/004/O	The level of developer contributions towards educational facilities should relate to existing provision and local need, and site specific constraints, including physical and commercial constraints.
Objection Joint Case	
	Westbury Homes
0107/1/002/O	The Policy justification should be expanded to indicate that regard will be had to proximity to transport, costs associated with development, other contributions and whether such provisions would prejudice other planning objectives.
Objection	
	Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110) Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0109/1/005/O	Delete Policy. Could encourage education Authority to leave education provision up to developer - this would be unfair. No guidance given on the potential cost. Contrary to Government advice on planning gain - must relate to development.
Objection Joint Case	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0113/1/007/O	Delete Policy. Could encourage education Authority to leave education provision up to developer - this would be unfair. No guidance given on the potential cost. Contrary to Government advice on planning gain - must relate to development.
Objection	
	Denshaw Community Association
0543/1/011/S	Support - Denshaw school has lost out in the past/present but hopefully won't in the future with this policy in place.
Support	
CF1.5 9.18	
	Alan Roughley
0243/1/004/O	Policy should specify that commuted sums should be credited to the nearest Primary and secondary schools to the proposed development, not be used elsewhere in the Borough.
Objection Joint Case	
D1	
	Countryside Agency
0008/1/013/O	Support policy D1 but it needs to be reworded to apply to all parts of the Borough, rural and urban (wording supplied)
Objection	
	Friends, Families and Travellers
0429/1/001/O	Consider a more diverse approach to the design of housing and accommodation that extends to the Gypsy and Traveller Community in order to limit social exclusion
Objection	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/008/S	None given.
Support	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
D1.1	Countryside Agency
0008/1/014/O	Urban design checklist should be replaced with "good design checklist" in para. 3.13 as it should apply equally everywhere (in rural and urban areas).
Objection	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/016/O	The level of detail in this policy should be reduced. Some of the criteria could be deleted altogether if the issues are dealt with in the policies which follow.
Objection	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/013/O	Broad support, esp. point "g". However wishes to see the word "appropriate" added, as in "the provision of appropriate new landscaping & habitats..". This to ensure that the most suitable types of habitat are provided for any particular location.
Objection	
	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/011/O	Reword policy on General Design Criteria to be less onerous and more compatible with PPG1
Objection	
	Paul Speak Properties Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0110/1/004/O	Reword policy on General Design Criteria to be less onerous and more compatible with PPG1
Objection	
	English Nature
0149/1/003/S	Welcomes this policy which seeks to ensure a range of benefits and safeguards to the nature conservation interest of the Borough through appropriate design considerations in all development.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Support	CPRE - Lancashire
0263/1/005/S	Supports and welcomes this comprehensive policy
Support	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/009/S	None given.
Support	Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL Agent : Cordingleys
0815/1/009/O	Section d. "where appropriate taking into consideration other relevant considerations" should be added after "pedestrian desire lines". Not always possible to accommodate all desire lines within new developments.
Objection	
D1.1 k) 3.15, 3.20	Highways Agency
0006/1/009/O	Queries whether additional statement should be included to promote less car dependency on car travel. Transport assessment should be included with the formal design statement.
Omission	
D1.11	Highways Agency
0006/1/008/O	The Highways agency should be consulted on all house extensions with respect to section "e" of the policy
Omission	
D1.12	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0038/1/002/O Objection	There is a lack of reference to sites of nature conservation value Crown Castle UK Ltd
0082/1/001/O Objection	Policy should list telecommunications sites; major telecommunication sites should be identified on the proposals map. Policy wording should be changed to allow more visually intrusive masts, in certain circumstances. Delete final sentence. Vodafone Ltd Agent : Tony Thorpe Associates
0264/1/001/O Objection	Policy should make connectivity between telecommunications and transport and promote access to variety of both. Clarifies and extends existing policy BE1.7 but requires fine tuning to comply with PPG8, Telecommunications Act and GPDO.
D1.12 3.75	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/019/O Objection	Amend the wording at the end of para. 3.75 to "character or appearance" in line with PPG15 para 4.14
D1.12 3.80	STORM
0016/1/009/S Support	No comment submitted
D1.13	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/012/O Objection	Policy should be substantially reworded to be less onerous.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	CPRE - Lancashire
0263/1/007/S	Supports policy - for reasons given and contribution the approach can make to urban regeneration
Support	
D1.2	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/011/O	If permission will be refused if proposals are not designed to achieve high levels of environmental performance, then the policy should include the criteria which must be met. Otherwise move wording to the RJ.
Objection	
	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/014/O	The policy should be deleted or substantially reworded to reflect matters that are material considerations in the planning process.
Objection	
	The House Builders Federation
0108/1/002/O	The policy should be rewritten to omit matters such as construction and materials which are covered by other legislation set out in the Building Regulations.
Objection	
	Paul Speak Properties Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0110/1/006/O	Delete or substantially reword policy to reflect matters that are material considerations in the planning process
Objection	
	CPRE - Lancashire
0263/1/004/S	Supports the policy
Support	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/010/S	None given.
Support	
D1.2 3.24	
	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0113/1/003/O	Object to the requirement under criterion a. of para. 3.24 to use local and sustainable resources for materials - should provide more flexibility.
Objection	
D1.3	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/017/O	The wording should be amended to make clear which criteria must be met if planning permission is to be granted.
Objection	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/011/S	None given.
Support	
D1.4	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/014/O	Broad support. Explain use of the word "significant". May be more appropriate to use "substantive". Also need to amend text to require habitat surveys where legally protected species exist on a potential development site.
Objection	
	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/010/O	Reword policy to be less onerous. The emphasis should be on mitigation and the avoidance of unnecessary harm.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0110/1/007/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Paul Speak Properties Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd</p> Reword policy to be less onerous. The emphasis should be on mitigation and the avoidance of unnecessary harm.
Objection	
0124/1/003/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Lancashire Wildlife Trust</p> The statement concerning habitat and wildlife does not carry enough weight. Development should only proceed where the integrity of important landscape features (hedgerows, stone walls, woodlands, ponds, etc) is not affected.
Objection	
0149/1/004/S	<p style="text-align: center;">English Nature</p> Strongly support this policy. Welcome the onus which is placed on developers to demonstrate that adverse impacts have been avoided where possible, and adequately mitigated for where harm is unavoidable.
Support	
0740/1/012/S	<p style="text-align: center;">North West Regional Assembly</p> None given.
Support	
0815/1/010/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL Agent : Cordingleys</p> Amend policy to refer to designated grades of biological importance which the Council consider to be significant and relevant instead of "significant biological resources". Existing wording does not provide clear guidance to developers.
Objection	
D1.5	
0045/1/013/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd</p> Rewrite policy to be less onerous and reflect the amenity value of any protected trees. Protected trees with a high amenity value that are removed should be replaced at a 1:1 ratio. Requirement to replace at 6:1 is unreasonable.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
0109/1/003/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110) Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership</p> <p>Change ratio for the number of replacement trees required for every mature or semi-mature tree lost from 6:1 to 2:1 as a minimum. Add the words "where possible" after the word "neighbourhood" in the last line of the policy. Requirement unreasonable</p>
Objection Joint Case	
0110/1/005/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Paul Speak Properties Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd</p> <p>Rewrite policy to be less onerous and reflect the amenity value of any protected trees. Protected trees with a high amenity value that are removed should be replaced at a 1:1 ratio. Requirement to replace at 6:1 is unreasonable.</p>
Objection	
0113/1/002/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership</p> <p>Change ratio for the number of replacement trees required for every mature or semi-mature tree lost from 6:1 to 2:1 as a minimum. Add the words "where possible" after the word "neighbourhood" in the last line of the policy. Requirement unreasonable.</p>
Objection	
0149/1/005/S	<p style="text-align: center;">English Nature</p> <p>Welcome this policy which gives a good level of protection to existing trees from development, seeks adequate replanting of indigenous species for trees lost to development, and employs Section 106 agreements to secure such compensation.</p>
Support	
0243/1/001/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Alan Roughley</p> <p>With regard to the provision of "six new native trees", the definition of native and the height of the trees need to be specified.</p>
Objection Joint Case	
	CPRE - Lancashire

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0263/1/003/S	Supports policy
Support	
	Forestry Commission
0723/1/001/O	Supports elements regarding trees and woodland - Should also refer to the control of tree felling administered by the Forestry Commission through the Forestry Act 1967 (as amended), Oldham Woodland Strategy, and Pennine Edge Forest
Objection	
	Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL Agent : Cordingleys
0815/1/011/O	The justification text should be amended to incorporate a definition of a semi-mature tree, in order to implement the policy successfully whilst providing clear guidance to developers.
Objection	
D1.5 3.40	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/015/O	Support for policy and supporting text. Para. 3.40 - change wording from "where possible" to "where appropriate".
Objection	
D1.6	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/018/O	The RJ should explain how the Council expects landscape design and tree conservation to contribute to energy conservation.
Objection	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/016/S	The unit supports this policy.
Support	
	The House Builders Federation

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0108/1/003/O	The careless wording of the policy which refers to "all" proposals should be corrected. Landscaping and tree planting may not be relevant or reasonable in, for example, residential conversion schemes.
Objection	
	English Nature
0149/1/006/S	Welcome and support this policy requiring habitat creation to be incorporated into landscaping schemes, which should be integral to new development.
Support	
	CPRE - Lancashire
0263/1/001/O	Add that the high standards for landscape design must be sensitive to the immediate site context, in order to support local distinctiveness
Objection Joint Case	
	Forestry Commission
0723/1/002/O	Supports elements regarding trees and woodland. Should also refer to Oldham Woodland Strategy and Pennine Edge Forest
Objection	
D1.7	
	GMPTE
0026/1/010/S	Supports the requirement to ensure safe pedestrian access in developments which should help encourage access on foot and reduce car use
Support	
	Greater Manchester Police, ALU
0270/1/001/O	Add to D1.7 after the first sentence: "All developments should take into consideration the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)..."
Omission	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/013/S	None given.
Support	
D1.9	
	Highways Agency
0006/1/010/O	The Highway Agency should be consulted on all advertisement hoardings
Omission	
GS1	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/010/S	The Unit supports this policy.
Support	
	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/022/O	Delete the policy, as it duplicates others and is inconsistent with PPG1 and Section 54A of the TCP Act 1990.
Objection	
	The House Builders Federation
0108/1/010/O	The policy should be rewritten in a style similar to the first part of GS3 to include the balancing of material considerations which is at the heart of government planning policy in PPG1 and Section 54A of the Planning Act.
Objection	
	Paul Speak Properties Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0110/1/011/O	Delete the policy, as it duplicates others and is inconsistent with PPG1 and Section 54A of the TCP Act 1990.
Objection	
	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0113/1/013/O	Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership The policy is too restrictive and should allow flexibility of land use where the allocation proves unrealistic or an alternative use would be beneficial.
Objection	
	West Pennine Bridleways Association
0175/1/010/S	Supports the policy.
Support	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/001/S	None given.
Support	
	Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL Agent : Cordingleys
0815/1/004/O	Amend policy to include '...will not be permitted unless the development proposals are justified by material considerations' to provide a more balanced statement of general planning policy
Omission	
GS2	
	Countryside Agency
0008/1/018/O	Policy should be amended to make it clear that it will not prevent development needed to meet the needs of people living in the open parts of the Borough but which may have some negative environmental impact
Objection	
	P. Wilson & Company
0023/1/005/O	The link between agricultural land grade and landscape value is inappropriate and should be deleted.
Objection	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0038/1/011/O	The units supports the policy, however it is considers that the term "open land" needs defining within the context of the policy - some nature conservation sites are not necessarily regarded as "open".
Objection	
	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/023/O	Delete the policy, as it duplicates others and is inconsistent with PPG1 and Section 54A of the TCP Act 1990.
Objection	
	Paul Speak Properties Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0110/1/012/O	Delete the policy as it duplicates others and is inconsistent with PPG1 and Section 54A of the TCP Act 1990.
Objection	
	English Nature
0149/1/008/S	Support the protection of certain types of land from inappropriate development.
Support	
	Cllr Brian Lord
0165/1/002/O	Requires change to the Green Belt boundary at Standedge Road, Diggle, to allow for some additional development.
Objection	
	West Pennine Bridleways Association
0175/1/011/S	Supports the policy.
Support	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/002/S	None given.
Support	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Birks Quarry, Huddersfield Rd, Austerlands	Harold Smith
0044/1/001/O	Agent : Megson Ponsonby Site should be allocated for housing (phase 1). Adjoins existing residential areas. In public interest to be allocated for housing to ensure it is used in environmentally acceptable way.
Objection Joint Case	
Birks Quarry, Huddersfield Rd, Austerlands	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd
0113/1/006/O	Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership Remove the land from Green Belt and allocate for housing. Should assess whether there are sites within the Green Belt which would be more sustainable for housing than proposed greenfield allocations. Quarry is sustainable, well located site.
Objection	
Birks Quarry, Huddersfield Rd, Austerlands	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd
0113/1/015/O	Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership Undertake a thorough review of Green Belt boundaries by identifying brownfield sites that are sustainable, including the worked areas of Birks Quarry. Reallocate these sites or exclude them from the Green Belt.
Objection	
Black Clough Farm, Shaw	Solutions
0030/1/001/O	Agent : Chorlton Planning Allocate site, or part of site, for housing development to increase choice and variety for potential purchasers. Is close to existing residential area. Relatively flat - development would not be detrimental to landscape.
Objection	
Cragg Road/Heights Lane area, Chadderton	W A Tomlinson
0691/1/003/O	Change allocation from Green Belt to Land Reserved for Future Development to allow housing infill in this area which is close to schools, a major road and public transport
Objection Joint Case	
Former Co-op, Friezland Lane, Greenfield	Robert Scott & Sons

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0020/1/001/O	Agent : Chorlton Planning
Exclude site from Green Belt to permit greater development opportunities	
Objection	
Former Neptune/Schlumberger measurement works	Mr G Daws
0047/1/001/O	The former industrial site is now used for open storage, contrary to Green Belt principles. Either Green Belt policy should be enforced or the site allocated for industrial development, as businesses operate nearby and find it a good location.
Objection	
Former Neptune/Schlumberger measurement works	Dobcross Village Community
0105/1/004/S	Glad to see designation of the site as Green Belt
Support	
Garden to Slade Bank, Dobcross	Mr Joseph Shepherdson
0438/1/001/O	Remove the land from the Green Belt as it is similar to land at Victoria Works which has planning permission for development.
Objection	
Joint Case	
Hull Mill, Delph	Mr G Bayley
0112/1/015/O	This site should become part of the adjacent Green Belt (or of LLG19, see separate representation) as it is illogical to leave it unallocated.
Omission	
Land adjacent 58A Manchester Rd, Greenfield	Mr & Mrs N Saxon
0434/1/001/O	Remove the existing garden from the Green Belt as the land was not Green Belt when property was purchased in 1968 and has been used as garden since 1971.
Objection	
Land adjacent to 3 Burnedge Lane, Grasscroft	Mr Paul Errock

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0433/1/001/O	The land should be taken out of the Green Belt to allow for the construction of a dwelling.
Objection	
Land adjacent to Tamewater Mill, Dobcross	Adept Development & Management Ltd
0229/1/002/O	Remove land, which includes former Mill Lodge area, from Green Belt and reallocate for mixed use to become part of Tamewater Mill site (PEZ28) to make development viable.
Objection	
Land at 3 Wall Hill Cottages, Dobcross	Mr Ian Hollingworth
0435/1/001/O	Extend boundary of unallocated (white) land south of Wall Hill Road approximately 50 m to the west to enable the siting of one dwelling
Objection	
Land at Alderney Farm, Ripponden Rd	Mr J. Jaskolka Agent : Chorlton Planning
0093/1/001/O	Site, or part of it, should be released from Green Belt and allocated for housing development. Would be a logical extension to built up area to the south west and provide more housing choice. Is accessible to public transport.
Objection	
Land at Ashton Road, Bardsley	Persimmon Homes
0111/1/003/O	Exclude this site from the Green Belt, as boundary changes should be considered where the contribution of the land to the Green Belt is questionable and the site is of less value as open land and/or more sustainable than land allocated for housing
Objection	
Land at Barrowshaw Farm, Ripponden Rd, Oldham	Mr J Lees Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0103/1/002/O	Exclude site from Green Belt and allocate for residential development under Policy H1. Previously dev'd as defined in Annex C,PPG3. Abuts urban area on 2 sides, differentiated from agric. land on third.Does not fulfill purposes of Green Belt.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Land at Brookside Poultry Farm, Royton 0031/1/004/O	Mr J Wood Agent : Chorlton Planning Exclude the land (site 1) from the Green Belt as it contains a number of residential and other properties built over the past few years. Boundary adjustments are proposed elsewhere in Borough to allow for anomalies and changed circumstances.
Objection	
Land at Brownhill, Uppermill 0125/1/001/O	Mr. M. Farrand Release land from Green Belt and allocate for housing as it is part of Uppermill and development would create logical boundary to village. Would also enable footpath and junction improvements . Close to services and public transport.
Objection	
Land at Counthill, Oldham 0096/1/001/O	North Ainley Halliwell Solicitors Agent : Chorlton Planning Remove from Green Belt and allocate for housing as an extension to existing built-up area and land allocated for future development (LR7 and LR8 Haven Lane) to west. Well located for services and would improve choice of properties in area.
Objection	
Land at Denshaw Vale, Denshaw 0034/1/001/O	Mrs M. Corbett Agent : Chorlton Planning Release part of land from Green Belt and re-allocate for development (housing). Additional families would support essential services and make this remote village more self-sufficient and sustainable.
Objection	
Land at Dumfries Farm, Denshaw 0172/1/001/O	Storer -Exors.of late Mary Agent : Chorlton Planning Release from Green Belt and designate for housing as part of a small village expansion plan. Additional residents would support essential services and make Denshaw more self-sufficient. Mix of dwellings, landscaping and woodland to soften impact.
Objection	
Land at Failsworth Road, Woodhouses 0609/1/001/O	Mr M. Clarke Agent : Chorlton Planning Allocate part of the site (north and/or south parts) for residential development,

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

including affordable or speciality housing, to round off edge of built area and enhance viability of services in Woodhouses village.

Objection

Land at Holebottom Farm, Mark Lane,
Shaw

Mr A Walker

Agent : Chorlton Planning

0029/1/001/O

Allocate part of site (plan attached) for housing, as it is adjacent to other existing or proposed housing sites.

Objection

Land at Paulden Farm, Waterhead

Mr F. Winterbottom

Agent : Chorlton Planning

0114/1/001/O

Allocate part of site for housing development. Adjacent to large residential estate to west and well located for services in Waterhead and A62 bus route.

Objection

Land at Plumpton Farm, Thornham

Mr F. Thomas

Agent : Chorlton Planning

0094/1/001/O

Release site, or part of it, from Green Belt and allocate for housing development. Site is near Summit services and bus. Development will sustain use of remaining agricultural land and not significantly affect strategic role of Green Belt.

Objection

Land at Rear of Delph Cricket club, Delph

Mr J. Whitehead

Agent : Chorlton Planning

0168/1/002/O

Allocate site for housing development. Would be logical extension to village, have no major effect on Green Belt which is extensive at this point and is close to public transport links with Oldham and Manchester.

Objection

Land at Rochdale Road, Summit.

Holroy Developments

Agent : Hall Needham Associates

0126/1/002/O

Requires amendment to the Green Belt boundary to allow infill development to occur.

Omission

Land at Steadway, Greenfield

Mr. P. Buckley

Agent : Hall Needham Associates

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0437/1/001/O	Remove land from Green Belt and allocate for housing. The Council indicated at the time of the local plan that this site should be a housing site.
Objection	
Land at Steadway, Greenfield	To be confirmed Agent : Chorlton Planning
0832/1/001/O	Requests the allocation of an area of Green Belt for residential development. The site is well located & is suitable for executive homes - this is in line with PPG3's requirement that the needs of the whole community are taken into account.
Objection	
Land at Stockport Road, Lydgate	Mrs Jean Stanhope Agent : Chorlton Planning
0122/1/001/O	Release from Green Belt and make available for housing development in accordance with a Design Brief to complement Lydgate conservation area. Site is near local services and public transport.
Objection	
Land at Victoria Works, Dobcross	Chapman Saddleworth Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning
0123/1/002/O	Allocate site for redevelopment, preferably housing development, as it is within walking distance of village, is unsuited for continued industrial due to location and access, and no hotelier is interested in developing restaurant/hotel/pub
Objection	
Land at Victoria Works, Dobcross	Mr Joseph Shepherdson
0438/1/002/O	Victoria Works should be removed from the Green Belt and shown as a development site, as it has planning permission for development.
Objection Joint Case	
Land at Wham Farm, Wham Lane, Denshaw	Mr J Lees Agent : Chorlton Planning
0033/1/001/O	Omit site from Green Belt to permit housing development. As Denshaw is remote, it would be sustainable to keep it self-sufficient by expanding population and supporting essential services in the village.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Land at Woodbrook Farm (SE), Springhead	Frost (Exors. of late Mr R.)
0167/1/002/O	Agent : Chorlton Planning Allocate as redevelopment site, preferably housing, as the present use, vehicle dismantling, is inappropriate in the Green Belt, visually intrusive and generates commercial traffic.
Objection	
Land at Woodbrook Farm, Springhead	Frost (Exors. of late Mr R.)
0167/1/003/O	Agent : Chorlton Planning Allocate this Green Belt site, or part of it, for housing development as it would form logical extension to existing residential area to the west and would improve choice of sites and dwelling types in the Borough.
Objection	
Land below Ashdene, Knarr Lane, Delph	Wiggett Construction Ltd
0045/1/004/O	Agent : Chorlton Planning Re-allocate for housing or add policies to Open Environment Section to permit housing development within Green Belt. Small development could complement substantial property at Ashdene without detriment to general landscape.
Objection	
Land bet. LGG17 Stoneswood & H1.1.15 Bailey Mill	Mr G Bayley
0112/1/014/O	Land should become part of Green Belt (or annexed to LGG17, see separate representation) as it is illogical to leave it unallocated.
Omission	
Land between 6 & 8 Barnfield Rise, Shaw	J Lumb Esq
0025/1/001/O	Agent : Morris Dean Want Green Belt boundary changing to allow site to be developed.
Objection	
Land between Ambrose Mount and Moorcrest, Diggle	Mr K. W. Redfearn
0444/1/001/O	Remove the land from the Green Belt to allow for the construction of a dwelling; to improve the visual quality of the land; and to provide a more logical Green Belt boundary..

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

Objection

Land between LGG18 and PEZ30, Delph

Mr G Bayley

0112/1/013/O

Land should become part of Green Belt (or Local Green Gap 18, see separate representation) as it seems illogical to leave unallocated.

Omission

Land between Spinners Way & Albany
Farm, Moorside

Peter Sykes

0022/1/001/O

Remove site from Green Belt to permit housing development, as it is in a sought after area between two existing developments and can have direct access to Ripponden Road. The land has no agricultural value.

Objection

Land north of Coal Pit Lane, land at
Ashton Road

Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL

Agent : Cordingleys

0815/1/012/O

Change allocation of these 2 sites from Green Belt to Land Reserved for Future Development, specifically housing. Recreational facilities could be retained; land reclamation and enhancement of main transportation corridor achieved.

Omission

Land off Burnedge Lane, Grasscroft

John Roodhouse

0050/1/001/O

Remove land from Green Belt to allow development of dwelling on the plot, and future development of the adjacent field, as they are not directly overlooked, not suitable for farming, and had buildings 50 m away in the past.

Objection

Land off Crib Lane/Long Lane, Dobcross

Mrs P. Lutener

Agent : Chorlton Planning

0035/1/001/O

Release all or part of site from Green Belt and re-allocate for residential purposes. Logical extension of existing residential development to south, near bus route and village services. Would add choice of housing in area and support local services.

Objection

Land off Delph Lane, Delph

Mr J. Whitehead

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0168/1/001/O	Agent : Chorlton Planning Allocate site, or part of it, for housing. Would be logical extension of existing development on Delph Lane and add to range of available housing types.
Objection	
Land off Haigh Lane	Mr Ben Lancaster
0384/1/001/O	Change the designation of the land from Green Belt to recreational open space, to allow the development of an education and leisure facility.
Objection	
Joint Case	
Land off Huddersfield Rd, Denshaw	Mr J. McLintock Agent : Chorlton Planning
0650/1/001/O	Release part of the land from the Green Belt and re-designate for development as part of comprehensive plan for expansion of Denshaw. As most remote village it would benefit from additional residents to support local services.
Objection	
Land off Manchester Road, Greenfield	J.G. McNeeney
0604/1/001/O	Remove site from Green Belt and re-designate to permit building of a house on the site
Objection	
Land off Manchester Road, Greenfield	D. McNeeney
0607/1/001/O	Remove site from Green Belt and re-designate to permit building of a house on the site
Objection	
Land off Manchester Road, Greenfield	K.A. McNeeney
0608/1/001/O	Remove from Green Belt and re-designate to permit building of a house on the site
Objection	
Land off Thornham Road, Shaw	I. Kershaw Agent : Chorlton Planning
0170/1/001/O	Exclude from Green Belt to allow much needed countryside/urban fringe recreational facilities such as stabling
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Land south of Argyll Park Road, Failsworth	Redwaters Construction Limited
0349/1/001/O	Agent : Ark Design & Architecture Ltd Remove land south of Argyll Park Rd, Failsworth, from Green Belt, and allocate for housing. Would provide clearer edge/more logical boundary to the Green Belt. Sustainable/accessible location. Potential to contribute to housing needs.
Objection	
Land south of Higher Hills Farm, Grasscroft	West Pennine Plant
0436/1/001/O	Remove land to the south of Higher Hills Farm and the former quarry from the Green Belt and allocate it for housing. Development would consolidate edge of built-up area and provide local housing.
Objection	
Land to the north of The Meadows, Grotton	Mr D Cox
0472/1/002/O	Agent : Chorlton Planning Re-allocate site, or part of it, for residential development as an extension to existing residential area to the south. Site is easily accessible to public transport and to Grotton local centre. Landscaping of remainder could benefit area in general
Objection	
Major developed sites	Wiggett Construction Ltd
0045/1/001/O	Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd Should identify major developed sites in the Green Belt on the Proposals Map and by way of a new policy in line with Annex C of PPG 2.
Omission	
Pickhill Reservoir, Uppermill	David Sanderson
0345/1/002/O	Requests that land between Saddleworth School and the houses on the eastern side of Uppermill High Street be designated as Green Belt or recreational open space to protect the site, which was restored through local voluntary effort, from development.
Omission	
Robert Fletcher (Greenfield) Ltd paper mill	Robert Fletcher (Greenfield) Ltd

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	Agent : De Pol Associates
0709/1/001/O	Add policy concerning 'major developed sites in the Green Belt', and identify the mill as a 'Major Developed Site'. Infilling/redevelopment possible in accordance with PPG2 Annex C.
Omission	
Royal George Mills, Greenfield	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/002/O	Should identify as Major Developed Site appropriate for limited infilling and redevelopment (housing) in line with PPG 2.
Omission	
Royal George Mills, Greenfield	Tanner Brothers Ltd
0267/1/004/S	Supports retention of the site in the Green Belt and as a conservation area, because Green Belt in Saddleworth must remain as such and be protected
Support	
Royal George Mills, Greenfield	Dr David Atherton
0368/1/001/O	Refers to omission of Royal George Mills site.
Objection	
Royal George Mills, Greenfield	Friezland Properties Ltd
0780/1/001/S	States that the Green Belt in Saddleworth should never be altered and specifically supports keeping this site in the Green Belt and as a conservation area
Support	
Royal George Mills/Fletchers Mill, Greenfield	David Sanderson
0345/1/004/S	Objects to lack of specific designation to these sites in the Green Belt. Sites should be designated for new business which creates jobs, but not for housing (apart from a modest proportion at Royal George).
Omission	
Shaws Lane, Uppermill	Mr D Lawton

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0048/1/001/O	Delete whole or part of site from Green Belt to allow housing development
Objection	
South of The Shaws and Redwood Road, Uppermill	Mr J. Downs
	Agent : Chorlton Planning
0171/1/001/O	Allocate site, or part of it, for housing development as an extension of existing residential area to north. Development would round off built area and add choice of locations and house types in Saddleworth.
Objection	
Ward Lane, Diggle	Karen Harvey
	Agent : Hall Needham Associates
0816/1/001/O	Designate as residential, phasing based on the timing for the new station. The site is strategically placed with regards to a new railway station being positioned in Diggle.
Omission	
GS2 2.10	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/028/O	The paragraph should be amended to reflect the changes to PPG7 made in March 2001, about the protection of agricultural land.
Objection	
	Alan Roughley
0243/1/008/O	Proposed SPG could release 'lower' grade agricultural land for housing development making a lot of the proposed protection of Green Belt irrelevant. SPG should be subject to same degree of public scrutiny as UDP
Objection	
Joint Case	
GS2 2.13	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/029/O	There is a reference to Local Green Gaps being given equivalent protection to Green Belt, however, the Green Belt policy needs to be made less restrictive.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
GS2 2.16	Alan Roughley
0243/1/003/O	The reference to development being allowed "in exceptional circumstances" weakens the protection of recreational open space - replacement provision should always be required in these circumstances.
Objection Joint Case	
GS2 B., E., G.	Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL Agent : Cordingleys
0815/1/008/O	Definitions needed of grade 3B, 4 & 5 agricultural land and 'inappropriate development' to allow for diversification. Delete Local Green Gaps or recognise their potential for development. Distinguish different grades of nature conservation sites.
Objection	
GS3	Countryside Agency
0008/1/019/O	Policy should expressly enable development (of various types) in rural areas if need is demonstrated as, at present, it seems only to suggest windfall housing development
Objection	
0113/1/011/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership</p> Policy GS3 for development on unallocated land is the reverse of policy GS1. The policies should be merged.
Objection	
0740/1/003/S	North West Regional Assembly
Support	None given.
GS4	West Pennine Bridleways Association

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0175/1/012/S Support	Supports the policy. North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/004/S Support	None given.
Birks Quarry 0113/1/012/O Objection	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership The policy is supported in principle, but it should allow the development of land at Birk's Quarry, currently shown as in the Green Belt Is type of land Council seeks to prioritise for development under policy GS4 and is sustainably located.
GS5	Highways Agency
0006/1/014/O Objection	More emphasis should be placed on public transport in this policy. Countryside Agency
0008/1/020/O Objection	The policy (and reasoned justification) should clarify that the diversification of rural areas would not be adversely affected by the rigid interpretation of the policy.
	STORM
0016/1/007/S Support	No comments submitted
	GMPTE
0026/1/008/S	Sets a solid framework for Part 2 policies, ensuring that major developments will be accessible by a choice of modes. The approach of mapping accessibility is also supported.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Support	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/005/S	None given.
Support	
GS5 2.24	Alan Roughley
0243/1/002/O	The second sentence should specify "commercial or industrial development" to clarify that the policy would apply to development, other than housing, that could provide local jobs in Saddleworth .
Objection Joint Case	
GS6	Highways Agency
0006/1/015/O	The policy should include additional wording which seeks to protect the safe and efficient operation of the trunk road network by considering the cumulative effects of the allocation and development of sites.
Objection	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/030/O	The Highways Agency should be consulted on this policy.
Objection	
	GMPTE
0026/1/009/S	Supports the requirement to locate development in order to reduce the need to travel and the recognition that this will help promote social inclusion
Support	
	Lawrence Watson
0138/1/002/O	Requires stronger control of noise arising from new developments, including traffic

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	noise, and of heavy traffic using Broadway, in order to protect residents.
Objection	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/006/S	None given.
Support	
GS6 2.27	
	Highways Agency
0006/1/016/O	Revised wording suggested to cover proposals for development near motorways and trunk roads, to reflect the requirements of the Highways Agency.
Objection	
GS7	
	Highways Agency
0006/1/017/O	The meaning of the terms "convenience" and "security" in clause c needs clarification.
Objection	
	Countryside Agency
0008/1/021/O	The policy on site considerations should be worded positively to encourage considerate development rather than concentrate on preventing harm
Objection	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/031/O	The policy is too restrictive and should be reworded to introduce some flexibility.
Objection	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/012/O	Broad support for the policy, but requests that "significant harm" be defined in the supporting text.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
0045/1/020/O	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd Policy GS7 should be deleted as it duplicates others and is inconsistent with PPG1 and Section 54A of the TCP Act 1990.
Objection	
0082/1/002/O	Crown Castle UK Ltd The policy is too restrictive and inflexible and will stifle the development of modern telecommunications infrastructure, which the Government has encouraged in the recently revised Planning Policy Guidance Note 8.
Objection	
0110/1/013/O	Paul Speak Properties Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd The policy should be deleted as it duplicates others and is inconsistent with PPG1 and Section 54A of the TCP Act 1990.
Objection	
0138/1/003/O	Lawrence Watson Requires stronger protection of residential amenity against noise and air pollution arising from all types of development and the traffic they generate, especially in problem areas such as along Broadway.
Objection	
0149/1/009/O	English Nature "Significant harm" should be defined and reference made to the precautionary principle, as what constitutes harm to national and international sites may be less apparent than harm to local nature conservation sites.
Objection	
0740/1/007/S	North West Regional Assembly None given.
Support	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
H1	P. Wilson & Company
0023/1/004/O	Brownfield target of 75% is unrealistic. Should be amended to 60% as stated in PPG3 - Housing.
Objection	
	Mr J Lees Agent : Chorlton Planning
0033/1/002/O	Concerned - lack of opportunities for the development of upper market housing. Wishes to see a wider range of sites allocated on the proposals map & the inclusion of policies which promote a limited amount of upper market housing on appropriate sites
Objection	
	Mrs M. Corbett Agent : Chorlton Planning
0034/1/002/O	Concerned - lack of opportunities for the development of upper market housing. Wishes to see a wider range of sites allocated on the proposals map & the inclusion of policies which promote a limited amount of upper market housing on appropriate sites
Objection	
	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Ltd
0041/1/002/O	Target for the reuse of previously developed land is too high. Insufficient information provided to support the assumed brownfield capacity. Also objects because Policy H1 allows for the development of greenfield windfall sites.
Objection Joint Case	
	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/003/O	Provide for a greater level of dwelling replacement and reduce the target for the development of previously developed land. The policy underprovides for dwelling replacement and adopts an unduly high target for the reuse of previously developed land.
Objection	
	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0045/1/031/O	Concerned - lack of opportunities for the development of upper market housing. Wishes to see a wider range of sites allocated on the proposals map & the inclusion of policies which promote a limited amount of upper market housing on appropriate sites
Objection	
	Kirstail Properties Agent : Chorlton Planning
0097/1/002/O	Concerned - lack of opportunities for the development of upper market housing. Wishes to see a wider range of sites allocated on the proposals map & the inclusion of policies which promote a limited amount of upper market housing on appropriate sites
Objection	
	Brierstone Properties Ltd Agent : Drivers Jonas
0102/1/001/O	Principle of H1 supported but considered that more previously developed sites should be allocated in order to meet the brownfield target. PEZ 17 (Wellyhole Street) is considered to be more suitable for housing than PEZ.
Objection Joint Case	
	Bellway Homes Agent : Drivers Jonas
0104/1/001/O	Supports the principle of Policy H1, however considers that the approach to the development of greenfield sites is too restrictive.
Objection Joint Case	
	The House Builders Federation
0108/1/001/O	Policy is unlikely to provide a wide choice of good quality housing. Also, remove reference to use of supplementary planning guidance in para 6.26, as it is contrary to government guidance to use SPG to revise statutory plans.
Objection	
	Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110) Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0109/1/001/O	Annual provision figure of 400 dwellings is too low and incorrect assumption used for losses through future clearance.
Objection Joint Case	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0110/1/001/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Paul Speak Properties Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd</p> <p>Provide for a greater level of dwelling replacement and reduce the target for the development of previously developed land. The policy underprovides for dwelling replacement and adopts an unduly high target for the reuse of previously developed land.</p>
Objection	
0111/1/001/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Persimmon Homes</p> <p>No reference to the findings of any urban capacity study. Future contribution of windfalls therefore not properly assessed. Inadequate reference to the period 2011-2016.</p>
Objection	
0112/1/001/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Mr G Bayley</p> <p>All present industrial/commercial/business sites in Saddleworth should be classed as Primary Employment Zones as proposed change to mixed use/housing will remove all possibility of future business development in Saddleworth.</p>
Objection	
0167/1/004/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Frost (Exors. of late Mr R.) Agent : Chorlton Planning</p> <p>Concerned - lack of opportunities for the development of upper market housing. Wishes to see a wider range of sites allocated on the proposals map & the inclusion of policies which promote a limited amount of upper market housing on appropriate sites</p>
Objection	
0181/1/007/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Oldham Labour Group</p> <p>Generally support policy aspiring to 75% of new housing being located on brownfield sites. Also think that greenfield land could be considered subject to specific conditions.</p>
Objection	
0263/1/015/O	<p style="text-align: center;">CPRE - Lancashire</p> <p>Object to balance between brownfield and greenfield development. Overall brownfield target for Phase 1 & 2 housing developments should be higher, e.g. 80%, to accord with RPG Panel Report. Exclude windfall greenfield developments as per PPG3.</p>

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection Joint Case	K Hanlon
0343/1/002/O	Objection to all housing development. Particularly concerned with development proposed on greenfield land and open spaces. Sufficient supply of housing already.
Objection Joint Case	Dr David Atherton
0368/1/004/O	Objection to loss of PEZ land to housing in Greenfield and Saddleworth. Not enough facilities, such as schools, medical and leisure to support. Loss of character of villages.
Objection	Mr R Eglin Agent : Chorlton Planning
0621/1/002/O	Concerned - lack of opportunities for the development of upper market housing. Wishes to see a wider range of sites allocated on the proposals map & the inclusion of policies which promote a limited amount of upper market housing on appropriate sites
Objection	Mr J. McLintock Agent : Chorlton Planning
0650/1/002/O	Concerned - lack of opportunities for the development of upper market housing. Wishes to see a wider range of sites allocated on the proposals map & the inclusion of policies which promote a limited amount of upper market housing on appropriate sites
Objection	R A Bagley
0729/1/001/O	Considers that there should be no more housing development - should maintain the existing stock & preserve open space and the countryside. Concerned about additional pressure on services. Particularly concened about development in Saddleworth.
Objection	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/021/S	None given.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Support	
0750/1/002/O	Exors of G S Sherratt deceased Agent : Chorlton Planning Concerned - lack of opportunities for the development of upper market housing. Wishes to see a wider range of sites allocated on the proposals map & the inclusion of policies which promote a limited amount of upper market housing on appropriate sites
Objection	
0815/1/001/O	Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL Agent : Cordingleys Requirement does not reflect higher past building rate. Clearance underestimated. Additional land will be required since dwellings are replaced at a lower density. Requirement fails to take into account the need for more affordable houses.
Objection	
0046/1/003/O	Birchinlee Mill, Royton Broadhurst Engineering (UK) Ltd Agent : Robert Turley Associates Requests that the site be allocated for residential development. Mill is underused and in a poor condition. Continued employment use not viable. Site is previously developed and is within walking distance of services & employment.
Omission	
0179/1/003/O	Birchinlee Mill, Royton Commhoist Ltd Agent : Robert Turley Associates Requests that the site be allocated for residential development. Mill is underused and in a poor condition. Continued employment use not viable. Site is previously developed and is within walking distance of services & employment.
Omission	
0617/1/001/O	Birchinlee Mill, Royton Medlock Limited Agent : Robert Turley Associates Underused mill complex. Buildings in poor condition. Continued employment use no longer viable. Previously developed land & is within walking distance of employment, shops & services inc. public tpt. Requests is allocated for residential development.
Omission	
	Birchinlee Mill, Royton U-Aerials & Communications Ltd Agent : Robert Turley Associates

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0711/1/003/O	Requests that the site be allocated for residential development. Mill is underused and in a poor condition. Continued employment use not viable. Site is previously developed and is within walking distance of services & employment.
Omission	
Birchinlee Mill, Royton	Medlock Communications Ltd Agent : Robert Turley Associates
0712/1/003/O	Requests that the site be allocated for residential development. Mill is underused and in a poor condition. Continued employment use not viable. Site is previously developed and is within walking distance of services & employment.
Omission	
Joint Case	
Birchinlee Mill, Royton	Medlock Construction Agent : Robert Turley Associates
0713/1/003/O	Requests that the site be allocated for residential development. Mill is underused and in a poor condition. Continued employment use not viable. Site is previously developed and is within walking distance of services & employment.
Omission	
Dico Warehouse, Constantine Street	Fairclough Homes Ltd
0269/1/003/O	Requests the allocation of the site of Dico Warehouse for residential development. This objection by Fairclough Homes also includes a petition from local residents comprising 27 signatures in support of their proposed use for the site.
Omission	
Dunkerley St/ Huddersfield Rd	Lookers PLC
0019/1/004/O	Change allocation of land to the east of Dunkerley Street and rear of properties fronting onto Huddersfield Road from district centre to housing, to replace the car dealership site suggested for removal from site H1.1.8.
Objection	
Greenfield Bowling Club	David Butterworth & Co. Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning
0731/1/001/O	Seeks the allocation of this site for a variety of reasons - within the village envelope, urban in character, accessible to services, will enhance the conservation area, will improve h'way/footpaths, bowling club closed due to lack of demand.
Omission	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Land at Brookside Poultry Farm, Royton 0031/1/001/O	Mr J Wood Agent : Chorlton Planning Allocate the land (site 2) for redevelopment, preferably for housing. A compact residential scheme would improve the site by replacing redundant and unsightly farm buildings.
Objection	
Land at Derwent Drive 0673/1/004/O	Mr J C Blakeman Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd Additional greenfield land should be allocated as brownfield development is unlikely to take place at predicted rates. Allocate land at Derwent Drive for Phase 1 housing development.
Omission	
Land at Foxdenton, Chadderton 0041/1/005/O	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Ltd Requests allocation of sites LR3, LR4 and LGG3 combined for housing or mixed housing/commercial or to be identified permissible greenfield site under a revised Policy H1.3. Considered to be a highly sustainable location.
Objection Joint Case	
Land off Radcliffe St, Springhead 0115/1/003/O	L. Perrins Agent : Chorlton Planning Requests that the site be allocated for residential development - is an infill site, would use an unused site, close to services, may be suitable for affordable housing, could be developed in conjunction with land to the south west.
Omission	
Land to the north of Ashton Rd, Woodhouses 0618/1/001/O	Mr D B Jones Requests that the site be allocated for residential development. Opportunity to "round-off" the village. Opposite site H1.2.3.
Objection	
Part of Long Clough, off Broadway, Royton 0626/1/001/O	Stockwell Construction (Midlands) Ltd (Dissol) Agent : Alan Kirkham MRICS Requests the land be allocated for residential dev't - poor quality area of land which

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	could be landlocked after adjacent approved development takes place. Could deteriorate further. Could be developed without detriment to green corridor.
Omission	
Site off Wall Hill Road, Dobcross	Mr R Eglin Agent : Chorlton Planning
0621/1/001/O	Residential allocation in adopted Plan has been deleted for the First Deposit. Requests the site be reinstated - site has had a previous planning permission, would be suitable for executive homes, no change in local circumstances.
Omission	
South of Denbigh Drive/Netherhouse Road	Betts Homes (Northern) Ltd Agent : The Planning Consultancy
0829/1/001/O	Allocate for residential development. Insufficient housing land has been identified to meet housing targets. Queries assumptions regarding windfalls, clearance rate and contribution from empty homes.Sustainable location/ accessible.
Objection	
H1 6.21	
	Westbury Homes
0107/1/001/O	Reference to greenfield windfall sites should be removed as Government guidance (PPG3, March 2000) makes clear they should no longer be considered in windfall calculations for the purpose of housing requirement/provision.
Objection	
H1.1	
	Countryside Agency
0008/1/027/O	Welcomes intention of H1.1 to allocate housing land in smaller settlements however requests that surveys should be undertaken to assess if these sites should meet very local needs rather than general needs.
Objection	
	The House Builders Federation
0108/1/009/O	Allocations are unlikely to provide for a wide choice of good quality housing. Contrary to government policy to revise statutory planning policies through

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	Supplementary Planning Guidance - remove reference to SPG in para 6.32.
Objection	
	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0113/1/001/O	Considers that some of the sites allocated for Phase 1 development may be unsuitable or inappropriate for development. Proposes a new site allocation at Birks Quarry (which is currently in the green belt). Brownfield/more sustainable.
Omission	
	Langtree Property Group Ltd Agent : Sedgwick Associates
0572/1/001/O	The assumptions relating to the rate of development in Phase 1 of previously developed and windfall sites are over optimistic. Development costs likely to exceed development value. More choice of sites required.
Objection	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/022/S	None given.
Support	
	Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL Agent : Cordingleys
Danisher Lane 0815/1/007/O	Housing allocations will not come forward as expected. Windfall and small sites allowances are overestimated. Suggests that available land at Danisher Lane be allocated (part green belt, part housing in the Adopted UDP) for housing.
Omission	
H1.1.1 Land at Hunt Lane, Chadderton	Lancashire Wildlife Trust
0124/1/004/O	A wildlife link from the Hunt Lane SBI to the wildlife corridor in the north (RR6) should be maintained so as not to isolate the SBI. This can be done by redrawing the boundary of the development or by adding a paragraph to the policy.
Objection	
H1.1.1 Land at Hunt Lane, Chadderton	Alice Hadfield
0163/1/002/S	Support allocation and hope it will be used for a varied types of housing, including

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	affordable housing.
Support	
H1.1.10 Athens Way, Lees	W. Shepherdson and Sons Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning
0710/1/001/S	Welcome inclusion as Phase 1 housing site as it is suitable for residential development and should be developed within the early phase of the plan.
Support	
H1.1.12 High Street/Hartshead Street, Lees	Arthur Greaves (Lees) Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning
0132/1/003/S	Support inclusion of this site for phase 1 housing is best suited for residential development, and site is ideally placed close to Lees District Centre.
Support	
H1.1.13 Coverhill Road, Grotton	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/026/S	This is a suitable site for housing & is not subject to any insurmountable or physical constraints. Only comprises a small area of land. Not viable for an alternative use.
Support	
H1.1.13 Coverhill Road, Grotton	Cllr Brian Lord
0165/1/004/O	The piece of land at the junction of Coverhill Rd and Oldham Rd, Grotton should be removed as housing land as the access from the original development is no longer available.
Objection	
H1.1.13 Coverhill Road, Grotton	CPRE - Lancashire
0263/1/006/O	Object to the continuing allocation of the site. The site makes a significant contribution to the Green Belt.
Objection Joint Case	
H1.1.13 Coverhill Road, Grotton	Grotton Action Group
0717/1/001/O	The site is both inappropriate and inadequate for inclusion as land for housing development.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
Joint Case	
H1.1.13 Coverhill Road, Grotton	Cllr C M Wheeler
0718/1/001/O	Remove housing allocation and protect site from development. Traffic conditions and egress from the site are most unsuitable. There is also a disused railway underneath the land.
Objection	
H1.1.13 Coverhill Road, Grotton	Harold J Taylor (deceased) Agent : John F.D. Pierce
0732/1/001/S	This site clearly meets the principles set out in H1 and is capable of being brought forward in the short term.
Support	
H1.1.13 Coverhill Road, Grotton	Saddleworth Civic Trust
0828/1/010/O	The site contains a barn once part of Grotton Farm which is Grade II listed. Should be considered as part of farm curtilage even though divided by the main road. Housing would detract from the character & appearance of the farm.
Objection	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/023/O	Disproportionate number of proposed housing in Phase 1 is in Saddleworth. The allocation at Lumb Mill is not supported.
Objection	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	John Saxon Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning
0099/1/002/O	Requires clarification that the indicative capacity and density is for statistical purposes and will not be a restraint on site design and layout.
Omission	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	John Saxon Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0099/1/004/S	Welcomes inclusion of the site as a mixed development (includes B1.3.2)
Support	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Bellway Homes
	Agent : Drivers Jonas
0104/1/012/O	Supports the principle of development but requires several areas of clarification/further consideration - site should be brownfield not greenfield, clarify size, clarify required density, better cross-referencing with mixed use business policy B1.3.
Objection Joint Case	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Mr G Bayley
0112/1/009/O	The whole of the Saddleworth Business Park should be Primary Employment Zone, not mixed use. The commercial/business units at Saddleworth Business Centre are fully occupied.
Objection	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Jane Walker
0128/1/001/O	H1.1.14 (and H1.1.15) should not both be proposed as residential in this central location as this quantity of new housing would be too much for the village and cause traffic problems.
Objection	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Janet Bottomley
0130/1/002/O	Concerned that PEZ land already eroded. Need more employment not less. Adj. business centre is in full use for employment. Is a well used site on a busy road with good access to m-way's. Mixed use designation should be deleted.
Objection Joint Case	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Andrew Clark
0527/1/002/O	Site should be kept for industrial/commercial use - would allow for an expansion of the adjacent business centre & preserve its long term future - it could be vulnerable

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

housing if mixed scheme goes ahead.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Joanne Clague

0627/1/001/O

Objects to the residential element of this mixed use allocation. States that the site is suitable for commercial use & that there is a market for industrial units without a need for cross-subsidy. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use.

Objection

Joint Case

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Alun Morgan

0630/1/001/O

Objects to the residential element of this mixed use allocation. States that the site is suitable for commercial use & that there is a market for industrial units without a need for cross-subsidy. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use.

Objection

Joint Case

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Nathan Berry

0631/1/001/O

Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Charmaine Berry

0633/1/001/O

Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

W Berry

0634/1/001/O

Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Sarah Gaskell

0635/1/001/O

Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Jennifer Clark

0636/1/001/O

Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Mrs A.R. Webster

0637/1/001/O

Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Peter Webster

0639/1/001/O

Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Dr. M.J. Schwarz

0640/1/001/O

Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Mr. R. Hitchcock

0641/1/001/O

Business/industry should be retained on this site. Will hopefully assist the business centre to increase employment. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Ms G Malone

0669/1/001/O

Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

R Walker

0671/1/001/O

Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

R and A Parker

0672/1/001/O

Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Adam Smart

0674/1/001/O

Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

Objection

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Mrs. L. Smart
0675/1/001/O	Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.
Objection	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Mr. B.L. Smart
0676/1/001/O	Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.
Objection	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Mr Eric Wild
0677/1/001/O	Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.
Objection	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Mr P. Whitworth
0678/1/001/O	Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.
Objection Joint Case	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Mr C.J. Dockray
0679/1/001/O	Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Mrs E. Dockray
0680/1/001/O	Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.
Objection	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	P. Harrison
0681/1/001/O	Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.
Objection	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Mrs P. Hurst
0682/1/001/O	Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.
Objection	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Mr W. Hurst
0683/1/001/O	Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.
Objection	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	R Rumacre
0685/1/001/O	Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.
Objection	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,	Mr R. Randerson

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

Delph

0686/1/001/O Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

J. Young

0687/1/001/O Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Mrs P. Waterhouse

0688/1/001/O Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Mr O. Morgan-Clague

0689/1/001/O Site is suitable for commercial use. No need for cross-subsidy from residential development to develop commercial use - see PEZ29 which has been developed without cross-subsidy & is fully let. Site should be wholly allocated for commercial use.

Objection

Joint Case

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Mrs J.L. Hindle

0690/1/001/O Objects to loss of employment land. Work places required to keep the village economy viable. Unhappy to see the erosion of more PEZ land.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Mr P. Whitehead

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0693/1/001/O	Site should be retained for employment use only - it is wholly suited for such development. Will retain the long term future of the business centre ensuring it does not become vulnerable to housing. There is a demand for commercial land in Delph.
Objection	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Mr Anthony Fisher
0694/1/001/O	Seeks the retention of the whole site for commercial/industrial purposes in order to maintain employment in the local area and to preserve PEZ designations such as the adjacent business centre.
Objection	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Mrs E. Peake
0695/1/001/O	Interested party in the business centre. Concerned about the vulnerability of the business centre to housing if the adjacent land is given housing status. States that this is a concern for many of the employees. Identify for industrial use only.
Objection	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Allison Beaver
0696/1/001/O	Site should be retained solely for business use. Is an appropriate site & would provide possible employment for local people. Housing would be a further drain on local amenities. Not a suitable location given proximity of business centre.
Objection	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Stella Hardy
0697/1/001/O	Retain whole site as a Primary Employment Zone, as it should be for business use only.
Objection Joint Case	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	C. Carruthers
0698/1/001/O	As an interested party in the business centre is concerned about its vulnerability to housing if adjacent land is given housing status. Requests the site be preserved for

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

industrial/commercial only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Mr & Mrs H Moore

0699/1/001/O

Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Mrs S. Whitworth

0700/1/001/O

Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

S. Ahmed

0703/1/001/O

As an interested party in the Business Centre is concerned about the vulnerability of the Business Centre to housing if adjacent land is given housing status - this is a concern for employees. Identify the site for industrial/commercial use only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Kieran Berry

0758/1/003/O

Business/industry should be retained wherever possible. Site is suitable for such. Concerned about impact on adjacent business centre - could be lost to housing if mixed scheme goes ahead. Requests the site be allocated for commercial use only.

Objection

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road,
Delph

Mr&Mrs F Whitehead

0818/1/001/O

Land should be for industry only - do not need more houses in Saddleworth

Objection

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Mrs G Clark
0833/1/002/O	Objects to allocation, as consideration should be given to the amount of traffic through Delph.
Objection Joint Case	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/025/O	Do not support the designation of this site as housing as there seems to be a disproportionate number of Phase 1 housing sites in Saddleworth in proportion to the rest of the Borough.
Objection	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mr G Bayley
0112/1/011/O	The disused railway should be protected from development to ensure that its use for transport, preferably rail, would not be precluded.
Objection	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mr G Bayley
0112/1/012/O	Bailey Mill site should remain as PEZ as policy appears to remove possibility of future business use of land in Saddleworth.
Objection	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Jane Walker
0128/1/002/O	An alternative site away from the centre of Delph should be sought because any additional traffic would strangle the village.
Objection	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mr P. Buckley

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0153/1/002/O	Object to the change of use from PEZ to housing. Bailey Mill should be broken up into industrial units similar to Lumb Mill. Once site has been lost for housing, the employment zone will not return to Saddleworth.
Objection Joint Case	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mr M. Buckley
0164/1/002/O	The mill and area should not be lost to housing development, rather broken up into small business units. Too much land already developed - infrastructure could not cope with extra pressure. Employment needed in area.
Objection Joint Case	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Joanne Clague
0627/1/002/S	Considers loss of the industrial site to housing H1.1.15 as acceptable.
Support Joint Case	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Alun Morgan
0630/1/003/S	Considers the loss of the industrial site to housing H1.1.15 as acceptable
Support Joint Case	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Nathan Berry
0631/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
Support	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Charmaine Berry
0633/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
Support	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham	W Berry

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Road/Delph New Road	
0634/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
Support	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Sarah Gaskell
0635/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
Support	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Jennifer Clark
0636/1/002/S	This site is appropriate for housing
Support	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Dr. M.J. Schwarz
0640/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
Support	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mr. R. Hitchcock
0641/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
Support	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Ms G Malone
0669/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
Support	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	R and A Parker
0672/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
---	-------------

Support

H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Adam Smart
--	------------

0674/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
--------------	-----------------------------------

Support

H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mrs. L. Smart
--	---------------

0675/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
--------------	-----------------------------------

Support

H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mr. B.L. Smart
--	----------------

0676/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
--------------	-----------------------------------

Support

H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mr P. Whitworth
--	-----------------

0678/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
--------------	-----------------------------------

Support
Joint Case

H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	P. Harrison
--	-------------

0681/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
--------------	-----------------------------------

Support

H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mrs P. Hurst
--	--------------

0682/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
--------------	-----------------------------------

Support

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mr W. Hurst
0683/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
Support	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	R Rumacre
0685/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
Support	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mr R. Randerson
0686/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
Support	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	J. Young
0687/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
Support	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mrs P. Waterhouse
0688/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
Support	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mr O. Morgan-Clague
0689/1/002/S	Considers the loss of the industrial site to housing H1.1.15 as acceptable
Support Joint Case	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mrs J.L. Hindle

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0690/1/002/O	Change allocation to Primary Employment Zone. Object to the loss of PEZ land and do not wish to see the Bailey Mill site have a drastic change of appearance
Objection	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mr P. Whitehead
0693/1/003/S	H1.1.15 as housing has some merit as Bailey Mill is not suitable for modern industry.
Support	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mr Anthony Fisher
0694/1/003/O	Reject the proposal for housing as it would detract from the essentially rural character of the local area.
Objection	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mr & Mrs H Moore
0699/1/002/S	The proposal for housing has some merit.
Support	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Mrs S. Whitworth
0700/1/002/S	This housing site has some merit.
Support	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Kieran Berry
0758/1/001/S	The proposal has some merit.
Support	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Saddleworth Civic Trust

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0828/1/001/O	Oppose change from PEZ to residential. Much new development has taken place. The area is a conservation area & new housing on an extensive scale is having a negative impact on its character. Proposals endanger the structure and appearance of the mill
Objection	
H1.1.16 Buckley New Mill, Uppermill	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/024/S	Supports mixed use on this site.
Support	
H1.1.16 Buckley New Mill, Uppermill	Wiggett Construction Ltd
0045/1/028/S	Supported for a variety of reasons, including - mixed use is deliverable, no demand for the use of the buildings for industrial use, currently an eyesore, proposed police station will be better located than the existing, village centre location.
Support	
H1.1.18 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/006/O	Do not support the change to mixed use. There is a disproportionate amount of proposed Phase 1 housing in the Saddleworth area as opposed to the rest of the borough.
Objection	
H1.1.18 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/015/O	Indicative number of dwellings for the mixed use site should be increased to 80-100. Number indicated is too low although allocation is supported.
Objection	
H1.1.18 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/027/S	Allocation for mixed use including housing is supported. It is well located for services & facilities. It's redevelopment would enable environmental improvements.
Support	
H1.1.18 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road	Paul Speak Properties Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0110/1/009/S	Support allocation as a mixed use development as it is a previously developed site,

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

well located for services and facilities, and its redevelopment will enable environmental improvements

Support

H1.1.18 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road

Paul Speak Properties Ltd

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

0110/1/017/O

Indicative number of dwellings for the mixed use site should be increased to 80-100. Number indicated is too low although allocation is supported.

Objection

H1.1.18 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road

Mr G Bayley

0112/1/005/O

Should be 100% PEZ. Greenfield in danger of becoming a commuter dormitory town with few prospects of employment sites. Education/medical services already overstretched.

Objection

H1.1.18 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road

Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn

0174/1/018/O

Consider that the site should remain as PEZ. Level site, access suitable for industry not generating heavy traffic. Only remaining vacant industrial site in village, following the redesignation of Andrew Mill for housing.

Objection

Joint Case

H1.1.18 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road

Brian Greenwood

0260/1/002/O

Support in principle but uses should be wider to include retail and tourism.

Objection

H1.1.18 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road

London Law & Land

Agent : Forge Architects

0294/1/002/S

Welcome the change of designation of this site from a PEZ to mixed use. The mixed use designation is a way of unlocking the sites potential and also a way of encouraging sustainable development.

Support

H1.1.18 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road

Mrs Joan Frost

0295/1/001/O

Support in principle but number of houses should be increased from 50 to 100, in

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	accordance with PPG3 recommendation.
Objection	
H1.1.18 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road	J. R. Taylor
0344/1/001/O	Strong objection to the redesignation of the site as mixed development. Saddleworth cannot afford to have such a large PEZ redesignated.
Objection	
H1.1.18 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road	David Sanderson
0345/1/001/O	Must not be largely used for housing. This is an excellent opportunity to use the rest of the site for a business park.
Objection	
H1.1.18 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road	Knoll Mill Campaign Group
0347/1/001/O	The UDP should provide far greater clarity about proposed uses. Requests the preparation of a detailed planning brief in consultation with local community groups
Objection	
H1.1.18 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road	G.R. Bennett
0706/1/001/O	Agree with the proposal for mixed use, but suggest that housing should be of a higher density.
Objection	
H1.1.18 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road	Cllr C M Wheeler
0718/1/005/O	Would press for the allocation to be changed to PEZ.
Objection	
H1.1.18 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road	Saddleworth Civic Trust
0828/1/018/O	Support for mixed use, but reservations - residential element should be modest density, historic & architecturally attractive buildings should be retained/treated sympathetically. Marina & suburban style hotel/pub not supported. Canal basin ok.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
H1.1.19 Andrew Mill, Greenfield	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/027/O	Do not support the designation for housing. There would seem to be disproportionate number of proposed housing sites in this phase in the Saddleworth area as opposed to the rest of the Borough.
Objection	
H1.1.19 Andrew Mill, Greenfield	Bellway Homes Agent : Chorlton Planning
0104/1/013/S	Welcome the allocation of the site for Phase 1 residential development
Support	
H1.1.19 Andrew Mill, Greenfield	Dr David Atherton
0368/1/002/O	Refers to more housing and loss of PEZ.
Objection	
H1.1.19 Andrew Mill, Greenfield	Steve Wright
0749/1/001/O	The area should be redeveloped as a park adjoining Chew Brook to meet the need for more play area in Greenfield. Housing is not needed.
Objection	
H1.1.19 Andrew Mill, Greenfield	Mrs S Andrew
0754/1/001/O	Land should return to the original designation of light industry to create jobs. Also housing would put strain on schools and parks.
Objection Joint Case	
H1.1.19 Andrew Mill, Greenfield	Warren G. Garland
0755/1/001/O	Want to see the land remain in its original, light industrial use to provide local job opportunities and because continuous housing development will destroy village environment and could lead to more travel, as schools are already at full capacity
Objection Joint Case	
H1.1.19 Andrew Mill, Greenfield	Harry Glover

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0756/1/001/O	The land contains a coppice of mature trees. Object to any proposal to fell these trees and to Plan's considering this part of the site as 'previously developed'.
Objection	
H1.1.19 Andrew Mill, Greenfield	Saddleworth Civic Trust
0828/1/007/O	Concerned at plans for further housing development at the site. Would prefer to see it dedicated to recreational use to protect Greenfield from excessive development.
Objection	
H1.1.3 Heywood Lane, Failsworth	British Telecommunications Plc Agent : RPS Chapman Warren
0289/1/004/O	Support a mixed use scheme but the precise mix of uses and the level of residential units should not be so prescriptive when alternative proposals may be just as acceptable.
Objection	
H1.1.4 High Barn Road, Royton	Howarth Brothers Properties Agent : Roger Hannah & Co
0223/1/004/S	Land is in a predominantly residential area, is of no environmental value and will help meet the housing needs of Royton.
Support	
H1.1.5 Cape Mill, Shaw	Siemens Real Estate Ltd Agent : Colliers Conrad Ritblat Erdman
0180/1/006/O	Include correct site area and capacity in relevant table. Expand site designation to include the adjoining former OSRAM private sports field, to reflect that it could be public open space associated with a future residential development.
Objection	
H1.1.7 Block Lane, Chadderton	North Ainley Halliwell Solicitors Agent : Chorlton Planning
0096/1/003/S	Allocation is supported.
Support	
H1.1.8 Land at Redgrave Street, Oldham	Standedge Limited
0018/1/002/O	The allocated housing site is currently in commercial use and should be included in Huddersfield Road District Centre - and by implication deallocated as housing.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
H1.1.8 Land at Redgrave Street, Oldham	Lookers PLC
0019/1/003/O	Remove the site of the existing Peugeot car dealership from the land allocated for housing, as it should be included in an extended Huddersfield Road District Centre which embraces other uses that contribute to its vitality.
Objection	
H1.1.9 Lower Lime Road, Oldham	Hollinwood ward (Limehurst Village area)
0715/1/001/O	Object to the proposal to build houses, as the recreational open space should be protected.
Objection Joint Case	
Land at Ashton Road, Bardsley	Persimmon Homes
0111/1/002/O	Objection to the allocation of greenfield sites in preference to this green belt site off Ashton Road, which is in a sustainable location and provides scope for environmental enhancement.
Objection	
Land at Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mrs V Ward
0473/1/002/O	Requests that this Local Green Gap allocation (LGG18) be redesignated as a Phase 1 housing site. It accords with PPG3, could count towards a potential shortfall in the supply, and is in a sustainable location.
Omission Joint Case	
Land off Manchester Road, Oldham	Lookers PLC Agent : Robert Turley Associates
0019/1/002/O	Requests the site be allocated as a phase 1 housing site - adjoins existing housing, is previously developed, accessible by public tpt, close to employment, shops & other services. Scope for medium to high density housing. Currently a car showroom.
Omission Joint Case	
Monarch Mill, Royton	Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110) Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0109/1/008/O	Requests that the site of Monarch Mill be allocated for Phase 1 housing development.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Omission Joint Case	Supporting reasons include: the mill is only partly occupied, is in a residential area & is well located. Also doubt about availability of existing allocations.
Waterside Mill, Greenfield	Tanner Brothers Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0267/1/003/O	The site should be included as a Phase 1 Housing Allocation at policy H1.1 as a mixed use housing development, rather than a Primary Employment Zone (PEZ27). Suitable site for a mixed use allocation with housing element.
Omission	
Wellyhole Street, Oldham	Brierstone Properties Ltd Agent : Drivers Jonas
0102/1/004/O	Requests the site be allocated for residential development - is previously developed, accessible to jobs, shops & services, infrastructure is available, close to existing residential development & is capable of development.
Objection Joint Case	
H1.1 6.28	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/018/O	Table 3 should give a breakdown of housing supply by sub-area.
Objection	
	Westbury Homes
0107/1/003/O	A discount or slippage allowance should be applied to existing commitments and Phase 1 housing allocations within Table 3 in order to recognise that not all committed or allocated sites will come forward, or may come forward at a lesser capacity.
Objection	
H1.1 6.30	Westbury Homes
0107/1/004/O	Lack of justification for the 63 dwellings per annum (vacant private homes which will be re-occupied) from reducing the vacancy rate. This component of the housing supply identified in Table 4 should be discounted.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
H1.1.5	
H1.1.5 Cape Mill, Refuge Street, Crompton	Fairclough Homes Ltd
0269/1/002/S	Supports residential allocation as it will enhance the area and replace a brownfield site in line with Government policies
Support	
H1.2	
	Countryside Agency
0008/1/028/O	Welcomes intention of H1.2 to allocate housing land in smaller settlements however requests that surveys should be undertaken to assess if these sites should meet very local needs rather than general needs.
Objection	
	The House Builders Federation
0108/1/004/O	Allocations unlikely to provide for a wide choice of good quality housing. Contrary to government policy to revise statutory planning policies through Supplementary Planning Guidance (remove references in 6.35, 6.36). Add appendix on site details.
Objection	
	CPRE - Lancashire
0263/1/008/S	Supports approach to phasing and proposed treatment of Phase 2 allocations
Support	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/023/S	None given.
Support	
Birks Quarry	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0113/1/020/O	Some of the phase 2 sites are considered unsuitable or inappropriate for development. Birks Quarry should be considered instead.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

Objection

H1.2.1 Parkside Farm, Chadderton

Holroy Developments

Agent : Hall Needham Associates

0126/1/003/O

Retain as a phase 1 housing site. Phase 2 allocation is contrary to Governmental sequential tests. The Local Authority has wrongly classified other land as Previously Developed and greenfield land is being used in less "sequential" areas.

Objection

Joint Case

H1.2.1 Parkside Farm, Chadderton

Exors of G S Sherratt deceased

Agent : Chorlton Planning

0750/1/001/O

Reclassify as Phase 1 residential allocation. Few housing sites in this part of Chadderton. Given the larger Phase 1 allocation at Hunt Lane, it would allow builders to compete and provide greater choice of housing types, styles and price.

Objection

H1.2.10 Knowls Lane, Lees

Leesfield Parish Schools

0015/1/002/O

Include a consideration of the possible need to increase places at local schools in response to housing developments. Housing development on site H1.2.10 would add to the argument to increase numbers on roll at St Agnes school at Knowls Lane.

Omission

Joint Case

H1.2.10 Knowls Lane, Lees

Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Ltd

0041/1/007/O

Requests allocation for housing or mixed housing/commercial within Phase 2, or to be identified permissible greenfield site under a revised Policy H1.3. Considered that the development would meet stated housing objectives.

Omission

H1.2.10 Knowls Lane, Lees

Persimmon Homes

0111/1/004/O

Remove housing allocation from this site which consists of highly attractive countryside in a less sustainable location than alternative sites such as at Ashton Road, Bardsley.

Objection

H1.2.10 Knowls Lane, Lees

Lord Deramore's Stanford Estates

Agent : Smiths Gore

0759/1/001/O

Transfer allocation from Phase 2 (Policy H1.2) to Phase 1 (Policy H1.1).Largest single

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

proposed housing allocation - more appropriate to include it in Phase 1. Well located, no constraints, would bring forward construction of new road link.

Objection

H1.2.10 Knowls Lane, Lees

Saddleworth Civic Trust

0828/1/013/O

The west of Saddleworth has been extensively overdeveloped. This is greenfield land which should be designated green belt. Visually prominent - development would change the face of this hillside dramatically.

Objection

H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road,
Denshaw.

GJ Belshaw

0003/1/001/O

Land should be protected as open land as it is part of the Green belt. Is part of farm with no easy means of access from roads or footpaths. Denshaw already has several half built estates to build on.

Objection

H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road,
Denshaw.

Margaret Ulyatt

0654/1/002/O

The site should not be developed for housing and should be protected as Green Belt. It is integral to Dumfries Farm. Allocation contradicts plan objectives to protect landscape and control development on farm holdings. Denshaw being overdeveloped.

Objection

H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road,
Denshaw.

Barry Ulyatt

0655/1/002/O

Object to housing development. Site should be Green Belt as is integral to Dumfries Farm. Contrary to Council policies to protect landscape and farm holdings, and to Gov't priority of brownfield development. Denshaw has already increased by 50%.

Objection

H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road,
Denshaw.

Mrs E Eddison

0656/1/002/O

The site should not be developed and should be protected as Green Belt. The proposed allocation contradicts Council objectives to protect the landscape, nature, village character and control development on farm holdings

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	Mrs G Travis
0658/1/002/O	The site should not be developed for housing and should be protected as Green Belt. It is integral to Dumfries Farm. Allocation contradicts plan objectives to protect landscape and control development on farm holdings. Denshaw being overdeveloped.
Objection	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	P.A. Coates
0659/1/002/O	The site should not be developed and should be part of Green Belt. The proposed allocation contradicts objectives to protect the landscape, nature and village character and to control development on farm holdings.
Objection	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	Joan Dean
0660/1/002/O	The site should not be developed and should be part of Green Belt. The proposed allocation contradicts objectives to protect the landscape, nature, village character and to control development on farm holdings
Objection	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	Susan Travis
0661/1/002/O	The site should not be developed and should be protected as Green Belt, as it is integral to Dumfries Farm. The allocation contradicts plan objectives to protect the landscape and control development on farm holdings. Denshaw is being over-developed.
Objection	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	Eileen Shaw
0662/1/002/O	The site, integral to Dumfries Farm, should not be developed and should be reinstated as Green Belt. Allocation contradicts Plan objectives to protect landscape and policies to control development in Green Belt and on farm holdings.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	Bernard Wright
0668/1/002/O	Object to housing designation. Site is an integral part of Dumfries Farm and should be Green Belt. Further development would be contrary to policies protecting landscape and controlling development on farmland, and spoil Denshaw.
Objection	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	Cllr C M Wheeler
0718/1/003/O	Request that this land be removed from housing designation and put into green belt. The number of dwellings in Denshaw has already increased 37% in past 5 years. Important to retain Denshaw's small village character.
Objection	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	Francis G. Mundy
0783/1/001/O	Object to housing on the site because Government calls for brownfield sites to be developed before greenfield sites and due to concerns about traffic and other impacts from development
Objection Joint Case	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	Michael Benton
0784/1/001/O	Oppose the housing. Protect as open land to retain quietness and views - many OAP's on Dumfries Avenue. No access for a road.
Objection	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	J. P. Breakey
0785/1/001/O	The site should not be allocated for housing, because Denshaw has had too much development already.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	Mrs J. Harrop
0786/1/001/O	Object to building on this site as development is already destroying the village's attractiveness and causing sewerage and access problems. Local facilities cannot accommodate more housing. The countryside should be protected.
Objection	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	Mr K. Harrop
0787/1/001/O	The land should be Green Belt as the village cannot support more housing and building on the site would obscure views of the moors and countryside
Objection	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	Mr M. Ragan
0788/1/001/O	The land should not be developed and should be preserved as open land. There is no clear access to the site.
Objection Joint Case	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	Mr & Mrs J Froggatt
0789/1/001/O	Remove housing allocation as developing here would generate more road traffic because the bus services are so poor and the village lacks facilities.
Objection	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	M. J. Holmes
0790/1/001/O	The site (Dumfries Farm front meadow) should not be allocated for housing because it is in the middle of open land/countryside and does not have proper access. It should be included in the Green Belt.
Objection	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	Mrs J. Hopwood

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0791/1/001/O	Object to housing on the site as it would put additional strain on sewerage and water supplies, create more traffic and alter the density of the village. Keep the land open.
Objection	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	Mr M. Rogers
0792/1/001/O	The land should be designated as a green area and not developed to retain countryside setting of village Conservation Area. Site has no access and development would worsen sewerage problems and encroach on privacy of existing properties.
Objection Joint Case	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	Ms E. Holmes
0793/1/001/O	The site should be Green Belt. It is a valuable asset to the village. Housing would spoil the area, the village's charm and appeal to tourists, and cause problems because of the difficult access.
Objection	
H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.	Saddleworth Civic Trust
0828/1/017/O	Support for the re-designation as a Phase 2 site, however would hope that the development of this land is given a low priority. Would rather see the land designated as green belt.
Objection	
H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd, Greenfield.	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/028/O	The site should not be used for housing. An additional 50 houses to those already identified in Phase 1 far exceeds a fair allocation for this area. Change to tourism and leisure uses which are more appropriate uses near the canal.
Objection	
H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd, Greenfield.	Saddleworth Parish Council
0040/1/016/O	Question the suitability for housing of the site because of its proximity to the Canal and the River Tame flood plain. Remove allocation or review the indicative capacity of

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

the site in light of measures necessary for drainage and flood control.

Objection
Joint Case

H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd,
Greenfield.

Mrs Brenda Jackson

0325/1/001/O

Remove the housing allocation from the site as access and parking cannot be made safe and the area is getting too built up. Site is attractive from the canal (supports tourism) and is used as a play area by local children.

Objection

H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd,
Greenfield.

Steve Wright

0749/1/002/O

The site should be kept undeveloped to halt further loss of open land in Saddleworth. Road infrastructure, schools, doctors surgeries etc cannot support further housing development. Goes against canal restoration.

Objection

H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd,
Greenfield.

Ms J. Lovatt

0760/1/001/O

The site should not be allocated for housing as road access in the area is already difficult, due to cars parked on-street. Land should be kept as green space for its wildlife value.

Objection

H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd,
Greenfield.

Mr P. Stevenson

0761/1/001/O

Remove the housing allocation to protect this green oasis and prevent loss of flora and fauna. There would be drainage and access problems with development and it would increase traffic and put pressure on local amenities.

Objection

H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd,
Greenfield.

R. Quarmby

0762/1/001/O

Remove housing allocation due to poor vehicle access. Development has previously been rejected on the site and nothing has changed to make it acceptable. Shaw Hall Bank Road and side roads are fully parked.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

Objection

H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd,
Greenfield.

Ms K. Brooks

0763/1/001/O

Change the housing allocation to Green Belt to discourage speculative building by developers and preserve open land. Applications for housing previously refused on access grounds. Conserve as natural meadow.

Objection

Joint Case

H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd,
Greenfield.

Ms K. Sage

0764/1/001/O

Remove allocation as housing. Development would be contrary to plan objectives and overload sewerage and road networks. Site should be conserved, as it is a wetland, wildlife habitat and gateway for rail passengers to Saddleworth area.

Objection

H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd,
Greenfield.

Mr & Mrs D Burke

0765/1/001/O

The site should not be allocated for housing because of its value for wildlife and as a play area and the impact of development on Shaw Hall Bank Rd with respect to traffic congestion and road safety.

Objection

H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd,
Greenfield.

Mr & Mrs Gardner

0766/1/001/O

The site should be considered as a conservation area or Green Belt. It has value as wildlife habitat and as a play area, and inadequate access for development.

Objection

H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd,
Greenfield.

Mr M. Ratcliff

0767/1/001/O

The site should be designated as Green Belt. It is one of the few remaining natural meadows in the area, used as play area by generations of children. Access to property difficult to obtain.

Objection

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd, Greenfield.	Mrs B. Washbrook
0768/1/001/O	The site should be redesignated as Green Belt to discourage further speculative building and protect and preserve open land.
Objection	
H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd, Greenfield.	Mr S.J. Quilter
0769/1/001/O	No development should be allowed on the site or in the area. The site is unspoilt, with mature trees and bog plants, enjoyed by walkers and as safe play area. Tipping would be needed to develop it. Parking and traffic are already a problem in area.
Objection Joint Case	
H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd, Greenfield.	Mr & Mrs S Ribbitts
0770/1/001/O	Remove housing allocation and keep as open land. It is wildlife habitat and only safe play area. Building is destroying character of Saddleworth for tourists and residents. Local roads cannot take extra traffic and are already dangerous.
Objection Joint Case	
H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd, Greenfield.	Oldham Friends of the Earth
0772/1/001/O	The site is wilded and should be subject to a biodiversity survey before any decision is made about its future use.
Objection	
H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd, Greenfield.	Mrs D. Kidd
0774/1/001/O	No housing should be built on the site because it is swampland on a floodplain, which is home to varied plant and animal species and is one of the few local areas where children can play safely.
Objection	
H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd,	Master J. Kidd

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Greenfield.	
0775/1/001/O	The site should not be built on but protected. It is wildlife habitat, is valued by residents and is a safe play area for local children.
Objection	
H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd, Greenfield.	BJ & EE Barnes
0777/1/001/O	Object to building on this site, for environmental reasons.
Objection	
H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd, Greenfield.	Mr Mark Dronsfield
0778/1/001/O	Change allocation from Housing to Local Green Gap to protect natural area that provides habitat for birds, play area for children and attractive approach to Greenfield from restored canal. Road is already congested with traffic and parked cars.
Objection Joint Case	
H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd, Greenfield.	Dr M. Strahand
0781/1/001/O	The site should be re-designated as Green Belt to preserve scarce open land, discourage speculative buying and selling, and prevent over-development which is increasing traffic and destroying village character.
Objection	
H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd, Greenfield.	Mr Paul Ashworth
0782/1/001/O	Keep land undeveloped to protect wildlife/plants. Refers to existing access and parking problems in area.
Objection	
H1.2.12 Shaw Hall Bank Rd, Greenfield	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/024/O	Housing allocation supported but should be as a Phase 1 site - there are no overriding constraints and the site is sustainably located for housing.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
H1.2.12 Shaw Hall Bank Rd, Greenfield	Dr David Atherton
0368/1/003/O	Objects to housing development at Shaw Hall Bank Road - gross overdevelopment on an unsuitable site - gross parking problems.
Objection	
H1.2.2 Rose Mill, Chadderton	Klynes Brothers Ltd
0751/1/001/O	Change to an allocation that allows housing, industrial or commercial development
Objection	
H1.2.3 Ashton Road, Woodhouses	Mr D B Jones
0618/1/002/S	This site offers an ideal opportunity to 'round off' the village with minimum impact.
Support	
H1.2.3 Ashton Road, Woodhouses	Mr D B Jones Agent : P. Wilson & Company
0618/1/003/S	Suitable for development and sustainable. Would form part of existing settlement with local amenities and access. Site and access can be delivered.
Support	
H1.2.3 Ashton Road, Woodhouses	Mr J. Ashworth Agent : P. Wilson & Company
0736/1/001/S	Suitable for development and sustainable. Would form part of existing settlement with local amenities and access. Site and access can be delivered.
Support	
H1.2.4 Medlock Road, Woodhouses	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/034/O	Object to inclusion of part of Brookdale Golf Course SBI in this allocation
Objection	
H1.2.4 Medlock Road, Woodhouses	Langtree Property Group Ltd Agent : Sedgwick Associates
0572/1/003/O	Change allocation to Phase I to enable land to be released for residential development in Woodhouses at different times and to increase the diversity of Phase 1 sites

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	available in the Borough, thereby reducing pressure on greenfield windfall sites
Objection	
H1.2.4 Medlock Road, Woodhouses	Mr D B Jones
0618/1/004/O	Remove site from housing allocations due to its poor access.
Objection	
H1.2.5 Blackshaw Lane, Royton	Mrs B M Smith
0752/1/001/O	Object to housing allocation on traffic grounds and because it is a greenfield site with wildlife and educational value.
Objection	
H1.2.6 Lilac View Close	Shaw & Crompton Parish Council
0042/1/004/O	Would prefer this housing site designated as Green Belt due to lack of access and its proximity to Green Belt and general position within the area.
Objection	
H1.2.6 Lilac View Close	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/029/O	Requests that land be redesignated as a Phase 1 housing site - deliverable development/not viable for alternative use/well serviced by public transpt/local facilities/would be a small dev't/adequate infrastructure/shortage of land in this area.
Objection	
H1.2.6 Lilac View Close	Mr J. Stott
0834/1/001/O	Strong objection - already refused planning permission & previously through the UDP process because no suitable access. Also flooding issues and traffic generation issues.
Objection Joint Case	
Monarch Mill, Royton	Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110) Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0109/1/009/O	Requests that the site of Monarch Mill be allocated for Phase 2 housing development. Supporting reasons include: the mill is only partly occupied, is in a residential area & is well located. Also doubt about availability of existing allocations.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Omission Joint Case	
H1.2 6.20	
0572/1/002/O	Langtree Property Group Ltd Agent : Sedgwick Associates The justification should state that the phasing of housing land release will be informed by the need to phase release to minimise the impact on communities.
Objection	
H1.3	
0041/1/006/O	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Ltd Policy allows for greenfield windfall sites to come forward - this is specifically excluded under PPG3. Requests either that the policy is deleted or that greenfield allocations are identified seperately under H1.3
Objection Joint Case	
0102/1/005/S	Brierstone Properties Ltd Agent : Drivers Jonas This policy provides general guidance on planning applications on non allocated sites and it complies with the guidance set out in PPG3.
Support Joint Case	
0104/1/005/O	Bellway Homes Agent : Drivers Jonas Although generally supported in principle, the policy should recognise that current housing requirements are unlikely to be met exclusively by previously developed sites and the reuse of existing buildings. This is in line with PPG3 and Draft RPG.
Objection Joint Case	
0108/1/005/O	The House Builders Federation The policy is unlikely to provide for a wide choice of good quality housing.
Objection	
	Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110) Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0109/1/006/O	Policy negatively worded. Permission should be granted where specified criteria are met. Policy not clear and precise. Not all sites will be suitable for a mix of housing. Not all sites will be suitable for an element of affordable housing.
Objection Joint Case	
	Paul Speak Properties Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0110/1/015/O	Policy is unclear and requires greater precision. Criteria in para. 6.40 are too onerous, particularly the requirement that housing sites should be within 400m of existing services.
Objection	
	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0113/1/014/O	Policy should be positively worded with a presumption in favour of planning permission where specified criteria are met. Not all sites will be suitable for affordable housing. "Particular costs" can reduce or negate the need for affordable housing.
Objection	
	CPRE - Lancashire
0263/1/019/O	Generally supportive, but concerned that intentions towards the assessment of unallocated greenfield sites are unclear. Not clear whether a proposal would be considered against Phase 2 sites.
Objection Joint Case	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/024/S	None given.
Support	
H1.3 6.39	
	P. Wilson & Company
0023/1/006/O	An applicant seeking to develop a greenfield site should not have to demonstrate that current requirements are unlikely to be met by the development of previously developed land - this should be the Council's responsibility.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
H1.3 6.40	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/021/O	Policy is unclear and requires greater precision. Criteria in para. 6.40 are too onerous, particularly the requirement that housing sites should be within 400m of existing services.
Objection	
H1.4	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/017/S	The Unit supports point "v" of this policy.
Support	
	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Ltd
0041/1/003/O	Suggestion that dev'ts which do not achieve 30/ha would be refused/treated as a departure is contrary to PPG3, & may be harmful to the development of those sites where lower density is appropriate. Re-word to state - "The Council will normally..."
Objection	
Joint Case	
	Bellway Homes Agent : Drivers Jonas
0104/1/006/O	Supported in principle. Suggests that it may be necessary to develop sites at lower densities owing to physical characteristics of a site, need to meet housing need for large family houses, need to create mixed communities in high density areas.
Objection	
Joint Case	
	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0113/1/016/O	Should be some relaxation of density standards where the character of the surrounding area or other special circumstances exist which would mitigate against such a high density.
Objection	
	English Nature
0149/1/014/S	Consideration of whether the plan's standard housing densities should be applied to

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Support	new development because of thier likely impact on nature conservation interests, is welcomed.
0263/1/009/S	CPRE - Lancashire
Support	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/025/S	None given.
Support	Countryside Agency
0008/1/029/O	Although supportive of the policy concerned that the authority needs to undertake sufficiently detailed household surveys to assess whether the sites identified as providing affordable housing would be sufficient to meet needs in smaller settlements.
Objection	Hall Needham Assoc.
0028/1/002/O	Re-work the policy so that affordable housing provision relates to local need & to give the option of a commuted sum to be paid which could be used to support the development of affordable housing in inner Oldham where need is greatest.
Objection Joint Case	Bellway Homes Agent : Drivers Jonas
0104/1/008/O	The principle of providing an adequate supply of affordable housing is supported. However it is considered that each site should be assessed on its merits/constraints and on the basis of local housing needs in line with Circ.6/98.
Objection Joint Case	Friends, Families and Travellers

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0429/1/002/O	Pleased that the Council is considering the appropriateness of housing provision. Council should actively encourage a permanent site for Gypsy caravans due to the national shortage of legal stopping places
Objection	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/026/S	None given.
Support	
H2.1	
	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/019/O	Does not agree that affordable housing should only be sought on larger sites over 25 dwellings. Requests a change in policy accordingly.
Objection	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/051/O	Define "affordable" eg refer to incomes & prices/rents. Include criteria on eligibility & control of occupancy, indicating how they will be secured & arrangements for ensuring that affordable housing is reserved for those who need it.
Objection	
	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Ltd
0041/1/004/O	The inclusion of a presumed requirement for 25% of dwellings to be affordable goes beyond the advice contained in Circular 6/98 which advises that the requirement is dependent upon accurate and updated housing needs information.
Objection	
	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/025/O	Not demonstrated that there is an identified need for affordable housing. There is a surplus of low priced housing. Need for affordable housing - limited to a few parts of the Borough. Policy should refer to importance of demonstrating local need.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0104/1/009/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Bellway Homes Agent : Chorlton Planning</p> <p>Objects to the requirement for affordable housing at Andrew Mill. Limited developable area (trees, Chew Brook, flood plain, topography), which will bring the capacity below the policy threshold & smaller units/public housing in the area.</p>
Objection	
0104/1/010/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Bellway Homes Agent : Drivers Jonas</p> <p>Policy should be more flexible & allow affordable housing requirements to be judged according to local housing need & individual site circumstances. Need a more up-to-date housing needs survey. Reconsider need for affordable housing at Lumb Mill.</p>
Objection Joint Case	
0107/1/005/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Westbury Homes</p> <p>Policy should indicate that the council will negotiate for affordable housing provision having regard to site location and the housing needs survey, rather than a general presumption that 25% of site capacity should be affordable.</p>
Objection	
0109/1/007/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110) Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership</p> <p>No definition of "suitable sites", blanket target figure does not take account of constraints/abnormalities, policy does not equate type & size of affordable housing/h'hold characteristics/location. No ref' to monitoring or situation if need is met.</p>
Objection Joint Case	
0110/1/016/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Paul Speak Properties Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd</p> <p>Identified need for affordable housing not demonstrated. Surplus of low priced housing. Need for affordable housing appears to be limited to a few parts of the Borough. Policy should refer to the importance of demonstrating local need.</p>
Objection	
0113/1/017/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership</p> <p>No definition of "suitable sites", blanket target figure does not take account of</p>

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
<p>constraints/abnormalities, policy does not equate type & size of affordable housing/h'hold characteristics/location. No refⁿ to monitoring or situation if need is met.</p> <p>Objection</p>	
<p>0180/1/007/O</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Siemens Real Estate Ltd Agent : Colliers Conrad Ritblat Erdman</p> <p>Concerned that the requirement for affordable housing (type and level) at the Cape Mill housing allocation in Shaw (H1.1.5) should be a matter for negotiation & recognise the potential wider benefits of the scheme, ie. provision of public open space.</p>
<p>Objection</p>	<p>Alan Roughley</p>
<p>0243/1/006/O</p>	<p>30% discount off market value insufficient. Need tighter definition of "affordable" - should be no-more than 3x annual income of family on/below average national wage. Should include rented accommodation without option to purchase without permission.</p>
<p>Objection Joint Case</p>	<p>CPRE - Lancashire</p>
<p>0263/1/020/O</p>	<p>Sympathetic to the intentions of the policy but notes that it is unlikely to generate sufficient affordable houses to meet the 4,000 dwellings required according to the Housing Needs Survey. A more determined approach is required.</p>
<p>Objection Joint Case</p>	<p>Denshaw Community Association</p>
<p>0543/1/009/S</p>	<p>Support - policy would help to stop migration of Saddleworth children due to the inability to afford the premium housing of the area.</p>
<p>Support</p>	<p>R A Bagley</p>
<p>0729/1/002/O</p>	<p>Objection to the provision of affordable housing in Saddleworth. Considers that the Council are trying to devalue Saddleworth.</p>
<p>Objection</p>	<p>North West Regional Assembly</p>

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0740/1/027/S	None given.
Support	
H2.1.11 Ripponden Rd, Denshaw	North Ainley Halliwell Solicitors Agent : Chorlton Planning
0096/1/004/O	The site should be allocated for Phase 1 housing as in adopted Plan, rather than Phase 2. All other land designated for residential in Denshaw has already been or is being developed. Additional residents would help support village services.
Objection	
H2.2	Friends, Families and Travellers
0429/1/003/O	Object to excluding caravan sites for Gypsies and Travellers from the Green Belt, as Green Belt and other open land has been a traditional stopping place for centuries
Objection	
	Traveller Law Research Unit
0605/1/001/O	Proposed criteria make it impossible for travelling people to find their own sites. Contravenes positive duty under Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 towards Gypsies & Irish Travellers. Should include identification of sites for travelling people.
Objection	
H2.3	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/052/O	Unclear what is meant by "Lifetime Home standards", therefore contrary to guidance in PPG12 which requires policies to be clearly and unambiguously expressed.
Objection	
	Bellway Homes Agent : Drivers Jonas
0104/1/011/O	No explanation for 10% target & 10 dwelling threshold. Amend policy to reflect the fact that each site should be assessed individually, although since building reg's require accessible homes the policy may not be necessary.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Joint Case	
	Westbury Homes
0107/1/006/O	Policy is inappropriate for inclusion within the UDP. Need for such proportions of "special housing" is not supported by assessment, research or housing needs study. The Policy should be deleted.
Objection	
	The House Builders Federation
0108/1/006/O	Requirement for lifetime homes has no basis in Government policy & should be deleted. Part M of building reg's applies to all housing. C8/98 sets out Government's policy on what are matters of planning and what are matters of building control.
Objection	
	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0113/1/019/O	Part M Building Regulations cover much of that sought through Lifetime Homes Policy. The Policy is unduly restrictive & contrary to PPG3. Planning policies should not interfere in the legislation (see PPG1). Policy should be deleted.
Objection	
	Denshaw Community Association
0543/1/010/S	Support - policy would help to stop migration of Saddleworth children due to the inability to afford the premium housing of the area & with lifetime homes to enable people to stay rather than move.
Support	
NR1	
	Environment Agency
0665/1/005/O	Policy makes reference to not permitting development which would cause water pollution, however a Part 2 Policy should be incorporated to ensure developers are clear on the measures that they have to take.
Omission	
NR1.1	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/044/O Objection	Recommend that the Policy state how applications outside AQMAs will be dealt with.
NR1.2	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/015/O Omission	A specific measurement should be quoted to support the "unacceptable impact" of noise.
	Denshaw Community Association
0543/1/005/S Support	This policy is extremely important as noise and vibration creates stress/anger/poor life quality which should be eliminated as much as possible.
NR1.3	Dr & Mrs G Read
0724/1/002/S Support Joint Case	Regulation of light pollution is required as it upsets wildlife, is insidious and unpleasant.
NR1.5	Health & Safety Executive
0773/1/001/O Omission	Specify controls on the location of new establishments at which hazardous substances are used or stored, and the development of land near existing establishments, to protect public health and safety and areas of natural sensitivity or interest
NR1.5 13.29	Environment Agency
0665/1/003/O	The policy should make specific reference to the hazardous potential of landfill gas

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
migration.	
Objection	
NR2 13.30-13.35	
0117/1/006/O	North West Tourist Board Agent : Paul Butler Associates Should encourage the use of other water resources in order to distribute visitor pressure more evenly within the borough.
Objection	
NR2 13.31	
0038/1/028/O	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit General support, however paragraph 13.31 should refer to mill lodges as well as ponds.
Objection	
NR2.1	
0038/1/029/S	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit The Unit supports this policy.
Support	
0149/1/011/S	English Nature This policy is welcomed and supported by English Nature
Support	
0422/1/003/O	British Waterways Support this policy which covers the future water supply to the canals. Asks for para 13.37 to add a reference to canal water supply and state that the Council will consult with British Waterways.
Objection	
	Denshaw Community Association

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0543/1/006/S	A lot of houses in Denshaw source their domestic water from springs - anything that threatens these supplies should not be allowed
Support	
	Environment Agency
0665/1/004/O	The Policy is supported in principle but needs to refer to the need to protect the quantity and supply of groundwater resources.
Objection	
NR2.1 13.36	
Rochdale Canal	The Inland Waterways Association - NW
0771/1/002/O	The Rochdale Canal within Oldham does not receive water from the Huddersfield Canal and the last sentence of para 13.36 should be corrected accordingly
Objection	
NR2.1 13.8	
	West Pennine Bridleways Association
0175/1/014/O	The plan does not address the ability of the public sewage system and treatment works to accommodate the foul sewage potential resulting from large scale housing developments.
Omission Joint Case	
NR2.2 13.40 - 13.45	
	Environment Agency
0665/1/001/O	The policy is supported in principle but would like to see both the policy and Reasoned Justification reworded to reflect the need for flood risk assessments and more exacting criteria.
Objection	
NR2.3	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/030/S	The Unit supports this policy.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Support	Environment Agency
0665/1/002/O	The words "there are sound public safety considerations" should be deleted as it is ambiguous.
Objection	
NR3.1	Countryside Agency
0008/1/025/S	Welcome the promotion of renewable energy generation.
Support	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/045/O	The UDP should identify broad locations, or specific sites, suitable for the various types of renewable energy installations.
Objection	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/031/S	The Units supports this policy.
Support	David Chadderton
0177/1/001/O	Add wording to ensure that proposed renewable energy developments will not affect the Manchester - Tadcaster Roman Road or the 200 Mesolithic flint sites in the Saddleworth area. (wording provided)
Omission	
NR3.2	Countryside Agency

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0008/1/026/S	Welcome the promotion of renewable energy generation.
Support	
	Peak District National Park
0036/1/003/S	The need to protect the interests of the Peak District National Park from proposals for wind turbines is gratefully acknowledged.
Support	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/008/O	Objection to this policy as it refers to habitat of international or national importance not SBI's.
Objection	
	Dobcross Village Community
0105/1/008/O	In addition to the listed criteria, there should be a requirement that full assessments of the environmental and visual landscape impacts be carried out of any proposal for wind turbine sites to enable a judgment of potential harm
Objection Joint Case	
	Friezland Residents' Association
0106/1/002/O	Opposed to wind farms
Objection	
	English Nature
0149/1/012/O	There is no mention of the impact that wind turbines may have on bird habitat or migratory patterns.
Objection	
	Cllr Brian Lord
0165/1/003/O	Policy should be amended so as not to give the impression that wind farms are accepted as a "fait accompli".
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	West Pennine Bridleways Association
0175/1/016/O	Other authorities have refused to include policies relating to wind turbines, making Oldham a major target for such proposals.
Objection Joint Case	
	Alan Roughley
0243/1/005/O	The proposed distance of wind turbines from other developments is too low.
Objection Joint Case	
	Alan Roughley
0243/1/007/O	Need to ensure that any concrete or other foundations to a mast be removed and natural predevelopment drainage restored.
Objection Joint Case	
	Denshaw Community Association
0543/1/002/O	Renewable energy sources other than wind should be given enhanced emphasis as they are less intrusive.
Objection	
	Margaret Ulyatt
0654/1/001/O	Remove policy and other references to wind farms, as they create industrial zones in the countryside and provide less energy than other sources, such as growing willow, which are more controlled, environmentally friendly and less polluting
Objection	
	Barry Ulyatt
0655/1/001/O	Remove policy and other references to wind farms, as they create industrial zones in the countryside and provide less energy than other sources, such as growing willow, which are more controlled, environmentally friendly and less polluting
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	Mrs E Eddison
0656/1/001/O	Remove policy and other references to wind farms as they create industrial zones in the countryside and provide less energy than other sources, such as growing willow, which are more controlled, environmentally friendly and less polluting
Objection	
	Mrs G Travis
0658/1/001/O	Remove policy and other references to wind farms, as they create industrial zones in the countryside and provide less energy than other sources, such as growing willow, which are more controlled, environmentally friendly and less polluting
Objection	
	P.A. Coates
0659/1/001/O	Remove policy and other references to wind farms, as they create industrial zones in the countryside and provide less energy than other sources, such as growing willow, which are more controlled, environmentally friendly and less polluting
Objection	
	Joan Dean
0660/1/001/O	Remove policy and other references to wind farms, as they create industrial zones in the countryside and provide less energy than other sources, such as growing willow, which are more controlled, environmentally friendly and less polluting
Objection	
	Susan Travis
0661/1/001/O	Remove policy and other references to wind farms, as they create industrial zones in the countryside and provide less energy than other sources, such as growing willow, which are more controlled, environmentally friendly and less polluting
Objection	
	Eileen Shaw
0662/1/001/O	Remove policy and other references to wind farms, as they create industrial zones in the countryside and provide less energy than other sources, such as growing willow, which are more controlled, environmentally friendly and less polluting

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
	Bernard Wright
0668/1/001/O	Remove policy and other references to wind farms, as they create industrial zones in the countryside and provide less energy than other sources, such as growing willow, which are more controlled, environmentally friendly and less polluting
Objection	
NR3.2 13.56	
	Saddleworth Parish Council Agent : Eagland Planning Associates
0040/1/014/O	Not opposed in principle to wind farms, but concerned about renewable energy targets, number of omissions in the Policy and that Saddleworth being asked to carry an unreasonable share of the targets.
Objection Joint Case	
	West Pennine Bridleways Association
0175/1/017/O	Wind turbine targets are unrealistic because turbines are so unpopular and intrusive.
Objection Joint Case	
NR4	
	Derbyshire County Council
0521/1/002/O	Policy is too restrictive in terms of requiring that need for minerals must be 'clearly established'.
Objection	
	Aggregate Industries UK Ltd
0602/1/001/O	Mineral resource zone map is unclear - should either be produced at a 1:2500 scale, or areas should be shown on the proposals map.
Objection	
	Greater Manchester Geological Unit
0746/1/001/S	Supports themes of provision, environmental protection and sustainable development

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	within the proposed policy framework for minerals developments
Support	
NR4 13.69	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/047/O	It is unclear whether any proposals for mineral working are likely to come forward during the Plan period.
Objection	
NR4 a)	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/046/O	The requirement to demonstrate need is contrary to guidance set out in MPG1.
Objection	
NR4.1	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/048/O	Should be a clearer commitment to the safeguarding of mineral deposits which are, or may become, of economic importance.
Objection	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/049/O	Currently worded the meaning is unclear.
Objection	
	Greater Manchester Geological Unit
0746/1/002/S	Supports the themes of provision, environmental protection and sustainable development within the proposed policy framework for minerals developments
Support	
NR4.1 13.74	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/050/O Objection	Paragraph should be re worded as seems to run counter to the terms of Policy NR4.1
	Greater Manchester Geological Unit
0746/1/003/S Support	Supports the themes of provision, environmental protection and sustainable development within the proposed policy framework for minerals developments
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/043/O Objection	Should reconsider requiring the demonstration of need.
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/032/O Objection	The Unit broadly supports this policy but believes that it should also include a reference to not harming species protected by law or their habitats.
	English Nature
0149/1/013/S Support	English Nature welcomes and supports the inclusion of the protection for wildlife and geological sites and the biodiversity resource.
	Derbyshire County Council
0521/1/003/O Objection	Policy is too restrictive in terms of requiring that need for minerals must be 'clearly established'.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
OE1. 10	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0174/1/010/S	Applaud the intention of the plan to safeguard the natural environment and preserve the separate identities and characters of the Saddleworth Villages in the face of continuing demand for building land.
Support Joint Case	
OE1.1	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/054/O	1) Delete or amend the requirement that development in the Green Belt enhance the appearance of the area. 2) Set out more fully any exceptional circumstances justifying changes to the Green Belt boundary.
Objection	
	P. Wilson & Company
0023/1/003/O	Delete criterion d. in policy on development in the Green Belt as wording 'would not harm people's enjoyment of the countryside' is too vague and subjective
Objection	
	Mr J Wood Agent : Chorlton Planning
0031/1/002/O	Amend or add policy to allow for the redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Green Belt, including sites with redundant agricultural buildings or which are unsightly, to bring them into productive use.
Omission	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/018/O	Broad support. Need for cross referencing to other open environment policies.
Objection	
	Saddleworth Parish Council Agent : Eagland Planning Associates
0040/1/006/O	Add a policy to allow limited re-use of mill and other business premises that have fallen into disuse in the Green Belt to meet the demand for employment land, particularly in the Saddleworth area

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Omission Joint Case	
	Friezland Residents' Association
0106/1/004/S	Pleased to note that the Green Belt Policy will protect the natural break between the conurbations of Oldham and Tameside.
Support	
	The House Builders Federation
0108/1/008/O	Policy misquotes the purposes of green belts set out in PPG2. The words '...and villages..' should be deleted from point (iv) of OE1.1a.
Objection	
	Chapman Saddleworth Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning
0123/1/001/O	Amend or add policy to allow for the redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Green Belt for housing, where housing would be more compatible with countryside uses, benefit the area and improve the environment.
Omission	
	Lancashire Wildlife Trust
0124/1/006/S	No comments submitted
Support	
	Frost (Exors. of late Mr R.) Agent : Chorlton Planning
0167/1/001/O	Amend or add policy to allow the redevelopment of previously developed sites in the Green Belt for a use such as housing that would be more appropriate and less harmful to the countryside than the existing use.
Omission	
	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0174/1/001/S	Applaud the intention of the plan to safeguard the natural environment and preserve the separate identities and characters of the Saddleworth Villages in the face of continuing demand for building land.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Support Joint Case	
	Oldham and District Model Aero Club
0461/1/002/O	Use of the Green Belt should be extended to make it available to more people, including for hobbies such as model aircraft flying which has problems re-locating in Oldham.
Objection	
	Jeff Garner
0730/1/001/S	Supports the Green Belt policy, in particular protection of the natural break between Oldham and Tameside at the end of Armit Road and both sides of Wellihole Road, including Saddleworth Cricket Club and Tennis Club
Support	
Land at Brownhill, Uppermill	Mr. M. Farrand
0125/1/002/O	Change policy to allow limited development on sites in the Green Belt in, or close to, existing settlements, specifically on this site which is geographically part of Uppermill, next to a residential area, and close to village centre services
Omission	
Land at Dale Farm, Delph	Mrs J.R. Whitehead Agent : Chorlton Planning
0830/1/002/O	Change policy to allow limited development in, or close to, existing historic settlements in Green Belt, such as Dale, which can accommodate mixed use in-fill without detriment to the countryside and Green Belt principles.
Omission	
Land at Higher Quick Farm, Lydgate	Mr G Heathcote Agent : Chorlton Planning
0470/1/001/O	Change policy to allow limited development in, or close to, existing settlements in Green Belt, specifically on this site where in-fill will help to consolidate the historic form of Quick without detriment to the countryside and Green Belt principles
Omission	
Land at Long Lane, Dobcross	Mr A. Bate Agent : Chorlton Planning
0098/1/001/O	Change policy to allow limited development in, or close to, existing settlements in

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	Green Belt, specifically on this site where development would have little impact on landscape and be near services in Dobcross.
Omission	
Land at New Barn, Delph	Mr C P Dawson Agent : Chorlton Planning
0463/1/001/O	Change policy to allow limited development in, or close to, existing settlements in Green Belt, specifically in New Barn where limited in-fill will help to consolidate its historic form without significantly affecting surrounding countryside.
Omission	
Land at Poplar Avenue, Lydgate	Mr D. Hind Agent : Chorlton Planning
0178/1/001/O	Change policy to allow limited development in, or close to, existing settlements in Green Belt, specifically on this site where in-fill will help to consolidate the historic form of Quick without detriment to the countryside and Green Belt principles
Omission	
Land at Stonebreaks, Springhead	Mr D Cox Agent : Chorlton Planning
0472/1/001/O	Identify, via detailed appraisal, historic settlements such as this where additional development could be accommodated to enhance & revitalise them. Include settlements in Green Belt if no detriment to landscape quality. (Define in policy & on Map)
Omission	
OE1.2	Countryside Agency
0008/1/007/O	Policy should also allow for new buildings required for diversification of existing rural enterprises
Objection	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/019/O	Broad support. Need for cross referencing to other open environment policies.
Objection	
	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0174/1/002/S	Applaud the intention of the plan to safeguard the natural environment and preserve the separate identities and characters of the Saddleworth Villages in the face of continuing demand for building land.
Support Joint Case	
Land at Brownhill, Uppermill	Mr. M. Farrand
0125/1/003/O	Identify, via detailed appraisal, historic settlements where additional development could be accommodated to enhance & revitalise them. Include settlements in Green Belt such as this if no detriment to landscape quality. Define in policy & on map.
Omission	
Land at Dale Farm, Delph	Mrs J.R. Whitehead Agent : Chorlton Planning
0830/1/001/O	Identify, via detailed appraisal, historic settlements where additional development could be accommodated to enhance & revitalise them. Include settlements in Green Belt such as this if no detriment to landscape quality. Define in policy & on map.
Omission	
Land at Higher Quick Farm, Lydgate	Mr G Heathcote Agent : Chorlton Planning
0470/1/002/O	Identify, via detailed appraisal, historic settlements where additional development could be accommodated to enhance & revitalise them. Include settlements in Green Belt such as this, if no detriment to landscape quality. Define in policy & on map.
Omission	
Land at Long Lane, Dobcross	Mr A. Bate Agent : Chorlton Planning
0098/1/002/O	Identify, via detailed appraisal, historic settlements where additional development could be accommodated to enhance & revitalise them. Include settlements in Green Belt such as this if no detriment to landscape quality. Define in policy & on map.
Omission	
Land at New Barn, Delph	Mr C P Dawson Agent : Chorlton Planning
0463/1/002/O	Identify, via detailed appraisal, historic settlements where additional development could be accommodated to enhance & revitalise them. Include settlements in Green Belt such as this if no detriment to landscape quality. Define in policy & on map.
Omission	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Land at Poplar Avenue, Lydgate 0178/1/002/O	Mr D. Hind Agent : Chorlton Planning Identify, via detailed appraisal, historic settlements where additional development could be accommodated to enhance & revitalise them. Include settlements in Green Belt such as Quick if no detriment to landscape quality. Define in policy & on map.
Omission	
Land at Stonebreaks, Springhead 0472/1/003/O	Mr D Cox Agent : Chorlton Planning Identify, via detailed appraisal, historic settlements where additional development could be accommodated to enhance & revitalise them. Include settlements in Green Belt providing no detriment to landscape quality. Define in policy & on Proposals Map
Omission	
Land at Victoria Works, Dobcross 0123/1/003/O	Chapman Saddleworth Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning Identify, via detailed appraisal, historic settlements where additional development could be accommodated to enhance & revitalise them. Include settlements in Green Belt such as this if no detriment to landscape quality. Define in policy & on map.
Omission	
OE1.3	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0174/1/003/S	Applaud the intention of the plan to safeguard the natural environment and preserve the separate identities and characters of the Saddleworth Villages in the face of continuing demand for building land.
Support Joint Case	
OE1.4	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/020/S	The Unit supports this policy.
Support	
	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0174/1/004/S	Applaud the intention of the plan to safeguard the natural environment and preserve the separate identities and characters of the Saddleworth Villages in the face of continuing demand for building land and forbidding garden extensions in Green Belt.
Support Joint Case	
OE1.5	P. Wilson & Company
0023/1/001/O	Delete a. and b. as they are unduly restrictive in respect of replacement buildings in the Green Belt.
Objection	
	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0113/1/018/O	Delete criteria a) of Policy OE1.5. Redraft the explanation so as to accord with PPG2 guidance. Is more restrictive than PPG2. No reason to raise structural condition. Should not exclude dwellings not of permanent/substantial construction.
Objection	
	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0174/1/005/S	Applaud the intention of the plan to safeguard the natural environment and preserve the separate identities and characters of the Saddleworth Villages in the face of continuing demand for building land.
Support Joint Case	
OE1.6	Countryside Agency
0008/1/006/O	Policy too restrictive - should be more positive towards the re-use of Green Belt buildings to enable job creation and diversification, and the protection of rural services.
Objection	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/053/O	Recommend replacing 'Change of use' in the title with 'Re-use' to be consistent with the policy content and PPG2

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0174/1/006/S	Applaud the intention of the plan to safeguard the natural environment and preserve the separate identities and characters of the Saddleworth Villages in the face of continuing demand for building land.
Support Joint Case	
OE1.6 11.31	
	North West Tourist Board Agent : Paul Butler Associates
0117/1/009/S	Strongly supports re-use of rural buildings for economic purposes (including tourism) rather than residential, to provide employment and encourage tourists to spend in the local economy
Support	
OE1.7	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/055/O	Clarify that no development on Land Reserved for Future Development will be permitted in the Plan period which would prejudice later comprehensive development.
Omission	
	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0174/1/007/S	Applaud the intention of the plan to safeguard the natural environment and preserve the separate identities and characters of the Saddleworth Villages in the face of continuing demand for building land.
Support Joint Case	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/030/S	None given.
Support	
Land north of Coal Pit Lane, land at Ashton Road	Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	Agent : Cordingleys
0815/1/005/S	Support the principle of reserving land for future development and propose two additional sites, for residential use if required: land to the north of Coal Pit Lane and land at Ashton Road/Coal Pit Lane (currently in the Green Belt)
Support	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Ms Liz Buckley
0002/1/001/O	Designate area as Green Belt. One of last remaining green areas within Shaw. Council has recently put a lot of effort into planting trees in the area. Are some rare newts and other wildlife in area that would lose their habitat.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/003/O	Objects to allocation as site contains SBI
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Shaw & Crompton Parish Council
0042/1/003/O	Designate wooded areas as Recreational Open Space and remainder as Local Green Gap. Area as a whole is valued by community. Much time, effort and funding went into planting trees on part of the land, which also includes an SBI (ponds).
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Amanda Hill
0100/1/001/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap. There are not many green areas left, especially ones that have been designated as SBIs. Development of the site would also put a strain on local services.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Lancashire Wildlife Trust
0124/1/005/O	Redefine boundary of Land Reserved for Future Development to protect SBI, provide buffer zones around SBI and include SBI as wildlife corridor.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Oak Street Area Community Group

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0152/1/012/O	Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development (No change or reason given)
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Stuart Bradbury
0183/1/001/O	Land should be identified as Green Gap. Only new buildings should be to support work of farm. Purchased property because of assurance that adjacent site was grazing land and supported wildlife.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Groundwork Oldham & Rochdale
0184/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt or Local Green Gap. Prime open green space including SBI. Important for nature conservation, agricultural, recreational, scenic, amenity and water conservation values. Trees planted by Groundwork.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	John Holt
0185/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt - one of few left in area. Separates Shaw and Royton. Important environmentally - wealth of wildlife and vegetation. Houses should be built on brownfield sites. Development would add to existing traffic congestion.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mary Holt
0186/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt - one of few left in area. Separates Shaw and Royton. Important environmentally - wealth of wildlife and vegetation. Houses should be built on brownfield sites. Development would add to existing traffic congestion.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Lucy Bennett
0187/1/001/O	LR1 should be designated as Green Belt to protect recreational, educational and conservation value. Value of area has been underestimated. Contrary to objectives of sustainability, improving environment, promoting conservation and civic pride.
Objection	
Joint Case	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR1 Cowlshaw	Patricia Hodson
0188/1/001/O	Area should be left as Green Gap. Haven for wildlife. Roads already gridlocked. New housing would put more commuters on these routes as there is no work in Shaw. Hundreds of trees recently planted.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Graham Bennett
0189/1/001/O	Site should be designated as Green Belt. Proposal is contrary to Plan's objectives on accessibility and natural assets. Site acts as green gap and is used for recreational purpose, and is of biological interest.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Collette Bennett
0190/1/001/O	Designate as Local Green Gap as allocation is contrary to plans objectives (on natural assets, physical resources, and accessibility). Separates built up areas. Bigger than other LR sites. Valuable green space/habitat/educational resource.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Alan Joannidi
0191/1/001/O	Objects to development of land - area satisfies definition of Local Green Gap
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr S. Chadwick
0192/1/001/O	Protect area from development - well used valuable amenity. Lot of money spent on tree planting which has attracted wildlife.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs N. Abbott
0193/1/001/O	Protect as green belt. Suggests renovating derelict houses and improving rundown areas of the Borough.
Objection Joint Case	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr D. Nield
0194/1/001/O	Allocate site as Local Green Gap. Would result in loss of green land to future generation; large increase in traffic in already congested area; contains SBI
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr N. Cash
0195/1/001/O	Objects to allocation (Change and Reason not known - attachment missing)
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mark Barrett
0196/1/001/O	Protect as green area. Already shortage of green areas. Building would be detrimental to the area. Traffic problem if developed.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs Whatmough
0197/1/001/O	Protect as Green Belt - seperates Cowlshaw and High Crompton. Supports wildlife. Large area proposed. Area already developed significantly in recent years. Proposals are for financial gain rather than needs of local people. Traffic problems.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr M.J. Lemmings
0198/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt. Amount of green belt on this side of the Borough is very small compared to east where it is more available for development. Area allocated is too large - already overdeveloped. Existing traffic problems will be worsened.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Paul Hicklin
0199/1/001/O	Leave as it is - need to protect few green areas left. Enough housing developments already nearby. Existing traffic problems would be made worse. Schooling numbers would also be a problem.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs G.K. Whittleworth

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0200/1/001/O	Leave area as it is and undeveloped. Home to wildlife, two ponds, many trees recently planted. Extra traffic would be a problem. Much of land unfit for building - subsidence.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Dorothy Barrow
0201/1/001/O	Allocate area as a Green Gap to protect natural history value of site. Refers to traffic problems in area.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr A.D. Ball
0202/1/001/O	Keep area as it is - great natural importance. Need to preserve habitats. Also Shaw cannot cope with any more traffic.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs J. Clark
0203/1/001/O	Objects to any building on the land as it would badly affect the community and reduce house prices. Also feels the land is not suitable for building being marsh and bog area.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	MA & TJ Lord & Field
0204/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap. Contains SBI. Should be protected for future generations to enjoy. Should consider the considerable development that has already taken place in this area. Huge increase in traffic.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr F Jagger
0205/1/001/O	Objects to area being developed. Already well populated. Recently was suggested that the Council land be designated a picnic area due to lack of open land in the area. Objector understood area to be Green Belt. Will affect open aspect.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	L Battersby

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0206/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt as such areas are disappearing to developers and local residents enjoy only bit of countryside around. Traffic would increase if area were developed.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs C.S. Barrow
0207/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt to protect wildlife. Also schools and health centres in area are already oversubscribed and site traffic would be horrendous.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	R & G Vance
0208/1/001/O	Protect as green area. Development for housing would increase traffic, crime and insurance. Would result in loss of SBI and footpaths. Loss of green area is for monetary gain and nothing for the community.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr & Mrs W Daley
0209/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt adjacent to Denbigh Drive/Edward Rd to protect amenity space. Development would worsen traffic problems. Lack of transport/local services. Contrary to green policies. Other more suitable sites available.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Derek Sheard
0210/1/001/O	Reduce size of proposed development to preserve wildlife habitat. Unsuitable access to the site. Prime area of nature conservation. Trees planted by Groundwork
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs R.H White
0211/1/001/O	Make area Local Green Gap. Land is only green left between Shaw and Royton and is habitat for numerous wildlife. Netherhouse and Edward Roads are already busy without more houses. Shaw is already overcrowded.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Harry Hamer

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0212/1/001/O	Designate site as Green Belt or Local Green Gap. Loss of SBI. Is need to separate built up areas of High Crompton and Cowlshaw with local green gap. Loss of footpaths and countryside used by the community in these already built up areas.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs P.J O'Donnell
0213/1/001/O	Designate as Local Green Gap to prevent encroachment of urban areas into the countryside. Would be detrimental to wildlife/habitat/SBI. New housing should be built on brownfield sites instead.
Objection	
Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs R. Thompson
0214/1/001/O	Make into country park like Tandle Hill to preserve wildlife habitat. One of the only green areas left in Shaw. European and tax contributions on improvements would be wasted.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	M.G. Hill
0215/1/001/O	Reclassify to protect the 'Green Gap' between built up areas and protect flora & fauna. Extra traffic could cause safety and access problems. Existing roads inadequate.
Objection	
Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Nigel Cooper
0216/1/001/O	Objects to allocation because open space between towns must be protected. Development of the site would cause traffic congestion and further increase primary school class sizes. Redevelop old mills and underused industrial estates instead.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Ian Taylor
0217/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt to protect wildlife, public pathways, trees, shrubs. Provides much needed leisure to surrounding area. Urban sprawl already too extensive. Locals value natural area. Road safety would be worsened.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR1 Cowlshaw	Dr A. Butterworth
0218/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap to protect open grassland - contains SBI, plants and wildlife. Peaceful place for walks. Demarcates and seperates built up areas.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Paul Monaghan
0219/1/001/O	No details provided
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Harry Bowker
0220/1/001/O	Protect as open space. Existing traffic problems. Land boggy and unsuitable for housing. Would undo work done by Groundwork on Cowlshaw Woods.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Robert Hilton
0221/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap. Policy of UDP states intention to control development. Area of land satisfies the definition of a Local Green Gap. Only likely to be considered for housing. Infrastructure could not support more expansion.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Joan L. Corlett
0222/1/001/O	No details submitted on Change or Reason
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs Butterworth
0224/1/001/O	Allocate at least 85% of site as Local Green Gap to protect major green walking areas. Would worsen already congested and busy roads. Residential development should take place on former mills.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mark Tracey

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0225/1/001/O	Retain as Local Green Gap. Development would destroy wildlife/nature. Would affect view from property and reduce value. Access/traffic will be horrendous.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Alan T. Marsden
0226/1/001/O	No details of change/reason provided.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs P Fielding
0227/1/001/O	Area should be re-designated as Green Belt. Development would increase traffic and destroy valuable wildlife habitat. Potential drainage problems if site is developed.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr G. Jackson
0228/1/001/O	Keep as Local Green Gap - SBI, blight existing houses, traffic, not evenly spread around Borough.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs B&J Holt
0230/1/001/O	Keep as open green space. More traffic on roads, not sufficient public transport, overcrowding in local schools, loss of a pond and its wildlife, government want us to build on reclaimed land not green open spaces.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	A&J Howard
0231/1/001/O	Protect as Green Gap. Increased traffic would cause problems on roads not made to carry it.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr & Mrs Coleman
0232/1/001/O	Object to development of area as schools are already oversubscribed and traffic would be unacceptable on Denbigh Drive. See no reason to build on only small green area - bad for environment and wildlife.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Dan Faulkner
0233/1/001/O	Reclassify as local green gap to prevent urban areas merging and protect rural open space/wildlife habitat. Rights of way would be lost, as would strong community spirit.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Miss K. Faulkner
0234/1/001/O	Reclassify area as local green gap to stop Shaw merging with Royton. One of only green areas left in Shaw. Contains SBI, prime grazing land and newly planted trees.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr A. Faulkner
0235/1/001/O	Designate whole area as Local Green Gap to protect grazing land, wildlife, picturesque area. Infrastructure cannot cope with more development. Contrary to sustainability objectives - living near work and reducing travel. Develop Brownfield sites first
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	J.M. Evans
0237/1/001/O	Area should remain as a local Green Gap between the two towns. Concerned about increased traffic on small local roads. Importance of conservation/wildlife value of area.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	M Horritt
0239/1/001/O	Should be allocated as Green Belt or Green Gap. Area is rural, seperates Shaw and High Crompton. Has had major funding for tree planting. Is area of outstanding beauty with the potential of becoming a nature reserve/park.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr P&Mrs H Bradbury
0240/1/001/O	Protect from development to protect views, quality of life, property prices and wildlife. Danger of additional traffic. Contrary to policy of building on brown field

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	sites. Council should not sacrifice another local green gap.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	A.I. Long
0241/1/001/O	Leave area as it is - objects to development. Only open space and fields in area. Edward Rd not wide - extra traffic is unthinkable.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	K. McMunn
0242/1/001/O	Keep as greenfield site. Contains wooded area. Building should be on brownfield sites as Government has said. Building houses will create heavy traffic and site is away from any public transport. Will spoil area.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	G.& M. Lowe
0244/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt. Develop brown field sites first. Concern about traffic access/congestion. Loss of green land within heavily built up area - precious resource to local people. Quality of life, noise, pollution, child safety should be considered
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Miss A. Maguire
0245/1/001/O	Maintain and develop Site of Biological Importance for present and future children
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Simon Mathews
0246/1/001/O	Keep as fields. Development would decimate what little countryside there is left in area. Will ruin the beautiful view objector bought house for. Will disrupt lives significantly during building and increase traffic to the area.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs P. Mellor
0248/1/001/O	Keep as green gap - separates Crompton and Cowlshaw. Ponds and reeds support wildlife. Money spent on developing wildlife reserve would be wasted. Too large an area.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	David Nield
0249/1/001/O	Objects to development of the area on traffic grounds.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr D.A. Orchard
0250/1/001/O	Change not specified. Reason: Area concerned is not brown field site and lack of public transport will make traffic congestion and pollution increase to an unacceptable level.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Norman Preece
0252/1/001/O	Leave as green field site - last in area. Will be a great loss to area - walks in fields with no need to use car, established hawthorn hedges will be destroyed, traffic congestion - already gridlocked, loss of wildlife/birds.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr K.H. Richardson
0253/1/001/O	Protect as green area to protect plant and animal life. Area well used and local schools and roads would become overcrowded. The amount of housing proposed is totally inappropriate to the area.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs S. Peers
0254/1/001/O	Protect as green land. Purchased property for views/position. Natural habitat for wildlife, one of only picturesque and pleasant areas in area. Land in Saddleworth should be developed. Will result in traffic problems.Maintain for local people.
Objection	
Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	V. Scholes
0255/1/001/O	Allocate area as Green Gap. Increased traffic. Loss of wildlife. 'Green belt'. Too much building in Shaw.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr K.C. Shaw
0257/1/001/O	Should only be developed if low volume traffic use, ie. recreation/school and youth development. Development would be an environmental and logistical disaster for Shaw. Existing traffic problems, schools at capacity.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Margaret Shaylor
0272/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt and develop as a wildlife space, trees, walks, etc. Traffic already a problem. Inadequate facilities to cope with more people.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Stephen Smythe
0273/1/001/O	All the land should be Local Green Gap. Traffic problems will become horrendous. Also are enough developments in the area making this one the last 'green belt' areas in Shaw, Crompton and Royton.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Carole Tasker
0274/1/001/O	No change to current land status. Proposed area for development is not near any bus or train routes, therefore it would be a traffic bottleneck. The land contains the source of the River Irk.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	F.L. Tasker
0275/1/001/O	Leave land as it is. Is start of a river on the land. Groundwork Trust has spent time and money planting trees. Habitat to various wildlife eg frogs, toads, lapwings (which nest here). Area already overcrowded with traffic.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs D. Taylor
0276/1/001/O	Protect from building - lovely green belt land. Roads not suitable for more traffic, housing or industry. Area already congested by heavy traffic. There are three schools

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

nearby. Development would lead to more traffic and air pollution.

Objection

LR1 Cowlshaw

Douglas Toop

0277/1/001/O

Re-classify area as Local Green Gap. Separates High Crompton and Cowlshaw. 75% of new housing should be sited on reclaimed land. Is suburban land - not priority for development. Contrary to sustainability criteria. SBI should be protected.

Objection

Joint Case

LR1 Cowlshaw

J. Townhill

0278/1/001/O

No details submitted.

Objection

Joint Case

LR1 Cowlshaw

F.M. Whitehead

0279/1/001/O

Allocate as Green Belt to prevent any building on land. Already traffic/access problems in area. Ecological importance. Loss of grazing land. Will take last green belt between High Crompton and Royton golf club. Land marshy.

Objection

LR1 Cowlshaw

Norman Whitehead

0280/1/001/O

Keep as Local Green Gap - separates High Crompton and Cowlshaw. Important to preserve few remaining green areas on this side of the Borough. Traffic would add to existing problems. Would be a shortage of schools.

Objection

LR1 Cowlshaw

Mr R. Whittles

0281/1/001/O

Keep as agricultural/grazing land. Should develop brownfield sites first in line with policy. Suggests using part of the green corridors and links which are not agricultural or green areas.

Objection

LR1 Cowlshaw

Barry Woodhouse

0282/1/001/O

Objects to development of the site. Area is by far the largest in the Borough for future

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	development. Traffic in the area is already at a standstill. Soon there wil be no green sites in this area.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs P. Wright
0283/1/001/O	Keep as natural green area. Used by community for walks, breathe clean air and enjoy nature. Few places of beauty left. Not brownfield therefore contrary to Gov.policy.No public transport.Traffic/pollution. Loss of wildlife habitat. Loss of privacy.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Kenneth Wylie
0284/1/001/O	Protect as open space. Provides large area of open farmland between Shaw and Oldham. Does not want all open spaces filled with houses. Would create large amount of traffic in Edward Road area.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs LJ Shore
0285/1/001/O	Allocate as green belt to prevent building on area. Bought house for private location, peaceful environment and to be near to countryside land. Property would be devalued and environment harmed if land developed.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs M. Wild
0286/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt. Used for grazing and wildlife. Should redevelop derelict buildings and boarded up/empty homes first. Would invade privacy and reduce property values. Area contains nature reserve.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Norman Moores
0287/1/001/O	Designate as Local Green Gap. Valuable community asset. Contrary to plan objectives c and e, and policies on Conservation, Recreation and Open Environment. Loss of woods, wildlife, ponds.Meets definition of green gap.
Objection Joint Case	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR1 Cowlshaw	Nicola Lever
0288/1/001/O	Protect from development to prevent area being overpopulated and spoiling cultural amenities.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	David Golding
0290/1/001/O	No details provided.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Harvey Hinchliffe
0291/1/001/O	Leave area as Park or Green Area. Development would mean more traffic and people using Nether House Rd. Depending on the type of development, value of property could be reduced. More people means more crime. Loss of green area.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs D. Howard
0292/1/001/O	Change to Local Green Gap. Roads unsuitable for traffic increase, loss of local pond/landmark and all wildlife. Loss of walking and leisure area, trees will be lost, destruction of a green area for financial gain.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs S. Holden
0293/1/001/O	Keep as Local Green Gap and develop into wildlife preserve or country park. Farm should continue. Little green land left in area - need to protect gap between built up areas, ponds, reeds and wildlife. Lot of money spent on improving area.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	James Fitton
0297/1/001/O	No information on Change or Reason provided.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	T & I Davies

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0298/1/001/O	Objects to development of site - should develop wildlife habitat not destroy it. Increasing urban area will increase inner city problems. Open space needed for walks/recreation. Traffic problems would be worsened. Pressure on services.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	B. Whitehead
0300/1/001/O	Protect from any development that would make this valuable land into urban sprawl. Maintain limited green space there is in the area. More traffic on side roads. Appears area is being penalised to keep other areas green eg. Saddleworth.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	R & J Ashworth
0301/1/001/O	Object to any development - allocate as green belt to retain green boundary between neighbouring towns. Would lose view from house. Schools already oversubscribed. Will make traffic worse.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Andy Czakow
0302/1/001/O development.Does	Protect from development as infrastructure cannot cope with more housing not fulfil criteria 6.23 c(iii) [housing land release], 6.40 (i) - (iii) [housing in relation to public transport/access to services]. Paths,SBI.Transport links
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	C. Goodinson
0303/1/001/O	Keep Green Gap - too easy to develop green areas. Run down/brown belt areas should be re-developed as in the case of several areas in Rochdale.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Gordon Allen
0304/1/001/O	Retain as green belt/gap to protect Shaw's natural environment.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs R. Kennedy

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0305/1/001/O	Objects to any building on site.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	R. & P. Heywood
0306/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt. Would destroy only bit of open country with immediate access from Edward Rd and would be detrimental to wildlife. Increased traffic along Edward Rd, already far too heavy. Increased pollution and noise.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Harry Bidwell
0307/1/001/O	Leave it as it is - allocate as Green Belt to protect for future generations. Acts as green corridor linking Shaw to Royton and Tandle Hill park. Used for walks.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Glenys Hinton
0308/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Gap to protect from development. Site of bio-diversity importance for plants and wildlife. Previously grazed. Valuable and attractive amenity which should be preserved for future generations. Why this site? Traffic problems.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs C. Jones
0309/1/001/O	Wish for land to remain a protected area. Concerned about protection of remaining green areas within district. SBI - wildlife, plants, birds. Area to walk dogs.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs Yates
0310/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap because of volume of traffic.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Jane Bidwell
0311/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap or Green Belt to protect green land, wildlife and place for children to learn about nature.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Ms&Mr Hadi
0312/1/001/O	Protect from development other than possibly play park at top of Moor Street. Remainder should be maintained for natural beauty. Valued amenity, contains SBI. One of few local green areas. Existing traffic would be made worse.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Alan Backhouse
0313/1/001/O	Redevelop land for agriculture because any building in the area would create over-loading on all services.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	J. & D. Stokes
0314/1/001/O	Consider other areas for development and preserve this site. West of borough already saturated with development, Saddleworth largely retained green belt status. Location not within council's top priority for future development areas. Acts as Green Gap.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Trevor Dunkerley
0315/1/001/O	Protect as Local Green Gap - separates built up areas. Much work and money spent on area. Local beauty spot. Lack of access/public transport. Roads unsuitable for more traffic. Brown field sites should be considered first.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Fred Dunkerley
0316/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap to protect local beauty spot which separates built up areas - has had much work and money spent on it. Lack of access/public transport. Roads unsuitable for more traffic.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Martin Bell
0317/1/001/O	Land should be allocated as Green Belt as it separates built up areas and is valuable

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
<p>Objection Joint Case</p>	<p>amenity. Not one of Council's priority locations for development. Inaccessible to public transport. Strain on schools and other services if developed.</p>
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs J. Moran
0318/1/001/O	<p>Objects to development of land - preserve for public to enjoy. SBI, picturesque amenity that family enjoy walking through. One of few remaining green areas in this part of the borough.</p>
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs F. Hollingworth
0319/1/001/O	<p>Protect as green area. Plan will increase already busy traffic leading to more accidents, more children injured or killed. Little enough green areas - would lose last area of countryside and reduce overall standard of area.</p>
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Robert Holland
0320/1/001/O	<p>Allocate as a Local Green Gap to preserve from development If developed would be increase in traffic, loss of a planned local community amenity , and loss of an existing and developing ecology.</p>
<p>Objection Joint Case</p>	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Michael Carrighan
0321/1/001/O	<p>Land reserved for development should be in places with more natural green areas and better building land eg Saddleworth etc. Site should be protected as it seperates built up areas and has wildlife/botanical importance. Traffic problems.</p>
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs J. Abson
0322/1/001/O	<p>Allocate as Local Green Gap as land separates built up areas. Also to protect SBI and valued amenity land. Access to site is poor, brownfield sites should be developed before green land.</p>
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs Joan Pedder
0323/1/001/O	Keep area designated for Green Belt. Road structure is already over used and the area involved would become a nightmare especially for schoolchildren. Need space for people who live near to give them a reasonable quality of life.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs J. Heather
0327/1/001/O	Retain land as Green Gap. Important to retain as much green area around west side of Borough as possible. Area is largely developed whilst vast areas of Saddleworth are remaining in Green Belt. Protect wildlife. Build on derelict sites first.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs M. Pritchard
0328/1/001/O	Protect green fields and utilise unlet Council owned properties, redundant cotton mills and sites. Development would result in loss of amenity, wildlife habitat, birds, plants and animals and could affect culverts. Would increase traffic/urban sprawl
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs A. Ellis
0329/1/001/O	Protect from development to protect wildlife, ponds and walking area. Traffic problem.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Miss C. Bailey
0330/1/001/O	Area should be re-classified as Local Green Gap as it provides valuable break between built up areas, also to protect SBI/wildlife habitat. Important agricultural resource. Shaw couldn't cope with extra traffic and strain on services.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr R. Blackman
0331/1/001/O	Allocate as green belt as there are few green areas within walking distance. Area already over-populated. Traffic problems would be worsened.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR1 Cowlshaw 0332/1/001/O	W.A. Blackman
Objection	Leave area as it is or build only a few houses - traffic problems
LR1 Cowlshaw 0333/1/001/O	Mrs B. Brown
Objection	Make field into Local Green Gap. Traffic is already very congested on Broadway, Shaw Road, Royton and around the centre. Schools already full - problems getting foster children into local schools.
LR1 Cowlshaw 0334/1/001/O	Mrs A. Browne
Objection Joint Case	Allocate as Green Belt to preserve little green land left in area and preserve property prices. Local people would need to drive to green belt areas - currently in walking distance. Traffic would worsen.
LR1 Cowlshaw 0335/1/001/O	Mr A. Dyson
Objection	Allocate as Local Green Gap to protect from development. Contains SBI. One of few green areas in West of Borough. Access roads are narrow - extra traffic would cause problems.
LR1 Cowlshaw 0336/1/001/O	MrSM&Mrs C Durr
Objection	Keep as 'green gap' for next ten years Building would bring more traffic to already congested area. Schools and local services already oversubscribed. Wildlife habitat, pond and trees would be lost.
LR1 Cowlshaw 0337/1/001/O	Marie Dixon
Objection	Allocate as Green Belt to preserve land and keep undeveloped. Bought property because of green area. Value of property would be reduced if area built up.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR1 Cowlshaw	T. & W.J. Leach
0338/1/001/O	Maintain as local green gap to serve as valuable and picturesque amenity for community, and safe habitat for wildlife. Sufficient brown land for development. No direct public transport, traffic would increase. Contains SBI & Crompton Circuit.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Fiona Hall
0339/1/001/O	Objects to development - should be redefined as Local Green Gap as it separates High Crompton from Cowlshaw. Contains SBI and is valuable educational resource. Further houses would put strain on amenities and increase traffic.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs S.T Hallett
0340/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Gap to preserve green area. Area separates built up areas. Contains SBI and wildlife. Would lose valuable amenity. Existing traffic problems/noise would be worsened. Area already saturated with development.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs Harrison
0341/1/001/O	Designate area as Green Belt - already traffic problems. Would destroy wildlife and habitats. Footpaths would be lost. Noise, pollution and traffic would increase. Building would affect views/privacy.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	M.& T. Hilton
0342/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt to protect from development. Existing roads are narrow, further traffic would be hazardous and cause further congestion.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr P.J Whybrow
0353/1/001/O	Objects to any more housing development in area - queries need for more housing. Economic, environmental, transport implications. One of few remaining green areas. Area saturated with housing development.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	C.J. Holt
0354/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt - natural extension of the Green Belt bordering the site. Poor access, already traffic congestion. Too far from public transport. Ponds, marshes, wildlife, reeds, grassland should be protected.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr A. Howard
0355/1/001/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap. Traffic increase, unsuitable estate access. Loss of local scenic area. Overcrowded schools. Not enough public transport. Loss of wildlife. Only green area for miles.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Keith Jackson
0357/1/001/O	Re-define as Local Green Gap. Increased volume of traffic. Further destruction of woodland and wildlife. Cancellation of plans to create childrens play area. Marshy land unsuitable for building. Only open area left between Shaw and Royton.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Susan Jackson
0358/1/001/O	Define area as Local Green Gap - natural belt seperating Shaw & Royton. If developed would be traffic problems/danger on narrow surrounding roads. Many trees planted, wildlife would be destroyed. Springs in area could be affected.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	K. Jones
0360/1/001/O	Protect as Green Belt to seperate sprawl of urban development. Traffic - infrastructure can barely cope with traffic at present. Safety of children gaining safe access to schools.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Paul Jones
0361/1/001/O	Minimise land for residential development to protect green areas. Develop part of area

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

as public park.Improve access- traffic already congested. More traffic would increase pollution. Develop public transport system.Pressure on schools.

Objection

LR1 Cowlshaw

Mr &Mrs Kobyra

0362/1/001/O

Leave area as it is - view of Oldham, enjoy fresh smell of pasture and sight of wildlife. Too much land in Oldham has been given up to construction. Last small area left untouched. Please leave to nature.

Objection

LR1 Cowlshaw

Mrs M. Newton

0363/1/001/O

Protect from development - one of few remaining green recreational areas in Shaw. Recent residential development has increased traffic. Shaw Rd difficult to cross. Would result in loss of wildlife, and further trees.

Objection

LR1 Cowlshaw

A. Barlow

0364/1/001/O

Protect as green fields for children to play and to protect wildlife. Traffic problems could be worsened if developed.

Objection

LR1 Cowlshaw

Mr Brian Hunt

0365/1/001/O

Allocate as Green Belt. Plan motivated by a money grabbing scheme. Should consider local residents who have seen green areas eroded. Childrens heritage will be to grow up in an urban sprawl.

Objection

Joint Case

LR1 Cowlshaw

Mrs L. Radcliffe

0366/1/001/O

Designate area as Local Green Gap. Does not want any building on the land. One of last green areas in Shaw. Been enough building in Shaw in recent years. Existing traffic problems would be made worse.

Objection

LR1 Cowlshaw

Mrs M. Fletcher

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0367/1/001/O	Re-classify as Local Green Gap to protect one of few remaining green areas providing country walks. Plant and animal species can be seen in natural environment . Would be traffic problems. Newly planted trees would be lost.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs Asha Gulati
0369/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap - seperates Shaw & Royton. Valuable wildlife/ flora would be lost. Safe play area for children. Natural area for walking. Traffic already a problem.Few green areas left.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Bill Friend
0370/1/001/O	Objects to possible development - not a brown field site
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Caroline Glennie
0371/1/001/O	Protect from development - Quiet 'green belt' area, development would increase traffic, noise and pollution. Could lead to more theft/burglaries. Properties would be devalued.Local amenities already under pressure.Enough development in area.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Walter Glennie
0372/1/001/O	Protect from development. Quiet area - would spoil outlook from house across green belt fields. Safety issues, noise, pollution from increased traffic. Schools/services already oversubscribed. Properties may be devalued.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	J.A. Hassan
0373/1/001/O	Objects to possible development - protect land. Lived in Longfield Park and brought children up there.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	C. Barnett

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0374/1/001/O	Land should have policy to protect it as agricultural/recreational land. Also to protect natural habitats and wooded areas.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr D. Westwood
0375/1/001/O	Objects to houses being built - would spoil last bit of countryside in Shaw. Safe play area for children. Used for dog walking. Would spoil the beauty of the area. More houses would bring more crime, drugs and pollution to peaceful neighbourhood.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr & Mrs Winterbottom
0376/1/001/O	Leave site as it is. Too many open spaces and fields being built on. Need somewhere for children to play. Is nowhere round here for them. Lot of housing built on green areas over last 30 years.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs Lucy Carroll
0377/1/001/O	Opposed to development. Why cause more problems for Shaw than we already have - traffic, children, crime.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Paul Turner
0378/1/001/O	Scale down or stop the plan. Need for green belt land in inner cities. Traffic use. Need for walking areas.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr C. Whybrow
0379/1/001/O	Opposed to any development. Would be environmental disaster. Mammals, birds and bats all live in area. Two ponds would also be destroyed. Why more houses when already hundreds for sale in Shaw.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	V. Daubney

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0380/1/001/O	Refers to traffic and crime but no Change indicated.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	J. Hart
0381/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt. Are enough houses in this area - more than is necessary. Why not get rid of very old houses and rebuild on those sites. Shaw has a large traffic problem, crime, schools, etc at it is, why provide more?
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Eric Suddaby
0382/1/001/O	Protect from development and leave as green area. Development would cause more traffic problems and put pressure on schools. Will lead to more children hanging around streets. Police cannot deal with problems in Shaw now.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs M. Gaffey
0383/1/001/O	Protect as green land- only green site left in area. Place for children to play and see wildlife and to walk dog.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	G.P. Martin
0385/1/001/O	Keep land rural/ wildlife sanctuary
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Roger Dunkerley
0386/1/001/O	Protect countryside from development. Large areas built up over years resulting in loss of wildlife. Recreational/educational value. Ongoing tree planting. Housing would be visually intrusive. Already traffic problems.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs H.I. Smith
0387/1/001/O	Make area a sensitively managed natural area. Development contrary to key objectives in UDP review. Will put extra pressure on community, pollution. One of last green

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	spaces between Shaw & Manchester.Lack of facilities,school places. Traffic problems.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr & Mrs Lees
0388/1/001/O	Designate as Local Green Gap. Contrary to GS2 and GS6 requirements. Also conflicts with OE1.1 and UDP11, 11.3, 11.7b and 11.7c - SBI, recreational use, trees planted. Would invalidate the sustainability objectives of UDP1.5.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs F. Fitton
0389/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap - too many houses in Shaw already. Lovely unspoilt area with good grazing land, wildlife, ponds. Extra traffic would be intolerable.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs S. Gilbert
0390/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap to protect from development. One of the only green areas left in Shaw. Contains ponds, good agricultural land and wildlife - a rarity which should be saved. Existing traffic problems would be worsened.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs D. Connor
0391/1/001/O	Keep as Local Green Gap. If developed, traffic on Edward Road will be horrific - already used as a short cut to High Crompton. Will be dangerous to residents and children.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs T. Stevenson
0392/1/001/O	Leave area undeveloped and habitat for wildlife. The traffic chaos this development would cause in and around Edward Road and surrounding areas would be horrendous.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs J. Bowker

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0393/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap. One of last, or the last, green areas in Shaw. Already no areas of play or biological interest for children. Shaw could not deal with high number of people and traffic.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	G.F. Wrigley
0394/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap. Area is covered with young trees and could be a park or nature reserve. Too much of Cowlshaw's greenfields have already been built on. Would prefer Cowlshaw not to be joined up with High Crompton.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	C.H. Watson
0395/1/001/O	Objects to any development which would add to existing traffic/access problems. Traffic has increased over the years. Valuable nature haven would be lost forever.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs V. Oldfield
0396/1/001/O	Area should be left as it is. Leave something for children to enjoy. Natural park with wildlife. (Feels Council wastes money and sells anything without a thought for anyone.)
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Martyn Edwards
0397/1/001/O	Protect from building. One of few green spaces left in Shaw. Haven for wildlife, important for children and walkers. Contrary to Council's promotion of trees, wildlife and green spaces for health of Oldhamers
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs D. Dowd
0398/1/001/O	Objects to any possible building on site. Enough problems in Shaw with traffic, shortage of school places, crime, drugs. Police cannot cope as it is.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Diane Broome

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0399/1/001/O	Keep area as nature reserve to preserve for beauty and wildlife. Many parts of Shaw already developed with loss of green areas.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr & Mrs Horton
0400/1/001/O	Leave in natural state. Why more houses when so many on sale in Shaw? Could demolish properties and rebuild. Crime, traffic and drug problems already.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Michael Warburton
0401/1/001/O	Leave as it is - only green area left. Increase in traffic. More children, more school places - schools struggling as it is.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	R. Smalley
0402/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt. Only greenery in area - built up over years. Site has access only from Moor St. Part of land fronting Moor St used to be football field - could revert back to that.
Objection	
Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs S. Seddon
0403/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt - separates Cowlshaw and High Crompton. Would create considerable traffic problems and pollution for sake of oneoff multi million pound windfall.
Objection	
Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Deborah Dyson
0404/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap to protect invaluable open space and wildlife habitat. Already traffic problems and local services overstretched. Possible drainage problems. Does not believe all brownfield sites have been exhausted.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr S. Horritt

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0405/1/001/O	Leave area as Local Green Gap. Thousands of pounds have been spent on tree planting and footpaths in area. Natural amenity - ponds/wildlife. Current traffic problems could get worse.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	N.H. Wright
0406/1/001/O	Redesignate as Local Green Gap. Only SBI in borough marked for future development. Unmarked recreation route - The Crompton Way - passes through the land. Insufficient primary school places. Traffic/access problems.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	P. Dodd
0407/1/001/O	Designate site as Green Belt as building on the land would increase traffic problems, spoil the green landscape, harm wildlife present on the land, and put safety of children on Denbigh Drive estate at risk.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	M.T. Dodd
0408/1/001/O	Make area Green Belt. Insufficient infrastructure. Need lung of green belt between built up areas.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr & Mrs Fitton Agent : Chorlton Planning
0409/1/001/O	Welcome allocation for future development, but south eastern part of land should be allocated as a Phase 1 housing site. It is close to built up area, public transport and most existing facilities and would establish access in southern area
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Paul Doney
0410/1/001/O	Designate land as a Protected Area of Open Space to protect SBI/rare species. Few green areas remain in area. Disagrees with development so far from principal highway corridor. Already traffic problems. Popular walking area.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR1 Cowlshaw	T.J. O'Regan
0411/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap. Contains SBI. Should be developed into country park. Traffic congestion in area. Lack of education places in area. Housing should be developed on Brown Belt sites.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr A. Bardsley
0412/1/001/O	Keep as greenfield/pasture land. Trees have been planted. Would be loss of wildlife. Building would spoil area and traffic would cause problems. Shaw has lost most of green belt over years.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	David Lochery
0413/1/001/O	Leave as farm land. Land is a local green gap that separates High Crompton and Cowlshaw. Traffic on Shaw Road is already a major problem without the addition of more houses.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Darren Cunliffe
0414/1/001/O	Allocate area as Local Green Gap to protect environment, ponds, wildlife and retain green land for future generations. Separates built up areas. Contrary to policy on developing 75% brownfield land. Infrastructure could not cope with development.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Lorraine Cunliffe
0415/1/001/O	Protect from development to protect wildlife/forestry. Valuable amenity. Development would impact on infrastructure/local services. Already development in area, Saddleworth has escaped process. Contrary to policy on brownfield site development.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Ian Waterhouse
0416/1/001/O	Area should be retained as a green open space. Add more planting. More brownfield sites should be identified and developed. Inadequate public transport. Acts as green

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	gap. Would generate unacceptable levels of traffic.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	C. Cochrane
0418/1/001/O	Supports views of Cowlshaw Action Group
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mark Shuttleworth
0419/1/001/O	Protect land from development. Only LRFD containing SBI. Sustainability issues. Roads could not cope with more people and amenities already oversubscribed. Suggests Saddleworth as alternative location.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr M. Schofield
0420/1/001/O	Leave as green open space. There are many more larger areas where houses could be built. Wildlife - natural green open space. Traffic - Shaw Rd already congested early morning and evening. Education of children - schools are full.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs Rita O'Neill
0421/1/001/O	Keep area as it is - need open spaces
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs T. O'Neill
0423/1/001/O	Area should remain as it is unless further schools are to be built.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Zoe O'Neill
0424/1/001/O	Area should remain as it is: green land for recreational use.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR1 Cowlshaw	J.D. Summers
0425/1/001/O	Protect from development. Wildlife would be lost. More and more traffic on Shaw Rd/Manchester Rd. Schools already over full.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs L.M. Fawns
0426/1/001/O	Protect as open land to prevent further housing development.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs B. Butterfield
0427/1/001/O	Change to Local Green Gap as area contains SBI and Shaw has lost its character and individuality over past 30 years - originally a lovely village. Traffic a nightmare on Edward Road since Netherhouse was built.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr H. Kenyon
0428/1/001/O	Change classification to Green Gap to prevent urban sprawl. Queries basis of housing requirement figures. Conflict with policy on Habitat Protection. (OE2.3), site contains SBI, valuable for birds. Loss of trees. Contrary to PPG3.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr P. Weaver
0430/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap for future generations to enjoy. One of last remaining natural green areas left in area. Separates built up areas of Cowlshaw and Higher Crompton.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs J. Weaver
0431/1/001/O	Keep area as it is - recreational value. View from property would be ruined - no privacy. Area used by walkers. Green spaces in Royton and Crompton are disappearing - soon be no greenery for children to appreciate.
Objection Joint Case	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs C. Abbott
0432/1/001/O	Area should have Green Gap status or become conservation area as it contains SBI, supports wildlife and is a precious green area for children. Development would increase traffic/pollution.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Marilyn Guest
0439/1/001/O	Protect from development or only develop small fraction of land away from natural Green Gap leaving forested areas and large area containing ponds and source of River Irk. Separates built up areas. Poor access. Used for running.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Pamela Platt
0440/1/001/O	Keep and maintain area as a leisure facility in line with UDP aim to provide recreational open space. Contribute to health and well being. Shaw has lost much open space. New amenities would be needed. Traffic would worsen. Loss of wildlife.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Wright Platt
0441/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt. Valuable asset to people of Shaw, one of few remaining rural areas. Scenic value/wildlife. Housing would not only destroy area but would place burden on overstretched amenities, especially roads which are already congested.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Julie Patterson
0442/1/001/O	Leave as it is - satisfies definition of Local Green Gap - separates built up areas. Understood building not allowed - owned by GroundworK Trust. Only LRFD containing SBI. Valuable wildlife habitat. Green areas in west of Borough should be preserved
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs Beryl Faulkner
0443/1/001/O	Reclassify as Local Green Gap to preserve one of few green areas left in Shaw. Includes SBI, wildlife, ancient hedges and newly planted trees. Prime grazing land. Provides visual break within built up area. Contains Crompton Circuit/source of Irk

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs K. Moss
0445/1/001/O	Objects to development - Important site for wildlife, plant life and pond life. If developed for housing would be traffic, noise, pollution and access problems and could be flooding. Schools/amenities would be needed. Used for pleasure/exercise.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs J. Korny
0446/1/001/O	Land should stay as green gap - separates built up areas. Contains SBI -valuable habitats/wildlife.Lot of development in west of Borough. Would increase traffic/pollution. Valuable amenity would be lost. Largest area reserved for development.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs Nora Sumner
0447/1/001/O	Protect from development to preserve wildlife, plant and pond life. Used for recreation - can never be replaced if planning permission is granted. Traffic problems/poor access.Danger of flooding if developed. Schools oversubscribed already.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Valerie Brocklehurst
0448/1/001/O	Protect as green area - one of last in west of Borough. Traffic problems will worsen. Schools already overcrowded. Build on brownfield sites instead of green fields.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	James Saville
0449/1/001/O	Protect as Local Green Gap - separates built up areas. Only LRFD site containing SBI - valuable habitat. Valued amenity.Green areas in west of Borough need to be preserved. Been saturated with development. Saddleworth has retained Green Belt status.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs Doris Smith

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0450/1/001/O	Protect as open space. Development would lead to increased traffic. Schools not able to cope with increased number of pupils.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	W. Tylor
0451/1/001/O	Protect as Green Belt - very little left for walking/children. Have enough people congestion, would have severe traffic problems. Feels misled by Council - important issue and no consideration taken of local residents.
Objection	
Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr A.H. Lees
0452/1/001/O	Area should remain as play area. A lot of work and expenditure has gone into area and is deprived enough for children. Will add to traffic problems - Moor St already being used as a race track.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs A. Spence
0453/1/001/O	Objects to any development - make into a park area. Already too many houses built in area. Local schools/roads could not support influx of so many people and cars. So many greenbelt areas are being lost to development - once gone can never be replaced
Objection	
Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs Stead
0454/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt. Only green belt in area - presently separates the built up areas. Important wildlife habitat. Public rights of way. Valued amenity. Traffic problems/noise. Could cause flooding. Bought house for outlook. Properties could devalue.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Tracey Bromiley
0455/1/001/O	Keep land as it is. Development would put strain on educational resources, overstretch police and worsen traffic problems. Build new secondary school if anything. Only gain is monetary - no gain to residents.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR1 Cowlshaw 0456/1/001/O	Mr C. Walker
Objection Joint Case	Objects to development of the area on traffic grounds.
LR1 Cowlshaw 0457/1/001/O	Mr A.P. Summersgill
Objection	Change allocation to Green Belt to preserve this wildlife haven for future generations. More housing would be folly without providing access, services, and amenities. Schools are already insufficient in the area.
LR1 Cowlshaw 0458/1/001/O	Ann Yazici
Objection	Protect from development. One of few remaining green places left. Development should be on brownfield sites. Crompton Way runs through site - should be preserved. Existing traffic congestion will be made worse. Schools already overcrowded.
LR1 Cowlshaw 0459/1/001/O	Mr & Mrs T Hewson
Objection Joint Case	Development should go elsewhere. Too much traffic congestion already. Need to keep open spaces. Not enough Green Belt in Shaw.
LR1 Cowlshaw 0460/1/001/O	Diane Stott
Objection Joint Case	Council should look to other areas of the Borough for future development sites eg. Oldham/Saddleworth border and Oldham/Ashton border, where there are vast areas of land. Last green area should be left to avoid Shaw and Royton merging. Traffic.
LR1 Cowlshaw 0462/1/001/O	L. Casey
Objection	Objects to development of site - should be kept rural - could fit on hundreds of houses which would worsen existing traffic problems, increase competition for school places, increase crime and devalue properties. Nice area for walks.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR1 Cowlshaw 0464/1/001/O	Joyce Donoghue
Objection Joint Case	Protect as open space - area getting more and more built up. Used as play area and for walking. Roads would be gridlocked. Suggests Saddleworth be considered instead.
LR1 Cowlshaw 0465/1/001/O	Michael Patterson
Objection Joint Case	Area should remain a protected open space. Housing development will increase traffic adding to existing chaos. Last remaining open space in the area - keep for present and future generations. Will destroy important wildlife habitat.
LR1 Cowlshaw 0468/1/001/O	Cllr Val Pemberton
Objection Joint Case	Allocate as Green Belt to protect from development. Believes land to be protected until 2011. National Forestry Commission planted trees in area - could cause financial problems if removed. Plans have been passed for play area off Moor St.
LR1 Cowlshaw 0469/1/001/O	Mr M. Cassidy
Objection Joint Case	Protect as greenfield site. All brownfield sites must be fully utilised before considering greenfield sites. Greenspace vital to quality of life - green lung, SBI. Existing traffic problems would be worsened..
LR1 Cowlshaw 0471/1/001/O	B & T Warburton & Johnson
Objection Joint Case	Object to development on 'Green Site' Land. Infrastructure not in place in Shaw and Oldham. Access/traffic problems. Lack of school places/play areas. No employment demand locally. Open areas eroded over years.
LR1 Cowlshaw 0475/1/001/O	Mr&Mrs A.J Conroy
Objection Joint Case	Area should be protected from development as it is the only untouched local green area. Develop existing poorly developed land or develop where there is abundance of open areas like Saddleworth. Contrary to summary sheet.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs A. Anderson
0476/1/001/O	Object to development. Allocate as Local Green Gap as land separates built up areas. Also to protect SBI and protect valued amenity. Lack of green areas in west of Borough. Will cause traffic problems.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs D. Thackeray
0477/1/001/O	No comments submitted.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	P. & S. Bolton
0478/1/001/O	Allocate as green belt or make into a wood to preserve wildlife and promote social inclusion.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	M. & J. Lamb
0480/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt to stop Shaw and Royton merging. Find more suitable areas for future development. Schools already oversubscribed and roads congested. Deprived area - needs open fields/footpaths, particularly children.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Cllr A.J. Dillon
0481/1/001/O	Area allocated for development as a park should be designated for recreation, remainder of LR1 should be designated Local Green Gap to protect buffer function and wildlife. Would be traffic increase. Lack of public transport.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	M. Hambley
0482/1/001/O	Area west of Crompton School should be excluded from LR1 - is part of school site. Area west of this, and area south of school should be allocated as Recreational Open Space or Local Green Gaps.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Ramblers' Association, Oldham Group
0484/1/004/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap. Many ROW cross the site - varied views, features of interest can be seen. Loss of recently planted trees, ponds, wildlife, hedgerows, source of River Irk. Loss of part of the Crompton Circuit.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Neil Cooper
0485/1/001/O	Allocate area as Green Gap or park/nature reserve/forest area. Separates built up areas. Valuable open area. Contrary to sustainability objectives. Brownfield sites not fully investigated or identified. Has agricultural and biological importance.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs J. Byrne
0486/1/001/O	Protect as greenfield - only greenery in area. Demarcates area. Against Government policy of building on brownfield sites. Traffic problems - little public transport accessibility. Trees have been planted on site.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Derek T. Oldham
0487/1/001/O	Make the land a park. Shaw should be left as a village. Too much traffic. Does not think the local green land should stay the way it is (needs clarifying)
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs K. Howard
0488/1/001/O	Keep as a greenfield area to protect ponds/wildlife. Only green area locally/place to walk. Lot of trees planted. Is money worth more than the environment for the residents of Shaw? Where will underground streams go?
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	D.W. Laws
0489/1/001/O	Objects to any further development in the Cowlshaw Area. Only LRFD site containing

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	an SBI. Valuable wildlife habitat. Valuable and picturesque amenity would be lost. Few remaining green areas in west of the Borough should be preserved.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	R.&H.I. Ashworth
0490/1/001/O	Keep as it is. Need to protect SBI. West side of Borough already saturated with housing development. Existing traffic problems in area. Largest area identified for future development.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr T. Bithell
0491/1/001/O	Classify as Green Gap or Green Belt. Flat area used for walking. Need to protect wildlife. Development would affect openness for golfers. Used by Royton Harriers for cross country running. Traffic problems would be worsened.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr Stephen Judge
0492/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Gap - satisfies definition. Development would increase traffic on local roads. Important to preserve such areas in line with Councils environmental policies. Contains SBI/developing wildlife reserve. Renovate existing housing.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr K.J. Watson
0494/1/001/O	Designate as Local Green Gap. Development would reduce property values. Loss of significant/ picturesque rural amenity. Traffic problems. Lack of amenities/schools - not sustainable. Should redevelop urban/brownfield sites. Contrary to UDP key objectives.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	J. & K. Wales
0496/1/001/O	Designate as Local Green Gap - separates the built up areas of High Crompton and Cowlshaw. Existing traffic problems would be worsened.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR1 Cowlshaw	David Norbury
0497/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt to protect from development - should develop on 'wasteland' not green belt land.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs N.A. Bickerton
0498/1/001/O	Designate as Local Green Gap to protect only greenfield site left in Shaw and to protect wildlife/ecology. Would cause traffic/noise pollution and be unsustainable.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Steve Buckley
0499/1/001/O	Designate as Green Belt. Green gaps are essential in this part of the borough. Royton in particular has had a lot of housing development in last 30 years. Traffic already bad and schools oversubscribed. One of last areas for walking.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	S.& F. Eades
0500/1/001/O	Land should remain protected to preserve countryside. Development would devalue property. More cars would lead to more noise and pollution. Need to protect wildlife and trees. Would be invasion of privacy.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs SK Thornton
0501/1/001/O	Remaining green areas should be protected - act as lungs. Preferential to developers. Planners should protect residents from purely commercial interests. Develop empty/derelict sites in Oldham first. Would overload roads/facilities. Trees would be lost.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr P. Buckley
0502/1/001/O	Redesignate area as Local Green Gap to protect agriculture, SBI, local amenity and support relatively narrow finger of 'green belt' between built up areas. Traffic already excessive. Contrary to accessibility policies.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR1 Cowlshaw 0503/1/001/O Objection	Brenda Robertson Protect from development. Objects to possible increase in traffic and effect on wildlife.
LR1 Cowlshaw 0504/1/001/O Objection	Mr&Mrs A Horsfall Traffic/Wildlife
LR1 Cowlshaw 0505/1/001/O Objection	Mr & Mrs D Colton Protect from development - feels area is losing green land. Ponds/wildlife would be lost. Shaw has had fair share of development, Saddleworth largely retained green belt status. More schools would be needed. Traffic problems.
LR1 Cowlshaw 0506/1/001/O Objection Joint Case	Kevin O'Regan Allocate as Local Green Gap. Contains SBI. Area should be developed into country park. Traffic problems in area. Lack of school places/medical services. Housing should be built on brown field sites.
LR1 Cowlshaw 0507/1/001/O Objection Joint Case	Mrs C. Schofield Area allocated as land reserved for future development is much too large. Traffic already a major problem. Schools are full. There is very little greenery and open spaces as it is. Wildlife and pond life will suffer. Will affect view and property value.
LR1 Cowlshaw 0508/1/001/O Objection	Jean Harrison Objects to building on this land. More fields disappearing never to be replaced. Lack of amenities already - bus routes etc put under further strain. Increase in traffic. Availability of brownfield sites in Oldham. Drainage problems.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR1 Cowlshaw 0509/1/001/O	B. Wood Make into Green Belt/Gap Area. Used to walk dog. Only green area between Shaw and Royton. Services eg. buses, shops, schools are already oversubscribed. Increase in traffic would be problem.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw 0510/1/001/O	Mr B. Mellor Return the area to Green Belt. Contains SBI and is one of few remaining open grass lands in district. Wildlife would be lost if developed. Traffic would increase leading to gridlock. Much of land boggy and unsuitable for building.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw 0511/1/001/O	Mr J. Morris Designate as Green Belt or Local Green Gap. Proposal contradicts Plans Key Objectives. Does not conserve/improve quality of natural resources. Does not improve accessibility/reduce need to travel. Existing traffic problems. Provides green lung.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw 0512/1/001/O	J. Koulouri Area should be returned to green belt status. Government is promoting use of brownfield sites - many in this area. Large development would alter area. Increase roads, noise and decrease the semi-rural atmosphere which now exists.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw 0513/1/001/O	Mr&Mrs E.G Smith Protect as Green Gap - only green area left in area. Damage to wildlife. Traffic congestion already at boiling point. Over population of Shaw/Royton.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw 0514/1/001/O	Mrs P. Mellor Allocate as Green Belt or Local Green Gap. Contrary to govt policy of developing 75% housing on brown field sites. Largest site proposed for LRFD. Lack of local amenities/public transport. Traffic implications. SBI should be preserved.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	L. & D. Pilling
0515/1/001/O	Change not specified. Reason: Would spoil the area, ruin wildlife. Would be more pollution. Road accidents would increase with more cars.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr T. Kolakowski
0516/1/001/O	Retain as green area to protect beauty, wildlife, trees. Redevelop areas in the town, eg.mills. Development would increase traffic and place families at risk.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Miss S. Bennett
0517/1/001/O	Allocate site as Local Green Gap in order to protect privacy/views and biological interest. Only green area left undeveloped in Shaw. Traffic, pollution and noise problems could result. Proposal not sustainable. Should build on brown field first.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	E. McDermott
0518/1/001/O	Objects to any more housing on green fields. Has seen large estate built behind property -enough is enough.Most of the birds now nest in the eaves of houses insteady of their natural nests in trees.More houses not a good idea.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Cllr P Dillon
0519/1/001/O	Retain proposed park areas and designate remainder as Local Green Gap. Would not meet Government targets for development on brownfield sites. Would cause sprawl between built up areas and increase traffic. Home to wildlife.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr K. Walker
0520/1/001/O	Develop site as nature reserve to further improve on work carried out by Groundwork

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

Trust. Acts as buffer between Shaw and Royton. 3 farms already lost to development. Traffic problems would be made worse. Property values will be reduced.

Objection

LR1 Cowlshaw

F.W. Hopkinson

0522/1/001/O

Allocate as Green Belt. Too many houses for roads to deal with. More land available for development in Saddleworth. Used for play by children. Wildlife. Birth rate is going down therefore why are more houses needed?

Objection

LR1 Cowlshaw

M. Barnett

0523/1/001/O

Keep as 'Protected Open Land' or 'Local Green Gap' to provide breathing space between Shaw and Royton and provide recreational land. Also to protect SBI, wildlife habitats and agricultural land.

Objection

LR1 Cowlshaw

Mrs E.M. Walker

0524/1/001/O

Objects to any large development in High Crompton. Rural area. Schools already oversubscribed. Denbigh Drive not suitable for access to site - would be unsafe for children to play outdoors.

Objection

Joint Case

LR1 Cowlshaw

Mr G. Walker

0525/1/001/O

Objects to development - serves as Local Green Gap. Valueable amenity. Too large. Contrary to policy on developing brownfield sites and criteria on location of development. Unsustainable. Loss of SBI. Possible flooding. Traffic problems.

Objection

LR1 Cowlshaw

Mr E. Lumley

0533/1/001/O

Re-designate northern part of site as Local Green Gap because of access problems. Keep access from Shaw Rd/Manchester Rd. Would encroach on land separating built up areas. SBI would be lost. Traffic already heavy in area.

Objection

Joint Case

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR1 Cowlshaw	C. & A. Kobyra & Iwanko
0534/1/001/O	No comments given
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr & Mrs F Healey
0535/1/001/O	Keep land as it is with no future developments taking place. SBI - valuable wildlife habitat. Valuable and picturesque amenity. This side of Borough already over developed. Traffic - already a nightmare along Manchester and Shaw Rds.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Karen Broome
0536/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap or Green Belt as most green areas in Shaw have disappeared to housing. Well used by local community/children. Important for wildlife. Development would put pressure on schools, and increase traffic.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Nigel Broome
0537/1/001/O	Area should be protected to keep few remaining green areas around Shaw as they are and prevent further development. Would worsen traffic. and put further pressure on local services.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs B. Paterson
0538/1/001/O	No change to area. Few remaining green areas in and around this part of the Borough need to be preserved. Already over-developed. Contains SBI - valuable wildlife habitat. Largest area allocated for future development. Traffic would be problem.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr R. Dearden
0539/1/001/O	Protect from development and keep and enhance area as natural green gap. Picturesque amenity. Infrastructure could not cope with more pressure.
Objection Joint Case	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR1 Cowlshaw	Linda Argyle
0540/1/001/O	Objects to any development of area - local green gap should be kept and developed as country park. Would protect wildlife/plants. Is enough housing in Shaw, further development would cause traffic/access problems and put strain on schools.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Emma Argyle
0541/1/001/O	Site should be made a nature area to protect wildlife and plants. Development would put strain on local amenities and cause extra traffic.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr & Mrs Whitehead
0542/1/001/O	Keep as open space. Wildlife, open fields are the only spaces in High Crompton and Cowlshaw. Walking area. Valued by community. Need to consider future generations, not short term financial benefits.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mark Argyle
0544/1/001/O	Objects to any more new houses in Shaw. Unnecessary to build houses on one of few remaining green sites in Shaw. Would increase traffic and put strain on local amenities. Why develop here when 70% development should be on brown field sites?
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	San Argyle
0545/1/001/O	Objects to possible development of area - build country park instead to protect plants/wildlife, and play area for local children. Also refers to danger from extra traffic.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr & Mrs Chadwick
0546/1/001/O	Designate as Local Green Gap. Contrary to sections of GS2, and some GS6 requirements. Also conflicts with OE1.1 and para.1.5, 11.3, 11.7b and 11.7c, as contains SBI, used for recreation and planted with trees.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw 0547/1/001/O	Mrs Doris Ragg Site should remain as it is for future generations to enjoy the ponds, reeds and wildlife. All development in this area while Saddleworth retains Green Belt. Could do with less traffic not more and development will mean much more.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw 0548/1/001/O	Mrs B. Gilmartin Protect from development. Area planted with trees, would spoil view from property. Local schools will be inadequate. Traffic will increase. Part of area already earmarked for park.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw 0549/1/001/O	Mr F. Dowd Objects to any development on site. Is enough traffic on Shaw roads - do not need anymore. Schools are overcrowded. Is nowhere for the children to play.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw 0550/1/001/O	Brian Lord Protect as gap between Cowlshaw and High Crompton. Only countryside walk in area for people without car. Wildlife value. Already have enough built up areas this side of the Borough. Already have enough traffic.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw 0551/1/001/O	Mr & Mrs J Simcock Leave area as it is. Increase of traffic could endanger school children using Moor St for school access. Erosion of what little green area is left. Destruction of plants, insects, wildlife, blight on the landscape.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw 0552/1/001/O	Paul Kenyon Protect from development. Traffic problems close to school. Environmental

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

issues/health issues. Lot of wildlife on site and ponds, area used for walking. Crime rate will go up.

Objection

LR1 Cowlshaw

Ivan Tokaryk

0553/1/001/O

Site should be developed for wildlife/plants/trees to provide locals with area in which to relax. Haven for wildlife. If housing is required, Council should pull down derelict and delapidated buildings to re-build new modern housing on same sites.

Objection

Joint Case

LR1 Cowlshaw

Louise Farrimond

0554/1/001/O

Leave area as it is - valuable piece of land already earmarked for recreational area. Will be far too much traffic, roads could not cope. Ponds/ wildlife would be destroyed.

Objection

LR1 Cowlshaw

Mrs B. Mearns

0555/1/001/O

Objects to any development of site. Shaw has had its fair share of houses over years. Is big problem with existing traffic without any more. Schools can hardly cope now to accomodate the children that live in this area.

Objection

LR1 Cowlshaw

Tonu Barik

0556/1/001/O

Protect as green land for wildlife and walks. Development could lead to environmental and traffic problems.

Objection

LR1 Cowlshaw

Mrs B. Broadbent

0557/1/001/O

Keep area as farmland/fields or develop as country park to protect for future generations. More houses would put pressure on roads and schools. Last 'green belt' in area.

Objection

Joint Case

LR1 Cowlshaw

T. & P. Stansfield

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0558/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt - last bit left in area. Are enough houses in this area. Extra traffic. Extra crime - not enough police in area as it is.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	J.F. Kinder
0559/1/001/O	Keep area as it is - why spoil it? Any more houses in area would be a disaster - road safety, schools are overcrowded as it is, crime.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Crompton & Royton Golf Club
0560/1/001/O	Concerned about impact of further houses adjacent to golf course - possible encroachment on golf club land and effluence from adjacent houses.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Marjorie Johnson
0561/1/001/O	Return land to Green Belt/Give town green status/plant woodlands to put more oxygen into the air. Would be loss of only green buffer between Shaw & Royton. Would increase land price, put pressure on services and increase pollution.SBI.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Daniel Ward
0562/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Belt. Not many places left of such natural beauty and it would be criminal to turn it into a concrete mass.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	J. & S. Earnshaw
0563/1/001/O	Protect as green area - one of few left. Supports wildlife/plants. Queries where extra families will be educated, how streets will be cleaned and how parking wil provided for.Queries how the transport system will cope.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr & Mrs P Todd

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0564/1/001/O	Object to losing Local Green Gap. Why should surrounding residents lose this area when Oldham has an abundance of existing land suitable for redevelopment. 1200 - 1400 houses would totally over stretch local amenities.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	E.J. Flynn
0565/1/001/O	Keep land as Local Green Gap - are few green gap areas left in the west of the Borough. Traffic on Cockermill Lane will increase. Already difficult to get access onto Shaw Road. Site contains SBI.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	J. & C. Mallon
0566/1/001/O	Site should remain as Protected Open Land to retain wildlife/plant life. Valuable and attractive resource. Shaw would suffer if this land was used for building houses, already traffic problems, and where would all the extra children be educated?
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Robin Hardman
0567/1/001/O	Not appropriate to build houses in this area - is only remaining 'green belt' area in the district. Area has not got the infrastructure to support additional 1400 houses. The plan does not meet the UDP criterion for new development.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr M. Hutchinson
0568/1/001/O	Objects to allocation as land reserved for future development - traffic grounds
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs L. Hilton Agent : Mr M. Hutchinson
0569/1/001/O	Objects to development of the land on traffic grounds.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr G. Lindsay

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0570/1/001/O	Keep as openland/farmland/grazing land as area already at saturation point with vehicular traffic, and proposal will reduce environmental wellbeing.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs M. Baker
0571/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap or Green Belt. Objects to possible development because of traffic problems and loss of one of the last remaining green areas locally.
Objection	
Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs Hebden
0573/1/001/O	Classify as Local Green Gap to preserve for future generations. Too many green spaces already built on. SBI - valuable wildlife habitat. Roads could not cope with increased traffic. All public services would be overloaded.
Objection	
Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Ms T. Gibson
0574/1/001/O	Re-classify as local green gap. Contains prime agricultural land, an SBI and area recently planted with trees. One of the only green areas left in Shaw. Roads cannot cope with extra traffic. Shaw already saturated with development.
Objection	
Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Jeffrey Harrison
0575/1/001/O	Objects to any building on this site - Loss of open space. Increase in traffic. Drainage problems. Loss of wildlife habitat. Does not believe site has requisite access criteria. Queries whether other brownfield sites are available.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Stuart Dyson
0576/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap to protect green space. Amount of land allocated seems out of proportion. Contains wildlife habitat. Traffic/accessibility problems. Possible drainage problems. Should explore brownfield opportunities for development.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Ian Nadin

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0577/1/001/O	Classify land as Green Belt. It is marshy and unsuitable for building. Existing drainage and sewerage system in the River Irk catchment cannot cope with the impact of past development, causing environmental damage.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	S.P. Woodhead
0578/1/001/O	Objects to any development which would worsen existing access/traffic problems. Concern about traffic safety on Edward Road. Loss of valuable nature haven.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	I. & C. Sutcliffe
0579/1/001/O	Leave as it is - Development would cause more traffic problems. Been enough new housing built in Shaw. Need green areas which are left.
Objection	
Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	K.M. Oates
0580/1/001/O	Allocate smaller area allowing green land around perimeter - too vast an area. Getting back to acres of terraced housing with no amenities or outlook. Part of site used as play area. Need to leave gaps for pleasure. Traffic will become more dangerous
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs PK Humphrys
0583/1/001/O	Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development to allow garden extension.
Objection	
Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	John Southern
0584/1/001/O	Protect as Local Green Gap - satisfies definition. Valuable amenity. Largest site allocated as LRFD. Not in Council's priority area for development. Contrary to policy on brownfield development. Sustainability -poor accessibility, pressure on services.
Objection	
Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr&Mrs J. Bennett

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0586/1/001/O	Protect from development. Acts as Local Green Gap. Valuable amenity. Largest area allocated for future development. Ecological/environmental value, SBI. Proposal not sustainable - inaccessible, pressure on services.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	G.M. Bickerstaffe
0587/1/001/O	Protect land from any building. Existing traffic problems would be worsened. Proposal contrary to Plan's key objectives.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	V. Bickerstaffe
0589/1/001/O	Protect land from any building. Traffic problems would be worsened. Proposal contrary to Plan's key objectives.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	G. Bickerstaffe
0590/1/001/O	Protect land from any building. Existing traffic problems would be worsened. Proposal contrary to Plan's key objectives.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Peter E. Kewn
0600/1/001/O	Not known - Incomplete information
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	W A Tomlinson
0691/1/004/O	Remove allocation on part of this site due to the soil's unsuitability for development and substitute land around Cragg Road/Heights Lane to fulfil the Council's need for land for future development
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Shaw and Royton Area Committee
0796/1/002/O	Request further consideration be given to allocation, particularly in the vicinity of

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	the park area on Moor Street (Details of change/reason not submitted)
Objection	
LR10 Ryefields Drive, Uppermill	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/020/O	Site not suitable for development - should be Local Green Gap or Site of Special Scientific Interest
Objection	
LR10 Ryefields Drive, Uppermill	Saddleworth Parish Council Agent : Eagland Planning Associates
0040/1/015/O	Allocate all the area from (disused) railway line to High Street as Local Green Gap, including this site. Contains valuable trees, logical link to LGG 16, very limited suitability for built development.
Objection Joint Case	
LR10 Ryefields Drive, Uppermill	Dobcross Village Community
0105/1/009/O	Change allocation from Land Reserved for Future Development to Local Green Gap due to value as woodland and wildlife habitat
Objection Joint Case	
LR10 Ryefields Drive, Uppermill	Brian Lee
0160/1/001/O	Remove designation as land reserved for future development and add site to adjacent Local Green Gap (LGG16), as it is within the Green Corridor, has protected trees and supports wildlife, including in Pickhill Brook.
Objection	
LR10 Ryefields Drive, Uppermill	Anita Lilley
0161/1/001/O	LR10 should not be allocated as Land Reserved for Future Development - it is an area covered by Tree Preservation Orders
Objection	
LR10 Ryefields Drive, Uppermill	Mr S.V. Sedgwick
0162/1/001/O	Delete LR10 designation and extend LGG16 to include the wooded clough and Pickhill Brook. Development would be contrary to existing tree protection orders, Green

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	Corridor designation, and protection of watercourses (NR2.3).
Objection	
LR10 Ryefields Drive, Uppermill	David Sanderson
0345/1/003/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect wildlife habitat and due to land's unsuitability for development
Objection	
LR10 Ryefields Drive, Uppermill	James Grimwood
0526/1/001/O	Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development because of existing tree preservation orders and woodland's value as wildlife habitat
Objection	
LR10 Ryefields Drive, Uppermill	Kevin Sanders
0528/1/001/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap to become part of adjoining area allocated as LGG16. Development would mean loss of a woodland with protected trees and of a significant wildlife habitat. Also consider including in Uppermill Conservation Area.
Objection	
Joint Case	
LR10 Ryefields Drive, Uppermill	E McCarthy
0529/1/001/O	Objects to allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development due to the land's value as woodland and for wildlife, and the possible consequences of developing the difficult terrain
Objection	
LR10 Ryefields Drive, Uppermill	Saddleworth Conservation Action Group
0606/1/002/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect mature woodland and wildlife habitat.
Objection	
LR10 Ryefields Drive, Uppermill	Saddleworth Civic Trust
0828/1/005/O	Strongly oppose LR designation. Deciduous woodland (shown on the 1770 Manorial Estate Map) & natural habitat for a variety of species. Would like to see some form of special designation apply e.g. SBI, SSSI, SPA or SAC.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
LR2 Shawside, Shaw (Moss Hey)	Lancashire Wildlife Trust
0124/1/002/O	Boundary of LR2 allocation should be altered to ensure it falls outside adjacent SBI, preferably including buffer zone.
Objection	
LR2 Shawside, Shaw (Moss Hey)	Oak Street Area Community Group
0152/1/011/O	Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development
Objection	
LR2 Shawside, Shaw (Moss Hey)	P & D Northern Steels Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning
0166/1/002/O	Extend the site to the east and reduce LR2 accordingly. Reallocate it for housing as a logical extension of the H1.1.5 Cape Mill site. Will add to range of house types available in Shaw area and allow a comprehensive development.
Objection	
LR3 Land at Foxdenton Lane, Chadderton	Mr J C Blakeman Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0673/1/001/O	Remove allocation of land shown on (attached) plan as Land Reserved for Future Development to accommodate short-medium term development needs
Objection	
LR3, LR4 Land at Foxdenton Lane, Chadderton	Highways Agency
0006/1/018/O	The policy should state that the HA will need to be consulted on proposals for the development of sites which could impact on the operation of trunk roads, specifically this site which could be accessed from Foxdenton Lane/A663 junction.
Omission	
LR3, LR4 Land at Foxdenton Lane, Chadderton	Oldham Labour Group
0181/1/006/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect as open space

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
LR3, LR4 Land at Foxdenton Lane, Chadderton	Mr G&Mrs J Horn
0653/1/002/O	Redesignate as Local Green Gap to prevent loss of open space and because the need to reserve land for future development is not proven
Objection Joint Case	
LR3, LR4 Land at Foxdenton Lane, Chadderton	Mrs Enid Johnson
0657/1/001/O	Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development to protect Foxdenton Hall and Park, and link area to restored Rochdale canal
Objection	
LR3, LR4 Land at Foxdenton Lane, Chadderton	John A Shaw
0663/1/001/O	Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development to protect open space and as access is poor. Make more use of brownfield sites in Borough for development
Objection Joint Case	
LR3, LR4 Land at Foxdenton Lane, Chadderton	Shirley Hamer
0666/1/001/O	Change allocation to protect land for use as a nature reserve and leisure park
Objection Joint Case	
LR3, LR4 Land at Foxdenton Lane, Chadderton	Mr Donald Easton
0667/1/001/O	Object to any future development in the area (business, industry or housing). It should be preserved as a nature area complementing restoration of the Rochdale Canal.
Objection Joint Case	
LR3, LR4 Land at Foxdenton Lane, Chadderton	Mr Ronald Dawson

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0670/1/001/O	Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development to protect open space and absent compelling reasons for development
Objection Joint Case	
LR3, LR4 Land at Foxdenton Lane, Chadderton	T Gaunt
0684/1/001/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect farmland and prevent more traffic problems
Objection	
LR4 Land at Foxdenton Lane (North), Chadderton	Lancashire Wildlife Trust
0124/1/011/O	The site should incorporate a wildlife link to connect the Hunt Lane SBI with the green corridor running towards the Rochdale Canal SSSI. This can be done by redrawing the boundary of the allocation or by adding a paragraph to the policy.
Omission	
LR4 Land at Foxdenton Lane (North), Chadderton	David S Owen
0664/1/001/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap, the same as land at Milton Drive (LGG3). Both sites go down to the recreational route. Access to development adjacent to Derwent Drive would be difficult. Roads would not accommodate traffic.
Objection	
LR4 Land at Foxdenton Lane (North), Chadderton	Mr J C Blakeman
	Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0673/1/003/O	Remove allocation of land shown on (attached) plan as Land Reserved for Future Development to accommodate short-medium development needs of the Borough
Objection	
LR5 Moston Brook, Failsworth	BAE Systems Properties Ltd
	Agent : Fuller Peiser
0236/1/004/O	Change allocation of this part of the Lancaster Sports and Social Club site from Land Reserved for Future Development to mixed development (housing and business/industry) to reflect landowners future aspirations for the site.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
LR7 Haven Lane North, Moorside	Mr P&Mrs P Glynn
0614/1/002/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect open land and prevent an increase in traffic
Objection Joint Case	
LR7 Haven Lane North, Moorside	Mr J Gregory
0632/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap to provide an attractive setting for Oldham 's urban areas, adding to the quality of life. Development would change character,appearance and landscape quality and could add to volume of traffic.
Objection Joint Case	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	North Ainley Halliwell Solicitors Agent : Chorlton Planning
0096/1/002/O	Change allocation to housing as there is no housing allocation in Moorside and the sites are suitable for this use
Objection	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	E Leeks
0610/1/001/O	Redesignate the land as Green Belt to prevent further residential development in the area as Haven Lane is a country lane, well-used by horse-riders and heavily used by motorists to and from Counthill School and new houses nearby.
Objection Joint Case	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	Mr & Mrs H Pearson
0611/1/001/O	Object to allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development on traffic grounds and because playing area is needed for children
Objection	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	J Brears
0612/1/001/O	Reallocate as Local Green Gap. Further development in the area will have a detrimental effect on the environment, both on residential amenity due to an increase in traffic on The Lanes and with the loss of wildlife habitat.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection Joint Case	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	Moorside East Residents Association
0613/1/001/O	Reallocate as Local Green Gap to prevent future development with an associated increase in traffic
Objection Joint Case	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	Mr Trevor Cash
0616/1/001/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap to prevent further increase in traffic and associated harm to highway safety and quality of life in the area. (Included petition with 79 signatures)
Objection Joint Case	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	C Ambrose & D Johnson
0619/1/001/O	Change allocation from Land Reserved for Future Development to one which protects the green area. Houses already built in area without adequate infrastructure, more development could degrade quality of life.
Objection	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	Mr & Mrs P Bailey
0620/1/001/O	Reallocate as Local Green Gap to protect open environment of the area
Objection	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	Mr & Mrs D Beard
0622/1/001/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect the green fields and to prevent an increase in traffic and the risk of a serious accident
Objection Joint Case	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	I J Bolton
0623/1/001/O	Change allocation to protect as open space and prevent further overdevelopment in Moorside. Natural green belt being lost. Road cannot cope with more traffic. Increased traffic would endanger children and cause pollution.

Objection

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Joint Case	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	Mr G Brand
0625/1/001/O	Reallocate as Local Green Gap. Traffic has increased on Haven Lane and Counthill Road in the past 20 years due to building of housing estates . Extra traffic from more houses would worsen problems.
Objection Joint Case	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	James Donohoe
0628/1/001/O	Change to an allocation that prevents any further development off Haven Lane that would have access from the Lane as it cannot accommodate additional traffic
Objection	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	Ronald Graham
0629/1/001/O	Change allocation from Land Reserved for Future Development to Local Green Gap on traffic grounds
Objection	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	Edith Mary Larder
0642/1/001/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect land for continued agricultural use (pasture, hay) and as open space. Much open land in area has been lost to earlier, probably inappropriate, development.
Objection	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	Mr & Mrs E Ogden
0643/1/001/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect the farmland which provides an important break between built-up areas
Objection	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	Mr & Mrs M Seddon
0644/1/001/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap on traffic grounds
Objection Joint Case	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	Mr&Mrs D J Shore
0645/1/001/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap to prevent further development as traffic on Haven Lane has reached saturation point with previous developments and there have been accidents
Objection Joint Case	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	C & D Tennant
0646/1/001/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap on traffic grounds and to protect farmland
Objection	
LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside	Jean Tennant
0647/1/001/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect well-maintained agricultural land
Objection	
LR8 Haven Lane South, Moorside	Mr R. Cocking Agent : Chorlton Planning
0101/1/001/O	Re-allocate land for housing development. It is not unduly prominent in landscape and no other housing sites have been allocated in Moorside area. Would help provide a full range of locations and housing types in Borough.
Objection	
LR8 Haven Lane South, Moorside	Mr P&Mrs P Glynn
0614/1/001/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect open land and prevent increase in traffic
Objection Joint Case	
LR8 Haven Lane South, Moorside	Mr&Mrs A C Bradbury
0624/1/001/O	Reallocate this land as open Green Belt to conserve landscape, and preserve views and property prices. Would increase traffic and pollution and endanger pupils of Counthill School. Already two busy junctions on Haven Lane.
Objection Joint Case	
LR8 Haven Lane South, Moorside	Mr J Gregory

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0632/1/002/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap to provide an attractive setting for Oldham 's urban areas, adding to the quality of life. Development would change character,appearance and landscape quality and could add to volume of traffic.
Objection Joint Case	
LR8 Haven Lane South, Moorside	A & J Haigh
0638/1/001/O	Change to an allocation that prevents any development for a range of reasons
Objection Joint Case	
LR8 Haven Lane South, Moorside	Marie Trainer
0648/1/001/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap to prevent further change in character of the area and prevent existing properties from being 'closed in'. Traffic on lane is already heavy.
Objection	
LR8 Haven Lane South, Moorside	Harold D Whitby
0651/1/001/O	Change to an allocation that does not lead to further development and traffic as Haven Lane is already overloaded with vehicles and is the main approach for children to Counthill School.
Objection	
LR8 Haven Lane South, Moorside	I & L Wormald
0652/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap to protect Moorside area and prevent an increase in traffic.
Objection Joint Case	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Saddleworth Parish Council Agent : Ealand Planning Associates
0040/1/008/O	Change allocation from Land Reserved for Future Development to Local Green Gap or Green Belt to preserve land for recreation and as access to Open Access Land on Wharmton.
Objection Joint Case	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Mr T. McCabe
0052/1/001/O	Remove allocation for Land Reserved for Future Development. Site has poor access and

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	development would be visually intrusive, destroy mature woodland, result in loss of amenity (used by walkers and supports flora and fauna).
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Harry Kershaw
0053/1/001/O	Objects to allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development because of the extra traffic and noise development would create
Objection Joint Case	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Miss Marga Ward
0054/1/001/O	Should be Green Belt because it is unsuitable for building (drainage and access problems, habitat value and lack of facilities).
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Samantha Durr
0055/1/001/O	Objects to allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development due to site's value for recreation, woodland and wildlife habitat, and concern about drainage problems
Objection Joint Case	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Mr & Mrs R Coverdale
0057/1/001/O	Leave land use as it is. Development would mean loss of amenity/recreational area, woodland and wildlife habitat. It would also be visually obtrusive and unsuitable due to poor access, geologically unstable land, drainage problems.
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Anne Hughes
0058/1/001/O	Remove allocation for Land Reserved for Future Development as narrow, congested roads could not accommodate further development
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	A. Mattinson
0059/1/001/O	Remove allocation of Land Reserved for Future Development. Site is used for recreation, has mature woods and wildlife. Problems with development include

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

drainage, school unable to take increased numbers, lanes too narrow for heavy traffic.

Objection

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

Mr Barry Parkin

0060/1/001/O

Remove allocation as Land for Future Development and leave undeveloped. Site is wooded with mature trees, a well-used amenity and wildlife habitat. Problems for development due to poor access and drainage, unstable land.

Objection

Joint Case

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

Mr & Mrs R Howarth

0061/1/001/O

Allocate as Local Green Gap as it is a nature spot with trees and wildlife, including protected species

Objection

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

Mr J.C. Budding

0062/1/001/O

Allocate as Local Green Gap or Green Belt to protect from development which would destroy one of few remaining woods in Grasscroft. Well used for recreation. Wildlife value. Development would increase traffic and blight landscape.

Objection

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

Mr B. Byram

0063/1/001/O

Change designation to Green Belt to protect this woodland site which has value for amenity, habitat for flora and fauna, and as a recreation area

Objection

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

J.M. Jackson

0064/1/001/O

Include site in Green Belt for its value as woodland and wildlife habitat. Access for development would be inadequate via Lovers Lane and dangerous if onto Oldham Road.

Objection

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

Jill Beswick

0065/1/001/O

Allocate as Local Green Gap or Green Belt to protect local amenity, woodland area

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

and wildlife. Poor access to site and onto Oldham Road.

Objection

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

Bernard Keeley

0066/1/001/O

Objects to allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development due to loss of amenity, woodland area and wildlife habitat, and poor access. Protect land from future development.

Objection

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

Mr & Mrs A Mercer

0067/1/001/O

Allocate site as Local Green Gap/Nature Reserve. Woods are used by local walkers and dog walkers and are a nature reserve (Badger set). Development would increase traffic.

Objection

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

Pamela Hilton

0068/1/001/O

Objects to allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development. Site is one of the few mature woodlands in Oldham and the wildlife is irreplaceable. Other barren sites are available for development.

Objection

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

Jack Wild

0069/1/001/O

Objects to allocation of site as Land Reserved for Future Development. Has mature trees, wide range of flora and fauna. Development would mean loss of amenity, recreation area; be visually obtrusive on elevated site. Access and drainage problematic.

Objection

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

Mr & Mrs A Cook

0070/1/001/O

Keep site as public open space to protect wooded area

Objection

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

Mr E. Moss

0071/1/001/O

Delete allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development. Leave land undisturbed

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

for environmental reasons. Development would increase traffic in Summershades estate.

Objection

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

Leatherbarrow

0072/1/001/O

Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development and leave undeveloped. Site is wildlife habitat, with protected trees and well-used footpaths. Roads are too narrow for more traffic from development and land has drainage problems.

Objection

Joint Case

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

Mrs J. Farrar

0073/1/001/O

Remove allocation and protect land from any future development. Land geologically unstable, unsuitable for drainage. Loss of recreational area and varied wildlife habitats. Development would increase traffic and destroy peaceful residential area.

Objection

Joint Case

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

John Farrar

0074/1/001/O

Remove allocation and keep land in its present undeveloped state. Development would mean loss of only woodland in area, would degrade local landscape and create extra traffic unsuitable on narrow lanes in quiet residential area.

Objection

Joint Case

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

Mr & Mrs Hulme

0075/1/001/O

Object to development of area as it is well used for recreation, has mature woods and varied habitats for wildlife. Access is poor and the land geologically unstable and poorly drained. As site is elevated, development would be visually intrusive.

Objection

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

Mrs Joan E Thompson

0076/1/001/O

Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development on environmental grounds and because access is unsuitable

Objection

LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft

J. Lawton

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0077/1/001/O	Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development to protect this well-used open space and stop the encroachment of development on the countryside
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Mr&Mrs G Dickinson
0078/1/001/O	Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development. Protect this mature woodland, important for wildlife and recreation, from development which would be visually intrusive and unsuitable due to narrow lanes and unstable, poorly drained ground
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	A & P M Edwards
0079/1/001/O	Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development, as there are plenty of brownfield sites available for development. This is a well-used wooded area and wildlife habitat. Access would be difficult due to narrow, steep lanes
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Dr S. Keba
0081/1/001/O	Change allocation to Green Belt or Local Green Gap. Land has amenity and ecological value, and is unsuitable for development on access and geological grounds. As it is outside urban area, housing need is not properly justified.
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Dr A.W. Taylor
0083/1/001/O	Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development and leave undeveloped. Site is amenity area with woods and well used footpath. Lanes are narrow and steep making access difficult. More traffic would result in danger and noise.
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	C. & C. Nicholson
0084/1/001/O	Site should be conservation area with no development. It is well used amenity and rare copse supporting wildlife, contributes to unique aspect of Saddleworth. Concerned about poor access for development and impact on road safety.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Terence Farmer
0085/1/001/O	Allocate site as Local Green Gap. Unstable, poorly drained ground is unsuitable for building. Development would create road safety hazards and be visually intrusive. Mature woodland, used by residents, walkers and wildlife would be lost.
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Mr&Mrs DG Tyrrell
0086/1/001/O	Change allocation to Green Belt to stop development and to preserve mature woods and wildlife habitat. Access for development would be problematic due to narrow lanes.
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Mrs J. Byram
0087/1/001/O	Allocate area as Green Belt to protect the site for its wildlife, woodland and recreational value and because development would be visually intrusive
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Mr&Mrs A W Andrews
0088/1/001/O	Allocate as Green Gap to protect one of the last wooded areas in Grasscroft, to benefit whole community. Refers to wildlife, recreational use and protected trees.
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	D.N&T.P. Rigby
0089/1/001/O	Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development. The site has mature woods, is habitat for variety of wildlife, and valued for amenity and recreation. Access to development would be problematic and Oldham Road is already congested.
Objection	
Joint Case	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Mr Malcolm Gelder
0090/1/001/O	Objects to allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development. Site unsuitable due to problems with access, road safety, geology and drainage. Concern about loss of woods and residential amenity, and future merging of Grasscroft with Greenfield
Objection	
Joint Case	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Mr&Mrs H&E Hammond
0139/1/001/O Access to site unsuitable - should be from Oldham Road	
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0174/1/017/O Allocate as Local Green Gap. Suitable contaminated sites should be developed for housing before sites like this. Used for recreation/play. Contains public footpaths, mature trees, wildlife habitats. Poor access. Unstable ground.	
Objection	
Joint Case	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	David Chadderton
0177/1/002/O Change the designation to Local Green Gap because of the site's value for recreation, as woodland, wildlife habitat, for biodiversity, and its unsuitability for development due to unstable geology, poor access and traffic congestion	
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Mrs BJ Lund
0299/1/001/O Site should be allocated as Local Green Gap as it is used for recreation and play, has mature trees, and provides rich wildlife habitat. Land is unsuitable for development due to unstable ground and access problems.	
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	G Bentley
0585/1/001/O Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development due to recreational, woodland and wildlife value, and the land's unsuitability for development.	
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Alan Fletcher
0588/1/001/O Object to future development on this site unless direct access from Oldham Road were provided and a weight limit on local roads were imposed.	
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Dr&Mrs K S MacKenzie
0591/1/001/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap or Green Belt to protect recreational area, trees and wildlife and due to poor access (for development)
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	R & M E Patriarca
0592/1/001/O	Object to any development in this area, in particular as it would be prejudicial to the safety of highway users
Objection Joint Case	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	David R Pollitt
0593/1/001/O	Change allocation to Local Green Gap or Local Nature Reserve as site is wooded, with varied flora and wildlife, and is an "adventure" play area for children.
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	P E Schofield
0594/1/001/O	Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development on various grounds, including environmental protection and highway safety
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Brian R. Smith
0595/1/001/O	Reclassify the site to become part of the adjacent Green Belt to the north and east as this is the last natural wooded area in Grasscroft
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Mr&Mrs D S Wareing
0596/1/001/O	Change to an allocation that will fully protect the land against any future development, eg Local Green Gap, in order to protect flora and fauna on the site and retain a local amenity.
Objection Joint Case	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Peter Wood

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0597/1/001/O	Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development to halt overdevelopment and additional traffic, and prevent loss of mature woodland, amenity and recreation area. Land unstable and unsuitable for development.
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Brian Jowle
0598/1/001/O	Redesignate land as Green Belt as it is totally unsuitable for development and should be left in its natural state
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Mr Michael Hilton
0599/1/001/O	Change to an allocation that will protect the land and wildlife for all time
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Mr Adamson
0601/1/001/O	Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development and protect site for the diversity of its wildlife habitats and its recreational/amenity value. Development would increase traffic pollution and could cause flooding.
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	B & J Read
0603/1/001/O	Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development and preserve land as it is for its value as local green space and wildlife haven. Traffic problems in area: Summershades Lane is over-used and Oldham Road is accident black spot.
Objection Joint Case	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Saddleworth Conservation Action Group
0606/1/001/O	Reallocate as Local Green Gap in recognition of site's value as woodland and varied wildlife habitat
Objection Joint Case	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	B. P. Howarth
0805/1/001/O	Do not want to lose any more Green Belt area at the woods

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Mr&Mrs D Hancock
0817/1/001/O	Object to any possible building, due to loss of amenity and woodland and to site development problems (access and geologically unstable ground)
Objection Joint Case	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	Saddleworth Civic Trust
0828/1/008/O	Stongly opposed to LR designation. Presently a greenfield site. Its development can only contribute to further urbanisation of this part of the district.
Objection	
OE1.7 & OE1.8	
LR10 & LGG16 Ryefields Drive, Uppermill	Mr S. Howarth
	Agent : Chorlton Planning
0095/1/001/O	Allocate land at Ryefields Drive for housing as the northeast part is suitable & would widen the scope for residential development in Uppermill, where few sites are allocated. Site is accessible to village facilities and public transport.
Objection	
OE1.7 11.37	
	West Pennine Bridleways Association
0175/1/013/O	Requires clarification of the approach to Land Reserved for Future Development and when it might be released for development, to overcome apparent contradiction between paragraphs 11.37 and 2.13.
Objection Joint Case	
	CPRE - Lancashire
0263/1/002/O	Delete final sentence of para.11.37 as it appears to imply that sustainability and suitability for development may outweigh Green Belt purpose, and appears to undermine the justification for including allocations under this policy.
Objection Joint Case	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
OE1.7 11.38	
LR10 Ryefields Drive, Uppermill	Mr Frank Mallalieu
0043/1/001/O	Site should not be allocated as Land Reserved for Future Development as it is unfit for building. Site is wooded and a valuable nature area.
Objection	
OE1.8	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/056/O	Set out circumstances in which development might be permitted in Local Green Gaps, as the policy is too restrictive
Objection	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/057/O	Amend the policy on Landscape to introduce some flexibility in considering development proposals
Objection	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/006/O	The key should provide an explanation for policy allocations such as Local Green Gaps
Omission	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/021/O	Strong support, but should be cross-referenced to other open environment policies.
Objection	
	Dobcross Village Community
0105/1/006/S	Applaud extension of green belt, including local green gap areas
Support	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	Friezland Residents' Association
0106/1/005/S	Supports designation of any 'white land' that is a green field site to have Green Gap status (refers particularly to Oaklands Road (OL29))
Support	
	Lancashire Wildlife Trust
0124/1/007/S	No comment submitted
Support	
	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0174/1/008/S	Applaud the intention of the plan to safeguard the natural environment and preserve the separate identities and characters of the Saddleworth Villages in the face of continuing demand for building land.
Support Joint Case	
	Dr & Mrs G Read
0724/1/001/S	Pleased to find that the UDP proposes to give protection to their local area as it provides a resource for the local wildlife and is full of good trees.
Support	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/031/S	None given.
Support	
Former H22, Wall Hill	Dobcross Village Community
0105/1/005/O	Include unallocated land in Local Green Gap 15 as it is now valuable wildlife habitat. Creating access to the site from Wall Hill Road would also be detrimental to residents of existing housing and increase traffic hazard on steep, dangerous road.
Omission Joint Case	
Hull Mill, Delph	Mr G Bayley
0112/1/007/O	The Hull Mill site to the north east of LGG19, should become part of LGG19 (or the

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

Green Belt, see separate representation) as it is illogical to leave it unallocated.

Omission

Land at Malby Street, Oldham

Miss L Armstrong

0701/1/001/O

Add this land to the Local Green Gap (LGG8 Oldham Edge) as it provides only safe local area for children to play. (Houses do not have gardens and pavements are unsafe due to parked cars and traffic)

Omission

Land at Malby Street, Oldham

J & A Patterson

0702/1/001/O

Add the land to the Local Green Gap (LGG8 Oldham Edge)

Omission

Land at Malby Street, Oldham

Mr P Siddall

0799/1/001/O

Wish the land at Malby Street to be added to the Local Green Gap area of Oldham Edge (LGG8)

Omission

Land at Malby Street, Oldham

Ernest Fleming

0800/1/001/O

Wish the land at Malby St to be added to the Local Green Gap area of Oldham Edge to compensate for the lack of green in front of terraced houses in the area

Omission

Land at Malby Street, Oldham

Anne Marrington

0801/1/001/O

Wish the land at Malby Street to be added to the Local Green Gap area of Oldham Edge to fully protect it from future development. Would be retrograde to increase density in Oldham Centre which has crowded dwellings.

Omission

Land at Malby Street, Oldham

Cllr M Sharif

0803/1/001/O

Wish the land at Malby Street to be added to the Local Green Gap area of Oldham Edge (LGG8)

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Omission	
Land at Malby Street, Oldham	Mr & Mrs Kershaw
0804/1/001/O	Would like the land designated as Local Green Gap to prevent permission for building of any type.
Omission	
Land at Oldham Road/Delph New Road, Delph	Saddleworth Parish Council
	Agent : Eagland Planning Associates
0040/1/010/O	The land west of housing allocation H1.1.15 should be allocated as Local Green Gap (LGG17) or Green Belt. Illogical to leave this piece of land between the Green Belt and a housing allocation (and across from a Local Green Gap) unallocated.
Omission	
Joint Case	
Land Below Ladcastle Farm	Saddleworth Civic Trust
0828/1/006/O	Would like to see land btw canal & railway below Ladcastle Farm/Denlane Quarries designated as a local green gap - is of natural beauty, to preserve the character adjoining historic structures such as canal & railway viaduct.
Omission	
Land bet. LGG17 Stoneswood & H1.1.15 Bailey Mill	Mr G Bayley
0112/1/008/O	Small piece of land left between Bailey Mill and the boundary of the Green Belt/Conservation Area, should be added to LGG17 (or to Green Belt, see separate representation) as it is illogical to leave unallocated.
Omission	
Land between LGG18 and PEZ30, Delph	Mr G Bayley
0112/1/010/O	Land should become part of Local Green Gap 18 (or Green Belt, see separate representation) as it seems illogical to leave unallocated.
Omission	
Land in vicinity of Prospect Farm	Saddleworth Civic Trust
0828/1/014/O	Area under threat from small developments. Land from Coverhill Road to the Lydgate

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

conservation area should be designated as a local green gap if this will enhance the degree of protection.

Omission

Land west of Bailey Mill, Delph

Cllr C M Wheeler

0718/1/006/O

Allocate the land as Local Green Gap

Omission

LGG1 Royley Clough, Royton

Mr J Wood

Agent : Chorlton Planning

0031/1/003/O

Change allocation of land at Brookside Poultry Farm (site 3), which is part of LGG1, for housing development. Land is surrounded by existing housing and has good road links to Royton town centre.

Objection

LGG10 Shawside, Shaw (Moss Hey)

P & D Northern Steels Ltd

Agent : Chorlton Planning

0166/1/003/O

Reduce the size of LGG10 to accommodate the extension of LR2 and PEZ22 for Housing and Employment uses.

Objection

LGG11 Land at Greenacres, Lees

Mr K. Payne

Agent : Chorlton Planning

0116/1/001/O

Re-allocate land west of former Birch Hall Hotel site, or part of it, for housing, as an extension of current development on Birch Hall site. Creates potential for landscaping in Medlock Valley.

Objection

LGG12 Thornlee Brook

Saddleworth Civic Trust

0828/1/011/S

LGG designation welcomed.

Support

LGG13 Stonebreaks, Springhead

Norman Thompson

0027/1/001/O

Land adjacent to Springhead Cricket Club should be removed from Local Green Gap and allocated for housing, as recent development has taken place on either side, 2 cul de sacs could be removed and club would not be affected

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
LGG13 Stonebreaks, Springhead	Saddleworth Parish Council Agent : Eagland Planning Associates
0040/1/013/O	Extend the Local Green Gap to include the disused Springhead Quarry and land to the east of the new development at Old Croft, as the land would be unsuitable for most types of development and best kept as a wilded area
Omission Joint Case	
LGG13 Stonebreaks, Springhead	L. Perrins Agent : Chorlton Planning
0115/1/001/O	Exclude southern edge of Local Green Gap allocation to allow access to a residential site off Radcliffe Street (proposed in a separate representation).
Objection	
LGG13 Stonebreaks, Springhead	L. Perrins Agent : Chorlton Planning
0115/1/002/O	Re-allocate land at Radcliffe Street, part of Local Green Gap, for housing as there are few sites in this part of the Borough. Site is close to facilities in Grotton and frequent bus route. Development would be designed to minimise visual effect.
Objection	
LGG13 Stonebreaks, Springhead	Saddleworth Civic Trust
0828/1/012/S	LGG designation welcomed.
Support	
LGG15 Wall Hill, Dobcross	Saddleworth Parish Council Agent : Eagland Planning Associates
0040/1/009/O	The allocation should extend (eastward) to the boundary of the Dobcross conservation area so as to complete a buffer between the conservation area and any future developments.
Omission Joint Case	
LGG15 Wall Hill, Dobcross	Elizabeth Stott
0092/1/001/S	Supports LGG15 allocation

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Support	
LGG15 Wall Hill, Dobcross	Dobcross Village Community
0105/1/003/O	Welcome designation of this former housing site, and would like to see it extended.
Objection	
LGG15 Wall Hill, Dobcross	Carl Woodhead
0707/1/001/S	Land is currently used as pasture, by walkers and carries a wealth of wildlife. Allocating the area as green gap will ensure that this continues.
Support	
LGG15 Wall Hill, Dobcross	Mr D. Hoare
0719/1/001/S	Important to maintain areas free of development
Support	
LGG15 Wall Hill, Dobcross	Mr&Mrs G. Bamforth
0722/1/001/S	All Green Belt in area should be maintained at all costs. (NB. area in question is not Green Belt)
Support	
LGG15 Wall Hill, Dobcross	N J Halliley
0734/1/001/O	Supports continued use as agricultural land, providing fodder and pasture for horses and a riding school. Suggests consideration for full Green Belt designation.
Objection	
LGG15 Wall Hill, Dobcross	Mr D.C. Marshall
0738/1/001/S	Supports designation as Local Green Gap
Support Joint Case	
LGG15 Wall Hill, Dobcross	D.& E. Ford
0741/1/001/S	Maintain and preserve the green belt with open space and wild life habitat

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Support	
LGG15 Wall Hill, Dobcross	Miss D. Fennell
0742/1/001/S	No comment submitted
Support	
LGG15 Wall Hill, Dobcross	Mr & Mrs G Deakin
0743/1/001/S	Object to any building on site - would devalue property, remove view and privacy, increase noise and traffic
Support	
LGG15 Wall Hill, Dobcross	T.E.& E.C. Arran
0744/1/001/S	No comment submitted
Support	
LGG15 Wall Hill, Dobcross	N & M Bocking
0745/1/001/S	Overdevelopment
Support	
LGG15 Wall Hill, Dobcross	T.J. Hinchcliffe
0806/1/001/S	Would be opposed to any extension to Wall Hill Road in Dobcross.
Support Joint Case	
LGG15 Wall Hill, Dobcross	Saddleworth Civic Trust
0828/1/004/S	LGG designation is welcomed.
Support	
LGG17 Land behind 29-33 Oldham Rd, Delph	Mr P. Buckley
0153/1/001/O	Allocate land west of Bailey Mill, Oldham Rd, Delph as Green Belt or Green Gap in

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

order to link it with LGG17, as land is rural and supports varied wildlife.

Omission
Joint Case

LGG17 Stoneswood, Delph

Mr B.H. Tomlinson
Agent : Chorlton Planning

0039/1/001/O

Allocate part of the land at Stoneswood Farm in the proposed Local Green Gap as housing. Site is unattractive and of questionable agricultural viability. Existing development around site, and village services and public transport nearby.

Objection

LGG17 Stoneswood, Delph

Mr&Mrs M. Bowker

0157/1/001/O

Allocate site as Green Belt as it serves the purposes of Green Belt and should be given the same protection. Population not increasing. Further housing not needed in area. Existing traffic/parking problems. Impact on character and infrastructure.

Objection
Joint Case

LGG17 Stoneswood, Delph

Mr M. Buckley

0164/1/001/O

Area rear of 29-33 Oldham Road should be allocated as Green Gap or Green Belt to protect wildlife habitat - supports wide range of birds and wildlife.

Omission
Joint Case

LGG17 Stoneswood, Delph

Joanne Clague

0627/1/004/S

Preserve site as 'Green'

Support
Joint Case

LGG17 Stoneswood, Delph

Alun Morgan

0630/1/002/S

Preserve site as 'Green'

Support
Joint Case

LGG17 Stoneswood, Delph

Mr O. Morgan-Clague

0689/1/004/S

Preserve as 'Green'

Support

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Joint Case	
LGG17 Stoneswood, Delph	Karen Mather
0714/1/001/O	Change allocation from Local Green Gap to Green Belt.
Objection Joint Case	
LGG17 Stoneswood, Delph	Mr M. Kenny
0716/1/001/O	Change allocation from Local Green Gap to Green Belt
Objection Joint Case	
LGG17 Stoneswood, Delph	Martin Capper
0748/1/001/O	Change from Local Green Gap to Green Belt as population is not increasing, no housing is needed in the area and development would have negative impacts on traffic, road safety, and local character and services
Objection Joint Case	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/021/S	Support designation as Local Green Gap
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	John Saxon Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning
0099/1/001/O	Allocate lower part of site for housing or mixed development as an extension to adjacent mixed use allocation (Lumb Mill), which would have little impact on amenity or open space. Northern part could be left open and landscaped.
Objection	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Janet Bottomley
0130/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support Joint Case	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mr&Mrs M. Bowker

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0157/1/002/O	Allocate site as Green Belt as it serves the purposes of Green Belt and should be given the same protection. Population not increasing. Further housing not needed in area. Existing traffic/parking problems. Impact on character and infrastructure.
Objection Joint Case	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mrs V Ward
0473/1/001/O	The Local Green Gap allocation should be removed from this site and replaced with an allocation for housing, as it does not meet any of the LGG criteria
Objection Joint Case	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Andrew Clark
0527/1/001/O	Change designation to Green Belt as the site should not be "greenfield"
Objection	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Joanne Clague
0627/1/003/S	Preserve site as 'Green'
Support Joint Case	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Alun Morgan
0630/1/004/S	Preserve as 'Green'
Support Joint Case	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Nathan Berry
0631/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Charmaine Berry
0633/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	W Berry

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0634/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Sarah Gaskell
0635/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Jennifer Clark
0636/1/003/O	This site must remain as a green buffer zone, although preferably as Green Belt.
Objection	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mrs A.R. Webster
0637/1/002/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Peter Webster
0639/1/002/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Dr. M.J. Schwarz
0640/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mr. R. Hitchcock
0641/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Ms G Malone
0669/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	R Walker
0671/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	R and A Parker
0672/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Adam Smart
0674/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mrs. L. Smart
0675/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mr. B.L. Smart
0676/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mr Eric Wild
0677/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mr P. Whitworth
0678/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
Joint Case	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mr C.J. Dockray
0679/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mrs E. Dockray
0680/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	P. Harrison
0681/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mrs P. Hurst
0682/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mr W. Hurst
0683/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	R Rumacre
0685/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mr R. Randerson
0686/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	J. Young

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0687/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mrs P. Waterhouse
0688/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mr O. Morgan-Clague
0689/1/003/S	Preserve site as 'Green'
Support Joint Case	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mr P. Whitehead
0693/1/002/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mr Anthony Fisher
0694/1/002/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Allison Beaver
0696/1/002/S	Supports area being retained as green buffer/meadow land and protected from development
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mr & Mrs H Moore
0699/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mrs S. Whitworth
0700/1/003/S	This green buffer zone is welcomed.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Karen Mather
0714/1/002/O	Change allocation from Local Green Gap to Green Belt.
Objection Joint Case	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Mr M. Kenny
0716/1/002/O	Change allocation from Local Green Gap to Green Belt
Objection Joint Case	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Cllr C M Wheeler
0718/1/002/S	Welcome this green gap
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Joyce Castle
0721/1/001/O	Supports protection of site from development, but land should be green belt. Distinction between Local Green Gap and Land Reserved for Future Development should also be clarified.
Objection	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Martin Capper
0748/1/002/O	Change from Local Green Gap to Green Belt as population is not increasing, no housing is needed in the area and development would have negative impacts on traffic, road safety, and local character and services
Objection Joint Case	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Kieran Berry
0758/1/002/S	Green buffer zone welcomed.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Saddleworth Civic Trust

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0828/1/003/S	Strongly supports LGG designation - important greenfield site forming a bridge between two conservation areas & should be protected from development.
Support	
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph (?)	Stella Hardy
0697/1/002/S	Supports Local Green Gap
Support Joint Case	
LGG19 Ainley Wood, Delph	Saddleworth Parish Council Agent : Eagland Planning Associates
0040/1/011/O	Extend the Local Green Gap into the unallocated land in the northeastern sector of the Village to link up with the Green Belt. There is no logic for retaining a small unallocated area between the two.
Omission Joint Case	
LGG19 Ainley Wood, Delph	Kirstail Properties Agent : Chorlton Planning
0097/1/001/O	Allocate part of site for housing (land at Ammons Way) and leave remainder as Local Green Gap. Would provide additional residential choice in area, close to existing housing. Set into slope, dwellings would have little effect on amenity or landscape
Objection	
LGG19 Ainley Wood, Delph	Mr&Mrs M. Bowker
0157/1/003/O	Allocate as Green Belt as it serves the purposes of Green Belt and would match designation of other side of valley. Population not increasing. More housing not needed in area. Existing traffic/parking problems. Impact on character and infrastructure.
Objection Joint Case	
LGG19 Ainley Wood, Delph	Karen Mather
0714/1/003/O	Change allocation from Local Green Gap to Green Belt to fit designation of other side of valley and protect the whole from development, with its impacts on traffic, road safety, local character and services.
Objection Joint Case	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LGG19 Ainley Wood, Delph	Mr M. Kenny
0716/1/003/O	Change allocation from Local Green Gap to Green Belt
Objection Joint Case	
LGG19 Ainley Wood, Delph	Martin Capper
0748/1/003/O	Change allocation from Local Green Gap to Green Belt to fit designation of other side of valley and protect the whole from development, with its impacts on traffic, road safety, local character and services
Objection Joint Case	
LGG19 Ainley Wood, Delph	Saddleworth Civic Trust
0828/1/002/O	Supports LGG designation but would like to see it extended to Hull Mill Lane for historic integrity.
Objection	
LGG2 Land off Ferney Field Road, Chadderton	Holroy Developments
	Agent : Hall Needham Associates
0126/1/001/O	Change allocation of land to residential as it is adjacent to existing housing on the north eastern side, it has access to Middleton Road, and does not provide functions suggested in the policy including recreation and open space.
Omission Joint Case	
LGG20 Land south of Oaklands Road, Grasscroft	Mr W.A. Fleming
	Agent : Macdonald & Son
0051/1/001/O	Allocate western half of site for housing or land reserved for future development, rest Local Green Gap. Less visually obtrusive than H1.2.12 (Shaw Hall Bank Rd) or LR9 (Summershades Lane) allocated in plan.
Objection	
LGG20 Land south of Oaklands Road, Grasscroft	Friezland Residents' Association
0106/1/003/S	Fully support this policy, particularly as development at Oaklands Road would create an ugly scar on any cross-valley views.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

Support

LGG20 Land south of Oaklands Road,
Grasscroft

Jeff Garner

0730/1/002/S

Supports the Local Green Gap policy, particularly designation of LGG20 due to the adverse effect any development of the site would have on cross-valley views

Support

LGG3 Land at Foxdenton Lane,
Chadderton

Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Ltd

0041/1/001/O

Site should be allocated for housing/mixed use, or at least Land Reserved for Future Development as its visual quality is no different to adjacent land which is allocated as Land Reserved for Future Development.

Objection

LGG6 Moston Brook, Failsworth

BAE Systems Properties Ltd
Agent : Fuller Peiser

0236/1/005/O

Remove allocation of area surrounding the Lancaster Sports and Social Club site as a Local Green Gap as the allocation does not reflect the landowner's future aspirations for the site.

Objection

LGG8 Oldham Edge

The Blue Coat School

0779/1/001/O

Land adjacent to The Blue Coat School should be removed from the proposed Local Green Gap and allocated as Recreational Open Space to allow sports hall to be built

Objection

LGG8 Oldham Edge, Oldham

Lattice Property

0032/1/004/O

Exclude land owned by Lattice Property at Higginshaw Lane from Local Green Gap to maximise amount of brownfield site that can be brought forward for development. Would not affect integrity and purpose of LGG.

Objection

Joint Case

LGG9 Bullcote Lane, Royton

Messrs Halliwell & Douglas
Agent : Chorlton Planning

0169/1/001/O

Allocate northern and eastern parts of site for in-fill housing development. It would

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section**Name**

extend the location, range and mix of housing in the Borough. Remaining land in same ownership could be developed as leisure/open space in line with LGG policy.

Objection

Lydgate tunnel/land adj. to Oaklands estate

Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn

0174/1/016/O

Extend LGG20 to include whole of the cutting at the mouth of Grasscroft end of Tunnel and the section 106 land which formed part of Oaklands Park. Wildlife and floral value identified by GMEU. Would link to Greenfield Station corridor.

Objection

Joint Case

Lydgate Tunnel/land adj. to Oaklands estate

David Chadderton

0177/1/003/O

Extend the Local Green Gap (LGG20) to include the whole of the disused railway cutting at the Grasscroft end of Lydgate Tunnel and the section 106 land (public open space) which formed part of Oaklands estate. Land is a wildlife corridor.

Omission

Lydgate Tunnel/land adj. to Oaklands estate

David O Haines

0776/1/001/O

Extend Local Green Gap 20 to include the whole of the cutting at the Grasscroft end of Lydgate Tunnel and the public open space in Oaklands Park Estate. Would complete Delph Donkey recreation route, the wildlife corridor and include protected trees.

Omission

Lydgate Tunnel/land adj. to Oaklands Estate

G Winterbottom

0827/1/001/O

Complete green corridor by extending Local Green Gap 20 to include the disused railway cutting at the Grasscroft end of Lydgate Tunnel and the public open space that is part of Oaklands estate. Land has protected trees and range of wildlife.

Omission

Springhead Quarry/Land off Cooper St, Springhead

Mr G.F. Wood

Agent : Simpsons

0049/1/001/O

Site should be allocated for housing development. In line with PPG3. Would bring derelict land into economic use and eliminate public danger and eyesore.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection Joint Case	
OE1.9	Countryside Agency
0008/1/005/O	Amend policy to reflect revised PPG7 and Countryside Agency policy, as it is too constrained by criteria which could stifle rural diversification in practice.
Objection	
	P. Wilson & Company
0023/1/002/O	Delete g. in policy on farm diversification as wording is too vague and subjective
Objection	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/022/O	Welcomes cross-referencing, however this should be located in the main policy text.
Objection	
	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0174/1/009/S	Applaud the intention of the plan to safeguard the natural environment and preserve the separate identities and characters of the Saddleworth Villages in the face of continuing demand for building land.
Support Joint Case	
	CPRE - Lancashire
0263/1/012/S	Supports the policy
Support	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/032/S	None given.
Support	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
OE1.9 11.46-11.49	W A Tomlinson
0691/1/002/O	More relaxed approach to diversification needed - limited market for small scale horse based enterprises or organic farming. Farmland could eventually become visually and economically unsatisfactory if farming cannot be sustained.
Objection Joint Case	
OE1.9 11.47	North West Tourist Board Agent : Paul Butler Associates
0117/1/004/O	Justification for OE1.9 should promote schemes such as campsites, farm holidays, rural holiday lets and farm shops as a means of rural diversification, to attract visitors and complement tourist facilities.
Objection	
OE2	Countryside Agency
0008/1/004/S	Supports OE2 and related Part 2 policies which seek to conserve and enhance the landscape character quality and environment of the Borough.
Support	
	Peak District National Park
0036/1/005/O	UDP should refer to the strategic importance of the Peak District National Park, as in the adopted UDP. Should include policy reference to the need to protect the park from harmful developments.
Omission	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/023/S	Strong support.
Support	
	English Nature
0149/1/015/S	Strongly supports policy as it attaches significant value to protecting and enhancing

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	biodiversity, features of geological interest, green corridors and tree cover, when considering development proposals
Support	
	Oak Street Area Community Group
0152/1/009/S	Supports the protection of wildlife species and of the environments that sustain them.
Support	
	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0174/1/011/S	Applaud the intention of the plan to safeguard the natural environment and preserve the separate identities and characters of the Saddleworth Villages in the face of continuing demand for building land.
Support Joint Case	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/033/S	None given.
Support	
OE2.1	
	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0174/1/012/S	Applaud the intention of the plan to safeguard the natural environment and preserve the separate identities and characters of the Saddleworth Villages in the face of continuing demand for building land.
Support Joint Case	
	CPRE - Lancashire
0263/1/013/S	Supports policy, the intention to prepare appropriate SPG and the support for Village Design Statements
Support	
	Denshaw Community Association
0543/1/003/S	Supports policy to protect local distinctiveness of landscape and the adoption of

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Support	village design statements as Supplementary Planning Guidance
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/034/S	None given.
Support	
OE2.2	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/024/O	The Unit supports this policy. However some amendments or a new policy may be required to meet the requirements of Regulation 37 on the Conservation (Natural Habitats etc..) Regulations.
Objection	
0046/1/002/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Broadhurst Engineering (UK) Ltd Agent : Robert Turley Associates</p> The policy should be deleted in the absence of any clear justification and because it overlaps with other policies protecting land with recreation or wildlife value
Objection	
0149/1/016/S	<p style="text-align: center;">English Nature</p> Welcomes the positive approach in the policy to protecting and enhancing the green link network and their identification on the Proposals Map
Support	
0174/1/013/S	<p style="text-align: center;">Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn</p> Applaud the intention of the plan to safeguard the natural environment and preserve the separate identities and characters of the Saddleworth Villages in the face of continuing demand for building land.
Support Joint Case	
0175/1/018/S	<p style="text-align: center;">West Pennine Bridleways Association</p> Support the designation of Green Corridors which have become valuable resources

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Support	
0179/1/002/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Commhoist Ltd Agent : Robert Turley Associates</p> <p>Policy should be deleted due to lack of clear criteria to justify its inclusion. Also overlaps with other policies.</p>
Objection	
0263/1/014/S	<p style="text-align: center;">CPRE - Lancashire</p> <p>Support principle of green corridors. Have some reservations about approach in para.11.66 - could create element of uncertainty, but do not consider this justifies an objection</p>
Support	
0617/1/003/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Medlock Limited Agent : Robert Turley Associates</p> <p>The policy should be deleted in the absence of any clear justification and because it overlaps with other policies protecting land with recreation or wildlife value</p>
Objection Joint Case	
0711/1/002/O	<p style="text-align: center;">U-Aerials & Communications Ltd Agent : Robert Turley Associates</p> <p>The policy should be deleted in the absence of any clear justification and because it overlaps with other policies protecting land with recreation or wildlife value</p>
Objection Joint Case	
0712/1/002/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Medlock Communications Ltd Agent : Robert Turley Associates</p> <p>The policy should be deleted in the absence of any clear justification and because it overlaps with other policies protecting land with recreation or wildlife value</p>
Objection Joint Case	
0713/1/002/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Medlock Construction Agent : Robert Turley Associates</p> <p>The policy should be deleted in the absence of any clear justification and because it overlaps with other policies protecting land with recreation or wildlife value</p>

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection Joint Case	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/035/S	None given.
Support	
Adjacent Royton Waste Water Treatment Works	United Utilities Properties Ltd
	Agent : Initiatives Architects Ltd
0024/1/001/O	Object to allocation as Green Corridor and Link. Site previously granted permission for 4 houses. Allocation would contradict this permission and prevent development of land. Not in recognised river valley and includes Birchinlee Mill.
Objection	
Disused railway line, Grasscroft	Saddleworth Parish Council
	Agent : Eagland Planning Associates
0040/1/012/O	Designate the old railway line from the Lydgate Tunnel exit into Grasscroft Cutting as Green Corridor to accord with the designation of the line through Springhead
Omission Joint Case	
Land adjacent to The Blue Coat School, Oldham	The Blue Coat School
0779/1/002/O	Land adjacent to The Blue Coat School should be removed from the Green Corridor at Oldham Edge and re-allocated to Recreational Open Space to allow sports hall to be built
Objection	
Land at Birchinlee Mill, Royton	Broadhurst Engineering (UK) Ltd
	Agent : Robert Turley Associates
0046/1/001/O	Green Corridor and Link allocation should be deleted. Land is of no particular recreational or wildlife interest. Previous plan - Inspector recommended similar designation be deleted.
Objection	
Land at Birchinlee Mill, Royton	Commhoist Ltd
	Agent : Robert Turley Associates
0179/1/001/O	Objects to designation of site as Green Corridor and Link - no particular recreational or

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
wildlife interest	
Objection	
Land at Birchinlee Mill, Royton	Medlock Limited Agent : Robert Turley Associates
0617/1/002/O	Objects to designation of site as Green Corridor and Link - no particular recreational or wildlife interest
Objection	
Joint Case	
Land at Birchinlee Mill, Royton	U-Aerials & Communications Ltd Agent : Robert Turley Associates
0711/1/001/O	Objects to designation of site as Green Corridor and Link - no particular recreational or wildlife interest
Objection	
Joint Case	
Land at Birchinlee Mill, Royton	Medlock Communications Ltd Agent : Robert Turley Associates
0712/1/001/O	Objects to designation of site as Green Corridor and Link - no particular recreational or wildlife interest
Objection	
Joint Case	
Land at Birchinlee Mill, Royton	Medlock Construction Agent : Robert Turley Associates
0713/1/001/O	Objects to designation of site as Green Corridor and Link - no particular recreational or wildlife interest
Objection	
Joint Case	
Land at Higginshaw Lane	Lattice Property
0032/1/001/O	Amend the boundary of the Green Corridor to exclude the land owned by Lattice Property. Would have no significant effect on integrity and purpose of Green Corridor and would maximise amount of brownfield site available for development.
Objection	
Joint Case	
Land at Huddersfield Road, Diggle (B1.1.28)	Mr Andy Friedrich
0127/1/001/O	Would like to see the 'green corridor' extended from Diggle brook along north boundary

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	and the Huddersfield Road boundary, thereby creating a buffer zone for the residential properties.
Omission	
Land at John Street, Lees	Phyllis Lord & John K Shaw Agent : P A Dust Chartered Architect
0708/1/001/O	Site, which is part of a Green Corridor, should be allocated as a housing site
Objection	
OE2.3	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/005/O	Boundaries of SSSIs, SBIs, the SPA and candidate SAC should be shown on the map and the key provide an explanation for these terms. Wrongly placed labels should be corrected.
Omission	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/025/O	Strong support, however the policy does not refer to the special scrutiny that proposals that European/proposed European sites are subject to. Some inaccuracies in the list of SBIs.
Objection	
	English Nature
0149/1/017/O	The habitat protection policy should be split into three to differentiate between the levels of protection for sites of international, national and local nature conservation designation
Objection	
	English Nature
0149/1/018/O	Add a paragraph to raise the profile of the Rochdale Canal cSAC and the protection afforded to it in law and policy
Omission	
	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0174/1/014/S	Applaud the intention of the plan to safeguard the natural environment and preserve the separate identities and characters of the Saddleworth Villages in the face of continuing demand for building land.
Support Joint Case	RSPB
0735/1/001/S	Excellent use of wording for Habitat Protection, which includes SPA's, SAC's, SSSI's and other sites of local importance
Support	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/036/S	None given.
Support	Denshaw Community Association
Crompton Moor	
0543/1/004/S	Supports designation of Crompton Moor as a Local Nature Reserve as part of policy OE2.3
Support	Thornham Area Neighbourhood Council
Oozewood Clough	
0091/1/001/O	Oozewood Clough should be labelled as an SBI
Omission	
Shawside SBI	P & D Northern Steels Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning
0166/1/004/O	Add wording within OE2.3 to require definition of SBI boundaries and agreement of maintenance regimes in advance of development proposals, so that company/land owner can plan its operations and expansion with confidence.
Omission	
Shawside SBI	P & D Northern Steels Ltd Agent : Chorlton Planning
0166/1/005/O	Delete SBI symbol from Proposals Map unless, or until such time, as the geographical area of the SBI is defined. SBI designation constrains the operations and any

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	expansion plans of company that owns the site.
Objection	
OE2.3 11.76	
Ladcastle and Den Quarries, Uppermill	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/022/S	Support inclusion of Ladcastle and Den Quarries, Uppermill, as Sites of Special Scientific Interest
Support	
OE2.4	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/026/O	General support. However the policy should be reworded to allow consideration of the impact of proposed development on European protected species and species listed in the Oldham Biodiversity Action Plan to take place.
Objection	
	Lancashire Wildlife Trust
0124/1/001/O	Policy should include reference to rare species as well as protected species.
Objection	
	English Nature
0149/1/020/O	The justification should include the requirement of surveys and mitigation to be carried out on site prior to grant of planning permission under the licensing procedure for European Protected Species (in Oldham, floating water plantain and bats)
Objection	
	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0174/1/015/S	Applaud the intention of the plan to safeguard the natural environment and preserve the separate identities and characters of the Saddleworth Villages in the face of continuing demand for building land.
Support Joint Case	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/037/S	None given.
Support	
OE2.4 11.81-11.88	
	Ruth Clamp
0727/1/001/S	Supports policy for the protection and extension of all our flora and fauna. Green Corridors and Green Gaps will help to further this policy.
Support	
	Alan Clamp
0728/1/001/S	Supports policy in protecting, encouraging and extending the diversity of living things within the Borough. Green Corridors and Green Gaps will assist in this policy
Support	
OE2.4 11.86	
	Peak District National Park
0036/1/004/S	The need to complement the Biodiversity Action Plan prepared for the Peak District National Park is gratefully acknowledged
Support	
R1	
	Countryside Agency
0008/1/022/S	Welcome policy R1 and its part 2 policies which protect and enhance existing recreational facilities and improve the Rights of Way network in the Borough.
Support	
	Lancashire Wildlife Trust
0124/1/008/S	No comments submitted
Support	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	West Pennine Bridleways Association
0175/1/003/S	Strongly support policy R1
Support	
	Sport England
0495/1/004/O	Policy does not refer to the term "sport"
Objection	
Lancaster Sports and Social Club, Chadderton	BAE Systems Properties Ltd
	Agent : Fuller Peiser
0236/1/003/O	Object to the allocation of the site as Recreational Open Space (policy R1) Want the site allocated for Housing and Business and Industry, or Mixed Development, to reflect the owners future aspirations for the site.
Objection	
Land at Huddersfield Road, Denshaw	John Saxon Ltd
	Agent : Chorlton Planning
0099/1/003/O	Change designation of part of Recreational Open Space to housing, and allocate adjacent land for housing. Development would help cross-subsidise the cost of recreational facilities and additional residents would help support village services.
Objection	
Land at Malby Street, Oldham	J & A Patterson
0702/1/002/O	Designate the land as Recreational Open Space
Omission	
Land at Malby Street, Oldham	Mr P Siddall
0799/1/002/O	Include the land in the Recreational Open Space at Oldham Edge
Omission	
Land at Malby Street, Oldham	Ernest Fleming
0800/1/002/O	Include land in Recreational Open Space at Oldham Edge to compensate for the lack of

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	green in front of terraced houses in the area
Omission	
Land at Malby Street, Oldham	Anne Marrington
0801/1/002/O	Include land in Recreational Open Space at Oldham Edge
Omission	
Land at Malby Street, Oldham	Cllr M Sharif
0803/1/002/O	Include the land in the proposed Recreational Open Space at Oldham Edge
Omission	
R1 10.13	West Pennine Bridleways Association
0175/1/004/S	Welcome commitment to protect Playing Fields from development
Support	
R1 10.9	Sport England
0495/1/011/O	Para. should be deleted or significantly amended to include reference to the undertaking of a local assessment of sport, recreation facilities and open space.
Objection	
Oak Street Area	Oak Street Area Community Group
0152/1/002/O	Space should be found within area for 2.4 hectares open/recreational space per 1000 population, as this is virtually non existent.
Omission	
R1.1	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/033/O	Inclusion of ponds supported, but unclear as to why they have been highlighted above

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	other habitats. Could include woodlands given their sparsity in Oldham. Does the term "ponds" cover mill lodges? Support for recreation routes & their wildlife value
0113/1/009/O	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership Delete part B of policy R1.1 or provide a much clearer definition of amenity open space, formal gardens and landscaped areas.
Objection	Lancashire Wildlife Trust
0124/1/009/S	No comments submitted
Support	CPRE - Lancashire
0263/1/011/S	Supports policy , particularly pleased to note inclusion of ponds
Support	The Clayton Action Group
0266/1/003/O	Where areas are already deficient in open space, commuted sums should be refused in preference to alternate land.
Objection Joint Case	N.H. Wright
0406/1/002/O	Mark the 'Crompton Way' as a recreational route on the plan.
Omission Joint Case	Ramblers' Association, Oldham Group
0484/1/002/O	Add the Crompton Circuit to the proposals map and para. 10.15
Omission	Sport England

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0495/1/005/O	Policy could lead to alternative facilities not being replaced. Policy does not give protection to other recreational facilities such as tennis courts, bowling greens etc.
Objection	
Area between Travis St., Oak St. and Crossley St.	Oak Street Area Community Group
0152/1/003/O	Site should be allocated as a 'pocket park' or 'recreational open space' to prevent future development.
Omission	
Bowling Club off Oakview Road, Greenfield	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0174/1/020/O	Designate as recreational land. Land was previously occupied by a bowling club - still has a pavilion on it. It has no designation. Shortage of recreational land in the Greenfield area and unsuitable for housing.
Omission Joint Case	
Clayton Playing Fields, Chadderton	Thornham Area Neighbourhood Council
0091/1/003/O	Site should be notated on Proposals Map as a Town Green rather than Recreational Open Space
Objection	
Clayton Playing Fields, Chadderton	The Clayton Action Group
0266/1/002/O	Include the missing strip of land at the rear of Boundary Park Road, which is part of Clayton Playing Fields, on the Proposals Map. Give the entire site a new designation, 'Town Green', for additional protection.
Omission Joint Case	
Clayton Playing Fields, Chadderton	Ramblers' Association, Oldham Group
0484/1/003/O	Support allocation of Clayton Playing Fields, including lacrosse pitch (former OL10) as Recreational Open Space. However, add missing strip at rear of Boundary Park Road to site on Proposals Map.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Joint Case	
Hanging Chadder, Royton	Thornham Area Neighbourhood Council
0091/1/002/O	Should be special notation on Proposals Map to identify sand-pit & former football ground as Village Green
Omission	
Land at Broadway north of Fire Station	Oldham Labour Group
0181/1/003/O	ROS designation should be varied to allow Police Station development to proceed
Objection	
Land between Milnrow Road and Oak Street	Oak Street Area Community Group
0152/1/004/O	This derelict land should be allocated as Recreational Open Space as there is a lack of provision in the area
Omission	
Oldham Way, adjacent Brushes Clough, Crompton Moor	Ramblers' Association, Oldham Group
0484/1/001/O	Check the route of RR3, the Oldham Way.
Objection	
Joint Case	
Saddleworth Cricket and Bowling Club, Calf Lane	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0174/1/019/O	To designate this site as recreational land within the Green Belt, bearing in mind its historical use and local support. It has just had a new pavilion built.
Objection	
Joint Case	
Tandle Hill Park	Thornham Area Neighbourhood Council
0091/1/004/O	Should include paragraph that states Council will ensure the continuous use and availability of footpaths classified as 'Public Footpaths', specifically those marked on the Proposals Map around Tandle Hill Park
Omission	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Town and Village Greens	The Clayton Action Group
0266/1/004/O	Add a designation for all town and village greens, including Clayton, Hanging Chadder, Greenacres, and show them on the Proposals Map
Omission Joint Case	
Wibsey Playing Fields	Saddleworth Civic Trust
0828/1/016/S	Designation as recreational land welcomed.
Support	
R1.1 10.13	
	Sport England
0495/1/006/O	The inclusion of para 10.13, specifically the second sentence, could if allowed to go unchecked, lead to the incremental loss of playing fields.
Objection	
R1.1 10.15	
	West Pennine Bridleways Association
0175/1/006/O	Strategic routes currently specified as cycleways should be for multi-use and recognised as Recreation Routes rather than cycleways
Omission Joint Case	
	Peter Jones
0581/1/001/O	Part of the Oldham Way route is incorrectly shown on the Proposals Map. Also the Crompton Circuit is not shown.
Omission	
R1.1 c.	
Luzley Brook allotments, Royton	Mr G. Lindsay
0570/1/002/O	Indicate allotments on the Proposals Map, specifically the Luzley Brook allotments, and distinguish them from recreation ground

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
R1.2	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/008/S	Support the improvement particularly of a) Huddersfield Narrow Canal
Support	
	Lancashire Wildlife Trust
0124/1/010/S	No comments submitted
Support	
	West Pennine Bridleways Association
0175/1/005/O	Needs of horse-riders should be taken into account when certain parks are improved (refers specifically to Waterhead Park)
Omission Joint Case	
Crompton Circuit	Shaw & Crompton Parish Council
0042/1/002/O	Crompton Circuit should be identified as Recreation Route on Proposals Map
Omission	
R2	Oldham and District Model Aero Club
0461/1/001/O	Object to the omission of any facilities for radio controlled model aircraft flying. Want the use of open spaces around Oldham maximised by making Green Belt available to all to use.
Omission	
	Sport England
0495/1/007/O	The title of this policy solely refers to provision of new areas of open space. The actual policy also refers to other recreational facilities.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road, Greenfield	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/029/O	Knoll Mill site should be converted to recreational open space for use by the whole of Saddleworth and by visitors, and not allocated for Mixed Use.
Omission	
R2 10.19	
	Sport England
0495/1/008/O	Para. fails to acknowledge the term "sport".
Objection	
R2.1	
	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/009/S	Support the proposal for the development of Sam Road, Diggle as Open Space
Support	
	Oldham Labour Group
0181/1/002/O	Designate more potential recreational sites, particularly in more densely populated parts of the Borough
Omission	
	Mrs C. Hollern
0467/1/001/O	Object to the omission of any green spaces in Hollinwood. Also want trees and grassed areas.
Objection	
R2.2	
	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/010/O	Support the ethos to have open space on housing developments but hope this will not just be used to extract money from developers, where there is no open space provided

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	or with no visible evidence of other provision.
Objection	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/022/O	Open space provision/commuted sum should only be required where existing provision is insufficient to meet the needs of residents of the new development.
Objection	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/023/O	Policy should take account of the fact that housing for elderly people will not generate the same need for open space
Objection	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/032/O	Open space provision (or a commuted sum) should only be required where existing provision insufficient to meet the needs of the new development.
Objection	
	Bellway Homes Agent : Drivers Jonas
0104/1/007/O	Recognise that the provision of on-site public open space is preferable in most circumstances. However, providing public open space for all developments of 30 or more dwellings may not always be appropriate or possible due to physical constraints.
Objection Joint Case	
	Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110) Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0109/1/004/O	Requirement for POS should be for 30 or more units as in current policy. No justification for change to 5 units or increase from 30sq.m to 35sq.m. Areas of deficiency in POS should be shown on map. Clarify term 'bed units'. Reduce maint. period to 5yrs
Objection Joint Case	
	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0113/1/010/O	Requirement for POS should be for 30 or more units as in current policy. No

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	justification for change to 5 units or increase from 30sq.m to 35sq.m. Areas of deficiency in POS should be shown on map. Clarify term 'bed units'. Reduce maint. period to 5yrs
	Oldham Labour Group
0181/1/001/O	Delete policy wording from 'or to enhance...'
Objection	
	Sport England
0495/1/009/O	The policy should be applied to all residential development except sheltered accommodation or residential care homes.
Objection	
	Denshaw Community Association
0543/1/012/S	Support - Denshaw has seen much development, but gained nothing in terms of public open space. This policy would be useful when the site at Dumfries Farm is developed.
Support	
	McCarthy & Stone (Development) Ltd Agent : The Planning Bureau
0582/1/001/O	In the case of sheltered housing for the elderly, the Council should only require amenity space, not public open space, as part of the scheme. Security implications of allowing public access to such areas. Low demand for active recreation areas.
Objection Joint Case	
S1	
	Somersetfield Stores Ltd. Agent : Roger Tym and Partners
0011/1/001/O	Policy implies that food retailing could be permitted within retail parks (out of centre)
Objection Joint Case	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/001/O	Reference to retail centres does not comply with PPG6.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/028/S	None given.
Support	
Failsworth district centre	Elsie M. Hamilton
0725/1/001/S	Supports proposals for Failsworth precinct
Support	
Huddersfield Road district centre	Standedge Limited
0018/1/001/O	Seeks alternative extension to district centre to provide easier access, stimulate environmental regeneration and protect listed 'Hill Stores' building. To include Springfield House medical centre and pharmacy and site of Onward/Newbreck Mill.
Objection	
Huddersfield Road district centre	Lookers PLC
0019/1/001/O	Extend district centre boundary to the east to embrace existing Health Centre, shops east of Spring Street and the car dealership, which contribute to centre activity, and exclude the backland site which is more suitable for housing.
Objection	
S1.2	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/002/O	Clarify whether the area identified in the policy is meant to be considered edge-of-town centre or within the town centre. In either case, PPG6 applies.
Omission	
	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/008/O	Developments should complement existing usages directly when outside the core area of the Town Centre and should link.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/018/O	Generally supportive, but concern expressed at percentage of non food retail that would be allowed within a supermarket proposal
Objection	
	Watermill Estates Limited Agent : GL Hearn Planning
0795/1/003/O	Amend S1.2 to acknowledge need for additional retail floorspace in Oldham Town Centre, identify sites to accommodate this need in Chp 8 and on proposals map
Objection	
S1.3 7.21/7.22	
	Deez Wine Bar Agent : Paul Butler Associates
0012/1/001/O	Objects to non-retail development in Primary Shopping Frontages being permitted only where 70% of the frontage remains in A1 use. Suggests 45% limit as more sensible. Policy creates too many vacancies. A2/A3 better than vacant A1 units.
Objection	
S1.3 7.23	
	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/001/O	Clarification is required of 'the flexible approach' proposed for primary shopping frontages in Uppermill district centre.
Omission	
S1.4	
	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/009/O	Encourage diversity in Yorkshire Street area of the Town Centre. Develop family night time economy.
Omission	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	Jean Stretton
0143/1/003/S	Supports planning department's right to refuse Class A3 developments on the basis of adverse impact on the amenities of residential occupiers.
Support Joint Case	
S1.4 c)	Highways Agency
0006/1/001/O	Paragraph on food and drink uses needs a reference to protecting the safe and efficient operation of the trunk road network.
Omission	
S1.5	Jean Stretton
0143/1/004/S	Supports planning department's right to refuse taxi and vehicle hire developments on the basis of adverse impact on the amenities of residential occupiers (noise), and on parking
Support Joint Case	
S1.6	Countryside Agency
0008/1/001/S	Support for farm shops in rural areas
Support	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/004/O	Policy needs to be amended to reflect the fact that planning applications for retail development outside the borough's town and district centres will be subject to the sequential approach as set out in PPG6.
Objection	
S1.6 7.29	Somerfield Stores Ltd. Agent : Roger Tym and Partners

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0011/1/002/O	Text implies food retail is acceptable in retail parks. This should be amended to exclude food.
Objection Joint Case	
S1.7	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/003/O	PPG6 does not apply any size criteria to the sequential approach and retail parks should be removed from the hierarchy.
Objection	
	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/010/S	Very supportive of leisure on Union Street South site (allocation TC1.3)
Support	
S1.7 7.36	Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC Agent : Peacock and Smith
0010/1/001/O	- Sequential approach does not fully accord with PPG6. - factors associated with need should be expanded. - need should be established on edge of centre sites.
Objection	
S1.7 c. ii)	GMPTE
0026/1/020/S	Supports the requirement for development outside town or district centres having to be accessible by a choice of transport modes
Support	
S1.8	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/005/O	If this policy refers to 'edge of centre' sites, would suggest use of this term rather than "adjacent to town and district centres"

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
S1.9	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/006/O	Delete paras a. and b. (toilet and baby changing facilities) as UDPs should not contain policies for matters other than the development and use of land
Objection	
S2.1	Countryside Agency
0008/1/002/S	Support for small shops in rural areas
Support	
S2.2	Countryside Agency
0008/1/003/S	Support for protection against loss of small shops.
Support	
	CPRE - Lancashire
0263/1/010/S	Supports this policy which may help to protect local shops in the more rural settlements
Support	
S2.3	Keith Lowe
0013/1/001/O	Increase local needs shopping threshold from 300 to 400m2 as it is unduly restrictive.
Objection	
	CPRE - Lancashire
0263/1/016/O	Wording appears to discourage proposals in more rural areas.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection Joint Case	
T1	
	Manchester Airport plc
0005/1/001/O	Policy should refer to improving the accessibility of Manchester Airport.
Omission	
	Highways Agency
0006/1/002/O	Define *convenient* and refer to public transport.
Objection	
	GMPTE
0026/1/012/S	The policy on the Transport Network represents a firm base for the Part 2 policies and will help achieve advice set out in PPG13
Support	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/014/S	None given.
Support	
T1.1	
	Highways Agency
0006/1/003/O	Refer to possible implications for trunk roads of the strategic park and ride at Hollinwood, adjacent to junction 22 of M60, and the Quality Bus Corridors (ref para 4.10) and the need to liaise with the Highways Agency.
Omission	
	Countryside Agency
0008/1/032/O	Supports rail station and park and ride at Diggle, but would encourage the Council to promote rural bus services rather than rely on park and ride in fringe locations

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Omission	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/009/O	With respect to Trans-Pennine rail routes, refer to the GMLTP rather than draft RPG.
Objection	
	Railtrack Property
0037/1/004/S	Welcome references to the Transpennine rail route and the proposed station at Diggle, including a strategic park and ride
Support	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/015/S	None given.
Support	
T1.1 4.10	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/010/O	Expand on the possible implications of detailed schemes for certain sections of Quality Bus Corridors for land that falls beyond the boundaries of the highway.
Omission	
	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/014/S	Support for bus corridors to bring people into the town centre by use of public transport.
Support	
T1.1 4.11	
	STORM
0016/1/004/O	Do not abandon a Council aspiration for a Metrolink stop at Wren's Nest. A stop at this site would be well-used as it is on the edge of an affluent catchment area, has a bus terminus and would reduce the need for passengers to travel to Shaw.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
	Shaw & Crompton Parish Council
0042/1/001/O	Include a possible Metrolink station at Bridge Street (Wren's Nest) which would allow replacement of footbridge with a pedestrian level crossing.
Omission	
	Oak Street Area Community Group
0152/1/001/O	Wren's Nest Metrolink stop should not be abandoned.
Objection	
T1.1 b.	
	GMPTE
0026/1/003/O	Omit park and ride at the future Derker Metrolink stop as it is unlikely to be implemented, and identify an alternative site for park and ride near the Oldham Mumps interchange.
Objection	
	Siemens Real Estate Ltd Agent : Colliers Conrad Ritblat Erdman
0180/1/001/O	Delete the park and ride at Hollinwood. The need for a facility is not demonstrated, but if it were a better location would be NW of the rail line, i.e. on vacant or underused land or where existing car parks have potential for dual use.
Objection	
	Mr G&Mrs J Horn
0653/1/001/O	Relocate Metrolink stop at South Chadderton to junction with either Stanley Road or Washbrook
Objection Joint Case	
	King Street Baptist Church, Trustees Agent : A. Gould Solicitor
0747/1/001/O	A precondition to the proposed Metrolink route through the Town Centre is that protective provisions in the Greater Manchester (Light Rapid Transit System) Act 1994 are first complied with. These are relevant to the King Street Baptist Church land.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
0794/1/001/O	Mossbridge Mill Co Ltd Agent : Roger Hannah & Co Remove the park and ride designation from the property at Albert Mill, Cromford Street near Derker [Correct Proposals Map to clarify that this property is not being allocated for park and ride]
Objection Joint Case	
0796/1/001/O	Shaw and Royton Area Committee Seek reinstatement of a Metrolink halt at Wren's Nest, Shaw in the Plan to facilitate provision of a facility at that location.
Omission	
0797/1/001/S	David Abbot Supports the extension of Metrolink to Oldham. Metrolink should also be extended to Bolton. Other less polluting public transport systems, e.g. Parry People Mover, should also be considered.
Support	
T1.1 c.	
0007/1/002/S	Uppermill Residents Association Support the development of a rail station and car park at Diggle and support the Ward Lane site
Support	
Diggle Station	STORM
0016/1/008/O	STORM fully supports the return of rail facilities to local communities. However, seek full appraisal of alternative site at Diggle which was subject of a previous study.
Objection	
T1.1 c. 4.9	
	Railtrack Property

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0037/1/002/O	More details needed about the proposed location and scale of Diggle station and the strategic park and ride.
Omission	
T1.2	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/026/S	Supports bus park and ride facilities for motorists from Saddleworth, particularly if the services connect with Oldham Mumps station (rail/Metrolink)
Support	
	Countryside Agency
0008/1/033/O	Supports bus park and ride at Waterhead, but would encourage the Council to promote rural bus services rather than rely on park and ride in fringe locations of the Borough in implementing this policy
Omission	
	STORM
0016/1/003/O	The Council should provide park and ride at every rail and Metrolink station because bus interchange is unattractive. Bus frequency and/or route availability are lower than Metrolink, in particular during evenings, Sundays and holidays.
Objection	
	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/012/O	If retained as a policy, must be redrafted to include criteria for judging the acceptability of development proposals.
Objection	
	GMPTE
0026/1/019/S	Supports the provision of suitably located Park and Ride facilities, subject to the GMPTE's objection regarding the lack of a policy on Park and Ride proposals in the Green Belt
Support	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0040/1/001/O	<p style="text-align: center;">Saddleworth Parish Council Agent : Eagland Planning Associates</p> <p>Identify Greenfield Station as a park and ride site. The Parish Council anticipates that car parking provision at Greenfield Station will improve in the near future.</p>
Omission Joint Case	
	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/015/S	Support park and ride schemes to alleviate Town Centre congestion and parking demand, preferably located outside the Town Centre boundary
Support	
	Siemens Real Estate Ltd Agent : Colliers Conrad Ritblat Erdman
0180/1/002/O	Local park and ride facilities should only be sought where there is a proven need. In this case, a criteria-based approach should be adopted to identify sites.
Objection	
	CPRE - Lancashire
0263/1/018/O	Adopt a more cautious approach to park and ride to ensure facilities do not encourage additional car use.
Objection Joint Case	
	Denshaw Community Association
0543/1/013/S	Reduction of the car is crucial for a sustainable future. Good public or alternative transport is essential & should be encouraged.
Support	
T1.2 4.13	
	STORM
0016/1/005/O	A park and ride is needed at Oldham Mumps rather than on the Quality Bus Corridor at Waterhead. Infrequency and lack of routes make bus interchange with Metrolink unattractive and parking at Mumps will be reduced on conversion to tram.
Objection	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
T1.3	Peak District National Park
0036/1/001/O	Add that special care is needed with the appearance of any highway schemes that could impact on the Peak National Park
Omission	
	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/016/S	Support new roads and widening of existing roads
Support	
T1.3 4.17	Highways Agency
0006/1/004/O	Include a statement on the role of the Highways Agency
Omission	
T1.3 4.18	West Pennine Bridleways Association
0175/1/008/O	Where traffic lanes are designated for use by a combination of transport modes, including cycles, these should not exclude horse-riders
Omission	
Joint Case	
T1.4	GMPTE
0026/1/013/S	Will facilitate walking and cycling which in turn will reduce the reliance on the car and the number of car journeys made
Support	
	Denshaw Community Association
0543/1/014/S	Reduction of car travel is crucial for a sustainable future. Good public or alternative transport, such as walking and cycling, is essential & should be encouraged.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Support	
T1.4 4.19	West Pennine Bridleways Association
0175/1/007/S	Supports the protection of a network of routes for non-motorised travel and the inclusion of bridleways
Support	
T1.4 4.21	Oldham Friends of the Earth
0182/1/001/O	The Walking Bus scheme for school travel should be mentioned in the Plan.
Omission	
T1.4 4.22	Leesfield Parish Schools
0015/1/001/O	Specify that all schools should have adequate pavement access. There is no pavement up to St Agnes School, Knolls Lane, and pedestrian access is dangerous. This will increase if H.1.2.10 development goes ahead.
Omission Joint Case	
T1.4 4.26	Oldham Friends of the Earth
0182/1/002/O	The Plan should do more to encourage cycling, including signposting of cycleways and improving surfaces
Omission	
T1.5	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/003/S	Support the protection of the canal corridors and their development for leisure use
Support	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/004/O	The matter of cyclists on canal towpaths is not addressed.
Omission	
	Countryside Agency
0008/1/030/S	The protection and enhancement of canal corridors is welcomed
Support	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/001/O	Include: the canals' importance for nature conservation; consultation with English Nature (and the GM Ecology Unit); cross-references to relevant Open Environment policies.
Omission	
	North West Tourist Board Agent : Paul Butler Associates
0117/1/005/O	Designate areas along canals for tourist facilities and accommodation and ensure that developments are sensitive to the canal environment. Oldham UDP needs to maximise the tourism potential of the canals. Valuable resource.
Omission	
	English Nature
0149/1/001/O	Mention English Nature as they are also involved in canal restoration work.
Omission	
	English Nature
0149/1/002/O	Include cross-reference to habitat protection policy (OE2.3) as Rochdale Canal is a designated nature conservation site.
Omission	
	British Waterways
0422/1/002/S	Strongly support this Policy which seeks to protect the operation and future use of the

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	canal network within the borough.
Support	
	Denshaw Community Association
0543/1/015/S	Reduction of the car is crucial for a sustainable future. Good public or alternative transport, such as canal navigation, is essential & should be encouraged.
Support	
	The Inland Waterways Association - NW
0771/1/001/O	Development of niche transportation, including freight, should be encouraged on navigable canals as the association believes that rivers and canals should be used for commercial as well as leisure boating
Omission	
T1.6	
	Countryside Agency
0008/1/031/S	Welcomes the protection and enhancement of disused rail infrastructure
Support	
	STORM
0016/1/002/O	Policy should also identify and protect former and potential sites for rail freight facilities.
Omission	
	Railtrack Property
0037/1/005/S	Welcome the protection of old railway formations
Support	
	Saddleworth Parish Council Agent : England Planning Associates
0040/1/002/O	Identify and protect all potentially suitable disused railway lines. There are disused lines with the potential for incorporating sustainable transport schemes which are not identified in the Plan .

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Omission Joint Case	Mr G Bayley
0112/1/002/O	T1.6 should read 'The Council will protect disused railway lines from development that would preclude their reuse for transport schemes, preferably rail' and remainder of para. and 2nd para. deleted, as policy is too restrictive.
Omission	Mr G Bayley
0112/1/004/O	The corridor of the disused railway from Mumps through Lees, Grotton, Greenfield to Delph should be protected for transport use, preferably rail, to protect from development that would preclude its use for transport.
Omission	West Pennine Bridleways Association
0175/1/009/S	Strongly support this policy
Support	Denshaw Community Association
0543/1/016/S	Reduction of the car is crucial for a sustainable future. Good public or alternative transport is essential & should be encouraged.
Support	STORM
0016/1/001/O	Add that the policy will be reviewed following consultation with the successful bidder for building the Oldham Metrolink extension, as they have discretion to propose alternative routes. The line between Werneth and Mumps should be protected for now.
Omission	GMPTE

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0026/1/001/O	The section of Oldham Loop rail line between Werneth and Mumps should be protected under this policy for public transport use, until such time as relevant negotiations and feasibility studies as to its future are concluded by GMPTA/E & Railtrack
Objection	
	Mr G Bayley
0112/1/003/O	The course of the railway from Mumps to Werneth should be protected from development that would preclude its use for transport, preferably rail. - cannot say that the railway will not be reused or continue in use once Metrolink is established
Objection	
T2	Highways Agency
0006/1/005/O	Include a reference to protecting the safe and efficient operation of trunk roads.
Omission	
	GMPTE
0026/1/014/S	Supports policy on Transport and Developments particularly the requirements for contributions towards transport infrastructure
Support	
	Lawrence Watson
0138/1/001/O	In assessing developments that generate HGV traffic, the impact of noise and air pollution on residential amenity should be given more consideration
Omission	
	Denshaw Community Association
0543/1/017/S	Reduction of the car is crucial for a sustainable future. Good public or alternative transport is essential & should be encouraged.
Support	
	North West Regional Assembly

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0740/1/016/S	None given.
Support	
	Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL Agent : Cordingleys
0815/1/002/O	This part 1 policy should be amended in line with policy T2.1 to allow development that may not be accessible by public transport, but is appropriate in terms of other relevant planning considerations
Objection	
T2.1	GMPTE
0026/1/015/S	Supports the policy on Access to New Developments particularly the recognition that accessibility by a choice of mode can help in achieving social inclusion
Support	
	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/008/O	Requiring pedestrian access to canal towpaths from sites adjacent to canals is excessive
Objection	
	Paul Speak Properties Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0110/1/002/O	Requiring pedestrian access to the canal towpath from sites adjacent to canals is excessive
Objection	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/017/S	None given.
Support	
T2.1 4.32&4.35	STORM
0016/1/006/S	No comments submitted

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Support	
T2.1 4.33	Countryside Agency
0008/1/010/S	Welcome exception to access requirements for developments which support village facilities and local job opportunities.
Support	
T2.1 4.34	Highways Agency
0006/1/006/O	Add that the Highways Agency will carry out improvements to trunk roads under a S. 278 if they so desire.
Omission	
T2.1 4.38	CPRE - Lancashire
0263/1/017/O	Make a 'home zone' approach in proposals for housing developments a requirement unless the developer can demonstrate why it would be inappropriate.
Objection Joint Case	
T2.2	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/013/O	Define major developments below the policy (in a reasoned justification)
Omission	
	GMPTE
0026/1/016/S	Sets out clearly when a Transport Assessment and a Travel Plan will be required alongside a planning application. Supports ensuring public transport accessibility between employment sites and areas of high unemployment.
Support	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/018/S	None given.
Support	
T2.2 4.43	
	Highways Agency
0006/1/007/O	Transport assessments should extend to developments that may have a material impact on the operation of trunk roads. These do not necessarily directly access trunk roads and can include smaller developments with a significant cumulative effect.
Omission	
T2.2 a. i)	
	Siemens Real Estate Ltd Agent : Colliers Conrad Ritblat Erdman
0180/1/003/O	On redevelopment schemes, only the net increase in floorspace should be taken into account in assessing whether they are major developments and therefore need a transport assessment
Objection	
T2.3	
	GMPTE
0026/1/017/S	Will help strengthen the Council's position when trying to secure a Section 106 agreement involving developer contributions to improve accessibility
Support	
	Wiggett Construction Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0045/1/009/O	The policy should be reworded to more closely reflect Circular 1/97.
Objection	
	Paul Speak Properties Ltd Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd
0110/1/003/O	The policy should be reworded to more closely reflect Circular 1/97

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Objection	
0180/1/004/O	Siemens Real Estate Ltd Agent : Colliers Conrad Ritblat Erdman Policy should more closely follow the advice in Circular 1/97
Objection	
0815/1/003/O	Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL Agent : Cordingleys The definition of major development should be incorporated within the policy (developer contributions for sustainable transport) rather than in future Supplementary Planning Guidance which is not subject to formal consultation and independent review
Omission	
T2.4	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/014/O	Car parking standards should be included in the UDP as an appendix to give them more weight to deliver parking policies, in accordance with PPG13 para 52
Objection	
	GMPTE
0026/1/018/S	Support inclusion of PPG13 and Greater Manchester parking standards, and the more restrictive stance taken towards town centre sites and those well accessed by public transport
Support	
T2.4 4.48	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/015/O	Car parking standards will have to reflect PPG3 para 62 as well as PPG13.
Omission	
TC1	North West Tourist Board

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0117/1/001/O	Agent : Paul Butler Associates There is no specific mention of tourism within the Policy. Believe the sites identified need to include tourism as an acceptable use.
Objection	
	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/001/S	Support issues relating to architectural design standards as well as other criteria mentioned, linking into urban design.
Support	
	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/002/O	Would also like to see the old Co op site allocated [currently: Mecca Bingo, King Street]
Omission	
	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/013/O	The policy should designate TC1.1 Clegg Street and TC1.3 Union Street South as the priority sites for development in the Town Centre
Omission	
	North West Regional Assembly
0740/1/029/S	None given.
Support	
	Watermill Estates Limited Agent : GL Hearn Planning
0795/1/001/O	Amend TC1 to ensure that the town centre will be the main focus of retail, business, cultural, educational, community and leisure activity in the borough, to sustain and enhance the town centre's role as a sub-regional shopping centre.
Objection	
The Mumps, Oldham	Watermill Estates Limited Agent : GL Hearn Planning
0795/1/002/O	Allocate site as mixed use development incorporating A1/A2/A3 uses, including both food and non-food floorspace. Important town centre site. Development would contribute

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	to regeneration of east end of town centre. Accessible by public transport.
Omission	
TC1 8.13	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/019/S	Support issues relating to architectural design standards as well as other criteria mentioned, linking into urban design.
Support	
TC1.2	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/003/S	Support future phases of the Cultural Quarter to include Lifelong Learning Centre, Performing Arts Centre adding to the newly built Art Gallery
Support	
TC1.4	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/005/O	Lack of car parking facilities on South Union Street site, taking in the Business Centre, Cultural Quarter and future developments.
Objection	
TC1.5	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/007/O	Change wording to reflect that the Council may "seek" rather than "require" a Section 106 obligation
Objection	
	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/004/O	General support for issues relating to car parking, but pricing policies need to be addressed.
Omission	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
TC1.6	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/008/O	Policy does not appear to fully comply with Circular 1/97
Objection	
	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/006/S	Support issues relating to urban design and enhancing the quality and the extent of the public realm.
Support	
TC1.8	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0119/1/007/S	Support for housing in the Town Centre.
Support	
W1	Government Office for the North West
0021/1/038/O	The first sentence does not read clearly.
Objection	
	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership
0113/1/008/S	Support policy which seeks to ensure that all new waste or landfill facilities are appropriately located in relation to residential and other environmentally sensitive areas of the borough.
Support	
	Denshaw Community Association
0543/1/007/S	Supports waste policies. Reduction of waste disposal is crucial for a sustainable future and its environment as is the siting & use to be made of sites.

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
Support	
	Greater Manchester Geological Unit
0746/1/004/S	Supports the themes of provision, environmental protection and sustainable development within the proposed policy framework for waste management
Support	
W1.1	
	Greater Manchester Geological Unit
0746/1/005/S	Supports the themes of provision, environmental protection and sustainable development within the proposed policy framework for waste management
Support	
W1.2	
	Uppermill Residents Association
0007/1/012/S	Supports policy for good waste management.
Support	
High Moor Quarry, Scouthead	Aggregate Industries UK Ltd
0602/1/002/O	Mineral extraction operations may be completed by 2006. An extension of landfilling and extraction activities may need to be considered within the period of the Plan. Plan should acknowledge that the site is a source of high quality dimension stone.
Objection	
W1.3	
	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0038/1/027/O	Broad support, but should be a reference to not harming species protected by law or their habitats.
Objection	
	Saddleworth Parish Council Agent : Eagland Planning Associates

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0040/1/004/O	The Parish Council would like to see tourism assets added to the list of matters worthy of protection under e).
Omission Joint Case	
	English Nature
0149/1/010/S	Support the inclusion of the protection for wildlife and geological sites and the biodiversity resource.
Support	
	Derbyshire County Council
0521/1/001/O	Consider that the need to demonstrate a clear shortfall in waste treatment or disposal capacity in the first paragraph of this Policy is inappropriate.
Objection	
W1.4	
	Denshaw Community Association
0543/1/008/S	Supports policy but wishes more could be done in terms of doorstep recycling. More needs to be done to educate people & make it easier for people to participate.
Support	
W1.4 14.19	
	Saddleworth Parish Council Agent : Eagland Planning Associates
0040/1/005/O	Objects to wording of the first part of this policy. Does not wish to see another land disposal site in area. Would also be concerned about facility where extensive recycling of waste takes place on site. Civic amenity site may be more acceptable.
Objection Joint Case	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section

Name

LATE REPRESENTATIONS

English Heritage

Conservation
0825/1/005/O

Should include Scheduled Ancient Monuments and registered historic parks and gardens on the Proposals Map.

Omission

B2.1

PEZ17 Wellyhole Street, Lees

Lisa J. Lancaster

0807/1/001/O

Refers to current planning application for residential development involving part of PEZ17. Would like to see the area kept safer. Sufficient land for industry. Would like to see developed as a residential use.

Objection

PEZ17 Wellyhole Street, Lees

Mrs M Leyland

0810/1/001/O

Industrial development would alter the area for the worst. Concerned about the impact on the amenity of existing residents.

Objection

PEZ17 Wellyhole Street, Lees

Mr & Mrs L Peacock

0811/1/001/O

PEZ designation would place industry in the middle of two residential areas. Current light industry on Wellyhole St causes no real problems, but concerned about having more industry alongside existing housing.

Objection

PEZ17 Wellyhole Street, Lees

Mrs B.A. Pilkington

0812/1/001/O

Would prefer not to be developed at all - should be landscaped and used for recreation purposes. If development has to take place would prefer houses. Industrial development - concerned about impact on house values.

Objection

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
PEZ17 Wellyhole Street, Lees	Miss R. Torr
0813/1/001/O	The site should be considered for housing or as a park area made available to local residents for recreation purposes.
Objection	
C1 12.12	
	English Heritage
0825/1/004/O	Questions whether or not the Council have a Local List - if not mention should be made of the compilation of such a list.
Objection	
D1.12	
	Orange Personal Communications Services L Agent : Adams Holmes Associates
0737/1/001/S	Support policy - it is clear and thorough
Support	
	One 2 One Personal Communications Ltd Agent : James Barr Consultants
0820/1/001/O	Requests more flexible approach to the assessment of applications for telecommunications development. Should be a presumption in favour of development in line with PPG8, subject to material considerations and technical/operating requirements.
Objection	
D1.8 3.58	
	English Heritage
0825/1/002/O	Cross reference to Policy C1.5 and the need to retain historic shop fronts.
Objection	
GS2	
Hodge Clough Farm, Moorside	John Ogden

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
0822/1/001/O	Requests change from green belt to residential designation - the land is in a built-up residential area, reason for green belt status is not clear, tipping has been allowed.
Objection Joint Case	
GS7 2.10	English Heritage
0825/1/001/O	Add reference to historic parks and gardens as included in para. 12.10.
Objection	
H1.1	
H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph	Joanna Leggett
0819/1/001/O	Site is wholly suited for commercial use. Concerned about possible impact of housing on the future expansion of the Business Centre. Should allocate for commercial use only.
Objection	
H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road	Joanna Leggett
0819/1/002/S	Considers that the proposal has some merit.
Support	
H1.2	
H1.2.12 Shaw Hall Bank Rd, Greenfield	Mr & Mrs Strahand
0809/1/001/O	Too much development already. Negative visual impact on the canal. Concerned about impact on congestion and services - sewage, electricity, schools. Negative impact on wildlife. Poor access.
Objection	
OE1.7	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mr & Mrs Grumbridge
0808/1/001/O	Satisfies definition of local green gap. Contains SBI. Valuable & picturesque. This

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
	part of the Borough already saturated by development therefore green areas should be preserved. Huge site compared with housing allocations. Traffic issues.
Objection Joint Case	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs V. Riley
0814/1/001/O	Need to preserve green areas for future generations. Concerned about impact of traffic - see Proposed UDP policies GS6 and GS7 which cover this issue. Rush hour brings long queues. Impact of HGV s.
Objection	
LR1 Cowlshaw	Mrs Gail Holden
0823/1/001/O	Allocate as Local Green Gap/Green Belt to protect from development. Proposal would destroy the natural environment, overlook existing properties, create extra traffic/congestion/noise, and would destroy wildlife.
Objection	
LR8 Haven Lane South, Moorside	M. Lynes
0821/1/001/O	Green land is scarce in Oldham. Should look at developing derelict/unused buildings before valuable countryside.
Objection Joint Case	
LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft	D. Hollins
0826/1/001/O	Remove allocation. Well used amenity area. Woodland with TPO. Sustains a variety of flora and fauna. Poor access. Development would be visually intrusive. Geologically unstable and unsuitable for drainage.
Objection	
OE1.8	
LGG15 Wall Hill, Dobcross	Yvonne Dawson
0824/1/001/S	Supports LGG designation. Concerned about potential traffic/access problems and impact on own property if development was allowed.
Support	

**Schedule of Objections and Representations to
Oldham Replacement Unitary Development Plan First Deposit, October 2001
By Policy, Paragraph, Site or Section**

Policy, Paragraph, Site, Section	Name
LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph	Joanna Leggett
0819/1/003/S	Designation of this land as a green buffer zone is welcomed.
Support	
OE1.9 11.45	
	English Heritage
0825/1/003/O	Concerning farm diversification, of the view that the supporting text could draw out the need to consider the effects of any proposed development upon traditional farm buildings.
Objection	