

Initial Responses to Objections

Appendices

Objections:

0108/1/007/O**The House Builders Federation***Summary of objection:*

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

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

Only two minor changes are proposed to the Green Belt boundary. One is to amend an anomaly created by the granting of planning permission for a very large industrial building in Shaw, such that the Green Belt boundary now passes through the building. In this case the land cannot be said to be fulfilling a Green Belt function. The second is to put land into the Green Belt following the development of a site adjacent to it, which provides a more recognisable and defensible boundary for the Green Belt along the newly created fence line. The boundary previously traversed a field at an apparently arbitrary point. These are considered to represent exceptional circumstances and changes which will result in a more legible and robust Green Belt boundary.

Initial Responses to Objections

Business & Industry**Objections:****0008/1/009/O****Countryside Agency***Summary of objection:*

Would welcome a separate policy which identifies the need to strengthen the rural economic base and addresses the issue of rural diversification.

Recommended Change:

Amend the introduction by inserting in para 5.4 before the last sentence: 'There are businesses on the urban fringe and in the Green Belt which are worth protecting as they provide local employment and support the rural economy. New activities are also encouraged to maintain and diversify business and employment, where the developments are located and designed appropriately.'

Reason :

A separate policy is unnecessary as proposals would be considered under other policies in this section and under policy OE1.9 Farm diversification. However, a reference to the rural economy and diversification in the introduction is recommended to clarify that the section applies to rural parts of the Borough.

0117/1/003/O**North West Tourist Board**

Agent : Paul Butler Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is no need for a separate policy in this section as proposals for caravan and camp sites would be addressed under B1.4 Tourism development. Any specific proposal for caravan and camp sites would be judged on its own merits and in relation to other relevant policies in the plan, such as policy OE1.9 Farm diversification in the Open Environment section.

5.2**Objections:**

Initial Responses to Objections

0005/1/002/O **Manchester Airport plc**

Summary of objection:

The role of Manchester Airport should be recognised.

Recommended Change:

Insert in para 5.2 line 5 after 'education establishments, ': 'access to international markets afforded by proximity to Manchester Airport, '.

Reason :

To redress the omission of a significant factor for 'sunrise' industries seeking an area to invest in.

Initial Responses to Objections

B1 Business & Industrial Land Allocations**Supporting Representations:**

0740/1/019/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0038/1/007/O Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The general approach in the UDP is to minimise cross-references to other policies. In any case, the Rochdale Canal is designated an SBI and SSSI on the Proposals Map so that any development proposals along the canal would have to take account of the relevant policies in the Natural Resources section.

0130/1/001/O

Janet Bottomley

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

As a matter of principle, the majority of existing employment sites in Saddleworth continue to be protected under the Primary Employment Zone policy (B2.1). A few changes in allocations were made after an assessment of each site's characteristics and the Borough's land use needs. The new designations are designed to stimulate employment development or secure the retention of landmark buildings. Existing employment sites outside PEZs are protected under policy B2.2.

0163/1/001/O

Alice Hadfield

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

No mention as to whether mills would be demolished and replaced with industrial units. Considers it very important that the mills are retained.

Recommended Change:

Insert in para 5.8 before last sentence: 'Mill buildings are not always suited to modern business and industrial operations. Maintenance and refurbishment costs can make such premises expensive to retain in employment uses. However, listed mills or mills in Conservation Areas are protected and those with architectural value are recognised in Design policies.'

Reason :

The objector draws attention to mills for their significance in the urban and rural landscape and their efficient use of land. It seems appropriate to discuss them in the section on business and industry. However, employment allocations must be realistic, i.e. deliverable, and take account of the needs of existing and future businesses in line with PPG1 and 12.

0343/1/001/O**K Hanlon*****Summary of objection:***

Consider redevelopment of industrial sites in the Borough rather than new build in the Saddleworth area, to protect the village environment

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Existing industrial and commercial areas and sites will remain the focus of economic activity in the Borough. However, there is a need to identify new sites for development in order to meet the demand from existing and future businesses whose needs may not be met through the existing supply of premises. In actual fact there are a limited number of allocations for new build industrial and commercial development in Saddleworth. Those that have been made are closely related to existing areas of industrial and commercial activity.

Initial Responses to Objections

B1.1 Industrial Allocations**B1.1.2 Albert Street, Hollinwood****Objections:****0001/1/002/O Brookhouse Group Limited**

Agent : Alyn Nicholls & Associates

Summary of objection:

Delete B1.1.2 from Proposals Map and from Policy B1.1 as the site is suitable for a wide range of uses.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

This is a key site, highly visible from the M60 and accessible to the motorway at junction 22 and to public transport (Metrolink and the A62 QBC). It is important to capitalise on this unique location. Whilst the site may be suitable for other uses, a quality business and industry development would bring most benefit to the Borough by boosting the local economy and employment, and improving the image of Oldham at a prominent location.

0131/1/001/O**J Beard***Summary of objection:*

Site is the only remaining area of green land and should not therefore be allocated for Business and Industry.

Recommended Change:

No change at present. Advise further consideration of retaining a part of the site as open space/buffer.

Reason :

This is a key site, highly visible from the M60 and accessible to the motorway at junction 22 and to public transport (Metrolink and the A62 QBC). It is important to capitalise on this unique location, the relatively large size of the site and the fact it does not adjoin housing and thereby impact directly on amenity. Its best use is considered to be for business and industry use which would boost the local economy and employment. The open space needs of communities are considered under Recreation and Open Space policy.

0143/1/001/O**Jean Stretton***Summary of objection:*

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

No change at present. However, advise further consideration of retaining part of the site as open space/buffer.

Reason :

Advise further consideration of retaining the southern part of the site as open space/buffer. However, it is not recommended to consider protecting as much as 50% of the site. The site is highly visible from the M60 and accessible to the motorway at junction 22 and to public transport (Metrolink and the A62 QBC). It is important to capitalise on this unique location, the relatively large size of the site and the fact it does not adjoin housing and thereby impact directly on amenity. Its best use is considered to be for business and industry use which would boost the local economy and employment.

0144/1/001/O**Councillor Barrow*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change at present. Advise further consideration of retaining southern part of the site as open space/buffer.

Reason :

Advise further consideration of retaining the southern part of the site as open space/buffer. However, it is not recommended to consider protecting all of the site apart from the gasometer. The site is highly visible from the M60 and accessible to the motorway at junction 22 and to public transport (Metrolink and the A62 QBC). It is important to capitalise on this unique location, the relatively large size of the site and the fact it does not adjoin housing and thereby impact directly on amenity. Its best use is considered to be for business and industry use which would boost the local economy and employment. The open space needs of communities are considered under Recreation and Open Space policy.

0154/1/001/O**Mrs Joan Gipson*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change at present. However, advise further consideration of retaining part of the site as open space/buffer.

Reason :

Advise further consideration of retaining the southern part of the site as open space/buffer.

Initial Responses to Objections

public transport (Metrolink and the A62 QBC). It is important to capitalise on this unique location, the relatively large size of the site and the fact it does not adjoin housing and thereby impact directly on amenity. Its best use is considered to be for business and industry use which would boost the local economy and employment. The open space needs of communities are considered under Recreation and Open Space policy.

0155/1/001/O**Mr Allan Taylor*****Summary of objection:***

Council should re establish the allotments and protect the site from development. It has been used as recreation for more than 50 years.

Recommended Change:

No change at present. Advise further consideration of retaining a part of the site as open space/buffer.

Reason :

Advise further consideration of retaining the southern part of the site as open space/buffer. However, it is not recommended to consider protecting the entire site. The site is highly visible from the M60 and accessible to the motorway at junction 22 and to public transport (Metrolink and the A62 QBC). It is important to capitalise on this unique location, the relatively large size of the site and the fact it does not adjoin housing and thereby impact directly on amenity. Its best use is considered to be for business and industry use which would boost the local economy and employment. The open space needs of communities are considered under Recreation and Open Space policy.

0156/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs T&M Sharples*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

No change at present. Advise further consideration of retaining a part of the site as open space/buffer.

Reason :

Advise further consideration of retaining the southern part of the site as open space/buffer. However, it is not recommended to consider protecting the entire site. The site is highly visible from the M60 and accessible to the motorway at junction 22 and to public transport (Metrolink and the A62 QBC). It is important to capitalise on this unique location, the relatively large size of the site and the fact it does not adjoin housing and thereby impact directly on amenity. Its best use is considered to be for business and industry use which would boost the local economy and employment.

The open space needs of communities are considered under Recreation and Open Space policy.

Initial Responses to Objections

0158/1/001/O

Mrs C Taylor

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change at present. Advise further consideration of retaining a part of the site as open space/buffer.

Reason :

Advise further consideration of retaining the southern part of the site as open space/buffer. However, it is not recommended to consider protecting the entire site. The site is highly visible from the M60 and accessible to the motorway at junction 22 and to public transport (Metrolink and the A62 QBC). It is important to capitalise on this unique location, the relatively large size of the site and the fact it does not adjoin housing and thereby impact directly on amenity. Its best use is considered to be for business and industry use which would boost the local economy and employment. The potential impact of a development proposal on traffic and air pollution would be addressed in the sections on Transport and Natural Resources (T2.2 and NR1.1). The open space needs of communities are considered under Recreation and Open Space policy.

0159/1/001/O

Miss Janet Gipson

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change at present. Advise further consideration of retaining a part of the site as open space/buffer.

Reason :

This is a key site, highly visible from the M60 and accessible to the motorway at junction 22 and to public transport (Metrolink and the A62 QBC). It is important to capitalise on this unique location, the relatively large size of the site and the fact it does not adjoin housing and thereby impact directly on amenity. Its best use is considered to be for business and industry use which would boost the local economy and employment. The pollution, traffic and amenity impacts of any specific development proposal would be considered under other policies of the Plan. The open space needs of communities are considered under Recreation and Open Space policy.

0359/1/001/O

Friends of the Wood

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

No change at present. Advise further consideration of retaining the southern part of the site as open space/buffer.

Reason :

Advise further consideration of retaining the southern part of the site as open space/buffer. The site is highly visible from the M60 and accessible to the motorway at junction 22 and to public transport (Metrolink and the A62 QBC). It is important to capitalise on this unique location, the relatively large size of the site and the fact it does not adjoin housing and thereby impact directly on amenity. Its best use is considered to be for business and industry use which would boost the local economy and employment. The open space needs of communities are considered under Recreation and Open Space policy.

B1.1.20 Highbarn Road**Objections:****0181/1/004/O****Oldham Labour Group*****Summary of objection:***

This site should be re designated as a housing location.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further information required regarding the suitability of this site (and the associated Vernon Mill) for continued economic use. At present, the intention will be to seek employment re-use of this site.

B1.1.21 British Gas Site, Higginshaw Lane, Royton**Objections:****0032/1/002/O****Lattice Property*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

Enlarge the allocated site to incorporate all the land in the objector's ownership. Retain the business and industry allocation.

Reason :

Whilst it is sensible to include all the objector's land in the site, it is considered preferable to retain the business and industry designation rather than change it to PEZ. This is one of the few large sites available for business and industry in the Borough.

B1.1.25 Land at Clarence Street, Royton**Objections:**

0223/1/001/O Howarth Brothers Properties

Agent : Roger Hannah & Co

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None. However, there is a need to clarify whether the issue is about the boundary or the allocation.

Reason :

The land allocated in the first deposit UDP differs somewhat from that in the adopted UDP, in terms of size and shape. However, the allocation is identical.

B1.1.31 Union Street West/Oldham Way, Oldham**Objections:**

0026/1/005/O GMPTE

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change at present. However, further discussion advised.

Reason :

Further discussion advised, given GMPTE's negotiations around conversion of the Oldham Loop line to Metrolink and the studies it is undertaking of disused railways. Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report.

Initial Responses to Objections

0251/1/001/O Meridian Development Company Ltd

Agent : Inside Out Design

Summary of objection:

Change allocation to mixed use to enable high quality development on this prominent site (see also B1.1.33)

Recommended Change:

No change at present. Further discussion advised.

Reason :

Further discussion advised, given GMPTE's negotiations around conversion of the Oldham Loop line to Metrolink and the studies it is undertaking of disused railways. Options for the future development of this site in light of the presence of the rail line are set out in the main report. Pending these discussions, would consider change of use to B1 and B2 because of the site's prominence at gateway to Oldham Town Centre.

B1.1.32 Oldham Way/Mumps, Oldham**Objections:****0026/1/006/O GMPTE****Summary of objection:**

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

Recommended Change:

No change at present. However, further discussion advised.

Reason :

Further discussion advised, given GMPTE's negotiations around conversion of the Oldham Loop line to Metrolink and the studies it is undertaking of disused railways. Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report.

0119/1/011/O Oldham Town Centre Partnership**Summary of objection:**

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.

Recommended Change:

No change at present, but further discussion advised.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

Further discussion advised, given GMPTE's negotiations around conversion of the Oldham Loop line to Metrolink and the studies it is undertaking of disused railways. (Options for the future development of this site in light of the presence of the rail line are set out in the main report.) Pending these discussions, would consider change of use to B1 and B2 due to the site's location near a public transport interchange and adjacent to the Town Centre.

B1.1.33 Primrose Street/Crossbank Street, Oldham**Objections:****0026/1/007/O****GMPTE*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

No change at present, but further discussion advised.

Reason :

Further discussion advised, given GMPTE's negotiations around conversion of the Oldham Loop line to Metrolink and the studies it is undertaking of disused railways. Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report.

0119/1/012/O**Oldham Town Centre Partnership*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change at present, but further investigation and internal discussion are advised.

Reason :

Further discussion advised, given GMPTE's negotiations around conversion of the Oldham Loop line to Metrolink and the studies it is undertaking of disused railways. (Options for the future development of this site in light of the presence of the rail line are set out in the main report.) Pending these discussions, would consider change of use because of the site's prominence at a gateway to Oldham Town Centre.

0151/1/001/O**Anglo West Indian Sport and Social**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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)

Recommended Change:

No change at present.

Reason :

The objector's premises are outside the allocated site. However, needs further discussion with objector.

0251/1/002/O

Meridian Development Company Ltd

Agent : Inside Out Design

Summary of objection:

Change allocation to mixed use to enable high quality development of this prominent site (see also B1.1.31)

Recommended Change:

No change at present, but requires further investigation and internal discussion.

Reason :

Further discussion advised, given GMPTE's negotiations around conversion of the Oldham Loop line to Metrolink and the studies it is undertaking of disused railways. (Options for the future development of this site in light of the presence of the rail line are set out in the main report.) Pending these discussions, would consider change of use because of the site's prominence at gateway to Oldham Town Centre. However, retail would be excluded as it is on the edge of the Town Centre and would not accord with retail policy.

B1.1.34 Hebron Street, Royton**Supporting Representations:**

0169/1/002/S	Messrs Halliwell & Douglas
0223/1/002/S	Howarth Brothers Properties

Objections:

0152/1/006/O

Oak Street Area Community Group

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Advise further investigation.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

Advice from GM Ecology Unit is being sought due to the ponds on land adjacent to the site. Further internal discussion is also needed of the allocation and PEZ boundary.

Land at Foxdenton Lane, Chadderton**Objections:**

0673/1/002/O Mr J C Blakeman

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Allocate land shown on (attached) plan, which is part of LR3, for business and industry. Insufficient land has been allocated for this purpose.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The site is identified as a possible future development site in the event of a future plan review identifying a need for additional land, including for business and industry. In the meantime it is considered to provide an important area of open space within a relatively built up area therefore it is not considered to be appropriate to allocate the area for short term development needs.

Land west of Wellyhole Street, Lees/PEZ17**Objections:**

0133/1/001/O Richardsons Commercial (Oldham) Ltd

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The principle of residential development on this site has been established through a recent planning application. The PEZ designation will be removed and therefore it will not be appropriate to add an employment allocation.

Initial Responses to Objections

Initial Responses to Objections

B1.1, B1.2**B1.2.1 Southlink Business Park****Objections:****0026/1/004/O****GMPTE***Summary of objection:*

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

Recommended Change:

No change at present, but further discussion advised.

Reason :

Further discussion advised, given GMPTE's negotiations around conversion of the Oldham Loop line to Metrolink and the studies it is undertaking of disused railways. Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report.

Initial Responses to Objections

B1.2 Business & Office Allocations**5.12****Objections:****0021/1/027/O****Government Office for the North West***Summary of objection:*

Clarify meaning of paragraph, by referring to policy GS7 A. if appropriate

Recommended Change:

Amend by referring to policy that protects residential and workplace amenity, now in Natural Resources section.

Reason :

For clarity.

Initial Responses to Objections

B1.3 Mixed use Allocations**Objections:****0040/1/003/O Saddleworth Parish Council**

Agent : Eagland Planning Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Refine the wording of the policy and reasoned justification to make it clear that the primary aim of the mixed use designations is to stimulate economic activity.

Reason :

It is proposed policy to amend the policy and reasoned justification to clarify the purpose of the mixed use designations. It is contended, however, that the policy sufficiently covers the issue of planning briefs, which would, if necessary be able to cover issues of market demand if necessary.

0045/1/007/O Wiggett Construction Ltd

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Refine the wording of the policy and reasoned justification to clarify the purpose of the mixed use designations. However no other changes.

Reason :

It is not considered appropriate to weaken the Council's approach to the type of mixed-use development envisaged for each site by expressly allowing for other uses to come forward, such as retail. As is the case on any allocated site, a planning application for an alternative use would be treated as a departure and considered on its merits and against other policies of the Plan.

The reference to planning briefs and phasing of development should be retained in the policy to ensure that the Council retains control over development on these key sites.

0110/1/008/O Paul Speak Properties Ltd

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Refine the wording of the policy and reasoned justification to clarify the purpose of the mixed use designations. However no other changes.

Reason :

It is not considered appropriate to weaken the Council's approach to the type of mixed-use development envisaged for each site by expressly allowing for other uses to come forward, such as retail. As is the case on any allocated site, a planning application for an alternative use would be treated as a departure and considered on its merits and against other policies of the Plan.

The reference to planning briefs and phasing of development should be retained in the policy to ensure that the Council retains control over development on these key sites.

0165/1/001/O**Cllr Brian Lord*****Summary of objection:***

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].

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

As a matter of principle, the majority of employment sites in Saddleworth are protected under the Primary Employment Zone policy. The Council has made a small number of mixed use designations to stimulate employment development as part of a wider development package. It is not accepted that this approach would be to the detriment of the local economy. Options for the future development of the mixed use sites are set out in the main report.

0289/1/002/O**British Telecommunications Plc**

Agent : RPS Chapman Warren

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change.

Initial Responses to Objections

Reason :

It is not considered appropriate to weaken the Council's approach to the type of mixed-use development envisaged for each site by expressly allowing for other uses to come forward. As is the case on any allocated site, a planning application for an alternative use would be treated as a departure and considered on its merits and against other policies of the Plan.

B1.3.1 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road, Greenfield**Supporting Representations:**

0110/1/010/S	Paul Speak Properties Ltd
0256/1/001/S	J Barrett (Haulage) Ltd
0260/1/001/S	Brian Greenwood
0294/1/001/S	London Law & Land

Objections:

0295/1/002/O Mrs Joan Frost

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Refine the wording of the policy and reasoned justification to make it clear that the primary aim of the mixed use designations is to stimulate economic activity.

Reason :

For clarity. It should also be noted that planning briefs will set out the type of mixed-use development envisaged for each site which will take into account the distinctive characteristics of each site and the regeneration opportunities it offers. However, any retail element of a proposal would be treated as a 'departure' from the Plan, and considered on its own merits and against other policies of the Plan.

0296/1/001/O J. H. Pellowe

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Whilst it is proposed to provide more detail about the type of mixed-use development envisaged for each site, the primary purpose of the mixed-use designation is to stimulate business and industry uses. Retail would therefore be treated as a 'departure' from the Plan

Initial Responses to Objections

and considered on its own merits and against other policies of the Plan. The site has already been identified under policy H2.1 to provide affordable housing.

0325/1/002/O**Mrs Brenda Jackson*****Summary of objection:***

Supports allocation but at least 50% of housing should be affordable and school places should be provided.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The site has already been identified under policy H2.1 to provide affordable housing. Whilst the general presumption is a provision of 25%, the approach is to negotiate the proportion with developers in order to take account of factors relevant to the type of proposal and to any updates in the Council's housing strategy. In making housing allocations, consideration was given to the capacity of social infrastructure, including schools, to accommodate new development (see para 6.20).

0344/1/002/O**J. R. Taylor*****Summary of objection:***

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"

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The Council has made mixed use designations to stimulate employment development as part of a wider development package. Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However, as stated in the policy, the mix of uses will retain an element of business and industry.

0706/1/002/O**G.R. Bennett*****Summary of objection:***

Support mixed use allocation and recommend that policy goes further to include development of site for tourism.

Recommended Change:

Refine the wording of the policy and reasoned justification to clarify the purpose of the mixed use designations.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

The primary aim of the mixed use designations is to stimulate employment development as part of a wider development package. The planning briefs will set out the type of mixed-use development envisaged for each site which will take into account the distinctive characteristics of each site and the regeneration opportunities it offers, including tourism-related opportunities.

B1.3.2 Lumb Mill, Delph**Objections:****0104/1/002/O****Bellway Homes**

Agent : Drivers Jonas

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

It is considered that the current approach which involves the drafting of planning briefs is reasonable. Further, to some extent the need for a brief on some of the mixed use sites has been superseded by events.

Waterside Mill, Greenfield**Objections:****0267/1/002/O****Tanner Brothers Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

At present there is no evidence to indicate that this site is unsuitable for continued employment use or that there would be no demand for such a use if the present user vacates the premises.

Initial Responses to Objections

Initial Responses to Objections

B1.4 Tourism Development**Supporting Representations:**

0119/1/017/S Oldham Town Centre Partnership

Objections:

0021/1/024/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

By stating that a particular issue will be a material consideration does not give sufficient certainty regarding what will or will not be permitted.

Recommended Change:

Further consideration of the policy wording is required in order to identify permitted uses.

Reason :

To provide greater certainty and clarity regarding what will or will not be permitted.

0038/1/004/O Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Summary of objection:

The impact of increased boat traffic on the nature conservation interest of the canals should be considered

Recommended Change:

The wording of this policy will be reconsidered, including a reference to the need for tourism development to take account of habitat and species protection (with specific reference to the Rochdale Canal).

Reason :

The general approach taken in the Plan is to minimise cross-references to other policies. However, an exception is proposed here given the significant nature conservation value of the Rochdale Canal and the fact we are encouraging tourism development along the restored canals, which could lead to increased boat traffic.

0045/1/006/O Wiggett Construction Ltd

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

Although further consideration is being given to the wording of this policy, based on the current wording it is suggested that the phrase 'or public appreciation' be inserted in criterion d. in the sentence relating to the Rochdale and Huddersfield Narrow Canals.

Remove reference to Tourism Development Areas in criterion e.

Reason :

Reference to developments on the canals should be widened to encompass developments that go beyond direct use of the waterway, e.g. navigation, to increase public appreciation of the canals more generally, e.g. by providing public access .

The Oldham Tourism Strategy is under review and, as part of that process, the Tourism Development Areas. Although it is proposed to continue referring to the Strategy, it is not appropriate to refer to specific areas or identify them on the Proposals Map until the review is completed.

0110/1/014/O**Paul Speak Properties Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Although further consideration is being given to the wording of this policy, based on the current wording it is suggested that the phrase 'or public appreciation' be inserted in criterion d. in the sentence relating to the Rochdale and Huddersfield Narrow Canals.

Remove reference to Tourism Development Areas in criterion e.

Reason :

Reference to developments on the canals should be widened to encompass developments that go beyond direct use of the waterway, e.g. navigation, to increase public appreciation of the canals more generally, e.g. by providing public access .

The Oldham Tourism Strategy is under review and, as part of that process, the Tourism Development Areas. Although it is proposed to continue referring to the Strategy, it is not appropriate to refer to specific areas or identify them on the Proposals Map until the review is completed.

0117/1/008/O**North West Tourist Board**

Agent : Paul Butler Associates

Summary of objection:

Strongly supports policy but would like the land use policies and proposals in the Oldham Tourism Strategy incorporated within the UDP

Recommended Change:

None.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

The policy will continue to refer to the Oldham Tourism Strategy. However, it would not be appropriate to include the land use policies and proposals in the existing strategy, as it is under review.

0132/1/001/O**Arthur Greaves (Lees) Ltd**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

Expresses support for all Tourist Development Areas, but would like to see them shown on the proposals map.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

Since the Tourism Strategy is under review, it would be inappropriate to indicate the current Tourism Development Areas on the proposals map.

0149/1/007/O**English Nature*****Summary of objection:***

All policies which refer to development/land use along Rochdale canal should cross reference to Designated Nature Conservation Site Policies.

Recommended Change:

The wording of this policy will be reconsidered, including a reference to the need for tourism development to take account of habitat and species protection (with specific reference to the Rochdale Canal).

Reason :

The general approach taken in the Plan is to minimise cross-references to other policies. However, an exception is proposed here given the significant nature conservation value of the Rochdale Canal as an SBI, SSSI and a candidate SAC and the fact we are encouraging tourism development along the restored canals.

5.15**Objections:****0117/1/002/O****North West Tourist Board**

Agent : Paul Butler Associates

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Insert after first sentence of para 5.15: Tourism developments can also support local distinctiveness and sustainability by re-using existing buildings.

Reason :

It is not proposed to change the policy itself (as a result of this particular objection) as it should focus on economic benefits, but the reasoned justification should mention that tourism developments can be an appropriate way of re-using existing buildings. The objector singles out buildings in the Green Belt. It could be beneficial and appropriate to re-use buildings elsewhere in the Borough for tourism, particularly if they have historic or architectural value or the development proposal helps regenerate the area.

Initial Responses to Objections

B1.4 d.

Supporting Representations:

0007/1/005/S Uppermill Residents Association

Initial Responses to Objections

B1.5 Business & Industrial Development on Unallocated Land**Objections:**

0021/1/025/O **Government Office for the North West**

Summary of objection:

Title relates to "Business and Industrial Development" but policy only refers to industrial development.

Recommended Change:

Insert 'business and' in first line of policy.

Reason :

The omission of a reference to business as well as industrial development was an oversight.

0045/1/005/O **Wiggett Construction Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

The policy should be re written to allow for limited infilling and redevelopment of unallocated business and industrial sites.

Recommended Change:

Further consideration will be given to either deleting or redefining this policy given that to some extent it duplicates other policies of the Plan.

Reason :

For the purposes of clarification.

0266/1/001/O **The Clayton Action Group**

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Specify which uses are covered by the policy by inserting in line 1, after '...development': '(Use Classes B1, B2 and B8, excluding 'bad neighbour' uses)'. However, no other changes.

Reason :

Objector is particularly concerned about the potential impact of large retail and leisure developments on residential amenity which are covered by other sections in the Plan, Retail and Leisure and Natural Resources. The traffic impacts of development are covered in the

Initial Responses to Objections

Transport chapter. Nevertheless, for clarity, it is proposed to specify the types of uses covered by the policy.

Initial Responses to Objections

B1.6 Working from Home

Supporting Representations:

0008/1/008/S Countryside Agency

Initial Responses to Objections

B1.7 Freight Generating Developments**Supporting Representations:**

0740/1/020/S North West Regional Assembly

5.19**Objections:**

0006/1/011/O Highways Agency

Summary of objection:

Developments that have a material effect upon the trunk road network should also refer to Highways Agency requirements.

Recommended Change:

Add to end of last sentence of paragraph 5.19: 'or have a material effect upon the trunk road network'.

Reason :

To comply with requirements of the Government agency responsible for the trunk road network.

Initial Responses to Objections**B1.7 a.****Objections:****0037/1/003/O****Railtrack Property*****Summary of objection:***

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'.

Recommended Change:

Under criterion a. replace 'served by rail' to 'connected to the rail network'.

Reason :

After conversion of the Oldham Loop Line to Metrolink, the only rail routes in the Borough will be the Calder Line through the western edge of Chadderton and the Transpennine through Saddleworth. It is therefore not realistic to expect that, over the plan period, most freight-generating developments can be connected to the rail network. However, some of the objector's suggested wording is adopted as it encourages more sustainable freight movements.

Initial Responses to Objections

B2 Existing Industrial Areas**Objections:****0113/1/004/O Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd**

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of 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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The suggested amendments would significantly weaken the policy which is designed to offer protection to all employment sites, whether or not located in a PEZ.

Initial Responses to Objections

B2.1 Primary Employment Zones**Supporting Representations:**

0268/1/001/S Charles Topham and Sons Ltd

Objections:

0013/1/002/O Keith Lowe

Summary of objection:

Increase local needs retailing threshold from 300 to 400m2 in Primary Employment Zones as it is unduly restrictive.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Objections were submitted to related policy S2.3 - New shops serving local needs, requesting that the threshold size be raised above 300 square metres. It is proposed not to change that policy. Therefore, for consistency, this policy should not be changed either.

0143/1/002/O Jean Stretton

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

It is proposed to amend the reasoned justification to reflect the fact that issues of residential amenity would be considered under policies in the Natural Resource section.

Reason :

Primary Employment Zones are considered the most appropriate location for general industrial uses including many waste management facilities. Whilst the latter will therefore continue to be acceptable in PEZs, text will be added to clarify how the impacts of new development on amenity are taken into account within the Plan.

0145/1/001/O National Grid

Agent : Malcolm Judd and Partners

Summary of objection:

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

Insert in last sentence of para 5.22: Essential development by statutory undertakers, such as utility providers, and other development currently covered by the General Permitted Development Order, will be considered under the appropriate statutes or regulations.

Reason :

It is not necessary to specify in the policy how development by statutory undertakers will be considered, as it falls under the General Permitted Development Order*. However, a reference to permitted development can be added to the reasoned justification to clarify that the policy does not exclude it. (* GPDO 1995 Sched 2 part 17 Class G Electricity undertakings]

0152/1/005/O**Oak Street Area Community Group*****Summary of objection:***

Objects to inclusion of waste facilities within PEZ's when located close to residential properties.

Recommended Change:

It is proposed to amend the reasoned justification to reflect the fact that issues of residential amenity would be considered under the appropriate policies in the Natural Resources section of the Plan.

Reason :

Primary Employment Zones are considered the most appropriate location for general industrial uses including many waste management facilities. Whilst the latter will therefore continue to be acceptable in PEZs, text will be added to clarify how the impacts of new development on amenity are taken into account within the Plan.

0180/1/005/O**Siemens Real Estate Ltd**

Agent : Colliers Conrad Ritblat Erdman

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Primary Employment Zones are designated to give priority to business and industrial uses in those areas. Broadening the range of acceptable uses to retail (beyond what is already allowed) and to housing defeats their main purpose.

0261/1/002/O**Oxley Threads Ltd**

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

The categories of uses in a PEZ should include hospital and medically related uses. These can generate employment opportunities. Under i) do not restrict the scale of leisure facilities to below 500m². Restriction unjustified.

Recommended Change:

Amend size limit of small leisure facilities to below 1000 m².

Reason :

Whilst hospital and medically related services do provide jobs, they should not be directed to PEZs. These areas are reserved primarily for business and industrial uses. Health services, which are community facilities, should be located where they can best serve their client groups.

The size of leisure facilities in PEZs should be consistent with policy S2.4.

0289/1/001/O**British Telecommunications Plc**

Agent : RPS Chapman Warren

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Primary Employment Zones are designated to give priority to business and industrial uses in those areas. Broadening the range of acceptable uses to retail (beyond what is already allowed) and to housing would defeat their main purpose.

B1.1.2 Albert Street, Hollinwood/PEZ4**Objections:****0001/1/001/O****Brookhouse Group Limited**

Agent : Alyn Nicholls & Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

This is a key site, highly visible from the M60 and accessible to the motorway at junction 22 and to public transport (Metrolink and the A62 QBC). It is important to capitalise on this unique location, the relatively large size of the site and the fact it does not adjoin housing and thereby impact directly on amenity. Its best use is considered to be for business and industry use which would boost the local economy and employment.

PEZ10 Manchester Street/Westwood, Chadderton**Supporting Representations:**

0268/1/002/S

Charles Topham and Sons Ltd

PEZ11 Busk, Chadderton**Objections:****0137/1/001/O****Copley Square Ltd.**

Agent : Whitehead and Co.

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The most recent retail capacity study shows no evidence of the need for additional retail floor space in the Borough. Should a need be identified in future, the sequential approach would be applied to identify the most appropriate location for a retail use. In any case, the PEZ designation is relatively flexible as it allows a range of uses.

PEZ16 Higginshaw/East Oldham**Objections:****0146/1/001/O****Williamsons**

Agent : Brown Rural Partnership

Summary of objection:

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

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

None.

Reason :

Removing the site from the PEZ would compromise the physical integrity and aim of the designation. The existing boundary of the Town Centre is well-established and is not being changed. Smaller retail and leisure are already allowed in PEZs. The sequential approach is applied to larger retail and leisure uses, with preference given to central locations. Accessibility to Mumps public transport interchange is a benefit for employment and commercial uses allowed in PEZs.

0150/1/001/O

Q Developments Ltd

Agent : Howard and Seddon Partnership

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Removing the site from the PEZ would compromise the physical integrity and aim of the designation by creating a 'hole' in the PEZ. In addition, the suggested alternative is not needed according to the most recent retail capacity study and any proposal would be subject to the sequential approach.

PEZ17 Wellyhole Street, Lees**Supporting Representations:**

0133/1/002/S

Richardsons Commercial (Oldham) Ltd

Objections:

0102/1/003/O

Brierstone Properties Ltd

Agent : Drivers Jonas

Summary of objection:

The PEZ designation is inappropriate and should be removed, and the site allocated for Phase 1 housing

Recommended Change:

Remove PEZ designation as it applies to the subject site.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

The principle of residential development on this site has been established through a recent planning application. The PEZ designation will therefore be removed.

0140/1/001/O**R Grabowski*****Summary of objection:***

Site is adjacent to housing and therefore unsuitable for industry.

Recommended Change:

Remove PEZ designation as it applies to the subject site.

Reason :

The principle of residential development on this site has been established through a recent planning application. The PEZ designation will therefore be removed.

0142/1/001/O**D O Meara*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Remove PEZ designation as it applies to the subject site.

Reason :

The principle of residential development on this site has been established through a recent planning application. The PEZ designation will therefore be removed.

0269/1/001/O**Fairclough Homes Ltd*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove PEZ designation as it applies to the subject site.

Initial Responses to Objections**Reason :**

The principle of residential development on this site has been established through a recent planning application. The PEZ designation will therefore be removed.

0348/1/001/O

Mrs E Connally**Summary of objection:**

Remove PEZ designation from this site and change it to housing as the site adjoins an existing housing development

Recommended Change:

Remove PEZ designation as it applies to the subject site.

Reason :

The principle of residential development on this site has been established through a recent planning application. The PEZ designation will therefore be removed. The site will count against the windfall allowance set out in policy H1. Specific allocation is not required.

0350/1/001/O

Cllr Mrs C Dugdale**Summary of objection:**

Change the designation of this land, part of PEZ17, from PEZ to housing (objection submitted jointly by all 3 ward councillors)

Recommended Change:

Remove PEZ designation as it applies to the subject site.

Reason :

The principle of residential development on this site has been established through a recent planning application. The PEZ designation will therefore be removed. The site will count against the windfall allowance set out in policy H1. Specific allocation is not required.

0351/1/001/O

Cllr J R Anchor**Summary of objection:**

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove PEZ designation as it applies to the subject site.

Reason :

The principle of residential development on this site has been established through a recent planning application. The PEZ designation will therefore be removed. The site will count

Initial Responses to Objections

against the windfall allowance set out in policy H1. Specific allocation is not required.

0352/1/001/O**Cllr Mrs K Knox***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove PEZ designation as it applies to the subject site.

Reason :

The principle of residential development on this site has been established through a recent planning application. The PEZ designation will therefore be removed. The site will count against the windfall allowance set out in policy H1. Specific allocation is not required.

0356/1/001/O**Mr J McQuillan***Summary of objection:*

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)

Recommended Change:

Remove PEZ designation as it applies to the subject site.

Reason :

The principle of residential development on this site has been established through a recent planning application. The PEZ designation will therefore be removed. The site will count against the windfall allowance set out in policy H1. Specific allocation is not required.

0807/1/001/O**Lisa J. Lancaster***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove PEZ designation as it applies to the subject site.

Reason :

The principle of residential development on this site has been established through a recent planning application. The PEZ designation will therefore be removed.

0810/1/001/O**Mrs M Leyland**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Remove PEZ designation as it applies to the subject site.

Reason :

The principle of residential development on this site has been established through a recent planning application. The PEZ designation will therefore be removed.

0811/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs L Peacock*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove PEZ designation as it applies to the subject site.

Reason :

The principle of residential development on this site has been established through a recent planning application. The PEZ designation will therefore be removed.

0812/1/001/O**Mrs B.A. Pilkington*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove PEZ designation as it applies to the subject site.

Reason :

The principle of residential development on this site has been established through a recent planning application. The PEZ designation will therefore be removed.

0813/1/001/O**Miss R. Torr**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

The site should be considered for housing or as a park area made available to local residents for recreation purposes.

Recommended Change:

Remove PEZ designation as it applies to the subject site.

Reason :

The principle of residential development on this site has been established through a recent planning application. The PEZ designation will therefore be removed.

PEZ2 Failsworth Mill**Objections:**

0134/1/001/O Indo African Exports Ltd

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The PEZ policy allows a wide range of uses to take place, including leisure and retail uses. There is no convincing case to allow residential development at present.

PEZ21 Vernon Works, High Barn Street, Royton**Objections:**

0223/1/003/O Howarth Brothers Properties

Agent : Roger Hannah & Co

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

Further information required regarding the suitability of this mill (and associated land) for continued economic use. At present, the intention will be to seek employment re-use of this site.

PEZ22 Shaw**Objections:****0152/1/007/O****Oak Street Area Community Group*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

PEZ22 has relatively good access via Linney Lane and Beal Lane to Crompton Way (the A663), a primary A road. Whilst there may currently be traffic issues in Shaw which suggest further investigation by the Council, they are not deemed sufficient to necessitate reappraisal of a well-established employment area in the only PEZ designated in Shaw. The traffic impacts of any future development proposals would be considered under other policies in the Plan.

0166/1/001/O**P & D Northern Steels Ltd**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

Extend the PEZ allocation into Local Green Gap 10 to allow local firm to expand as and when required.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The Plan must balance a range of considerations and aims in allocating land for sustainable development. The land in question has been designated as Local Green gap in recognition of its importance in providing a significant open area on the edge of the urban fringe. It also contains an extensive Site of Biological Importance. It is not, therefore considered to be appropriate to designate such an area for development purposes.

Initial Responses to Objections

PEZ23 Friezland Lane, Greenfield**Objections:****0020/1/002/O Robert Scott & Sons**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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..

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The principle of housing development has been accepted by the Council through a planning application. It would therefore be inappropriate to include this land in an extended PEZ.

PEZ25 Chew Valley Road, Greenfield**Objections:****0147/1/001/O North Manchester Construction Ltd.**

Agent : John Barnes - Architect

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The current PEZ designation would allow a range of uses to come forward should redevelopment of this PEZ be an option.

0831/1/001/O Ainsworth Construction

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

This objection has been withdrawn.

PEZ27 Waterside Mill, Greenfield**Objections:**

0267/1/001/O Tanner Brothers Ltd

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Remove PEZ designation, as site is more suitable for a mixed use allocation.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

At present there is no evidence to indicate that this site is unsuitable for continued employment use or that there would be no demand for such a use if the present user vacates the premises.

PEZ28 Tamewater Mill, Dobcross**Objections:**

0229/1/001/O Adept Development & Management Ltd

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further information required in order to fully investigate the options for the future use of this site. However, at present, the intention is that the site should be retained for employment generating uses.

PEZ29 Delph New Road, Delph**Objections:**

Initial Responses to Objections

0718/1/004/O**Cllr C M Wheeler***Summary of objection:*

Objection to boundary change, specifically the removal of Bailey Mills from the PEZ as allocated in the adopted UDP

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Although formerly in employment use, it is considered that the long-term future of this important local landmark will be best secured through its conversion for residential use.

0833/1/001/O**Mrs G Clark***Summary of objection:*

Remove allocation as consideration should be given to the amount of traffic through Delph.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

As a matter of principle, the majority of sites with business and industry uses in Saddleworth are protected under the Primary Employment Zone policy to support the local economy and retain local employment. The size of this PEZ was in fact reduced to help secure development of a landmark building (Bailey Mills). Where a development proposed in the area is acceptable in principle but would have significant traffic impacts, a transport assessment would be required and appropriate measures implemented to mitigate these impacts.

PEZ30 Lumb Mill, Delph**Objections:****0251/1/003/O****Meridian Development Company Ltd**

Agent : Inside Out Design

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Initial Responses to Objections

Reason :

There is no evidence that the business centre will be unable to continue to operate as an employment generating site.

PEZ32 Warth/Ellis Mills, Diggle**Objections:**

0132/1/002/O **Arthur Greaves (Lees) Ltd**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Warth Mill cannot reasonably be dissociated from Ellis Mill to create a separate allocation. The PEZ allocation allows a range of uses, including tourism uses such as accommodation, smaller retail and leisure and food and drink. The site is already covered by the Diggle Framework Document, a comprehensive planning study for the development of the area, which was approved for wider consultation by the Saddleworth & Lees Area Committee in September 2002.

PEZ4 Hollinwood South (Mirror Group/Albert Street)**Objections:**

0032/1/003/O **Lattice Property**

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

No change is proposed to PEZ policy as the aim is to protect existing employment areas and associated uses. The designation already allows a range of uses, including smaller retail and leisure. In principle, larger retail proposals are subject to a consideration of need, of which there is no evidence, and to the sequential approach. The site is sizable and well-located for

Initial Responses to Objections

access to the M60 and public transport. Given the relatively limited amount of land available for employment in the Borough, it should not be de-allocated.

PEZ9 Fields New Road, Chadderton**Objections:**

0148/1/001/O Raven Avenue Residents

Summary of objection:

Object to any further allocation to industry within the Chadderton Area because of traffic impact.

Recommended Change:

No change at present to PEZ designation, but propose including a reasoned justification around considering impacts of PEZ uses on any adjacent residential areas.

Reason :

Whilst PEZs are areas in which business and industry dominate, the impacts of these uses should be considered on any residential areas at their boundaries. In any case, further discussion of this particular PEZ is needed around issues arising from other objections to the designation.

0181/1/005/O Oldham Labour Group

Summary of objection:

Southern tip of this site should be de-allocated or redesignated to allow community facilities such as a health centre.

Recommended Change:

Further investigation and internal discussion.

Reason :

Planning consent has been given for a medical facility on the site. Further investigation and internal discussion needed around possible re-allocation of the land and revision of the PEZ boundary.

0247/1/001/O Chadderton & Hollinwood Medical Group

Agent : G P I Corporation Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

Objector has withdrawn objection. Planning consent has been given for a medical facility on the site.

0265/1/001/O**Zetex plc*****Summary of objection:***

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 restrict future development prospects for the property if company decided to move.

Recommended Change:

No change at present.

Reason :

Whilst there is no convincing argument for removing such significant premises from the PEZ, further discussion is being recommended as issues around traffic, re-allocation and uses have been raised by other objections.

Saddleworth PEZs**Objections:****0129/1/001/O****Mr Richard Hindle*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

As a matter of principle, the majority of employment sites in Saddleworth are protected under the Primary Employment Zone policy. The Council has made a small number of mixed use designations to stimulate employment development as part of a wider development package. It is not accepted that this approach would be to the detriment of the local economy.

Walk Mill, Dobcross**Objections:****0105/1/002/O****Dobcross Village Community**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

This objection has been superseded by the recent planning appeal decision which gave approval for residential development.

Werneth Ring Mills, Henley Street, Oldham**Objections:****0261/1/001/O****Oxley Threads Ltd**

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Requires further investigation and discussion of PEZ designation. However, it is not proposed to change the uses acceptable in PEZs generally.

Reason :

Further investigation and discussion required around the merits of allocating the area as a PEZ. However, this will not address the objector's proposal for medically-related uses under the designation. (Note that the site is on Westhulme Street across from Royal Oldham Hospital.)

Initial Responses to Objections

B2.2 Protection of Existing Employment Sites outside PEZs**Objections:****0006/1/012/O Highways Agency***Summary of objection:*

Additional consideration under c. should be negative impact on the efficient operation of the highway network

Recommended Change:

Insert 'and efficient operation of the highway network'

Reason :

In addition to highway safety, consideration should be given to any significant impact of existing employment uses on traffic.

0104/1/003/O Bellway Homes

Agent : Drivers Jonas

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

The need for flexibility in marketing arrangements will be considered further. However, it is expected that the wording of the policy will continue to contain a reference to the need for prior agreement with the Council on marketing arrangements.

Reason :

To clarify the intentions of the policy.

0109/1/002/O Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110)

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

Amend policy to express a presumption in favour of development, remove unnecessary requirements, and provide clarity and fuller justification

Recommended Change:

Consideration will be given to providing further clarity within the wording of the policy and reasoned justification. However, it is not envisaged that the fundamental aims of the policy will be amended.

Initial Responses to Objections

Reason :

To clarify the intentions of the policy.

0113/1/005/O**Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd**

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Consideration will be given to providing further clarity within the wording of the policy and reasoned justification. However, it is not envisaged that the fundamental aims of the policy will be amended.

Reason :

To clarify the intentions of the policy.

0261/1/003/O**Oxley Threads Ltd**

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

Amend policy to express a presumption in favour of development, remove unnecessary requirements, and provide clarity and fuller justification

Recommended Change:

Consideration will be given to providing further clarity within the wording of the policy and reasoned justification. However, it is not envisaged that the fundamental aims of the policy will be amended.

Reason :

To clarify the intentions of the policy.

0289/1/003/O**British Telecommunications Plc**

Agent : RPS Chapman Warren

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Consideration will be given to providing further clarity within the wording of the policy and reasoned justification. However, it is not envisaged that the fundamental aims of the policy will be amended and no change is envisaged in direct response to this objection.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

The Plan allocates a relatively modest amount of land specifically for business and industry and therefore relies to a considerable extent on existing land and premises to accommodate the needs of business and industry over the Plan period. The policy does not preclude alternative uses, but sets out criteria which such proposals would have to meet. Proposals that provide employment on site will be favoured over those that do not, as stated in the last sentence of para 5.25.

Initial Responses to Objections

B2.2 b.

Objections:**0102/1/002/O Brierstone Properties Ltd**

Agent : Drivers Jonas

Summary of objection:

Criteria relating to the length of time that a site should be marketed should be amended to become more flexible.

Recommended Change:

The need for flexibility in marketing arrangements will be considered further. However, it is expected that the wording of the policy will continue to contain a reference to the need for prior agreement with the Council on marketing arrangements.

Reason :

To clarify the intentions of the policy.

Initial Responses to Objections

B2.3 Existing Businesses within the Green Belt**Objections:**

0021/1/026/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

Extension, alteration and infilling of existing business in Green Belt is contrary to PPG2.

Recommended Change:

Further discussion advised.

Reason :

To investigate whether the aim of supporting existing businesses in the Green Belt justifies the retention of the policy, with amendments.

0040/1/017/O Saddleworth Parish Council

Agent : Eagland Planning Associates

Summary of objection:

Limited development should be allowed within existing curtilages of disused mills and other business premises in the Green Belt for employment, including as part of a mixed use scheme, subject to protection of flora and fauna and Green Belt policies.

Recommended Change:

Amend wording to make the policy extend to mill or other business premises that have fallen into disuse.

Reason :

It is unnecessary to add a new policy, but the existing policy can reasonably be extended to apply to mill or business premises, which is also consistent with the purpose of Green Belt policy OE1.6 in the Plan. Consideration of flora, fauna and habitats is covered in the Open Environment section.

5.26**Supporting Representations:**

0106/1/007/S Friezland Residents' Association

Initial Responses to Objections

Conservation**Objections:****0825/1/005/O****English Heritage***Summary of objection:*

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

Recommended Change:

Include Scheduled Ancient Monuments and registered Historic Parks and Gardens on the proposals map.

Reason :

To identify these important designations.

Initial Responses to Objections

C1 Conservation of the Historic Environment**Supporting Representations:**

0117/1/010/S North West Tourist Board

Objections:

0007/1/014/O Uppermill Residents Association

Summary of objection:

This section does not contain any provision for preserving and removing an historic building to another site.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

This is likely to be a relatively rare occurrence. The need for such action would be considered on its merits should the situation arise.

0106/1/006/O Friezland Residents' Association

Summary of objection:

Would like policy strengthened to conserve and regenerate industrial heritage as speculative developments threaten the character and heritage of the area.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

It is considered that the plan policies relating to the conservation of the built environment are consistent with current Government Policy as expressed in PPG 15 "Planning and the Historic Environment" and provide a comprehensive framework against which to assess development proposals.

PPG 15 is a material planning consideration in its own right.

12.10 Royal George Mills, Greenfield**Objections:**

0106/1/001/O Friezland Residents' Association

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Conservation Area statements should be stronger to protect conservation areas such as the Royal George and to enhance the Green Belt

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The reasoned justification of the policy already gives due emphasis to the critical importance of the historic environment and indicates that the Council will attach a high priority to its preservation and enhancement.

The policy (and the Part 2 policies) in this section apply with equal force to all designated conservation areas and it is not considered either necessary or reasonable to introduce additional policies specific to particular conservation areas.

Conservation area character appraisals are however, amongst other things, intended to facilitate more informed consideration of development proposals within particular designated conservation areas and the Council has indicated an intention to prepare more of these as resources permit.

The proposed policies already attach due importance to the protection of open land or spaces within or in the vicinity of a conservation area where this is important to the special character or appearance of the area or its setting.

Green Belt policy is dealt with elsewhere in the plan.

12.12**Objections:****0825/1/004/O****English Heritage*****Summary of objection:***

Questions whether or not the Council have a Local List - if not mention should be made of the compilation of such a list.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The value of such a list for development control purposes is acknowledged. However, given scarce resources, the Council is reluctant to give a firm commitment in the plan to the preparation of such a list as any failure to do so may suggest that important non-listed historic buildings are of no intrinsic merit.

Initial Responses to Objections

Initial Responses to Objections

C1.1 Development within or affecting the Setting of Conservation Areas**Supporting Representations:**

0543/1/001/S Denshaw Community Association

Objections:

0045/1/017/O Wiggett Construction Ltd

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Policy should be rewritten to simplify its content and express its intentions more clearly.

Recommended Change:

Amend the first two paragraphs of the policy as follows:

"Permission will only be granted for development proposals within or affecting the setting of a designated conservation area which would clearly serve to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the area.

In this regard the Council will require proposals for development in such locations to achieve particularly high standards of design, a sensitive and appropriate response to context and good attention to detail."

Reason :

To clarify in what circumstances the policy will apply although in general terms the policy is not considered to be either too detailed or unclear.

Initial Responses to Objections

C1.10 Demolition of a Listed Building or Structure**12.49****Objections:****0021/1/041/O Government Office for the North West***Summary of objection:*

Give correct title of PPG15

Recommended Change:

Give the correct title to PPG 15 in paragraph 2.49 of the reasoned justification i.e."Planning and the Historic Environment"

Reason :

To ensure that the PPG 15 is given its correct title.

Initial Responses to Objections

C1.2 Demolition of Buildings in Conservation Areas**Objections:****0021/1/042/O****Government Office for the North West***Summary of objection:*

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

Recommended Change:

Delete the existing policy criteria and replace with the following:

- a. (i) there is no realistic prospect of the building continuing in its existing use or that a suitable alternative use cannot reasonably be found; or
- (ii) the building is in poor structural condition and the cost of repairing and maintaining it would be disproportionate in relation to its importance and to the value derived from its continued use; and
- b. the demolition is part of a redevelopment proposal which would, in its own right, serve to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the conservation area.

Reason :

The inconsistency between the wording of the policy and the reasoned justification is acknowledged. The intended requirement is that the two stated tests in criterion a. relating to (i) use or (ii) structural condition are alternatives.

The required amendment of the wording of the proposed new criterion b. of the policy to accord with the wording of the Act is acknowledged.

0045/1/019/O**Wiggett Construction Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Policy should be reworded to more accurately reflect the content of national guidance.

Recommended Change:

No change (but see response to objection 0021/1/042/O)

Reason :

As amended it is considered that this policy is not inconsistent with the content of national guidance.

Initial Responses to Objections

Initial Responses to Objections

C1.3 Retention of Distinctive Local Features or Structures**Objections:****0021/1/039/O****Government Office for the North West***Summary of objection:*

Would suggest that the Policy set out circumstances in which, exceptionally, development proposals might be approved.

Recommended Change:

Add an additional paragraph to the policy as follows:

"In exceptional circumstances the fact that a development would bring substantial benefits to the community may be weighed in the balance against the requirements of this policy to retain such features."

Reason :

This suggestion is accepted as it will render the policy more robust in that, whilst in effect retaining a presumption that features and structures of architectural, historic or townscape importance should normally be retained and incorporated in any proposed development, allowing, in exceptional circumstances, some flexibility to accept loss of such features where it is considered that a proposed development will deliver substantial benefits to the local community.

0045/1/016/O**Wiggett Construction Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Policy should be deleted. Policy C1.3 duplicates the content of policies C1.1 and C1.2 and is therefore not required.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The policy does not duplicate policy C1.2 which deals exclusively with buildings whereas this one deals with structures and other features of importance, both built and unbuilt, to the character or appearance of a conservation area.

There is some limited overlap with Policy C1.1 (specifically criterion e.) which gives the range of criteria against which new development within or affecting the setting of a conservation area will be assessed. However this policy seeks to protect a wider range of structures and features of importance to the character of a conservation area by a range of

Initial Responses to Objections

means and as such is considered to warrant a separate policy in its own right.

Initial Responses to Objections

C1.4 Alterations & Extensions to Buildings in Conservation Areas**Objections:****0045/1/018/O Wiggett Construction Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Policy should be rewritten to be less onerous and reflect the need to conserve or enhance a Conservation Area and not just individual buildings.

Recommended Change:

Delete the present criteria a. and replace it with a new criteria to read as follows:

a. "the proposal will not result in the loss, alteration or concealment of important architectural or historic features of the building which would significantly detract from its character or appearance and the contribution it makes to the character or appearance of the conservation area."

Reason :

The policy reflects the fact that many unlisted buildings in conservation areas make a valuable contribution to the character and appearance of such areas and that consequently alterations to or extensions of such buildings requiring planning permission need to be designed with due regard to both the character and appearance of the building itself and that of the wider area.

It is however suggested that the policy could be modified to refer to "important" features of the building, thus ensuring that the policy is not unduly restrictive.

Initial Responses to Objections

C1.6 Advertisements in Conservation Areas & on Listed Buildings

12.28

Supporting Representations:

0007/1/013/S Uppermill Residents Association

Initial Responses to Objections

C1.7 The Re-use of Historic Buildings**Objections:****0021/1/040/O****Government Office for the North West***Summary of objection:*

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

Recommended Change:

Amend the wording of the policy to read "...preserve or enhance..." and similarly lines 7 and 9 of paragraph 12.30 of the reasoned justification.

Reason :

To accord with the wording of the Act.

0693/1/004/O

Mr P. Whitehead*Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Proposals for the demolition of unlisted buildings in conservation areas will be considered on their merits against the criteria contained in Policy C1.2 of the plan and the guidance contained in PPG 15 (Planning and the Historic Environment).

Initial Responses to Objections

Community/Education**9.6****Objections:****0495/1/001/O Sport England***Summary of objection:*

Community Facilities should also include sport and recreation facilities

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Policies governing the development and protection of sport and recreation facilities are adequately set out in the Recreation and Open Space section of the plan (which is being redrafted in the light of the revised PPG17).

Initial Responses to Objections

CF1 New & Improved Education & Community Facilities**Supporting Representations:**

0152/1/013/S Oak Street Area Community Group

Objections:

0008/1/023/O Countryside Agency

Summary of objection:

Chapter should promote community planning and the means of participation for example Village Design Statements.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Consideration will be given to adding text which promotes community planning.

0368/1/005/O

Dr David Atherton

Summary of objection:

The shortage of doctors in Oldham has not been considered in the Plan - list sizes and premises in Greenfield already over capacity.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The plan cannot directly influence the number of doctors in an area. It is unlikely that a planning application for housing development could be refused owing to a claimed lack of doctors in an area. However, the aim is to ensure that sites are allocated where, as far as possible, there are the community facilities available to support the residents. The availability of community facilities will therefore continue to be explored.

0474/1/002/O

Parish of Leesfield

Summary of objection:

Requests additional wording to be added as follows: "The need to expand schools due to new housing estates should be kept under careful review".

Recommended Change:

The desired change suggested by the objector could be accommodated by including a reference under H1 or H1.2 and within the Community and Education Facilities section.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

The objector is particularly concerned about the potential impact on St. Agnes CoE school of releasing phase 2 housing site H1.2.10 Knowls Lane. It is accepted that the Plan should be amended to make it clear that the need to address the impact of development on local schools will be considered before releasing any Phase 2 housing sites.

Land at Royal Oldham Hospital**Objections:**

0493/1/001/O The Royal Oldham Hospital

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

Include policies to allow for the development and expansion of the Hospital Services which are expected during the Plan period.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further consideration of policy approach required to ensure the hospital can operate effectively.

Initial Responses to Objections

CF1.1 Education Facilities**Objections:****0474/1/001/O** **Parish of Leesfield***Summary of objection:*

Policy should include identification of a suitable replacement site for St. Thomas C of E aided school.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further discussion with objector required in order to determine precise land requirements.

CF1.1.2 Platting Road, Lydgate**Supporting Representations:****0007/1/011/S** **Uppermill Residents Association****Objections:****0479/1/001/O** **Murray Foster***Summary of objection:*

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

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Currently there are no plans to erect buildings on this site. Any such proposals would have to be consistent with Policy CF1.2. and the Open Space, Sport and Recreation policies of the Plan.

0828/1/009/O **Saddleworth Civic Trust***Summary of objection:*

Would like to see this land (allocated as playing fields) protected from further development by being designated for recreational use.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

None.

Reason :

The recreational policies of the UDP will be re-drafted in the light of the newly revised PPG17. It is likely that the new policies will cover the point made by the objector.

Initial Responses to Objections

CF1.2 New & Improved Community Facilities**Objections:****0021/1/034/O****Government Office for the North West***Summary of objection:*

The Policy should make clear which criteria must be met if planning permission is to be granted.

Recommended Change:

Consider revising policy wording to comply with Government guidance.

Reason :

For clarity.

Initial Responses to Objections

CF1.2 d.

Supporting Representations:

0152/1/008/S

Oak Street Area Community Group

Initial Responses to Objections

CF1.3 Loss of Education & Community Facilities**Objections:****0021/1/035/O****Government Office for the North West***Summary of objection:*

The Policy should be redrafted to make clear which criteria must be met if planning permission is to be granted.

Recommended Change:

Consider revising policy wording to comply with Government guidance.

Reason :

For clarity.

Initial Responses to Objections

CF1.4 Dual Use**Supporting Representations:**

0495/1/013/S Sport England

Objections:

0021/1/036/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

The Policy should make clear which criteria must be met if planning permission is to be granted.

Recommended Change:

Consider revising policy wording to comply with Government guidance.

Reason :

For clarity.

Initial Responses to Objections

CF1.5 Developer Contributions to New Teaching Spaces**Supporting Representations:**

0543/1/011/S Denshaw Community Association

Objections:

0021/1/037/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

There is an inconsistency between the Policy and Justification which should be rectified.

Recommended Change:

The wording of this policy will be reconsidered to make it clearer and to provide a more detailed description of how it will operate.

Reason :

It is accepted that both the wording of this policy and justification require reconsideration for the sake of clarity.

0104/1/004/O Bellway Homes

Agent : Drivers Jonas

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

The wording of this policy will be reconsidered to make it clearer and to provide a more detailed description of how it will operate.

Reason :

It is accepted that both the wording of this policy and justification require reconsideration for the sake of clarity.

0107/1/002/O Westbury Homes

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

The wording of this policy will be reconsidered to make it clearer and to provide a more detailed description of how it will operate.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

It is accepted that both the wording of this policy and justification require reconsideration for the sake of clarity.

0109/1/005/O**Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110)**

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

It is not intended to delete this policy, however it is accepted that the wording of this policy and justification requires reconsidering.

0113/1/007/O**Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd**

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

It is not intended to delete this policy, however it is accepted that the wording of this policy and justification requires reconsidering.

9.18**Objections:****0243/1/004/O****Alan Roughley*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

The wording of this policy will be reconsidered to make it clearer and to provide a more detailed description of how it will operate.

Reason :

It is accepted that both the wording of this policy and justification require reconsideration for the sake of clarity.

Initial Responses to Objections

Design**Objections:****0008/1/012/O****Countryside Agency***Summary of objection:*

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

It is considered that the policy thrust of the whole plan is very much concerned with quality of life in its widest sense and not just the physical design dimension. A specific reference in this regard is felt to be unnecessary.

Rochdale Canal**Objections:****0038/1/009/O****Greater Manchester Ecology Unit***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

Include reference to the international designation of the Rochdale canal in para 13.36 of the reasoned justification of NR2.1

Reason :

To ensure that developers are aware of the international level of protection enjoyed by the Rochdale canal and the implications of this in terms of development adjacent to it. Designated sites are specifically covered by Policy OE2.3.

Initial Responses to Objections

D1 Design of New Development**Supporting Representations:**

0740/1/008/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0008/1/013/O Countryside Agency

Summary of objection:

Support policy D1 but it needs to be reworded to apply to all parts of the Borough, rural and urban (wording supplied)

Recommended Change:

Amend the wording of the first sentence of paragraph 3.11 of the reasoned justification of the policy to refer to urban and rural environments.

Reason :

. "Urban design" is an increasingly widely used and understood term that has a different and more specific meaning than the word "design" used in isolation. The term is given prominence in PPG 1 in the section on design (paras 13-20).

The reasoned justification for the policy (3.10) indicates that the policy applies equally to both urban and rural situations.

0429/1/001/O

Friends, Families and Travellers

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

The phrase "social exclusion" in this particular context is with reference to the design of the public realm.

Initial Responses to Objections

D1.1 General Design Criteria**Supporting Representations:**

0149/1/003/S	English Nature
0263/1/005/S	CPRE - Lancashire
0740/1/009/S	North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0008/1/014/O Countryside Agency

Summary of objection:

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).

Recommended Change:

Amend paragraph 3.13 of the reasoned justification to read "This policy provides a checklist on good design for new development that will be applied as appropriate to development in both urban and rural locations."

Reason :

To make it clear that the Council's intention is indeed that this policy should apply equally in all types of area.

0021/1/016/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

1. Amend the first sentence of the policy to read "The Council will only permit new development if its design meets the following criteria, as applicable to the type and scale of development under consideration, and the particular characteristics of the site, its location and context:"
2. Delete the words "it contributes to the creation of a high quality public realm" at the start of criterion e. and replace with "is consistent with the creation and maintenance of a high quality public realm"
3. Delete the existing criterion l. from the policy and replace with a new criterion l. worded as follows "it seeks to reduce it's environmental impact in terms of energy efficiency and surface water run-off."
4. Transfer the reference to the requirement for the submission of design statements for major applications and those on sensitive sites to the reasoned justification.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

It is not accepted that this is an over-detailed policy. It does contain a considerable number of criteria but it is considered important to combine these into a single policy to provide an appropriate focus for the multi-faceted issue of good urban design. More flexibility and robustness can be built into the policy by amending the introductory sentence to make it plain that not all criteria may be applicable in all cases dependent on the type, scale or location of the development in question.

There is some degree of overlap with certain of the following policies but where this occurs it is because the topics concerned warrant more detailed policy guidance to give sufficient clarity as to the Authority's intentions.

The wording of criterion e. is amended to reflect the view that requiring new development to be consistent with the creation (and maintenance) of a high quality public realm is a more reasonable general requirement than requiring a positive contribution in all instances.

It is accepted that criterion l. of the policy dealing with environmental performance is insufficiently explicit. Whilst the requirement for new development to be designed to optimise sustainability in its wider sense is substantially covered by the other criteria in this policy, in respect of achieving more sustainable design in terms of energy efficiency and surface water run-off it is suggested that the current criteria be deleted and a new one introduced.

It is agreed that the reference to design statements would more appropriately sit in the reasoned justification rather than in the policy itself.

0038/1/013/O**Greater Manchester Ecology Unit*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Amend wording of criteria g. to read "...the provision of appropriate new landscaping and habitats..."

Reason :

To ensure that the most suitable types of habitat are provided for any particular location.

0045/1/011/O**Wiggett Construction Ltd****Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Reword policy on General Design Criteria to be less onerous and more compatible with PPG1

Recommended Change:

See changes proposed in response to objection 0021/1/016/O from the Government Office for the North West which should partially address the objectors concerns.

Reason :

The policy is not considered to be too detailed or too long.

Potential for some additional flexibility in interpretation has been built in in response to the objection from GONW together with a modified criteria 1. dealing with environmental performance.

In general the policy is not considered to be incompatible with central government planning policy as set out in PPG 1 (General Policy and Principles) and PPG 3 (Housing) and their associated companion guides.

0110/1/004/O**Paul Speak Properties Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Reword policy on General Design Criteria to be less onerous and more compatible with PPG1

Recommended Change:

See changes proposed in response to objection 0021/1/016/O from the Government Office for the North West which should partially address the objectors concerns.

Reason :

The policy is not considered to be too detailed or too long.

Potential for some additional flexibility in interpretation has been built in in response to the objection from GONW together with a modified criteria 1. dealing with environmental performance.

In general the policy is not considered to be incompatible with central government planning policy as set out in PPG 1 (General Policy and Principles) and PPG 3 (Housing) and their associated companion guides.

0815/1/009/O**Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL**

Agent : Cordingleys

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

The criterion already indicates the qualification "where possible".

Initial Responses to Objections

D1.1 k)

3.15, 3.20

Objections:

0006/1/009/O

Highways Agency

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

This particular criterion of the policy is concerned with ensuring the provision of safe and convenient vehicular access, servicing and essential parking in new developments. The issues of promoting less car dependency and transport assessments are covered elsewhere in the plan.

The reference is paragraph 3.20 of the reasoned justification of the policy to more flexible highway standards relates to housing developments and will not impact on trunk roads.

Initial Responses to Objections

D1.11 House Extensions**Objections:****0006/1/008/O****Highways Agency***Summary of objection:*

The Highways agency should be consulted on all house extensions with respect to section "e" of the policy

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

Policies should not deal with consultation arrangements. Notwithstanding, the need to consult with the Highways Agency on householder planning applications is not accepted.

Initial Responses to Objections

D1.12 Telecommunications**Supporting Representations:**

0737/1/001/S

Orange Personal Communications Services LTD

Objections:**0038/1/002/O****Greater Manchester Ecology Unit***Summary of objection:*

There is a lack of reference to sites of nature conservation value

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

Criterion c. of the policy refers to areas of particular environmental importance which paragraph 3.74 of the reasoned justification advises includes a range of sites of nature conservation interest.

0082/1/001/O**Crown Castle UK Ltd***Summary of 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.

Recommended Change:

See response to objection 0264/1/001/O in respect of removal of redundant equipment.

No other change proposed.

Reason :

The policy already addresses the issue of mast sharing. There is no requirement in PPG 8 to identify mast sites in development plans and in any event full information is not to hand to do so.

0264/1/001/O**Vodafone Ltd**

Agent : Tony Thorpe Associates

Summary of 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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

Delete the last sentence of the policy.

Reason :

The requirement to remove redundant equipment is included in the provisions of the Telecommunications Act 1984.

The need for a particular telecommunications development as opposed to the service as a whole is acknowledged as a material planning consideration in PPG 8.

PPG 8 does not preclude consideration of the impact of telecommunications development on other than statutory designated areas as a material consideration.

0820/1/001/O

One 2 One Personal Communications Ltd

Agent : James Barr Consultants

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

This representation makes general comment on planning policy for telecommunications development with reference to national guidance. The representation makes no specific comments in respect of Policy D1.12 of the plan.

3.75**Objections:**

0021/1/019/O

Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

Amend the wording at the end of para. 3.75 to "character or appearance" in line with PPG15 para 4.14

Recommended Change:

Amend the reference to "character and appearance" in the last sentence of paragraph 3.75 of the reasoned justification to read "character or appearance".

Reason :

To accord with the wording in PPG 15.

Initial Responses to Objections

3.80

Supporting Representations:

0016/1/009/S

STORM

Initial Responses to Objections

D1.13 Design of Development Adjoining Main Transport Corridors & at Gateway Locations in Town & District Centres**Supporting Representations:**

0263/1/007/S

CPRE - Lancashire

Objections:**0045/1/012/O****Wiggett Construction Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Policy should be substantially reworded to be less onerous.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

It is considered that it is entirely reasonable to require new development to optimise (i.e. make the best or most of) potential for the enhancement of the general visual amenity of the transport corridor in question. It is merely good planning and urban design and cannot reasonably be considered to be onerous.

Initial Responses to Objections

D1.2 Environmental Performance of New Built Developmen**Supporting Representations:**

0263/1/004/S CPRE - Lancashire
0740/1/010/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0021/1/011/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Initial Responses to Objections

Delete existing policy and insert new policy entitled "Designing for energy efficiency" as follows:

"New development should be designed to optimise its energy efficiency in respect of its layout, built form, fenestration and landscaping, insofar as is reasonably practicable and with due regard to other planning objectives"

Reasoned Justification: The need to procure more genuinely sustainable development is now an accepted objective for the planning system. It is widely acknowledged that seeking to achieve more energy efficient siting and design of buildings can make a major contribution in this regard by significantly reducing CO₂ emissions and conserving non-renewable energy supplies.

PPG 3 advises that local planning authorities should adopt policies which "promote the energy efficiency of new housing where possible". The materiality of the subject for the planning system has been acknowledged by the publication of "Planning for Passive Solar Design" on behalf of the DTI and DETR. (1997).

For example, in respect of housing developments, the following measures can significantly reduce potential energy consumption of the completed development:

- (i) Siting buildings so as to avoid very exposed positions such as hill crests and conversely favour sites that are naturally sheltered by landform or woodland.
- (ii) Use of an increased proportion of attached house types (flats and terraced)
- (iii) Having an emphasis on wider shallower floor plans.
- (iv) Orientating buildings within 45 degrees of south (but preferably within 30 degrees) and arranging fenestration to catch light and sun.
- (v) Positioning the main living accommodation on the south side of the house.
- (vi) Designing the layout of buildings and trees so as to minimise overshadowing.
- (vii) Use planting creatively to provide a sheltered microclimate for buildings and external spaces.
- (viii) Avoiding layouts which exacerbate "wind tunnel" effects.
- (ix) Incorporating pitched roofs that are capable of receiving solar panels or PVCs.
- (x) Positioning conservatories and porches to maximise solar gain and thermal buffering to external doorways.

Practical advice on designing to achieve more energy efficient designs can be found in:

Planning for Passive Solar Design (BRESCU, 1997).

Sustainable Settlements (University of the West of England, Local Agenda 21 UK, the Local Government Management Board, 1995).

The Council intends to incorporate practical advice in supplementary planning guidance as a matter of priority.

It is accepted that developments designed to maximise energy efficiency may, in some instances, incorporate features that may give a building something of an unconventional appearance that may be considered at odds with its surrounding. However with good design there is no reason why such features need have any significant adverse visual impact on the public realm. However in those instances where this is an issue the Council will attach positive weight to the sustainability benefits accruing in considering the issue of the visual impact of the development on the public realm.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

It is suggested that the existing somewhat imprecise policy be deleted and replaced with one dealing with designing for energy efficiency which is clearer as to its scope and purpose and which more clearly deals only with acknowledged material planning considerations.

0045/1/014/O**Wiggett Construction Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

The policy should be deleted or substantially reworded to reflect matters that are material considerations in the planning process.

Recommended Change:

See response to objection 0021/0011/O from the Government Office for the North West.

Reason :

It is suggested that the existing policy D1.2 be wholly deleted and replaced with a new policy designing for energy efficiency through layout, landscape and building design that is clearer in scope and purpose and deals only with widely accepted material planning considerations.

0108/1/002/O**The House Builders Federation*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

See the response to objection 0021/1/011/O from the Government Office for the North West.

Reason :

It is suggested that the existing policy D1.2 be wholly deleted and replaced with a new policy designing for energy efficiency through layout, landscape and building design that is clearer in scope and purpose and deals only with widely accepted material planning considerations.

0110/1/006/O**Paul Speak Properties Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Delete or substantially reword policy to reflect matters that are material considerations in the planning process

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

See response to objection 0021/1/011/O from the Government Office for the North West.

Reason :

It is suggested that the existing policy D1.2 be wholly deleted and replaced with a new policy designing for energy efficiency through layout, landscape and building design that is clearer in scope and purpose and deals only with widely accepted material planning considerations.

3.24**Objections:**

0113/1/003/O Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

Object to the requirement under criterion a. of para. 3.24 to use local and sustainable resources for materials - should provide more flexibility.

Recommended Change:

See response to objection 0021/1/011/O from the Government Office for the North West.

Reason :

It is suggested that the existing policy D1.2 be wholly deleted and replaced with a new policy designing for energy efficiency through layout, landscape, and building design that is clearer in scope and purpose and deals only with widely accepted material planning considerations.

Initial Responses to Objections

D1.3 Access for Mobility & Sensory Impaired people**Supporting Representations:**

0740/1/011/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0021/1/017/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

The wording should be amended to make clear which criteria must be met if planning permission is to be granted.

Recommended Change:

Amend the first paragraph of the policy to read as follows: "The Council will require the design of new development to make adequate provision for access by people who have mobility or sensory impairments. As appropriate to the type and scale of development proposed, such provision should include:"

Reason :

To make it clear that not all criteria will be applicable in all cases dependent on the nature of the development proposed.

Initial Responses to Objections

D1.4 Habitat & Wildlife on Development Sites**Supporting Representations:**

0149/1/004/S English Nature
 0740/1/012/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0038/1/014/O Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Amend the wording of the first paragraph of the policy to read "Development proposals affecting a site containing features of substantive nature conservation value shall be designed to minimise any adverse impact on such features and to mitigate any unavoidable adverse impact caused."

Modify the first sentence of paragraph 3.37 of the reasoned justification to read "In the case of sites containing features of substantive nature conservation value which would be affected by the proposed development, and including all sites which contain protected species or their roosts or habitats, applications for planning permission should be accompanied by a habitat survey of the site carried out by a qualified ecologist or other appropriate professional."

Reason :

To ensure consistency with PPG 9 and to emphasis the need for habitat surveys to be carried out on sites where protected species are involved.

0045/1/010/O Wiggett Construction Ltd

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Reword policy to be less onerous. The emphasis should be on mitigation and the avoidance of unnecessary harm.

Recommended Change:

Initial Responses to Objections

Amend the wording of the first paragraph of the policy as follows:

"Development proposals affecting a site containing features of substantive nature conservation value shall be designed to minimise any adverse impact on such features and to mitigate any unavoidable adverse impact caused."

Amend criterion a. to read: "that all significant adverse effects on such features have been avoided wherever reasonably practicable"

Amend criterion c. to read: "that, notwithstanding any requirements in respect of criterion b., the design of the development seeks to optimise any potential for the provision of new habitats by sensitive landscaping and planting and other measures."

Add to beginning of paragraph 3.36 - "National planning policy on nature conservation advises that "Plans should be concerned not only with designated areas but also with other land of conservation value and the possible provision of new habitats." (PPG 9 para. 24). "Sensitive landscaping and planting, the creation, maintenance and management of landscape features important to wildlife and the skilled adaptation of derelict areas can provide extended habitats." (PPG 9 para 15)"

Inset an additional paragraph in the reasoned justification- "For the purposes of this policy sites containing features of substantive nature conservation value are as defined in policies OE 2.3 and OE 2.4 of the plan."

Reason :

The policy is not considered to be unduly onerous and is considered to be broadly in line with national planning policy as expressed in PPG9 (Nature Conservation). PPG9 acknowledges that features of nature conservation value may occur on other than designated sites and that the planning process should properly have regard to such features and to the creation of new habitats where opportunities arise.

It is proposed that the wording of the policy be generally amended to more accurately reflect national planning guidance as expressed in PPG9 (Nature Conservation) and to provide greater clarity.

Reference to Policies OE2.3 and OE2.4 of the Plan (as amended) clarifies the range of sites and species to which this policy relates and this is made clear by a suggested addition to the reasoned justification.

0110/1/007/O**Paul Speak Properties Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Reword policy to be less onerous. The emphasis should be on mitigation and the avoidance of unnecessary harm.

Recommended Change:

See response to objection 0045/1/010/O

Reason :

See response to objection 0045/1/010/O

0124/1/003/O
Lancashire Wildlife Trust
Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Add an additional paragraph to the reasoned justification of the policy as follows: " For the purposes of the policy an affected site may comprise the development site itself or adjoining land the nature conservation value of which would be likely to be adversely affected by the development".

Reason :

The policy seeks to afford a high priority to ensuring that significant habitats and wildlife are adequately protected when new development takes place, where harm is unavoidable, to ensuring that appropriate mitigation is carried out, and that opportunities are taken to create new habitats of value to wildlife wherever possible.

The policy already makes reference to wildlife corridors but it is accepted that some additional reference to the potential impact of development on habitats and wildlife on land adjoining a proposed development site would be reasonable.

0815/1/010/O
Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL

Agent : Cordingleys

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

See response to objection 0045/1/010/O

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

See response to objection 00451/010/O

Initial Responses to Objections

D1.5 Protection of Trees on Development Sites**Supporting Representations:**

0149/1/005/S English Nature
 0263/1/003/S CPRE - Lancashire

Objections:

0045/1/013/O Wiggett Construction Ltd

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Revise the policy requirement from 6 replacement trees for each tree removed to 3 trees for each tree removed.

Reason :

The policy explicitly relates only to trees which are likely, by virtue of their established nature and size, to make a significant contribution to visual amenity and local biodiversity.

It is not considered to be an unreasonable requirement for the design of a development to seek to maximise the retention and continued health of such trees where reasonably practicable to do so.

The existing Unitary Development Plan specifies a minimum replacement ratio of 1:3 for any trees lost to development rather than the 1:6 figured incorporated in this policy at present. On reflection this is a more reasonable replacement ratio that better balances the need to see more trees planted in the Borough and the fact that the amenity and wildlife value of replacement trees will inevitably be less in the short to medium term than that of the existing trees against the need to achieve an efficient use of land in terms of density of development..

0109/1/003/O Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110)

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Initial Responses to Objections

Revise the policy requirement from 6 replacement trees for each tree removed to 3 trees for each tree removed.

Amend the last sentence of the policy to read as follows: "In exceptional circumstances (e.g. certain small infill sites), where it is agreed that on-site replacement planting is not practicable, arrangements must be made for the planting of the replacement trees on a suitable site in the wider locality through the medium of a Section 106 Planning Obligation."

Reason :

The existing Unitary Development Plan specifies a minimum replacement ratio of 1:3 for any trees lost to development rather than the 1:6 figured incorporated in this policy at present. On reflection this is a more reasonable replacement ratio that better balances the need to see more trees planted in the Borough and the fact that the amenity and wildlife value of replacement trees will inevitably be less in the short to medium term than that of the existing trees against the need to achieve an efficient use of land in terms of density of development. A ratio of 1:2 is considered to be too low.

It is suggested that the policy be modified to clarify that, in exceptional circumstances, where replacement trees are not to be accommodated on site arrangements to plant the required trees elsewhere must be embodied in a Section 106 planning obligation.

0110/1/005/O**Paul Speak Properties Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

As for 0045/1/013/O

Reason :

As for 0045/1/013/O

0113/1/002/O**Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd**

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Initial Responses to Objections

Revise the policy requirement from 6 replacement trees for each tree removed to 3 trees for each tree removed.

Amend the last sentence of the policy to read as follows: "In exceptional circumstances (e.g. certain small infill sites), where it is agreed that on-site replacement planting is not practicable, arrangements must be made for the planting of the replacement trees on a suitable site in the wider locality through the medium of a Section 106 Planning Obligation."

Reason :

The existing Unitary Development Plan specifies a minimum replacement ratio of 1:3 for any trees lost to development rather than the 1:6 figured incorporated in this policy at present. On reflection this is a more reasonable replacement ratio that better balances the need to see more trees planted in the Borough and the fact that the amenity and wildlife value of replacement trees will inevitably be less in the short to medium term than that of the existing trees against the need to achieve an efficient use of land in terms of density of development. A ratio of 1:2 is considered to be too low.

It is suggested that the policy be modified to clarify that, in exceptional circumstances, where replacement trees are not to be accommodated on site arrangements to plant the required trees elsewhere must be embodied in a Section 106 planning obligation.

0243/1/001/O**Alan Roughley*****Summary of objection:***

With regard to the provision of "six new native trees", the definition of native and the height of the trees need to be specified.

Recommended Change:

Delete the reference "of an appropriate size and type" from the second/third lines of the last paragraph of the policy.

Add a paragraph to the reasoned justification as follows "The mix of species to be included in any required scheme of replacement will be negotiated on a case by case basis but in most cases will predominantly comprise native species considered appropriate to the site and context and, where appropriate, having regard to the species of trees that are to be lost. Replacement trees should normally have a minimum girth of 10-12 cm measured 1 metre from ground level (i.e. standards).

Reason :

To clarify the intentions of the policy in respect of the type and size of replacement trees required.

0723/1/001/O**Forestry Commission*****Summary of objection:***

Initial Responses to Objections

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

Recommended Change:

Discuss possible reference to controls over tree felling under the Forestry Act 1967 in the reasoned justification of the policy with the Forestry Commission and refer to the Oldham Woodland Strategy and the Pennine Edge Forest in the reasoned justification.

Reason :

To ensure adequate referencing to other important controls and initiatives.

0815/1/011/O

Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL

Agent : Cordingleys

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Replace the references to "mature and semi-mature trees" in the policy with the term "trees" and define "tree" for the purposes of the policy in the reasoned justification as a tree having a minimum diameter of 75mm as measured at a point 1.5 metres above ground level.

Reason :

The need for clearer guidance as to the size of tree to which this policy applies is accepted. The given size is that above which notification is required for works to trees in designated conservation areas.

3.40**Objections:**

0038/1/015/O

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Summary of objection:

Support for policy and supporting text. Para. 3.40 - change wording from "where possible" to "where appropriate".

Recommended Change:

Amend the last sentence of paragraph 3.40 of the reasoned justification to read as follows: "Where appropriate, indication should also be provided as to whether the trees are used by bats or breeding birds."

Reason :

To make it clear that notification should be given to the local planning authority when protected species may be in evidence.

Initial Responses to Objections

Initial Responses to Objections

D1.6 Landscape Design & Tree Planting**Supporting Representations:**

0038/1/016/S Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
 0149/1/006/S English Nature

Objections:

0021/1/018/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

The RJ should explain how the Council expects landscape design and tree conservation to contribute to energy conservation.

Recommended Change:

Add an additional sentence to the end of paragraph 3.48 of the reasoned justification as follows: "The retention of existing and the creation of new planting can contribute to energy conservation by reducing the exposure of buildings to cold winds."

Reason :

To explain how landscaping can contribute to energy conservation.

0108/1/003/O The House Builders Federation

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Amend the first sentence of the policy to read "Where appropriate, the Council will require..."

Add an additional paragraph to the reasoned justification to read as follows: "It is acknowledged that landscaping of any description may be either inappropriate or impracticable with some types of development (e.g certain changes of use or infill developments).

Reason :

To acknowledge that in some instances external landscaping may either be impracticable or inappropriate.

0263/1/001/O CPRE - Lancashire

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Add that the high standards for landscape design must be sensitive to the immediate site context, in order to support local distinctiveness

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The need for landscape schemes to be designed to reinforce local distinctiveness is already referred to in paragraph 3.46 of the reasoned justification of the policy.

0723/1/002/O**Forestry Commission*****Summary of objection:***

Supports elements regarding trees and woodland. Should also refer to Oldham Woodland Strategy and Pennine Edge Forest

Recommended Change:

Amend the reasoned justification of the policy to refer to the Oldham Woodland Strategy and the Pennine Edge Forest.

Reason :

These are important tree planting initiatives to which landscaping associated with new development can contribute.

Initial Responses to Objections

D1.7 Designing for Safety & Security**Supporting Representations:**

0026/1/010/S GMPTE
0740/1/013/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0270/1/001/O Greater Manchester Police, ALU

Summary of objection:

Add to D1.7 after the first sentence: "All developments should take into consideration the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)..."

Recommended Change:

Add the following sentence to paragraph 3.55 of the reasoned justification: "All developments should take into consideration the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) and developers are recommended to consult the Arcitectural Liaison Unit of Greater Manchester Police for advice in this regard."

Reason :

Consultation arrangements or references to particular schemes of accreditation are not considered appropriate for inclusion within a planning policy. They can more properly be accomodated within the reasoned justification of the policy.

Initial Responses to Objections

D1.8**3.58****Objections:****0825/1/002/O****English Heritage***Summary of objection:*

Cross reference to Policy C1.5 and the need to retain historic shop fronts.

Recommended Change:

Add an additional paragraph to the reasoned justification as follows: "See policy C1.5 in respect of historic shop fronts."

Reason :

This cross reference is inserted to ensure that the need to have special regard to the preservation of historic shop fronts is acknowledged.

Initial Responses to Objections

D1.9 Advertisements on Business Premises**Objections:**

0006/1/010/O Highways Agency

Summary of objection:

The Highway Agency should be consulted on all advertisement hoardings

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The policy does not relate to advertisement hoardings.

Initial Responses to Objections

General**Supporting Representations:**

0606/1/003/S Saddleworth Conservation Action Group

Objections:

0021/1/033/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

References in various parts of the UDP to draft RPG will need to be updated once RPG has been issued

Recommended Change:

Amend references to draft Regional Planning Guidance as and when the final version of the Guidance is issued.

Reason :

For accuracy.

0798/1/001/O H M Prison Service

Agent : Paul Dickinson and Associates

Summary of objection:

Plan should include a policy and allocation for a new prison in line with Circular 03/98

Recommended Change:

No change at present but suggested response should be discussed further with objector.

Reason :

Would suggest that the provision of sites for new prisons is a matter which should be considered at a more strategic sub-regional scale, on the assumption that there is not a requirement for a prison in every district. Furthermore, Circular 03/98 indicates that the ideal prison site should extend to approximately 16 hectares. There are no sufficiently large sites within the Borough.

0815/1/006/O Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL

Agent : Cordingleys

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of 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

Recommended Change:

Add an explanation to the Introduction Section of the plan about the role and status of Supplementary Planning Guidance as set out in national guidance. This indicates that it supplements plan policies and proposals, rather than containing new policies and proposals which should be included in the plan itself.

Reason :

To clarify the role and status of SPG.

Rochdale Canal, Huddersfield Narrow Canal**Objections:****0422/1/001/O****British Waterways*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The Plan includes allocations along the canals, e.g. Failsworth District Centre, PEZ/employment sites in Oldham Broadway Business Park on the Rochdale canal; mixed use at Frenches Wharf, Diggle PEZs on the Huddersfield Narrow Canal. These accommodate a range of uses that can harness the economic potential of the restored canals.

The design of all developments is expected to reinforce or complement what is distinctive about its context, and canal-side developments are specified under the design policy on transport corridors and gateways (D1.13 para 3.80)

Initial Responses to Objections

General Strategy

2.1

Objections:

0008/1/017/O

Countryside Agency

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Take on board some of the suggestions in the Introduction section to the plan, such as a brief description of the characteristics and needs of the Borough (though not focusing just on rural needs). Other matters, for example the particular strategy for the urban fringe, to be referred to in relevant sections (Open Environment, possibly also Recreation, Sport and Open Space). Devise wording and discuss with objector.

Reason :

To provide context for the plan and ensure that the strategy for the urban fringe is clear.

2.2

Objections:

0006/1/013/O

Highways Agency

Summary of objection:

The objective to reduce the need to travel and distance travelled should place more emphasis on the importance of choosing sustainable modes of travel.

Recommended Change:

Reconsider objective a) to include reference to mode.

Reason :

The objective refers only to distance travelled and need to travel because it relates to the broad location of development. Thus by locating uses sensibly in relation to one another (e.g schools to housing), the need to travel or distance can be reduced. However this could also impact on choices about mode and therefore mode should be incorporated. It should be noted that mode is covered in the objectives for the Transport Section.

Initial Responses to Objections

Land at 2 Oldham Road, Uppermill

Supporting Representations:

0733/1/001/S

Mr F J T Tanner

Initial Responses to Objections

GS1 Development Land Release**Supporting Representations:**

0038/1/010/S	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0175/1/010/S	West Pennine Bridleways Association
0740/1/001/S	North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0045/1/022/O Wiggett Construction Ltd

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Delete the policy, as it duplicates others and is inconsistent with PPG1 and Section 54A of the TCP Act 1990.

Recommended Change:

Delete the policy. Relevant parts of the reasoned justification should be moved to the Introduction Section of the UDP to explain the status of the plan.

Reason :

The policy duplicates PPG1 and Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, and it does not make clear the approach to material considerations as set out in paragraph 2.8 of the reasoned justification.

0108/1/010/O

The House Builders Federation

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Delete the policy.

Reason :

The policy is unclear on the weight to be given to material considerations, and duplicates PPG1 and Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act.

0110/1/011/O

Paul Speak Properties Ltd

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Delete the policy, as it duplicates others and is inconsistent with PPG1 and Section 54A of the TCP Act 1990.

Initial Responses to Objections

Recommended Change:

Delete the policy. Relevant parts of the reasoned justification should be moved to the Introduction Section of the UDP to explain the status of the plan.

Reason :

The policy duplicates PPG1 and Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act and does not make clear the approach to material considerations, as set out in paragraph 2.8 of the reasoned justification.

0113/1/013/O**Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd**

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

The policy is too restrictive and should allow flexibility of land use where the allocation proves unrealistic or an alternative use would be beneficial.

Recommended Change:

Delete the policy.

Reason :

I disagree that the results of monitoring should lead to exceptions being made to policies and/or allocations. If monitoring indicates that development is not happening at the rate or where it was expected to and planned for, then the plan should be subject to partial alteration. However, because this policy duplicates the content of PPG1 and the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, it is considered unnecessary to retain it in the UDP.

0815/1/004/O**Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL**

Agent : Cordingleys

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Delete policy GS1 and move relevant parts of the reasoned justification of the policy to the Introduction (Section 1), in order to amplify the explanation there of the role of the planning system and the development plan.

Reason :

PPG1 sets out the Government's commitment to a plan-led system of development control, which is given force by Section 54A of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act. Where an adopted or approved development plan contains relevant policies, Section 54A requires that an application for planning permission or an appeal shall be determined in accordance with the plan, unless other material considerations indicate otherwise. Conversely, applications which are not in accordance with the plan should not be allowed unless material considerations justify granting planning permission. Given that this is set out in the PPG1, which in turn draws on the 1990 Act, there is no need to repeat it in the UDP.

Initial Responses to Objections

The policy is also unclear about the treatment of material considerations. Deletion of unnecessary policies also corresponds with streamlining the UDP.

Initial Responses to Objections

GS2 Protecting Open Land**Supporting Representations:**

0149/1/008/S	English Nature
0175/1/011/S	West Pennine Bridleways Association
0740/1/002/S	North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0008/1/018/O	Countryside Agency
---------------------	---------------------------

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Add an explanation of the term "inappropriate development" to the reasoned justification and check whether this would meet the objection.

Reason :

Development in most rural areas other than Local Green Gap and Land Reserved for Future Development has to accord with Green Belt policy, since the open countryside areas of the Borough have Green Belt designation. The policy refers to "inappropriate development" not being permitted within certain areas of open land, but more detailed policies in other sections of the UDP go on to explain what types of development may be considered appropriate. For example, there are detailed Part 2 policies in the draft UDP for farm diversification and business expansion within the Green Belt. Therefore it is considered that the policies, read together, do allow appropriate development to meet the needs of people in the countryside.

0023/1/005/O
P. Wilson & Company
Summary of objection:

The link between agricultural land grade and landscape value is inappropriate and should be deleted.

Recommended Change:

Delete clause B of policy GS2 and the last sentence of paragraph 2.10 of the reasoned justification.

Reason :

Revised national guidance has been issued on the protection of agricultural land. This suggests a different approach, whereby the agricultural land quality should be weighed against other sustainability considerations, therefore Clause B is inappropriate and does not accord with national guidance.

Initial Responses to Objections

0038/1/011/O**Greater Manchester Ecology Unit***Summary of objection:*

The Unit supports the policy, however it is considered that the term "open land" needs defining within the context of the policy - some nature conservation sites are not necessarily regarded as "open".

Recommended Change:

Clarify the definition of open land in the reasoned justification.

Reason :

In the field of nature conservation, the term "open land" has a specific meaning which is different from that intended in the policy. The broader meaning intended in the policy therefore needs explanation to clarify this.

0045/1/023/O**Wiggett Construction Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Delete the policy, as it duplicates others and is inconsistent with PPG1 and Section 54A of the TCP Act 1990.

Recommended Change:

Delete Clauses B., C., G., H., and I. Move remainder of policy to the Open Environment Section. Adjust the reasoned justification accordingly.

Reason :

The policy is not inconsistent with PPG1 and Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as it says that these areas are protected from inappropriate development, not all development per se. However, confusion could arise from the apparent overlap between this policy and others in the plan. Therefore some clauses are removed to avoid duplication, and the remainder of the policy is moved to the Open Environment Section where the detailed policies explain what development may be permitted.

0110/1/012/O**Paul Speak Properties Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Delete the policy as it duplicates others and is inconsistent with PPG1 and Section 54A of the TCP Act 1990.

Recommended Change:

Delete Clauses B., C., G., H., and I. Move remainder of policy to the Open Environment Section. Adjust the reasoned justification accordingly.

Reason :

The policy is not inconsistent with PPG1 and Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, as it says that these areas are protected from inappropriate development,

Initial Responses to Objections

duplication, and the remainder of the policy is moved to the Open Environment Section where the detailed policies explain what development may be permitted.

0165/1/002/O

Cllr Brian Lord***Summary of objection:***

Requires change to the Green Belt boundary at Standedge Road, Diggle, to allow for some additional development.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed boundaries defined in adopted UDPs should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances in this case.

2.10**Objections:****0021/1/028/O****Government Office for the North West*****Summary of objection:***

The paragraph should be amended to reflect the changes to PPG7 made in March 2001, about the protection of agricultural land.

Recommended Change:

Initial Responses to Objections

Delete clause B of policy GS2. Amend clause A to read: "THE BEST AND MOST VERSATILE AGRICULTURAL LAND (GRADES 1, 2 AND 3A), EXCEPT WHERE OTHER SUSTAINABILITY CONSIDERATIONS SUGGEST OTHERWISE". Delete paragraph 2.10 of the reasoned justification and replace with: Agricultural land is classified according to the extent to which its physical and chemical characteristics limit its use for food production. The best and most versatile agricultural land (grades 1, 2 and 3a) is that which is best suited to adapting to the changing needs of agriculture. Revised national guidance on protecting agricultural land, contained in PPG7*, advises local planning authorities to look first at previously developed land and sites within existing urban areas, to determine whether there is a need to consider the development of greenfield land, including best and most versatile agricultural land, at all. If the use of agricultural land is unavoidable to meet development needs, then poorer quality land should be used as a general rule, but agricultural land quality should be weighed against other sustainability considerations (e.g. accessibility, infrastructure, biodiversity, landscape quality, etc). Thus, a poor quality piece of land which has, for example, high biodiversity value may merit stronger protection than a better quality piece of land with no biodiversity value. This is significant for Oldham because most agricultural land in the Borough falls within the grades 3b, 4 and 5, reflecting the upland nature of the area. There may therefore be areas where the land has been well managed and contributes to the quality of the environment, which should be given equal protection from development to best and most versatile agricultural land. Discuss proposed changes with objector.

Reason :

To reflect updated national planning guidance on the protection of agricultural land.

0243/1/008/O

Alan Roughley
Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Delete clause B of policy GS2 and the last sentence of paragraph 2.10 of the reasoned justification.

Reason :

The policy is unclear, as the approach to agricultural land quality would not alter the fact that the land may have Green Belt protection. Revised national guidance has been issued on the protection of agricultural land. This suggests a different approach from previously, whereby agricultural land quality should be weighed against other sustainability considerations. Therefore, clause B is inappropriate and does not accord with national guidance, and accordingly the reference in paragraph 2.10 to Supplementary Planning Guidance is no longer needed.

2.13**Objections:**

GS2 Protecting Open Land

Initial Responses to Objections

0021/1/029/O

Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

There is a reference to Local Green Gaps being given equivalent protection to Green Belt, however, the Green Gap policy needs to be made less restrictive.

Recommended Change:

Amend the detailed policy on Green Gaps in the Open Environment Section (OE1.8) to distinguish the level of protection from that extended to the Green Belt, and discuss proposed changes with objector.

Reason :

Green Gaps perform a less strategic role than Green Belt in providing local breaks in or adjacent to urban areas, whereas the purposes of the Green Belt are set out in national planning guidance. Therefore, there may be circumstances in which development may be appropriate in a Green Gap even though it would be inappropriate in the Green Belt.

2.16**Objections:**

0243/1/003/O

Alan Roughley

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Delete Clause I. of the policy relating to recreational open space and delete or incorporate into the Recreation Section the reasoned justification in paragraph 2.16.

Reason :

To avoid possible confusion arising from duplication in the plan. The Recreation section sets out the approach to protecting recreational open spaces and contains more detailed policies explaining the exceptional circumstances in which the development of such spaces may be permitted. This takes into account revised national planning guidance in PPG17.

Birks Quarry, Huddersfield Rd, Austerlands**Objections:**

0044/1/001/O

Harold Smith

Agent : Megson Ponsonby

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. Draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

0113/1/006/O**Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd**

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. Draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

0113/1/015/O**Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd**

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the

Initial Responses to Objections

Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. Draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

Black Clough Farm, Shaw**Objections:****0030/1/001/O Solutions**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. Draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011. The existing Green Belt boundary follows the advice in PPG2 in being clear and defensible, following the track, and then the rear gardens of numbers 2 to 12 on Hannerton Road. It is considered that the sites allocated for housing in the draft replacement UDP, together with the policies for housing development, already provide for a choice in the type and location of new dwellings.

Cragg Road/Heights Lane area, Chadderton**Objections:****0691/1/003/O W A Tomlinson*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

No change.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. Furthermore, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

Former Co-op, Friezland Lane, Greenfield**Objections:**

0020/1/001/O Robert Scott & Sons

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

Exclude site from Green Belt to permit greater development opportunities

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. The objector wishes to have complete flexibility in the use of the site. However, current Green Belt policy already allows certain forms of development which are not inappropriate. Therefore, no exceptional circumstances are considered to exist to justify a change to the Green Belt boundary in this case. In addition, the Green Belt boundary follows Friezland Lane/Manchester Road in line with PPG2 advice that boundaries should use readily recognisable features.

Former Neptune/Schlumberger measurement works**Objections:**

0047/1/001/O Mr G Daws

Summary of objection:

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

No change.

Reason :

The site of the former Neptune/Schlumberger Measurements was washed over by the Green Belt designation in the adopted Unitary Development Plan and remains so in the first deposit replacement UDP. The Green Belt includes many existing premises, including farms, houses and rural industrial buildings. Green Belt policies can be used to control development at these sites, such as new building or changes of use. Any application for development on the site would have to be considered against Green Belt policies. The question as to whether the open storage represents a material change of use of the site is a matter for development control, and is outside the scope of this plan review process. Allocation of the site for industry would necessitate its removal from the Green Belt, and there is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national planning policy.

0105/1/004/O**Dobcross Village Community*****Summary of objection:***

Glad to see designation of the site as Green Belt but would want the parts of the site that are not in industrial use conserved as open space for recreation

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The site is in Green Belt and therefore the Green Belt policies, which strictly control new building, already apply to it anyway. Recreational uses which preserve the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt would be permitted where they accord with the relevant policies of the UDP.

Garden to Slade Bank, Dobcross**Objections:****0438/1/001/O****Mr Joseph Shepherdson*****Summary of objection:***

Remove the land from the Green Belt as it is similar to land at Victoria Works which has planning permission for development.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states

Initial Responses to Objections

boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance.

Hodge Clough Farm, Moorside**Objections:****0822/1/001/O****John Ogden***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify a change in this instance.

Hull Mill, Delph**Objections:****0112/1/015/O****Mr G Bayley***Summary of objection:*

This site should become part of the adjacent Green Belt (or of LLG19, see separate representation) as it is illogical to leave it unallocated.

Recommended Change:

Minded not to change subject to site assessment.

Reason :

Local Green Gaps (LGGs) are sites formerly allocated as Other Protected Open Land. Where judged to provide valuable open areas they have been reallocated as LGG's. They primarily perform a local green belt function by providing locally important open spaces with significant visual amenity. This site is a relatively small area of land left over after development and is not considered to provide a Green Gap function, however, this will be assessed on site. In terms of Green Belt, there is a presumption against Green Belt change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be

Initial Responses to Objections

altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. The approach in the UDP is not to zone every piece of land, but only those where change is expected or restrictive policies apply. The land was unallocated in the adopted UDP and its status has not changed. Any proposed development of the site would still need to be assessed against the relevant policies of the plan.

Land adjacent 58A Manchester Rd, Greenfield**Objections:****0434/1/001/O****Mr & Mrs N Saxon*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify change in this instance.

Land adjacent to 3 Burnedge Lane, Grasscroft**Objections:****0433/1/001/O****Mr Paul Errock*****Summary of objection:***

The land should be taken out of the Green Belt to allow for the construction of a dwelling.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify change in this instance.

Initial Responses to Objections

Land adjacent to Tamewater Mill, Dobcross**Objections:****0229/1/002/O****Adept Development & Management Ltd***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. This stretch of Green Belt separates Dobcross from Delph. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify changing the Green Belt in this instance.

Land at 3 Wall Hill Cottages, Dobcross**Objections:****0435/1/001/O****Mr Ian Hollingworth***Summary of objection:*

Extend boundary of unallocated (white) land south of Wall Hill Road approximately 50 m to the west to enable the siting of one dwelling

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify change in this instance.

Land at Alderney Farm, Ripponden Rd**Objections:****0093/1/001/O****Mr J. Jaskolka**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011. The sites allocated for housing in the draft replacement UDP, together with the policies for housing development, already provide for a choice in the type and location of new dwellings.

Land at Ashton Road, Bardsley**Objections:****0111/1/003/O****Persimmon Homes*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011. The land is an important part of the Green Belt separating Oldham from Ashton.

Land at Barrowshaw Farm, Ripponden Rd, Oldham**Objections:****0103/1/002/O****Mr J Lees**

Initial Responses to Objections

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Exclude site from Green Belt and allocate for residential development under Policy H1. Previously developed 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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

Land at Brookside Poultry Farm, Royton**Objections:**

0031/1/004/O

Mr J Wood

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in adopted UDPs should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify change in this instance.

Land at Brownhill, Uppermill**Objections:**

0125/1/001/O

Mr. M. Farrand

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. Release of the site for housing would reduce the open break between Uppermill and Dobcross.

Land at Counthill, Oldham**Objections:**

0096/1/001/O **North Ainley Halliwell Solicitors**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011. It is considered that the sites allocated for housing in the draft replacement UDP, together with the policies for housing development, already provide for a choice in the type and location of new dwellings.

Land at Denshaw Vale, Denshaw**Objections:**

0034/1/001/O **Mrs M. Corbett**

Initial Responses to Objections

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence, and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. The draft UDP allocations provide sites in a range of locations, and policies require a mix of house types to be provided, thus catering for different sections of the market.

Land at Dumfries Farm, Denshaw**Objections:**

0172/1/001/O Storer -Exors.of late Mary

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

Land at Failsworth Road, Woodhouses**Objections:**

Initial Responses to Objections**0609/1/001/O Mr M. Clarke**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

Allocate part of the site (north and/or south parts) for residential development, including affordable or speciality housing, to round off edge of built area and enhance viability of services in Woodhouses village.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011. The land is an important part of the open break between Failsworth and Woodhouses.

Land at Holebottom Farm, Mark Lane, Shaw**Objections:****0029/1/001/O Mr A Walker**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011. The draft UDP allocations provide sites in a range of locations, and policies require a mix of house types to be provided, thus catering for different sections of the market.

Initial Responses to Objections

Land at Paulden Farm, Waterhead**Objections:****0114/1/001/O Mr F. Winterbottom**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

Land at Plumpton Farm, Thornham**Objections:****0094/1/001/O Mr F. Thomas**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

It should be noted that only approximately half of this site falls within Oldham Borough and the remainder within Rochdale. There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011. It is considered that the sites allocated for housing in the draft replacement UDP, together with the policies for housing development,

Initial Responses to Objections

already provide for a choice in the type and location of new dwellings.

Land at Rear of Delph Cricket club, Delph**Objections:**

0168/1/002/O **Mr J. Whitehead**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

Land at Rochdale Road, Summit.**Objections:**

0126/1/002/O **Holroy Developments**

Agent : Hall Needham Associates

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that boundaries defined in adopted UDPs should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify it in this instance.

Initial Responses to Objections

Land at Steadway, Greenfield**Objections:****0437/1/001/O Mr. P. Buckley**

Agent : Hall Needham Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

0832/1/001/O To be confirmed

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The Council have received instructions to withdraw this objection as it is a duplicate of objection reference 0437/1/001/O submitted on behalf of Mr. P Buckley.

Land at Stockport Road, Lydgate**Objections:****0122/1/001/O Mrs Jean Stanhope**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Release of the site for housing would effectively join Lydgate village to Grasscroft. Development here could also affect the Lydgate Conservation Area, which includes the church.

Land at Victoria Works, Dobcross**Objections:****0123/1/002/O****Chapman Saddleworth Ltd**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The site lies within the Green Belt mid way between Uppermill, Diggle and Dobcross. New building in the Green Belt is strictly controlled and therefore it would not be appropriate to allocate the site for residential use. There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. Current Green Belt policies potentially allow for the re-use of the buildings for industrial or business purposes or their change of use, in accordance with the detailed policies.

0438/1/002/O**Mr Joseph Shepherdson**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Victoria Works should be removed from the Green Belt and shown as a development site, as it has planning permission for development.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

Victoria Works lies within the Green Belt mid way between Uppermill, Diggle and Dobcross. New building in the Green Belt is strictly controlled and therefore it would not be appropriate to allocate the site for development. There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. Current Green Belt policies potentially allow for the re-use of the buildings for industrial or business purposes or their change of use, in accordance with the detailed policies.

Land at Wham Farm, Wham Lane, Denshaw**Objections:**

0033/1/001/O Mr J Lees

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

Land at Woodbrook Farm (SE), Springhead**Objections:**

Initial Responses to Objections

0167/1/002/O Frost (Exors. of late Mr R.)

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

Allocate as redevelopment site, preferably housing, as the present use, vehicle dismantling, is inappropriate in the Green Belt, visually intrusive and generates commercial traffic.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The current use of the site for vehicle dismantling may adversely affect the visual amenity of the Green Belt. However, this is not considered to represent the exceptional circumstances required to justify changing the Green Belt boundary to allow the residential development of the site.

Land at Woodbrook Farm, Springhead**Objections:****0167/1/003/O Frost (Exors. of late Mr R.)**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011. It is considered that the draft UDP allocations already provide sites in a range of locations, and policies require a mix of house types to be provided, to cater for different sections of the market.

Initial Responses to Objections

Land below Ashdene, Knarr Lane, Delph
Objections:**0045/1/004/O** **Wiggett Construction Ltd**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. This is an important piece of Green Belt separating Dobcross from Delph. Release of the site for housing would reduce the openness of the Green Belt. The draft UDP allocations provide sites in a range of locations, and policies require a mix of house types to be provided, thus catering for different sections of the market.

Land bet. LGG17 Stoneswood & H1.1.15 Bailey Mill
Objections:**0112/1/014/O** **Mr G Bayley***Summary of objection:*

Land should become part of Green Belt (or annexed to LGG17, see separate representation) as it is illogical to leave it unallocated.

Recommended Change:

Minded not to change subject to site assessment.

Reason :

Local Green Gaps (LGGs) are sites formerly allocated as Other Protected Open Land. Where judged to provide valuable open areas they have been reallocated as LGG's. They primarily perform a local green belt function by providing locally important open spaces with significant visual amenity. This site is a relatively small area of land partially fronted by houses and is not considered to provide a Green Gap function, however, this will be assessed on site. In terms of Green Belt, there is a presumption against Green Belt change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be

Initial Responses to Objections

altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. The approach in the UDP is not to zone every piece of land, but only those where change is expected or restrictive policies apply. The land was unallocated in the adopted UDP and its status has not changed. Any proposed development of the site would still need to be assessed against the relevant policies of the plan.

Land between 6 & 8 Barnfield Rise, Shaw**Objections:**

0025/1/001/O **J Lumb Esq**

Agent : Morris Dean

Summary of objection:

Want Green Belt boundary changing to allow site to be developed.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify change in this instance.

Land between Ambrose Mount and Moorcrest, Diggle**Objections:**

0444/1/001/O **Mr K. W. Redfearn**

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed boundaries defined in adopted UDPs should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify change to the boundaries in this case.

Initial Responses to Objections

Land between LGG18 and PEZ30, Delph**Objections:****0112/1/013/O****Mr G Bayley***Summary of objection:*

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

Recommended Change:

Change unlikely.

Reason :

The small piece of land between PEZ30 and Local Green Gap 18 and to the north of the mixed use allocation H1.1.14 was omitted from the Local Green Gap as it appears to be domestic garden. However, this will be checked.

Land between Spinners Way & Albany Farm, Moorside**Objections:****0022/1/001/O****Peter Sykes***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

Land north of Coal Pit Lane, land at Ashton Road**Objections:**

Initial Responses to Objections**0815/1/012/O****Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL**

Agent : Cordingleys

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011. The plan provides for Land Reserved for Future Development or "safeguarded land" elsewhere, in accordance with PPG2 .

**Land off Burnedge Lane, Grasscroft
Objections:****0050/1/001/O****John Roodhouse*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

Land off Crib Lane/Long Lane, Dobcross

Initial Responses to Objections

Objections:**0035/1/001/O Mrs P. Lutener**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance also indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011. It is considered that the sites allocated for housing in the draft replacement UDP, together with the policies for housing development, already provide for a choice in the type and location of new dwellings.

Land off Delph Lane, Delph**Objections:****0168/1/001/O Mr J. Whitehead**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

Initial Responses to Objections

Land off Haigh Lane**Objections:****0384/1/001/O****Mr Ben Lancaster***Summary of objection:*

Change the designation of the land from Green Belt to recreational open space, to allow the development of an education and leisure facility.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. Detailed planning policies for Green Belt already permit essential facilities for outdoor sport or recreation, provided that the proposals accord with other relevant policies of the plan.

Land off Huddersfield Rd, Denshaw**Objections:****0650/1/001/O****Mr J. McLintock**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify change in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

Initial Responses to Objections

Land off Manchester Road, Greenfield**Objections:****0604/1/001/O****J.G. McNeeney***Summary of objection:*

Remove site from Green Belt and re-designate to permit building of a house on the site

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that the reasons set out by the objector to justify the removal of the land from the Green Belt to facilitate the provision of a dwelling represent the exceptional circumstances needed to change the boundary.

0607/1/001/O

D. McNeeney*Summary of objection:*

Remove site from Green Belt and re-designate to permit building of a house on the site

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that the reasons set out by the objector to justify the removal of the land from the Green Belt to facilitate the provision of a dwelling represent the exceptional circumstances needed to change the boundary.

0608/1/001/O

K.A. McNeeney*Summary of objection:*

Remove from Green Belt and re-designate to permit building of a house on the site

Recommended Change:

No change.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that the reasons set out by the objector to justify the removal of the land from the Green Belt to facilitate the provision of a dwelling represent the exceptional circumstances needed to change the boundary.

Land off Thornham Road, Shaw**Objections:**

0170/1/001/O **I. Kershaw**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

Exclude from Green Belt to allow much needed countryside/urban fringe recreational facilities such as stabling

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify change in this instance. Essential facilities for outdoor sport and recreation are already permissible under Green Belt policy, where the proposed development accords with the relevant policies of the plan.

Land south of Argyll Park Road, Failsworth**Objections:**

0349/1/001/O **Redwaters Construction Limited**

Agent : Ark Design & Architecture Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify change in this instance. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The site makes an important contribution to the area of Green Belt separating Failsworth from Woodhouses. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

Land south of Higher Hills Farm, Grasscroft**Objections:****0436/1/001/O****West Pennine Plant*****Summary of objection:***

Remove land to the south of Higher Hills Farm from the Green Belt and allocate it for housing. Development would consolidate edge of built-up area and provide local housing.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify change in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

Land to the north of The Meadows, Grotton**Objections:****0472/1/002/O****Mr D Cox**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify change in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

Major developed sites**Objections:**

0045/1/001/O Wiggett Construction Ltd

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

See covering report to Executive.

Reason :

The proposals for Royal George Mills and Robert Fletcher (Greenfield) Ltd Paper Mill are set out in the report for consideration by the Executive.

Pickhill Reservoir, Uppermill**Objections:**

0345/1/002/O David Sanderson

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Check whether the area is large enough to show as recreational open space on the proposals map.

Reason :

Land within the urban area does not serve the purposes of Green Belt, and therefore its

Initial Responses to Objections

open space under draft UDP policy R1.1, but only spaces larger than 0.4 hectares were shown on the proposals map at first deposit stage. It is now proposed to show those larger than 0.2 ha.

Robert Fletcher (Greenfield) Ltd paper mill**Objections:**

0709/1/001/O **Robert Fletcher (Greenfield) Ltd**

Agent : De Pol Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

See covering report to Executive.

Reason :

The proposals for Robert Fletcher (Greenfield) Ltd Paper Mill are set out in the report for consideration by the Executive.

Royal George Mills, Greenfield**Supporting Representations:**

0267/1/004/S Tanner Brothers Ltd

0780/1/001/S Friezland Properties Ltd

Objections:

0045/1/002/O **Wiggett Construction Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Should identify as Major Developed Site appropriate for limited infilling and redevelopment (housing) in line with PPG 2.

Recommended Change:

See covering report to Executive.

Reason :

The proposals for Royal George Mills are set out in the report for consideration by the Executive.

Initial Responses to Objections

0368/1/001/O**Dr David Atherton***Summary of objection:*

Refers to omission of Royal George Mills site.

Recommended Change:

See covering report to Executive.

Reason :

The proposals for Royal George Mills are set out in the report for consideration by the Executive.

**Royal George Mills/Fletchers Mill, Greenfield
Objections:****0345/1/004/O****David Sanderson***Summary of objection:*

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).

Recommended Change:

See covering report to Executive.

Reason :

The proposals for Royal George Mills and Robert Fletchers Paper Mill are set out in the report for consideration by the Executive.

**Shaws Lane, Uppermill
Objections:****0048/1/001/O****Mr D Lawton***Summary of objection:*

Delete whole or part of site from Green Belt to allow housing development

Recommended Change:

No change.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

There is a presumption against Green Belt boundary change in national policy. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belt is its permanence and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance.

South of The Shaws and Redwood Road, Uppermill**Objections:**

0171/1/001/O Mr J. Downs

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify change in this instance.

Ward Lane, Diggle**Objections:**

0816/1/001/O Karen Harvey

Agent : Hall Needham Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed

Initial Responses to Objections

Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt boundaries in Greater Manchester before 2011.

Initial Responses to Objections

GS2 B., E., G.

Objections:

0815/1/008/O

Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL

Agent : Cordingleys

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Delete Clause B of the policy and amend the reasoned justification in paragraph 2.10. Amend Clause A of the policy to read: "...LAND (GRADES 1, 2 AND 3A), EXCEPT WHERE OTHER SUSTAINABILITY CONSIDERATIONS SUGGEST OTHERWISE."

Local Green Gaps - keep in the policy but relocate the policy to the Open Environment Section which contains the detailed policy on Local Green Gaps (OE1.8). Clarify in the detailed policy those circumstances in which development in Local Green Gaps may be permitted, such that different levels of protection can be distinguished between Green Belt and Local Green Gaps. However it is not proposed to adopt the wording suggested by the objector.

Delete Clause G. relating to sites designated for their nature conservation importance and ensure that this is covered by policy OE2 in the Open Environment Section.

Reason :

National planning advice on the protection of agricultural land has changed and the policy needs to be amended to reflect the guidance more closely. However, it still allows for agricultural land quality to be balanced against other considerations. A detailed policy in the Open Environment Section (OE1.9) sets out criteria against which farm diversification proposals will be considered.

Relocation of the policy to the Open Environment Section aids clarity. Amendment to the level of protection extended to Green Gaps recognises that they serve a local function, not a strategic function like Green Belt. However the changes proposed by the objector are not accepted, as they would give insufficient protection to what are locally important breaks in the urban area. Part of their value stems from their integrity as substantially open areas, providing visual amenity, wildlife habitat or recreational routes. Development needs to be very strictly controlled in the Local Green Gaps, in order to maintain their function as such.

Delete Clause G. in order to avoid duplication within the plan.

Initial Responses to Objections

GS3 Development on Unallocated Land**Supporting Representations:**

0740/1/003/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0008/1/019/O Countryside Agency

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change to the policy, but add explanation to reasoned justification in paragraph 2.18: "... safety. In rural areas of the Borough, the other relevant policies of the plan include Green Belt policies".

Reason :

Development in open countryside areas of the Borough would have to accord with Green Belt policy, and as such it is covered the reference in the policy to other relevant policies of the plan. Paragraph 2.18 explains this, but it could be made more clear by including explicit reference to development in rural areas.

0113/1/011/O Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

Policy GS3 for development on unallocated land is the reverse of policy GS1. The policies should be merged.

Recommended Change:

Move first part of policy to Introduction Section as explanatory text. Retain second part, but consider moving it to policy D1.1 which deals with the design of development.

Reason :

The content of the first part of the policy is considered to be important, because it is common for plan users to misinterpret the status of areas of land that are not allocated, designated or zoned for any specific use on the Proposals Map. However, it is accepted that this may be more appropriately expressed as explanatory text about the plan's status and how it works. The specific requirements about the effective use of land and not prejudicing the use of other land are important principles which may sit logically with design issues.

Initial Responses to Objections

GS4 Derelict, Vacant & Underused Land**Supporting Representations:**

0175/1/012/S West Pennine Bridleways Association
0740/1/004/S North West Regional Assembly

Birks Quarry**Objections:**

0113/1/012/O Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1) and that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in an adopted UDP should be altered only exceptionally. I do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances to justify a change to the Green Belt in this instance. In addition, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that, in Greater Manchester, Green Belt boundaries should not need to be reviewed before 2011.

Initial Responses to Objections

GS5 Accessibility of New Development**Supporting Representations:**

0016/1/007/S	STORM
0026/1/008/S	GMPTE
0740/1/005/S	North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0006/1/014/O Highways Agency

Summary of objection:

More emphasis should be placed on public transport in this policy.

Recommended Change:

No change suggested, but should discuss with objector whether they have specific suggestions, such as a reduction in the thresholds used to define major development.

Reason :

The policy already represents an advance on the adopted UDP in trying to make public transport accessibility, taking into account frequency of service as well as the existence of routes, a key criterion in the location of major new development.

0008/1/020/O Countryside Agency

Summary of 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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The policy only refers to "major" uses (defined in terms of floorspace, seating or number of dwellings) or "travel intensive" uses (such as offices, retail, leisure), which are unlikely to come forward as rural diversification proposals. The policy also allows other planning objectives and material considerations to be weighed against this accessibility requirement and therefore it is flexible enough already.

2.24**Objections:**

0243/1/002/O Alan Roughley

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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 .

Recommended Change:

Insert "business or industrial" before "development" in the second sentence of paragraph 2.24.

Reason :

The reasoned justification refers to job creation and reducing the need to travel only as examples of other planning policy objectives that may need to be weighed against the accessibility of a development site. However, the example is intended to refer to business and industrial development and therefore it should be clarified.

Initial Responses to Objections

GS6 Impact of New Development on Road Traffic**Supporting Representations:**

0026/1/009/S GMPTE
 0740/1/006/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0006/1/015/O Highways Agency

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Consider changing clause A of the policy as follows, and discuss with the objector both the wording and implementation of such a policy:

A. MAKES EFFICIENT AND SAFE USE OF THE EXISTING ROAD NETWORK IN TERMS OF INDIVIDUAL AND CUMULATIVE EFFECTS ON THE NETWORK; AND

B. ...

Reason :

I do not consider that the policy needs a specific reference to the trunk road network, as the policy covers the whole road network. However, the requirement to refer to the safe operation of the road network, and to take on board possible cumulative effects of developments, could be incorporated through an addition to clause A, which helps to clarify the policy. This will need to be checked to ensure that it is capable of implementation.

0021/1/030/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

The Highways Agency should be consulted on this policy.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The Highways Agency have been consulted on the policy and changes are proposed in response to their objection.

0138/1/002/O Lawrence Watson

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Requires stronger control of noise arising from new developments, including traffic noise, and of heavy traffic using Broadway, in order to protect residents.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

I consider that the draft policies cover the assessment of the effects of traffic on the road network. The remainder of the comment relates to retrospective noise alleviation and is therefore outside the scope of the UDP. The policy on noise pollution in the Natural Resources section ensures that avoiding noise pollution is a consideration in determining planning applications.

2.27**Objections:****0006/1/016/O****Highways Agency*****Summary of objection:***

Revised wording suggested to cover proposals for development near motorways and trunk roads, to reflect the requirements of the Highways Agency.

Recommended Change:

Delete the first sentence of reasoned justification paragraph 2.27, but retain the rest of paragraph. Add a new paragraph to address the objector's concerns, based on the wording they have provided. I suggest: "Proposals for development near to motorways are subject to the strict policy of the DTLR, which prohibits direct access from most private developments to motorways or motorway slip roads. In relation to all-purpose trunk roads, the Highways Agency will restrict new accesses to them to protect the efficient and safe operation of the trunk road network.

Reason :

For clarity about the role of the Government and the Highways Agency in respect of motorways and trunk roads.

Initial Responses to Objections

GS7 Site Considerations

Supporting Representations:

0740/1/007/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0006/1/017/O Highways Agency

Summary of objection:

The meaning of the terms "convenience" and "security" in clause c needs clarification.

Recommended Change:

Delete Clause C relating to the convenience, safety and security of highway users and ensure these aspects are covered by policy T2 in the Transport Section. Add an explanation of any terms used to the reasoned justification. The terms relate to the convenience of all highway users, not just motorists; the safety of all highway users; and the security of highway users in terms of crime and fear of crime, which could relate to thoughtful landscaping and lighting on highways.

Reason :

To avoid duplication and to improve clarity.

0008/1/021/O Countryside Agency

Summary of objection:

The policy on site considerations should be worded positively to encourage considerate development rather than concentrate on preventing harm

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The policy deals with the principle of development. The quality of any development will be assessed against other more detailed policies in the plan, including those in the Design section which encourage good quality design.

0021/1/031/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

The policy is too restrictive and should be reworded to introduce some flexibility.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

Delete clauses B to F of the policy. Reword the remainder of the policy to ensure the protection of residential and workplace amenity, but consider introducing an exceptions clause (i.e. circumstances in which development may be permitted). Discuss this with the objector.

Reason :

The objector's view is that the policy is too restrictive. It is problematical in that it overlaps with policies elsewhere in the plan which protect, for example, wildlife habitats and archaeology. These policies elsewhere in the plan go on to provide detail as to circumstances in which exceptions may be made. Therefore for clarity and to avoid repetition, the policy is narrowed down to the amenity issue which is not covered directly elsewhere.

0038/1/012/O**Greater Manchester Ecology Unit*****Summary of objection:***

Broad support for the policy, but requests that "significant harm" be defined in the supporting text.

Recommended Change:

Delete clauses B. to F. of the policy, including clause D relating to the Borough's habitats and species, trees and woodlands.

Reason :

For clarity and to avoid repetition with policies elsewhere in the plan.

0045/1/020/O**Wiggett Construction Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Policy GS7 should be deleted as it duplicates others and is inconsistent with PPG1 and Section 54A of the TCP Act 1990.

Recommended Change:

Delete clauses B. to F. of the policy. Consider adding an exceptions clause explaining in what circumstances significantly harmful development may be permitted.

Reason :

For clarity and to avoid the duplication of other policies. However clause A dealing with the protection of amenity is retained, as it is not covered elsewhere and is a fundamental aim of planning. The policy is already flexible in referring to "significant" harm, but in addition consideration will be given to including an exceptions clause, to ensure that the policy is in line with PPG1 and the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

0082/1/002/O**Crown Castle UK Ltd**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Delete clauses B. to F. of the policy. Consider adding an exceptions clause to the remainder of the policy, explaining in what circumstances significantly harmful development may be allowed.

Reason :

For clarity and to avoid the duplication of other policies. Clause A. dealing with the protection of amenity is retained, as it is not covered elsewhere and is a fundamental aim of planning. The policy is already flexible in referring to "significant" harm, but in addition consideration will be given to an exceptions clause, to ensure that the policy is in line with PPG1 and the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

0110/1/013/O**Paul Speak Properties Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

The policy should be deleted as it duplicates others and is inconsistent with PPG1 and Section 54A of the TCP Act 1990.

Recommended Change:

Delete clauses B. to F. of the policy. Retain Clause A and consider adding an exceptions clause explaining in what circumstances significantly harmful development may be allowed.

Reason :

For clarity and to avoid the duplication of other policies. However clause A dealing with the protection of amenity is retained, as it is not covered elsewhere and is a fundamental aim of planning. The policy is already flexible in referring to "significant" harm, but in addition consideration will be given to an exceptions clause, to ensure that the policy is in line with PPG1 and the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

0138/1/003/O**Lawrence Watson*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change (propose to retain clause A of the policy relating to residential and workplace amenity. No change in respect of pollution policies.

Reason :

The policy already ensures that residential and workplace amenity are taken into consideration. The pollution policies in the Natural Resources section already address noise

Initial Responses to Objections

and air pollution and to introduce it here would lead to duplication.

0149/1/009/O**English Nature*****Summary of objection:***

"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.

Recommended Change:

Delete clauses B. to F.

Reason :

To avoid duplication. The policies in the Open Environment Section deal with the protection of wildlife and habitats from inappropriate development.

2.10**Objections:****0825/1/001/O****English Heritage*****Summary of objection:***

Add reference to historic parks and gardens as included in para. 12.10.

Recommended Change:

Delete Clause E and associated text from the reasoned justification.

Reason :

To avoid duplication with other sections of the plan.

Initial Responses to Objections

H1 Housing Land Requirement & Supply**Supporting Representations:**

0740/1/021/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:**0023/1/004/O P. Wilson & Company***Summary of objection:*

Brownfield target of 75% is unrealistic. Should be amended to 60% as stated in PPG3 - Housing.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The objector seeks a reduction in the brownfield target from 75% to 60%. However this is contrary to the objective of maximising the amount of development on previously developed land and the policies of emerging Regional Planning Guidance.

0033/1/002/O Mr J Lees

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Amend housing objective (g) to read "to encourage the development of a variety of house types, including affordable housing and upper market housing, that reflect housing needs and demands in the Borough and in a manner consistent with delivering the Plan's sustainability objectives".

Reason :

The above change clarifies the plans objectives in respect of the need to encourage the development of a range of house types including upper market housing. Similar wording could also be added to the justification to policy H1. However it is not intended to include specific policies to encourage the development of upper market housing, nor is it intended to allocate additional greenfield sites for this purpose.

0034/1/002/O Mrs M. Corbett

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Amend housing objective (g) to read "to encourage the development of a variety of house types, including affordable housing and upper market housing, that reflect housing needs and demands in the Borough and in a manner consistent with delivering the Plan's sustainability objectives".

Reason :

The above change clarifies the plans objectives in respect of the need to encourage the development of a range of house types including upper market housing. Similar wording could also be added to the justification to policy H1. However it is not intended to include specific policies to encourage the development of upper market housing, nor is it intended to allocate additional greenfield sites for this purpose.

0041/1/002/O**Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Ltd*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The allocated phase 1 housing land supply is considered to be available for development and, in terms of the amount of capacity available on brownfield sites, exceeds the 75% minimum expressed in the policy. Deleting the target would be contrary to guidance in PPG3 and Draft Regional Planning Guidance aimed at maximising the development of previously developed land. Monitoring indicates that brownfield allocations are coming forward for development in line with the capacities indicated in the policy. The issue of greenfield windfalls is dealt with under policy H1.3. However it is noted that PPG3 does not specifically prohibit the development of greenfield windfall sites.

0045/1/003/O**Wiggett Construction Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Potentially minor amendments to the clearance allowance.

Initial Responses to Objections**Reason :**

Future clearance levels may alter in the long term, however in the short to medium term in all probability levels will remain similar to those expressed in Policy H1. If clearance levels are significantly higher than expected as the plan period progresses, then the Council will consider either bringing forward Phase 2 sites or, if necessary, adopting an alteration to the plan. It is not intended to reduce the brownfield target as this would not be consistent with objectives expressed in PPG3 and Draft Regional Planning Guidance aimed at maximising the development previously developed land.

0045/1/031/O**Wiggett Construction Ltd**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Amend housing objective (g) to read "to encourage the development of a variety of house types, including affordable housing and upper market housing, that reflect housing needs and demands in the Borough and in a manner consistent with delivering the Plan's sustainability objectives".

Reason :

The above change clarifies the plans objectives in respect of the need to encourage the development of a range of house types including upper market housing. Similar wording could also be added to the justification to policy H1. However it is not intended to include specific policies to encourage the development of upper market housing, nor is it intended to allocate additional greenfield sites for this purpose.

0097/1/002/O**Kirstail Properties**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Amend housing objective (g) to read "to encourage the development of a variety of house types, including affordable housing and upper market housing, that reflect housing needs and demands in the Borough and in a manner consistent with delivering the Plan's sustainability objectives".

Reason :

The above change clarifies the plans objectives in respect of the need to encourage the development of a range of house types including upper market housing. Similar wording could also be added to the justification to policy H1. However it is not intended to include

Initial Responses to Objections

specific policies to encourage the development of upper market housing, nor is it intended to allocate additional greenfield sites for this purpose.

0102/1/001/O

Brierstone Properties Ltd

Agent : Drivers Jonas

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

This objection although raising general housing land supply issues in relativity relates to the development of land identified as part of a wider Primary Employment Zone (PEZ). A planning application for residential development has recently been considered by the planning committee who were minded to approve the application subject to the signing of a Section 106 agreement. This being the case, the principle of residential use has been established and the site will be counted as a windfall site against the RUDP windfall allowance. It is therefore not appropriate to allocate the site for residential development. The issue of the PEZ boundary as it relates to this site is dealt with under a separate objection in the Business and Industry section of this report.

0104/1/001/O

Bellway Homes

Agent : Drivers Jonas

Summary of objection:

Supports the principle of Policy H1, however considers that the approach to the development of greenfield sites is too restrictive.

Recommended Change:

Insert additional wording within the Reasoned Justification to policy H1 to ensure that the approach of policy H1 is consistent with the advice in PPG3 as it relates to greenfield development.

Reason :

It is not accepted that the approach to the development of greenfield sites is too restrictive since its aim is to promote the maximisation of development of previously developed land in line with the key objectives of PPG3. It is therefore not intended to amend the policy wording itself. However it is proposed to amend the Reasoned Justification to better reflect the guidance in PPG3 as it relates to circumstances in which greenfield development would be permissible.

0108/1/001/O

The House Builders Federation

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change to policy wording, although further consideration will be given to the issue of using SPGs as a means of operating the phasing policies.

Reason :

The claim that Policy H1 will not provide for a wide choice of good quality housing is not accepted - the Plan allocates a range of housing sites in a range of locations. No change is recommended pending further clarification of the objectors position. It is accepted that further clarification of the role of SPGs in the implementation of the phasing policy is necessary.

0109/1/001/O**Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110)**

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

Annual provision figure of 400 dwellings is too low and incorrect assumption used for losses through future clearance.

Recommended Change:

Potentially minor amendments to the clearance allowance.

Reason :

The housing requirement is consistent with Draft Regional Planning Guidance and, unless a significant change in circumstances has occurred, is not a matter for negotiation. Future clearance levels may alter in the long term, however in the short to medium term in all probability levels will remain similar to those expressed in Policy H1. If clearance levels are significantly higher than expected as the plan period progresses, then the Council will consider either bringing forward Phase 2 sites or, if necessary, adopting an alteration to the plan.

0110/1/001/O**Paul Speak Properties Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Potentially minor amendments to the clearance allowance.

Reason :

Future clearance levels may alter in the long term, however in the short to medium term in

Initial Responses to Objections

are significantly higher than expected as the plan period progresses, then the Council will consider either bringing forward Phase 2 sites or, if necessary, adopting an alteration to the plan. It is not intended to reduce the brownfield target as this would not be consistent with objectives expressed in PPG3 and Draft Regional Planning Guidance.

0111/1/001/O**Persimmon Homes*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

It is intended to insert additional text into the reasoned justification which will explain in more detail how housing allocations and windfall allowances were derived. Additional text will be added to better explain how Regional Planning Guidance treats the period post 2011.

Reason :

Additional text will be inserted to aid understanding of how housing allocations and windfall allowances were derived and to explain the approach in Regional Planning Guidance to the period post 2011.

0112/1/001/O**Mr G Bayley*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The issue of mixed use allocations in Saddleworth is addressed in the covering report.

0167/1/004/O**Frost (Exors. of late Mr R.)**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Amend housing objective (g) to read "to encourage the development of a variety of house types, including affordable housing and upper market housing, that reflect housing needs and demands in the Borough and in a manner consistent with delivering the Plan's sustainability objectives".

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

The above change clarifies the plans objectives in respect of the need to encourage the development of a range of house types including upper market housing. Similar wording could also be added to the justification to policy H1. However it is not intended to include specific policies to encourage the development of upper market housing, nor is it intended to allocate additional greenfield sites for this purpose.

0181/1/007/O**Oldham Labour Group*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Land swap idea (allowing greenfield development on the basis of the developer greening an inner urban brownfield site) needs further discussion with the objector.

0263/1/015/O**CPRE - Lancashire*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

If necessary, amend brownfield target in line with final Regional Planning Guidance when published (expected early 2003).

Reason :

The brownfield target may be increased if recommended in Regional Planning Guidance when finally published. PPG3 does not specifically prohibit the development of greenfield windfall sites. However, the expectation must be that greenfield windfalls should be the exception rather than the rule. Policy H1.3 deals with this issue further.

0343/1/002/O**K Hanlon*****Summary of objection:***

Objection to all housing development. Particularly concerned with development proposed on greenfield land and open spaces. Sufficient supply of housing already.

Recommended Change:

None.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

Housing allocations reflect draft Regional Planning Guidance housing requirements which are themselves based, in part, upon expected increase in households. The RPG housing requirement cannot be revisited through the RUDP unless there has been a significant change in circumstances. There are a small number of phase 1 housing allocations on greenfield sites to meet specific objectives. The vast majority of phase 1 sites are on previously developed land.

0368/1/004/O**Dr David Atherton*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

As a matter of principle, the majority of employment sites in Saddleworth are protected under the Primary Employment Zone policy. The Council has made a small number of mixed use designations to stimulate employment development as part of a wider development package. The issue of mixed use designations is considered in the covering report. It is not accepted that the proposed developments would be to the detriment of local character. To date no objections or adverse comments have been received from the appropriate medical bodies concerning the impact of development on local medical services. However, the location of development in relation to the capacity of local basic services is an issue which could be investigated further.

0621/1/002/O**Mr R Eglin**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Amend housing objective (g) to read "to encourage the development of a variety of house types, including affordable housing and upper market housing, that reflect housing needs and demands in the Borough and in a manner consistent with delivering the Plan's sustainability objectives".

Reason :

The above change clarifies the plans objectives in respect of the need to encourage the development of a range of house types including upper market housing. Similar wording could also be added to the justification to policy H1. However it is not intended to include specific policies to encourage the development of upper market housing, nor is it intended

Initial Responses to Objections

to allocate additional greenfield sites for this purpose.

0650/1/002/O**Mr J. McLintock**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Amend housing objective (g) to read "to encourage the development of a variety of house types, including affordable housing and upper market housing, that reflect housing needs and demands in the Borough and in a manner consistent with delivering the Plan's sustainability objectives".

Reason :

The above change clarifies the plans objectives in respect of the need to encourage the development of a range of house types including upper market housing. Similar wording could also be added to the justification to policy H1. However it is not intended to include specific policies to encourage the development of upper market housing, nor is it intended to allocate additional greenfield sites for this purpose.

0729/1/001/O**R A Bagley*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Housing allocations reflect draft Regional Planning Guidance housing requirements which are themselves based, in part, upon expected increase in households. The RPG housing requirement cannot be revisited through the RUDP unless there has been a significant change in circumstances. There are a small number of phase 1 housing allocations on greenfield sites to meet specific objectives. The vast majority of phase 1 sites are on previously developed land. All housing allocations aim to avoid areas of valuable open space. The Council have distributed allocations throughout the Borough - which should lessen the impact on services in any one area.

0750/1/002/O**Exors of G S Sherratt deceased**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Amend housing objective (g) to read "to encourage the development of a variety of house types, including affordable housing and upper market housing, that reflect housing needs and demands in the Borough and in a manner consistent with delivering the Plan's sustainability objectives".

Reason :

The above change clarifies the plans objectives in respect of the need to encourage the development of a range of house types including upper market housing. Similar wording could also be added to the justification to policy H1. However it is not intended to include specific policies to encourage the development of upper market housing, nor is it intended to allocate additional greenfield sites for this purpose.

0815/1/001/O**Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL**

Agent : Cordingleys

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Potentially minor amendments to the clearance allowance..

Reason :

The housing requirement is consistent with Draft Regional Planning Guidance and, unless there has been a significant change in circumstances, is not a matter for negotiation. Future clearance levels may alter in the long term, however in the short to medium term in all probability levels will remain similar to those expressed in Policy H1. If clearance levels are significantly higher than expected as the plan period progresses, then the Council will consider either bringing forward Phase 2 sites or, if necessary, adopting an alteration to the plan. The issue of meeting housing needs will be monitored and methods of meeting need continue to be investigated. However, it is not accepted that the scale of housing needs justifies a departure from policies aimed at meeting the principles enshrined in PPG3 and the protection of open land.

6.21**Objections:****0107/1/001/O****Westbury Homes**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

PPG3 does not specifically prohibit the development of greenfield windfall sites. However the expectation must be that greenfield windfalls should be the exception rather than the rule. Table 4 of the First Deposit Replacement UDP (page 65/66) shows that the windfall allowance is based on brownfield completions.

Birchinlee Mill, Royton**Objections:**

0046/1/003/O Broadhurst Engineering (UK) Ltd

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

It is not proposed to positively encourage the development of this existing employment site owing to concerns regarding its location in relation to the adjacent sewage works, sub-standard access and concerns regarding pedestrian access to public transport and basic services.

0179/1/003/O Commhoist Ltd

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

It is not proposed to positively encourage the development of this existing employment site owing to concerns regarding its location in relation to the adjacent sewage works, sub-standard access and concerns regarding pedestrian access to public transport and basic services.

0617/1/001/O**Medlock Limited**

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

It is not proposed to positively encourage the development of this existing employment site owing to concerns regarding its location in relation to the adjacent sewage works, sub-standard access and concerns regarding pedestrian access to public transport and basic services.

0711/1/003/O**U-Aerials & Communications Ltd**

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

It is not proposed to positively encourage the development of this existing employment site owing to concerns regarding its location in relation to the adjacent sewage works, sub-standard access and concerns regarding pedestrian access to public transport and basic services.

0712/1/003/O**Medlock Communications Ltd**

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

Initial Responses to Objections

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

It is not proposed to positively encourage the development of this existing employment site owing to concerns regarding its location in relation to the adjacent sewage works, sub-standard access and concerns regarding pedestrian access to public transport and basic services.

0713/1/003/O**Medlock Construction**

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

It is not proposed to positively encourage the development of this existing employment site owing to concerns regarding its location in relation to the adjacent sewage works, sub-standard access and concerns regarding pedestrian access to public transport and basic services.

Dico Warehouse, Constantine Street**Objections:****0269/1/003/O****Fairclough Homes Ltd*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

This site is currently the subject of a planning application for residential development which was submitted by the objector. At present, it is felt that there is insufficient evidence to

Initial Responses to Objections

suggest that there is no demand for the continued employment use of this site.

Dunkerley St/ Huddersfield Rd**Objections:****0019/1/004/O****Lookers PLC*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

As a result of a recent planning appeal decision it will be necessary to remove housing allocation reference H1.1.8. At present, however, it is felt that there is no need to identify a 'replacement' site in the location suggested by the objector.

Greenfield Bowling Club**Objections:****0731/1/001/O****David Butterworth & Co. Ltd**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

This site is currently the subject of a planning application for residential development. It is currently felt that the development of this greenfield site would be contrary to the objectives of PPG3. Further, the recreational history of this site indicates that regard should also be had to the revised PPG17.

Land at Brookside Poultry Farm, Royton**Objections:**

Initial Responses to Objections

0031/1/001/O Mr J Wood

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

This site lies in the green belt in a location with poor accessibility to public transport and local services. Vehicular access is poor. In line with government and regional planning guidance there is no intention to amend green belt boundaries through the UDP review. Residential development is therefore considered inappropriate.

Land at Derwent Drive**Objections:****0673/1/004/O Mr J C Blakeman**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

It is not accepted that brownfield sites will fail to come forward at anticipated rates. However, should levels of development fall significantly below expected rates, then the authority has the option of bringing forward phase 2 site allocations. At present, therefore, it is considered that there are insufficient grounds to allocate the subject site as suggested.

Land at Foxdenton, Chadderton**Objections:****0041/1/005/O Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Ltd*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

None.

Reason :

The areas of land suggested for release by the objector together represent a significant amount of greenfield land. Whilst some of this land may need to be considered for release in the longer term, at present it is felt to be unnecessary in the light of current housing requirements and would be contrary to the aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

Land off Radcliffe St, Springhead**Objections:****0115/1/003/O****L. Perrins**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

This site is below the size threshold for site allocations which is normally 0.4 hectares (1 acre) or 10 units. Further, the site is greenfield in nature and can only be accessed through an area of land designated as Local Green Gap. These factors lead to the conclusion that the site is not suitable for allocation.

Land to the north of Ashton Rd, Woodhouses**Objections:****0618/1/001/O****Mr D B Jones*****Summary of objection:***

Requests that the site be allocated for residential development. Opportunity to "round-off" the village. Opposite site H1.2.3.

Recommended Change:

None.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

The subject site currently lies within the green belt. The allocation of the site for residential development would require a change to the green belt boundary. In line with Regional Planning Guidance, it is not proposed to amend green belt boundaries through the review of the plan.

Part of Long Clough, off Broadway, Royton**Objections:**

0626/1/001/O Stockwell Construction (Midlands) Ltd (Dissolved)

Agent : Alan Kirkham MRICS

Summary of objection:

Requests the land be allocated for residential dev't - poor quality area of land which could be landlocked after adjacent approved development takes place. Could deteriorate further. Could be developed without detriment to green corridor.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further consideration required, however it is felt that the fact that this is a greenfield site and a green corridor would preclude development, certainly in the short term.

Site off Wall Hill Road, Dobcross**Objections:**

0621/1/001/O Mr R Eglin

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Additional information is required on site access. However, this is a greenfield site in a location which does not have good access to public transport. Access to basic services is also limited. The strategy of the RUDP is to very much limit the allocation of greenfield sites. It is not expected, therefore, that the subject site will be deemed suitable for allocation at the present time.

Initial Responses to Objections

South of Denbigh Drive/Netherhouse Road**Objections:****0829/1/001/O Betts Homes (Northern) Ltd**

Agent : The Planning Consultancy

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The area of land suggested for release by the objector represents a significant amount of greenfield land. Whilst some of this land may need to be considered for release in the longer term, at present it is felt to be unnecessary in the light of current housing requirements and would be contrary to the aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

Initial Responses to Objections

H1.1 Housing Land Release – Phase 1**Supporting Representations:**

0740/1/022/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0008/1/027/O Countryside Agency

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Surveying housing needs will be a matter for an updated housing needs survey.

0108/1/009/O The House Builders Federation

Summary of objection:

Allocations are 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 reference to SPG in para 6.32.

Recommended Change:

No change to policy wording, although further consideration will be given to the issue of using SPGs as a means of operating the phasing policies.

Reason :

The claim that Policy H1.1 will not provide for a wide choice of good quality housing is not accepted - the RUDP allocates a range of sites in a range of locations. No change is recommended pending further clarification of the objectors position. It is accepted that further clarification of the role of SPGs in the implementation of the phasing policy is necessary.

0113/1/001/O Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

None.

Reason :

The subject site currently lies within the green belt. The allocation of the site for residential development would require a significant change to the green belt boundary in this locality. In line with Regional Planning Guidance, it is not proposed to significantly amend green belt boundaries through the review of the plan.

0572/1/001/O

Langtree Property Group Ltd

Agent : Sedgwick Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Currently the Borough is developing a robust supply of brownfield land with a number of allocations coming forward for development. The windfall allowance will be monitored and adjustments to the land supply made if necessary.

6.28**Objections:**

0007/1/018/O

Uppermill Residents Association

Summary of objection:

Table 3 should give a breakdown of housing supply by sub-area.

Recommended Change:

Provide a breakdown of Table 3 (Phase 1 supply) by sub area.

Reason :

For clarity.

0107/1/003/O

Westbury Homes

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

There is insufficient evidence for imposing a slippage allowance. If any significant slippage does occur, the implications will be dealt with through monitoring reports and, if necessary, bringing forward Phase 2 allocations.

6.30**Objections:****0107/1/004/O****Westbury Homes*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Clarify justification of figure for the reoccupation of vacant dwellings.

Reason :

The Council is committed to the principle of including a figure within the land supply for the reoccupation of vacant dwellings as outlined in the Empty Homes Strategy. Further consideration will be given to clarifying the reasoning for this approach in the policy justification.

Danisher Lane**Objections:****0815/1/007/O****Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL**

Agent : Cordingleys

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

The subject site is a greenfield site on the edge of the urban area. The RUDP strategy aims to maximise the amount of development on brownfield land. It is considered that there are no particular set of circumstances pertaining to this site which justify an exception to this aim. The loss of green belt would be contrary to national and regional planning guidance.

H1.1.1 Land at Hunt Lane, Chadderton**Supporting Representations:**

0163/1/002/S Alice Hadfield

Objections:

0124/1/004/O Lancashire Wildlife Trust

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

A planning application for housing development on this site is currently under consideration. The issue raised by the objector will be considered as part of the assessment of the proposal.

H1.1.10 Athens Way, Lees**Supporting Representations:**

0710/1/001/S W. Shepherdson and Sons Ltd

H1.1.12 High Street/Hartshead Street, Lees**Supporting Representations:**

0132/1/003/S Arthur Greaves (Lees) Ltd

H1.1.13 Coverhill Road, Grotton**Supporting Representations:**

0045/1/026/S Wiggett Construction Ltd
0732/1/001/S Harold J Taylor (deceased)

Objections:

Initial Responses to Objections

0165/1/004/O**Cllr Brian Lord***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

A planning application for housing development on this site is currently under consideration. The issue raised by the objector will be considered as part of the assessment of the proposal.

0263/1/006/O**CPRE - Lancashire***Summary of objection:*

Object to the continuing allocation of the site. The site makes a significant contribution to the Green Belt.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

A planning application for housing development on this site is currently under consideration.

0717/1/001/O**Grotton Action Group***Summary of objection:*

The site is both inappropriate and inadequate for inclusion as land for housing development.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

A planning application for housing development on this site is currently under consideration.

0718/1/001/O**Cllr C M Wheeler***Summary of objection:*

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

None.

Reason :

A planning application for housing development on this site is currently under consideration. The issue raised by the objector will be considered as part of the assessment of the proposal.

0828/1/010/O

Saddleworth Civic Trust

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

A planning application for housing development on this site is currently under consideration.

H1.1.14 Lumb Mill, Huddersfield Road, Delph**Supporting Representations:**

0099/1/004/S

John Saxon Ltd

Objections:

0007/1/023/O

Uppermill Residents Association

Summary of objection:

Disproportionate number of proposed housing in Phase 1 is in Saddleworth. The allocation at Lumb Mill is not supported.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development. It is not considered that a disproportionate number of sites are allocated in Saddleworth. In particular Oldham and Chadderton contain significant areas of housing land release.

Initial Responses to Objections

0099/1/002/O John Saxon Ltd

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

Requires clarification that the indicative capacity and density is for statistical purposes and will not be a restraint on site design and layout.

Recommended Change:

Additional reference will be made in the reasoned justification to the indicative nature of the capacity/density figures.

Reason :

For clarity.

0104/1/012/O Bellway Homes

Agent : Drivers Jonas

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Clarify cross referencing to mixed use policy B1.3. Clarify the fact that the site density and capacity are indicative only.

Reason :

Minor changes are required to clarify certain aspects of this allocation. Check whether or not the site should be classified as greenfield or brownfield.

0112/1/009/O Mr G Bayley**Summary of objection:**

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0128/1/001/O Jane Walker

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of the Lumb Mill site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0130/1/002/O**Janet Bottomley*****Summary of objection:***

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 motorway's. Mixed use designation should be deleted.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0527/1/002/O**Andrew Clark*****Summary of objection:***

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 housing if mixed scheme goes ahead.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0627/1/001/O**Joanne Clague**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0630/1/001/O**Alun Morgan*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0631/1/001/O**Nathan Berry*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0633/1/001/O**Charmaine Berry**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0634/1/001/O**W Berry*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0635/1/001/O**Sarah Gaskell*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0636/1/001/O**Jennifer Clark**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0637/1/001/O

Mrs A.R. Webster***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0639/1/001/O

Peter Webster***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0640/1/001/O

Dr. M.J. Schwarz

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0641/1/001/O**Mr. R. Hitchcock*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0669/1/001/O**Ms G Malone*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0671/1/001/O**R Walker**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0672/1/001/O**R and A Parker*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0674/1/001/O**Adam Smart*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0675/1/001/O**Mrs. L. Smart**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0676/1/001/O**Mr. B.L. Smart*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However, at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0677/1/001/O**Mr Eric Wild*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0678/1/001/O**Mr P. Whitworth**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0679/1/001/O**Mr C.J. Dockray*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0680/1/001/O**Mrs E. Dockray*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0681/1/001/O**P. Harrison**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0682/1/001/O**Mrs P. Hurst*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0683/1/001/O**Mr W. Hurst*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0685/1/001/O**R Rumacre**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0686/1/001/O**Mr R. Randerson*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0687/1/001/O**J. Young*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0688/1/001/O**Mrs P. Waterhouse**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0689/1/001/O**Mr O. Morgan-Clague*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0690/1/001/O**Mrs J.L. Hindle*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0693/1/001/O**Mr P. Whitehead**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0694/1/001/O**Mr Anthony Fisher*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0695/1/001/O**Mrs E. Peake*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0696/1/001/O**Allison Beever**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0697/1/001/O**Stella Hardy*****Summary of objection:***

Retain whole site as a Primary Employment Zone, as it should be for business use only.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0698/1/001/O**C. Carruthers*****Summary of objection:***

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 industrial/commercial only.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0699/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs H Moore**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0700/1/001/O

Mrs S. Whitworth***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0703/1/001/O

S. Ahmed***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0758/1/003/O

Kieran Berry

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0818/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs F Whitehead*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0819/1/001/O**Joanna Leggett*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

0833/1/002/O**Mrs G Clark*****Summary of objection:***

Objects to allocation, as consideration should be given to the amount of traffic through Delph.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

None.

Reason :

Options for the future development of this site are set out in the main report. However at present it is recommended that the current allocation be retained as the best means of generating commercial development.

H1.1.15 Bailey Mill, Oldham Road/Delph New Road**Supporting Representations:**

0627/1/002/S	Joanne Clague
0630/1/003/S	Alun Morgan
0631/1/002/S	Nathan Berry
0633/1/002/S	Charmaine Berry
0634/1/002/S	W Berry
0635/1/002/S	Sarah Gaskell
0636/1/002/S	Jennifer Clark
0640/1/002/S	Dr. M.J. Schwarz
0641/1/002/S	Mr. R. Hitchcock
0669/1/002/S	Ms G Malone
0672/1/002/S	R and A Parker
0674/1/002/S	Adam Smart
0675/1/002/S	Mrs. L. Smart
0676/1/002/S	Mr. B.L. Smart
0678/1/002/S	Mr P. Whitworth
0681/1/002/S	P. Harrison
0682/1/002/S	Mrs P. Hurst
0683/1/002/S	Mr W. Hurst
0685/1/002/S	R Rumacre
0686/1/002/S	Mr R. Randerson
0687/1/002/S	J. Young
0688/1/002/S	Mrs P. Waterhouse
0689/1/002/S	Mr O. Morgan-Clague
0693/1/003/S	Mr P. Whitehead
0699/1/002/S	Mr & Mrs H Moore
0700/1/002/S	Mrs S. Whitworth
0758/1/001/S	Kieran Berry
0819/1/002/S	Joanna Leggett

Objections:

0007/1/025/O **Uppermill Residents Association**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Although formerly in employment use, it is considered that the long-term future of this important local landmark will be best secured through its conversion for residential use.

0112/1/011/O**Mr G Bayley*****Summary of objection:***

The disused railway should be protected from development to ensure that its use for transport, preferably rail, would not be precluded.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The issue raised by the objector would be a matter of detail to be considered as part of the assessment of any future development proposal. As such it is not intended to amend the proposed allocation.

0112/1/012/O**Mr G Bayley*****Summary of objection:***

Bailey Mill site should remain as PEZ as policy appears to remove possibility of future business use of land in Saddleworth.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Although formerly in employment use, it is considered that the long-term future of this important local landmark will be best secured through its conversion for residential use.

0128/1/002/O**Jane Walker*****Summary of objection:***

An alternative site away from the centre of Delph should be sought because any additional traffic would strangle the village.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

None.

Reason :

Although formerly in employment use, it is considered that the long-term future of this important local landmark will be best secured through its conversion for residential use. The site is located away from Delph centre on a main throughroute. It is therefore considered that the impact from traffic movements on Delph village would be limited

0153/1/002/O**Mr P. Buckley*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Although formerly in employment use, it is considered that the long-term future of this important local landmark will be best secured through its conversion for residential use.

0164/1/002/O**Mr M. Buckley*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Although formerly in employment use, it is considered that the long-term future of this important local landmark will be best secured through its conversion for residential use.

0690/1/002/O**Mrs J.L. Hindle*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

None.

Initial Responses to Objections

Reason :

Although formerly in employment use, it is considered that the long-term future of this important local landmark will be best secured through its conversion for residential use.

0694/1/003/O
Mr Anthony Fisher
Summary of objection:

Reject the proposal for housing as it would detract from the essentially rural character of the local area.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Although formerly in employment use, it is considered that the long-term future of this important local landmark will be best secured through its conversion for residential use.

0828/1/001/O
Saddleworth Civic Trust
Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Although formerly in employment use, it is considered that the long-term future of this important local landmark will be best secured through its conversion for residential use.

H1.1.16 Buckley New Mill, Uppermill**Supporting Representations:**

0007/1/024/S	Uppermill Residents Association
0045/1/028/S	Wiggett Construction Ltd

H1.1.18 Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road**Supporting Representations:**

0045/1/027/S	Wiggett Construction Ltd
0110/1/009/S	Paul Speak Properties Ltd
0294/1/002/S	London Law & Land

Objections:

Initial Responses to Objections

0007/1/006/O**Uppermill Residents Association***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

See covering report.

Reason :

See covering report.

0045/1/015/O**Wiggett Construction Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

See covering report.

Reason :

See covering report.

0110/1/017/O**Paul Speak Properties Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

See covering report.

Reason :

See covering report.

0112/1/005/O**Mr G Bayley***Summary of objection:*

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

Initial Responses to Objections

Recommended Change:

See covering report.

Reason :

See covering report.

0174/1/018/O**Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

See covering report.

Reason :

See covering report.

0260/1/002/O**Brian Greenwood*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

See covering report.

Reason :

See covering report.

0295/1/001/O**Mrs Joan Frost*****Summary of objection:***

Support in principle but number of houses should be increased from 50 to 100, in accordance with PPG3 recommendation.

Recommended Change:

See covering report.

Reason :

See covering report.

0344/1/001/O**J. R. Taylor**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Strong objection to the redesignation of the site as mixed development. Saddleworth cannot afford to have such a large PEZ redesignated.

Recommended Change:

See covering report.

Reason :

See covering report.

0345/1/001/O**David Sanderson*****Summary of objection:***

Must not be largely used for housing. This is an excellent opportunity to use the rest of the site for a business park.

Recommended Change:

See covering report.

Reason :

See covering report.

0347/1/001/O**Knoll Mill Campaign Group*****Summary of objection:***

The UDP should provide far greater clarity about proposed uses. Requests the preparation of a detailed planning brief in consultation with local community groups

Recommended Change:

See covering report.

Reason :

See covering report.

0706/1/001/O**G.R. Bennett*****Summary of objection:***

Agree with the proposal for mixed use, but suggest that housing should be of a higher density.

Recommended Change:

See covering report.

Initial Responses to Objections

Reason :

See covering report.

0718/1/005/O

Cllr C M Wheeler

Summary of objection:

Would press for the allocation to be changed to PEZ.

Recommended Change:

See covering report.

Reason :

See covering report.

0828/1/018/O

Saddleworth Civic Trust

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

See covering report.

Reason :

See covering report.

H1.1.19 Andrew Mill, Greenfield**Supporting Representations:**

0104/1/013/S

Bellway Homes

Objections:

0007/1/027/O

Uppermill Residents Association

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Initial Responses to Objections

Reason :

Further consideration will be given to the allocation of this site. Particular attention will be given to the possibility of allocating the site for a mix of employment and housing uses through the development of a live/work scheme.

0368/1/002/O**Dr David Atherton****Summary of objection:**

Opposed to more housing and loss of PEZ.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further consideration will be given to the allocation of this site. Particular attention will be given to the possibility of allocating the site for a mix of employment and housing uses through the development of a live/work scheme.

0749/1/001/O**Steve Wright****Summary of objection:**

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further consideration will be given to the allocation of this site. Particular attention will be given to the possibility of allocating the site for a mix of employment and housing uses through the development of a live/work scheme.

0754/1/001/O**Mrs S Andrew****Summary of objection:**

Land should return to the original designation of light industry to create jobs. Also housing would put strain on schools and parks.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further consideration will be given to the allocation of this site. Particular attention will be given to the possibility of allocating the site for a mix of employment and housing uses

Initial Responses to Objections

through the development of a live/work scheme.

0755/1/001/O

Warren G. Garland

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further consideration will be given to the allocation of this site. Particular attention will be given to the possibility of allocating the site for a mix of employment and housing uses through the development of a live/work scheme.

0756/1/001/O

Harry Glover

Summary of objection:

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'.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further consideration will be given to the allocation of this site. Particular attention will be given to the possibility of allocating the site for a mix of employment and housing uses through the development of a live/work scheme. The coppice of trees referred to by the objector is covered by a Tree Preservation Order the existence of which would be a material consideration when considering redevelopment proposals for the site.

0828/1/007/O

Saddleworth Civic Trust

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further consideration will be given to the allocation of this site. Particular attention will be given to the possibility of allocating the site for a mix of employment and housing uses through the development of a live/work scheme.

Initial Responses to Objections

H1.1.3 Heywood Lane, Failsworth**Objections:****0289/1/004/O** **British Telecommunications Plc**

Agent : RPS Chapman Warren

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further consideration will be given to the mix of uses appropriate to this site. The level of residential units is not prescriptive - the capacity given in the policy is indicative only.

H1.1.4 High Barn Road, Royton**Supporting Representations:**

0223/1/004/S Howarth Brothers Properties

H1.1.5 Cape Mill, Shaw**Objections:****0180/1/006/O** **Siemens Real Estate Ltd**

Agent : Colliers Conrad Ritblat Erdman

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Details such as site area will be checked. It is considered inappropriate to extend the housing designation to cover a substantial area of (potential) public open space.

H1.1.7 Block Lane, Chadderton

Initial Responses to Objections

Supporting Representations:

0096/1/003/S

North Ainley Halliwell Solicitors

H1.1.8 Land at Redgrave Street, Oldham**Objections:**

0018/1/002/O

Standedge Limited

Summary of objection:

The allocated housing site is currently in commercial use and should be included in Huddersfield Road District Centre - and by implication deallocated as housing.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The recent approval of a supermarket on this site will necessitate its deletion as a housing allocation. The issue of the district centre boundary is dealt with under two separate objections (see Shopping section of this schedule objection 0018/1/001/O and 0019/1/001).

0019/1/003/O

Lookers PLC

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The recent approval of a supermarket on this site will necessitate its deletion as a housing allocation. The issue of the district centre boundary is dealt with under two separate objections (see Shopping section of this schedule objection 0018/1/001/O and 0019/1/001).

H1.1.9 Lower Lime Road, Oldham**Objections:**

0715/1/001/O

Hollinwood ward (Limehurst Village area)

Summary of objection:

Object to the proposal to build houses, as the recreational open space should be protected.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

None at present.

Reason :

Further consideration of objectives for this site is required, particularly in relation to the potential to retain an area as open space for recreational purposes and the advice in the revised PPG17. However it is noted that this site is a long standing development opportunity with the potential to meet government objectives aimed at creating mixed communities.

Land at Ashton Road, Bardsley**Objections:****0111/1/002/O****Persimmon Homes*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The allocation of this site for residential development would be contrary to current green belt policy and would not serve the aim of maximising development on brownfield land.

Land at Rumbles Lane, Delph**Objections:****0473/1/002/O****Mrs V Ward*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

This site has been designated as Local Green Gap in recognition of its importance in providing a significant local area of open space. It is not, therefore, considered to be appropriate to designate such an area for development purposes. Allocation of the site for

Initial Responses to Objections

housing would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

Land off Manchester Road, Oldham**Objections:**

0019/1/002/O Lookers PLC

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

At present there is no evidence to indicate that this site is unsuitable for continued employment use or that there would be no demand for such a use if the present user vacates the premises. Further, the suggested redevelopment would bring housing even closer to other employment uses within the PEZ. The locational advantages suggested by the objector are not necessarily unusual in urban Oldham and should not be allowed to override the PEZ policy.

Monarch Mill, Royton**Objections:**

0109/1/008/O Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110)

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

Requests that the site of Monarch Mill be allocated for Phase 1 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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further discussions regarding the future of this site are required, particularly in relation to the extent of the current use of the mill, the potential demand for the continued use of the mill and the condition of the mill. The objector has made a number of references to the make-up and derivation of the UDP supply. It is not accepted that any of the issues raised will have an impact upon the future of this site within the development plan.

Initial Responses to Objections

Waterside Mill, Greenfield**Objections:****0267/1/003/O****Tanner Brothers Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

At present there is no evidence to indicate that this site is unsuitable for continued employment use or that there would be no demand for such a use if the present user vacates the premises.

Wellyhole Street, Oldham**Objections:****0102/1/004/O****Brierstone Properties Ltd**

Agent : Drivers Jonas

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The principle of residential development on this site has been established through a recent planning application. The site will count against the windfall allowance set out in policy H1. Specific allocation is not required.

Initial Responses to Objections

H1.1.5

H1.1.5 Cape Mill, Refuge Street, Crompton

Supporting Representations:

0269/1/002/S

Fairclough Homes Ltd

Initial Responses to Objections

H1.2 Housing Land Release – Phase 2**Supporting Representations:**

0263/1/008/S CPRE - Lancashire
 0740/1/023/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0008/1/028/O Countryside Agency

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Surveying housing needs will be a matter for an updated housing needs survey.

0108/1/004/O The House Builders Federation

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change to policy wording, although further consideration will be given to the issue of using SPGs as a means of operating the phasing policies. The omitted Appendix 2 will be added.

Reason :

The claim that Policy H1 will not provide for a wide choice of good quality housing is not accepted since the RUDP allocates a range of housing sites in a range of locations. No change is recommended pending further clarification of the objectors position. It is accepted that further clarification of the role of SPGs in the implementation of the phasing policy is necessary. The omitted Appendix 2, which gives a description of each site will be included for clarity.

6.20**Objections:**

0572/1/002/O Langtree Property Group Ltd

Initial Responses to Objections

Agent : Sedgwick Associates

Summary of objection:

The justification should state that the phasing of housing land release will be informed by the need to minimise the impact on communities.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Phase 2 sites are located across the Borough and so the points raised by the objector are not considered to warrant any amendments to the policy. Further clarification from objector will be sought regarding any specific concerns they may have.

Birks Quarry**Objections:**

0113/1/020/O Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

Some of the phase 2 sites are considered unsuitable or inappropriate for development. Birks Quarry should be considered instead.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The subject site currently lies within the green belt. The allocation of the site for residential development would require a significant change to the green belt boundary in this locality. In line with Regional Planning Guidance, it is not proposed to significantly amend green belt boundaries through the review of the plan.

H1.2.1 Parkside Farm, Chadderton**Objections:**

0126/1/003/O Holroy Developments

Agent : Hall Needham Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

None at present.

Reason :

A recent planning appeal has placed significant weight on the phase 2 status of this site. As a general point, it is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services.

0750/1/001/O

Exors of G S Sherratt deceased

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

A recent planning appeal has placed significant weight on the phase 2 status of this site. As a general point, it is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services.

H1.2.10 Knowls Lane, Lees**Objections:**

0015/1/002/O

Leesfield Parish Schools

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Including additional wording which highlights issues which will need to be considered if this site is released for housing development, with specific reference, if needed, to the impact on St. Agnes CoE school.

Initial Responses to Objections

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option. However, it is accepted that reference could be made within the housing section to the potential impact of development on St. Agnes CoE school.

0111/1/004/O**Persimmon Homes****Summary of objection:**

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The subject site represents a longstanding development plan allocation, unlike the suggested alternative site which lies within the green belt.

0759/1/001/O**Lord Deramore's Stanford Estates**

Agent : Smiths Gore

Summary of objection:

Transfer allocation from Phase 2 (Policy H1.2) to Phase 1 (Policy H1.1). Largest single proposed housing allocation - more appropriate to include it in Phase 1. Well located, no constraints, would bring forward construction of new road link.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0828/1/013/O**Saddleworth Civic Trust**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

H1.2.11 Land at Ripponden Road, Denshaw.**Objections:****0003/1/001/O****GJ Belshaw*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option. For the avoidance of doubt, the site is not in the green belt.

0654/1/002/O**Margaret Ulyatt*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0655/1/002/O

Barry Ulyatt

Summary of objection:

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%.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0656/1/002/O

Mrs E Eddison

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to

Initial Responses to Objections

public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0658/1/002/O

Mrs G Travis

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0659/1/002/O

P.A. Coates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0660/1/002/O

Joan Dean

Summary of objection:

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

Initial Responses to Objections

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0661/1/002/O
Susan Travis
Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0662/1/002/O
Eileen Shaw
Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to

Initial Responses to Objections

public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0668/1/002/O**Bernard Wright***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0718/1/003/O**Cllr C M Wheeler***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0783/1/001/O**Francis G. Mundy***Summary of objection:*

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

Initial Responses to Objections

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0784/1/001/O**Michael Benton*****Summary of objection:***

Oppose the housing. Protect as open land to retain quietness and views - many OAP's on Dumfries Avenue. No access for a road.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0785/1/001/O**J. P. Breakey*****Summary of objection:***

The site should not be allocated for housing, because Denshaw has had too much development already.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term

Initial Responses to Objections

option.

0786/1/001/O

Mrs J. Harrop

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0787/1/001/O

Mr K. Harrop

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0788/1/001/O

Mr M. Ragan

Summary of objection:

The land should not be developed and should be preserved as open land. There is no clear access to the site.

Initial Responses to Objections

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0789/1/001/O

Mr & Mrs J Froggatt

Summary of objection:

Remove housing allocation as developing here would generate more road traffic because the bus services are so poor and the village lacks facilities.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0790/1/001/O

M. J. Holmes

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to

Initial Responses to Objections

public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0791/1/001/O**Mrs J. Hopwood*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0792/1/001/O**Mr M. Rogers*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0793/1/001/O**Ms E. Holmes*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0828/1/017/O

Saddleworth Civic Trust

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

H1.2.12 Land at Shaw Hall Bank Rd, Greenfield.**Objections:**

0007/1/028/O

Uppermill Residents Association

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and

Initial Responses to Objections

allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0040/1/016/O**Saddleworth Parish Council**

Agent : Eagland Planning Associates

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0325/1/001/O**Mrs Brenda Jackson*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0749/1/002/O**Steve Wright**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0760/1/001/O
Ms J. Lovatt
Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0761/1/001/O
Mr P. Stevenson
Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and

Initial Responses to Objections

allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0762/1/001/O**R. Quarmby***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0763/1/001/O**Ms K. Brooks***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0764/1/001/O**Ms K. Sage**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0765/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs D Burke*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0766/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs Gardner*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and

Initial Responses to Objections

allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0767/1/001/O**Mr M. Ratcliff*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0768/1/001/O**Mrs B. Washbrook*****Summary of objection:***

The site should be redesignated as Green Belt to discourage further speculative building and protect and preserve open land.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0769/1/001/O**Mr S.J. Quilter**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0770/1/001/O

Mr & Mrs S Ribbitts
Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0772/1/001/O

Oldham Friends of the Earth
Summary of objection:

The site is wilded and should be subject to a biodiversity survey before any decision is made about its future use.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and

Initial Responses to Objections

allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0774/1/001/O**Mrs D. Kidd*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0775/1/001/O**Master J. Kidd*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0777/1/001/O**BJ & EE Barnes**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Object to building on this site, for environmental reasons.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0778/1/001/O**Mr Mark Dronsfield*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0781/1/001/O**Dr M. Strahand*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and

Initial Responses to Objections

allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0782/1/001/O**Mr Paul Ashworth*****Summary of objection:***

Keep land undeveloped to protect wildlife/plants. Refers to existing access and parking problems in area.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

H1.2.12 Shaw Hall Bank Rd, Greenfield**Objections:****0045/1/024/O****Wiggett Construction Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Housing allocation supported but should be as a Phase 1 site - there are no overriding constraints and the site is sustainably located for housing.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term

Initial Responses to Objections

option.

0368/1/003/O

Dr David Atherton

Summary of objection:

Objects to housing development at Shaw Hall Bank Road - gross overdevelopment on an unsuitable site - gross parking problems.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0809/1/001/O

Mr & Mrs Strahand

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

H1.2.2 Rose Mill, Chadderton

Objections:

0751/1/001/O

Klynes Brothers Ltd

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Change to an allocation that allows housing, industrial or commercial development

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the need to allocate the site within phase 1 will be considered.

H1.2.3 Ashton Road, Woodhouses**Supporting Representations:**

0618/1/002/S	Mr D B Jones
0618/1/003/S	Mr D B Jones
0736/1/001/S	Mr J. Ashworth

H1.2.4 Medlock Road, Woodhouses**Objections:**

0038/1/034/O	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
---------------------	--

Summary of objection:

Object to inclusion of part of Brookdale Golf Course SBI in this allocation

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The objector has withdrawn their comments owing to a change in the SBI boundary which does not now impinge upon the allocation.

0572/1/003/O	Langtree Property Group Ltd
Agent : Sedgwick Associates	

Summary of objection:

Initial Responses to Objections

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 available in the Borough, thereby reducing pressure on greenfield windfall sites

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0618/1/004/O

Mr D B Jones

Summary of objection:

Remove site from housing allocations due to its poor access.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

H1.2.5 Blackshaw Lane, Royton**Objections:**

0752/1/001/O

Mrs B M Smith

Summary of objection:

Object to housing allocation on traffic grounds and because it is a greenfield site with wildlife and educational value.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

H1.2.6 Lilac View Close**Objections:****0042/1/004/O****Shaw & Crompton Parish Council*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

0045/1/029/O**Wiggett Construction Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence

Initial Responses to Objections

option.

0834/1/001/O

Mr J. Stott

Summary of objection:

Strong objection - already refused planning permission & previously through the UDP process because no suitable access. Also flooding issues and traffic generation issues.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

Knowls Lane, Lees

Objections:

0041/1/007/O

Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

This area of land forms part of an extensive area of land identified as a Local Green Gap in the draft RUDP. Further, at present housing requirement levels, the release of this site would result in an over-supply of housing land.

Monarch Mill, Royton

Objections:

Initial Responses to Objections

0109/1/009/O Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110)

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further discussions regarding the future of this site are required, particularly in relation to the extent of the current use of the mill, the potential demand for the continued use of the mill and the condition of the mill. The objector has made a number of references to the make-up and derivation of the UDP supply. It is not accepted that any of these comments will have an impact upon the future of this site within the development plan.

Initial Responses to Objections

H1.3 Assessing Non Allocated Sites & the Renewal of Planning Permissions**Supporting Representations:**

0102/1/005/S Brierstone Properties Ltd
 0740/1/024/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0041/1/006/O Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Ltd

Summary of objection:

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 separately under H1.3

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

PPG3 does not specifically prohibit the development of greenfield windfall sites, although it is the Council's position that these should be the exception rather than the rule. The need for greenfield development will be considered as part of the Council's housing land monitoring procedures and reports.

0104/1/005/O Bellway Homes

Agent : Drivers Jonas

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The need for the development of greenfield sites will be considered as part of the Council's housing land monitoring procedures. At present, and until Government guidance is issued to the contrary, the policy approach of the Council is to maximise the amount of development on previously developed land in line with PPG3.

0108/1/005/O The House Builders Federation

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

The policy is unlikely to provide for a wide choice of good quality housing.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The claim that Policy H1 will not provide for a wide choice of good quality housing is not accepted. The Council have allocated a range of sites in a range of locations.

0109/1/006/O

Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110)

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove reference to affordable housing in the policy and consider minor amendments to the Reasoned Justification.

Reason :

The policy reflects criteria set out in PPG3 and other UDP policies and is intended to support sustainability objectives. It is accepted that the inclusion of a reference to affordable housing may lead to confusion. It is proposed to omit this element of the policy and provide a cross reference to the appropriate affordable housing policies in the Reasoned Justification. Generally, further consideration will be given to the wording of the Reasoned Justification in order to aid clarity, although major changes are not envisaged.

0110/1/015/O

Paul Speak Properties Ltd

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Minor changes only to the Reasoned Justification in order to aid clarity.

Reason :

The policy reflects criteria set out in PPG3 and other UDP policies and is intended to support sustainability objectives. Further consideration will be given to the wording of the Reasoned Justification in order to aid clarity, although major changes are not envisaged.

0113/1/014/O

Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd

Initial Responses to Objections

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove reference to affordable housing in the policy and consider minor amendments to the Reasoned Justification.

Reason :

The policy reflects criteria set out in PPG3 and other UDP policies and is intended to support sustainability objectives. It is accepted that the inclusion of a reference to affordable housing may lead to confusion. It is proposed to omit this element of the policy and provide a cross reference to the appropriate affordable housing policies in the Reasoned Justification. Generally, further consideration will be given to the wording of the Reasoned Justification in order to aid clarity, although major changes are not envisaged.

0263/1/019/O

CPRE - Lancashire

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The release of Phase 2 sites will be governed according to the criteria set out in paragraph 6.23 of the Plan (under Policy H1) as stated in paragraph 6.24.

6.39**Objections:**

0023/1/006/O

P. Wilson & Company

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Amend paragraph 6.39 to make it clear that it is not intended to require applicants to demonstrate that housing requirements are unlikely to be met through the development of previously developed sites.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

For the sake of clarity.

6.40**Objections:**

0045/1/021/O Wiggett Construction Ltd

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Minor amendments to the Reasoned Justification.

Reason :

The policy reflects criteria set out in PPG3 and other UDP policies and are intended to support sustainability objectives. Further consideration will be given to the wording of the Reasoned Justification in order to aid clarity, although major changes are not envisaged.

Initial Responses to Objections

H1.4 Housing Density**Supporting Representations:**

0038/1/017/S	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0149/1/014/S	English Nature
0263/1/009/S	CPRE - Lancashire
0740/1/025/S	North West Regional Assembly

Objections:**0041/1/003/O Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Ltd***Summary of objection:*

Suggestion that dev't's 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..."

Recommended Change:

Amend wording to allow exceptions to the rule that developments should achieve a net density of 30 dwellings to the hectare or more.

Reason :

It is accepted that the policy wording requires clarification. Using the objectors suggested wording, however, would be contrary to Government advice. Instead it is intended to add wording to make it clear that exceptionally a density lower than the norm could be accepted. In circumstances where an exception is claimed, the criteria already set out in the policy would be taken into account.

0104/1/006/O Bellway Homes

Agent : Drivers Jonas

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Clarify policy regarding exceptions.

Reason :

It is considered that the policy needs to be clearer in terms of how it defines those circumstances where it may not be possible or desirable to meet the minimum density.

0113/1/016/O Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Clarify policy regarding exceptions.

Reason :

It is considered that the policy needs to be clearer in terms of how it defines those circumstances where it may not be possible or desirable to meet the minimum density.

Initial Responses to Objections

H2 Meeting the Need for Affordable Housing**Supporting Representations:**

0740/1/026/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0008/1/029/O Countryside Agency

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Surveying housing needs will be a matter for a future update of the housing needs survey.

0028/1/002/O Hall Needham Assoc.

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further discussions required with the objector to investigate the suggested alternative approach to affordable housing provision as part of a package of measures aimed at delivering affordable housing.

0104/1/008/O Bellway Homes

Agent : Drivers Jonas

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Amend policy to provide a definition of "local" within the context of affordable housing provision.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

It is accepted that for the purposes of clarity the policy should define "local" within the context of the Borough.

0429/1/002/O**Friends, Families and Travellers*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

It is considered that policy H2.2 sufficiently addresses the issue of site provision for Gypsies.

Initial Responses to Objections

H2.1 Providing Affordable Housing**Supporting Representations:**

0543/1/009/S Denshaw Community Association
 0740/1/027/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0007/1/019/O Uppermill Residents Association

Summary of objection:

Does not agree that affordable housing should only be sought on larger sites over 25 dwellings. Requests a change in policy accordingly.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The policy reflects government guidance.

0021/1/051/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Amend the reasoned justification to clarify how the occupancy of affordable dwellings will be controlled.

Reason :

It is accepted that some clarification of the Council's approach to affordable housing provision is required, including how the occupancy of the dwellings will be controlled. Further consultation with the objector is required in order to clarify the position with regard to the definition of "affordable".

0041/1/004/O Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Initial Responses to Objections**Reason :**

The policy, in terms of defining the sites to which it applies, is entirely consistent with Circular 6/98. The 25% requirement is consistent with the findings of the Council's housing needs survey.

0045/1/025/O**Wiggett Construction Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Amend policy to provide a definition of "local" within the context of affordable housing provision.

Reason :

It is accepted that for the purposes of clarity the policy should define "local" within the context of the Borough. In principle it is felt that the policy is based upon accurate and up-to-date housing needs information.

0104/1/009/O**Bellway Homes**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Include additional wording to clarify the intentions of the policy to make it clear that the affordable housing requirement will normally apply to sites with a capacity of 25 dwellings or more.

Reason :

This is a site specific issue which will be dealt with through the process of determining a planning application taking into account issues such as the impact of site topography on the capacity of the site. Additional wording could be added to the policy or its justification to clarify this point.

0104/1/010/O**Bellway Homes**

Agent : Drivers Jonas

Summary of objection:

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

Amend policy to provide a definition of "local" within the context of affordable housing provision.

Reason :

It is considered that the policy is sufficiently flexible that individual site circumstances can be taken into account. It is considered that the Lumb Mill site should accommodate an element of affordable housing as part of an overall package aimed at delivering a mix of uses. It is accepted that for the purposes of clarity the policy should define "local" within the context of the Borough. In principle it is felt that the policy is based upon accurate and up-to-date housing needs information.

0107/1/005/O**Westbury Homes*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The policy is intended to set a general presumption in favour of providing affordable housing on suitable sites. The 25% requirement is consistent with the findings of the Council's housing needs survey. However, the policy justification makes it clear that this will be achieved through negotiation with developers.

0109/1/007/O**Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110)**

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

No definition of "suitable sites", blanket target figure does not take account of constraints/abnormalities, policy does not equate type & size of affordable housing/hold characteristics/location. No ref to monitoring or situation if need is met.

Recommended Change:

Add more robust reference to monitoring and definition of suitable sites. Include wording to cover a situation whereby the need for affordable housing ceases.

Reason :

The recommended changes are for the sake of clarity and to be consistent with Circular 6/98 - Planning and Affordable Housing. The 25% requirement is consistent with the findings of the Council's housing needs survey. The reasoned justification makes it clear that the provision of affordable housing is a matter for negotiation.

0110/1/016/O**Paul Speak Properties Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Amend policy to provide a definition of "local" within the context of affordable housing provision. Include additional text on housing needs in Oldham.

Reason :

It is intended to amend this policy in order to aid clarity. Further details on housing need in Oldham will be added. The issue of negotiating for affordable housing based on local need will be considered further, although housing needs can be found throughout the Borough. It is accepted that for the purposes of clarity the policy should define "local" within the context of the Borough.

0113/1/017/O**Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd**

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

No definition of "suitable sites", blanket target figure does not take account of constraints/abnormalities, policy does not equate type & size of affordable housing/hhold characteristics/location. No ref to monitoring or situation if need is met.

Recommended Change:

Add more robust reference to monitoring and the definition of suitable sites in the Reasoned Justification. Include wording to cover a situation whereby the need for affordable housing ceases. Add further wording to clarify the approach to the consideration of "particular costs".

Reason :

It is proposed to make minor amendments to aid clarity. The issue of negotiating for affordable housing based in local need will be considered further, although housing needs can be found throughout the Borough. The issue of site constraints is dealt with in paragraphs 6.64 and 6.65 of the policy justification under the term "particular costs". Consideration will be given to providing further guidance to developers on this point.

0180/1/007/O**Siemens Real Estate Ltd**

Agent : Colliers Conrad Ritblat Erdman

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Initial Responses to Objections

Reason :

The provision of affordable housing on this site is being negotiated through a current planning application. It considered that the site is appropriate for the provision of affordable housing.

0243/1/006/O
Alan Roughley
Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Further consideration will be given to the term "affordable".

Reason :

Further consideration needs to be given to the definition of affordable and the implications in higher value areas, for example with reference to wage levels.

0263/1/020/O
CPRE - Lancashire
Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

Meeting housing needs through new provision is only one method of meeting housing needs. Funding generated through the Housing Market Renewal initiative will further enable the Council to meet needs. Further clarification from the objector will be sought in terms of required changes to the policy.

0729/1/002/O
R A Bagley
Summary of objection:

Objection to the provision of affordable housing in Saddleworth. Considers that the Council are trying to devalue Saddleworth.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

Providing affordable housing will help to sustain local communities under pressure from

Initial Responses to Objections

to continue for the foreseeable future.

H2.1.11 Ripponden Rd, Denshaw**Objections:**

0096/1/004/O **North Ainley Halliwell Solicitors**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

It is intended to review the operation of the phasing mechanism as set out in Policy H1 and implemented through policies H1.1 and H1.2. As part of this review, the Phase 2 allocations will be reconsidered in terms of their time of release. Factors that will influence the inclusion of sites within phase 2 will include: Regional Planning Guidance, the availability and suitability (in policy and practical terms) of alternative sites and access to public transport and local services. In this case the site is considered to be a long-term option.

Initial Responses to Objections

H2.2 Caravan Sites for Gypsies or Travelling Showpeople**Objections:****0429/1/003/O Friends, Families and Travellers***Summary of objection:*

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

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The development of caravan sites within the green belt would be contrary to current government policy on green belt protection.

0605/1/001/O Traveller Law Research Unit*Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

It is considered that the proposed criteria fairly reflect both the need to promote sustainable development, ensure that sites are in safe and convenient locations and the need to protect the amenity of neighbouring properties.

Initial Responses to Objections

H2.3 Lifetime Homes**Supporting Representations:**

0543/1/010/S Denshaw Community Association

Objections:

0021/1/052/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

Unclear what is meant by "Lifetime Home standards", therefore contrary to guidance in PPG12 which requires policies to be clearly and unambiguously expressed.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

The definition of "lifetime homes" is set out in the RUDP's glossary of terms. Further consideration will be given to clarifying the objectives of this policy. However, it is felt that the provision of lifetime homes which are adaptable for people with differing needs overtime is an important element of developing a more sustainable housing stock.

0104/1/011/O Bellway Homes

Agent : Drivers Jonas

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further consideration will be given to clarifying the objectives of this policy. However, it is felt that the provision of lifetime homes which are adaptable for people with differing needs over time is an important element of developing a more sustainable housing stock.

0107/1/006/O Westbury Homes

Summary of objection:

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

None at present.

Reason :

Further consideration will be given to clarifying the objectives of this policy. However, it is felt that the provision of lifetime homes which are adaptable for people with differing needs overtime is an important element of developing a more sustainable housing stock.

0108/1/006/O

The House Builders Federation

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further consideration will be given to clarifying the objectives of this policy. However, it is felt that the provision of lifetime homes which are adaptable for people with differing needs overtime is an important element of developing a more sustainable housing stock.

0113/1/019/O

Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

Further consideration will be given to clarifying the objectives of this policy. However, it is felt that the provision of lifetime homes which are adaptable for people with differing needs overtime is an important element of developing a more sustainable housing stock.

Initial Responses to Objections

Introduction**1.10****Supporting Representations:**

0175/1/001/S

West Pennine Bridleways Association

Objections:**0008/1/016/O****Countryside Agency***Summary of objection:*

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

Recommended Change:

Include reference in the Introduction Section to the Local Strategic Partnership's vision as set out in the Community Strategy.

Reason :

The first deposit draft UDP pre-dates the publication of the Oldham Community Strategy. The Strategy, including the vision for the Borough, needs to be more closely reflected and links to the UDP explained in this section so that it is clear how the UDP helps to achieve Community Strategy objectives.

1.10 e., 1.11**Objections:****0117/1/007/O****North West Tourist Board**

Agent : Paul Butler Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The Borough's historical and cultural assets are to be protected and conserved for human benefit, both now and in the future. There is no need to state that this is for the benefit of one or other groups of people. Natural assets are to be protected and conserved for human benefit and for their own sake. Therefore the objective should be left open ended.

Initial Responses to Objections

1.12, 1.13**Objections:****0008/1/015/O****Countryside Agency***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

Expand the Introductory section to include a brief explanation of the Council's approach to rural areas in the UDP.

Reason :

To set the context for the plan and make it clear how the Council proposes to meet the needs of the Borough's rural areas.

1.13**Supporting Representations:**

0175/1/002/S

West Pennine Bridleways Association

Objections:**0036/1/002/O****Peak District National Park***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

Expand paragraph 1.13 to make reference to the need to support the Peak District National Park Authority's policies.

Reason :

To ensure that the policies in the draft replacement UDP complement those of the Peak District National Park Authority whose plan covers that part of Oldham Borough which falls within the National Park.

1.2**Objections:****0021/1/020/O****Government Office for the North West**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Require clarification of reference to "other material considerations".

Recommended Change:

Revise paragraph 1.2 to more closely reflect the wording of Section 54A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

Reason :

For clarity.

1.4**Objections:****0008/1/011/O****Countryside Agency*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Expand the Introduction section to clearly explain how the plan's policies and proposals are expected to deliver more sustainable development.

Reason :

For clarity and to set the plan in context.

Initial Responses to Objections

Natural Resources**Objections:****0665/1/006/O The Environment Agency***Summary of objection:*

There should be Policy guidance in terms of what will be expected when developing adjacent to watercourses and canals in urban areas.

Recommended Change:

It is not considered necessary to include a new policy. Agree that existing policies be amended as follows: NR2 add at end of policy "DEVELOPMENT ALONGSIDE WATERCOURSES AND CANALS SHOULD, WHEREVER POSSIBLE, ENHANCE THE WATERSIDE ENVIRONMENT." and to para 13.33 "Watercourses and canals are valued for their visual contribution to the environment and their habitat value, and can play an important role in regeneration schemes. The Council will, therefore, seek to ensure that development adjacent to watercourses and canals fully incorporates and, where possible, improves the waterside setting."

NR2.3 Change title to "Protection of Open Watercourses". In reasoned justification replace "to a more natural state." with "in order to maintain watercourses in a more open and natural state. To this end, development alongside watercourses should, where possible, retain a green corridor next to the water to enhance the ecological value of the watercourses and their role as green corridors. In some locations, for example along urban canals, it may, however, be more appropriate for hard landscaping to be used and this should also aim to improve the visual quality of the waterside environment."

Reason :

Existing policies NR2 and NR2.3 are intended to relate to watercourses and canals in both urban and rural locations. Furthermore, general design policies eg. D1.13 and D1.1 provide guidance which would be applicable to development in the vicinity of waterways. The amendments to the existing policies are made to make more explicit what will be expected in relation to development adjacent to watercourses and canals.

0665/1/007/O The Environment Agency*Summary of objection:*

A sites constraints section should be included.

Recommended Change:

Plan should include section/appendices indicating constraints on allocated sites.

Initial Responses to Objections**Reason :**

To indicate issues which could affect the development of particular sites.

13.50 - 13.67**Supporting Representations:**

0726/1/001/S Energy Technology Support Unit (ETSU)

13.56**Supporting Representations:**

0007/1/017/S Uppermill Residents Association

Objections:

0007/1/016/O Uppermill Residents Association

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None

Reason :

Point a. in para. 13.56 refers to possible wind development targets in the North West towards which Oldham could contribute. The Council is obliged to consider how it can contribute towards national and regional objectives on producing energy from renewable resources. Wind is one of the known potential resources in Oldham. Policy NR3.2 recognises that wind developments give rise to particular planning considerations because of their locational requirements and potential impact on the environment. The policy therefore includes additional criteria, over and above those which need to be met in policy NR3.1, in recognition of these considerations. The importance of energy saving measures, as mentioned, is acknowledged but these are not land use planning matters.

0105/1/007/O

Dobcross Village Community

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

None

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

The targets referred to are those identified by the North West Regional Assembly for the north west region, towards which Oldham could contribute. Perhaps this needs to be clarified by adding to para 13.56: ... in the "North West" region by 2010..., and by replacing "play a part in achieving as additions" with "contribute towards in addition" ...

Initial Responses to Objections**NR1 Environmental Quality****Objections:****0665/1/005/O****The Environment Agency*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Incorporate reference to need to maintain satisfactory sewerage system into policy NR2.1.(Details to be discussed further with Drainage Engineer and Environment Agency)

Reason :

To ensure that problems associated with non-mains sewerage systems are properly addressed in accordance with draft regional guidance, PPG 12 (para 6.14) and Circ 3/99 (Planning Requirements in respect of the Use of Non Mains Sewerage incorporating Septic Tanks in New Development) and to raise awareness of developers responsibilities on this matter.

Initial Responses to Objections

NR1.1 Air Quality

Objections:

0021/1/044/O

Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

Recommend that the Policy state how applications outside AQMAs will be dealt with.

Recommended Change:

Amend policy and reasoned justification to clarify how development proposals will be reviewed for acceptability.

Reason :

To clarify within the policy how applications will be dealt with, although further detail will still necessarily be contained in the Air Quality Action Plan. The AQAP will include air quality guidance for developers which is expected to be finalised in approximately 12 months.

Initial Responses to Objections

NR1.2 Noise & Vibration

Supporting Representations:

0543/1/005/S Denshaw Community Association

Objections:

0007/1/015/O Uppermill Residents Association

Summary of objection:

A specific measurement should be quoted to support the "unacceptable impact" of noise.

Recommended Change:

None

Reason :

It is impracticable to quote a specific measurement to cover all developments which could give rise to noise/vibration. Acceptability is dependent on many factors, therefore each case would need to be assessed on its own merits, in consultation with Environmental Health officers as appropriate.

Initial Responses to Objections

NR1.3 Light Pollution

Supporting Representations:

0724/1/002/S

Dr & Mrs G Read

Initial Responses to Objections

NR1.5 Hazard & Nuisance

Objections:

0773/1/001/O

Health & Safety Executive

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Propose new wording:

NR1.5 The Council will not permit:

- a. new developments, including residential properties, in the vicinity of existing establishments where an identified source of potential hazard exists.
- b. new development which is likely to introduce a source of potential hazard, or works to existing premises which are likely to increase the existing level of potential hazard,

unless advised by the relevant agencies that such developments can be carried out without unacceptable risk to the public and the surrounding environment.

reasoned justification: Certain premises and pipelines are designated as notifiable installations because of the processes taking place, or because of the quantity or type of substance present. Whilst the use and storage of certain substances above specified quantities is subject to strict control by the Health & Safety Executive (HSE), this policy ensures that for the sake of health, safety and amenity, sensitive developments should not be located close to a known source of hazard. This includes residential development and any other development which is potentially at risk, as advised by the HSE. Equally, development that constitutes a potential hazard will not be permitted near to existing sensitive land uses. The HSE advises on consultation distances for different types of installation, and the Council will consult with the HSE when determining applications for proposed developments within these consultation distances in accordance with Circular 04/2000 "Planning Controls for Hazardous Substances".

The suggestion to include hazardous substances establishments and pipelines on the Proposal Map is not considered to be appropriate as they are subject to stringent control by the Health & Safety Executive.

Reason :

In order to clarify the situation relating to developments at or in the vicinity of hazardous installations.

13.29

Objections:

Initial Responses to Objections

0665/1/003/O

The Environment Agency

Summary of objection:

The policy should make specific reference to the hazardous potential of landfill gas migration.

Recommended Change:

Include section specifically on Landfill Gas within the reasoned justification of policy NR1.4 based on the suggested wording:

"In relation to the potential migration of landfill gas, the Council will strictly control all forms of built development on, or in close proximity to, existing or former landfill sites, and will not grant permission for such development where there is considered to be a substantial risk to the development. Any proposals that are permitted will be subject to conditions to ensure that site investigations are carried out and adequate precautionary measures are incorporated to secure long-term safety of the structure and its occupants. "

Reason :

Not specifically covered in plan at present. To alert developers to possible hazard of landfill gas.

Initial Responses to Objections

NR2 Water Resources & Infrastructure

13.30-13.35

Objections:

0117/1/006/O North West Tourist Board

Agent : Paul Butler Associates

Summary of objection:

Should encourage the use of other water resources in order to distribute visitor pressure more evenly within the borough.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Para 13.30 recognises the value of water resources in attracting visitors. B1.4 seeks to encourage development which will lead to increased use of the Rochdale or Huddersfield Narrow canals which will help spread visitors across the Borough. The canals have also been identified as important recreational routes on the proposal map.

13.31

Objections:

0038/1/028/O Greater Manchester Ecology Unit*Summary of objection:*

General support, however paragraph 13.31 should refer to mill lodges as well as ponds.

Recommended Change:

Refer to mill lodges as well as ponds in para. 13.31 as requested.

Reason :

Important part of the industrial heritage of the Borough and can be as important, ecologically, as other ponds.

Initial Responses to Objections

NR2.1 Water Infrastructure

Supporting Representations:

0038/1/029/S	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0149/1/011/S	English Nature
0543/1/006/S	Denshaw Community Association

Objections:

0422/1/003/O British Waterways

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

1. Include words "and to supply canals" after "... drinking purposes", in para 13.37.
2. It is not proposed to change the wording from "may need to" to "will" in para. 13.37 as requested.

Reason :

1. In order to clarify the two main purposes of protecting the water infrastructure.
2. Development covered by this policy may not necessarily involve canals, in which case it would not be necessary to consult British Waterways.

0665/1/004/O The Environment Agency

Summary of objection:

The Policy is supported in principle but needs to refer to the need to protect the quantity and supply of groundwater resources.

Recommended Change:

Add "groundwater resources or" after "...adversely affect"

Reason :

Policy does not specifically refer to protection of groundwater resources - agree should be included

13.36 Rochdale Canal**Objections:**

0771/1/002/O The Inland Waterways Association - NW

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Omit "the Huddersfield Canal and from" from para 13.36.

Reason :

Factual clarification. Rochdale Canal within Oldham does not receive water from the Huddersfield Canal. (This has also been confirmed by the Executive Director of Environment and Transportation)

13.8**Objections:****0175/1/014/O****West Pennine Bridleways Association*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Incorporate reference to need to maintain satisfactory sewerage system into policy NR2.1.(Details to be agreed with Drainage Engineer)

Reason :

To ensure that problems associated with non-mains sewerage systems are properly addressed in accordance with draft regional guidance, PPG 12 (para 6.14) and Circ 3/99 (Planning Requirements in respect of the Use of Non Mains Sewerage incorporating Septic Tanks in New Development) and to raise awareness of developers responsibilities on this matter.

Initial Responses to Objections

NR2.2 Flooding & Flood Protection

13.40 - 13.45

Objections:

0665/1/001/O

The Environment Agency

Summary of objection:

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 and a sequential approach to allocations within flood risk area.

Recommended Change:

Update policy in light of comments of Environment Agency.

Reason :

In order to reflect PPG 25 (Development and Flood Risk) (published July 2002)

Initial Responses to Objections

NR2.3 Culverting & Channelisation of Watercourses

Supporting Representations:

0038/1/030/S

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Objections:

0665/1/002/O

The Environment Agency

Summary of objection:

The words "there are sound public safety considerations" should be deleted as it is ambiguous.

Recommended Change:

Minded to delete words "there are sound public safety considerations" as suggested, although further discussion with Drainage Engineer/Environment Agency is needed to agree wording of revised policy.

Reason :

Environment Agency advises that phrase is ambiguous - culverts can cause increased health and safety hazards. Culverting does not remove the risk of drowning or injury.

Initial Responses to Objections

NR3.1 Renewable Energy Developments

Supporting Representations:

0008/1/025/S Countryside Agency
0038/1/031/S Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Objections:

0021/1/045/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

The UDP should identify broad locations, or specific sites, suitable for the various types of renewable energy installations.

Recommended Change:

Intention is to identify sites of search for different types of renewable energy installations but are awaiting outcome of study on renewable energy.

Reason :

In accordance with requirements of PPG22 (Renewable Energy) and draft Regional Planning Guidance.

Initial Responses to Objections

NR3.1 g)

Objections:**0177/1/001/O****David Chadderton***Summary of objection:*

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)

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Policy NR3.1 includes sites of archaeological interest under part g. as one criteria upon which renewable energy developments should not have an unacceptable impact. Also policies C1, C1.11 and C1.12 refer specifically to sites with archaeological significance.

Initial Responses to Objections

NR3.2 Wind Turbines

Supporting Representations:

0008/1/026/S Countryside Agency
 0036/1/003/S Peak District National Park

Objections:

0038/1/008/O Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Summary of objection:

Objects to this policy as it refers to habitat of international or national importance not SBI's. It also makes no reference to the impact on protected species, particularly birds and their migratory patterns.

Recommended Change:

Propose to remove reference to habitats in part c of NR3.2.
 Propose to add "Wildlife" under criterion a. of NR3.2.

Reason :

Policy NR3.1 criterion e) refers to sites designated for their nature conservation value. Nature Conservation sites are also covered in policy OE2.3 and protected species are covered in policy OE2.4.

Additional criterion covering wildlife will be explained in reasoned justification as particularly relating to birds not covered under policies OE2.3 or OE2.4.

0105/1/008/O Dobcross Village Community

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

para 13.67 a. add "visual" after "assessment of their" and b. add "a full assessment of all" after "to allow"

Reason :

points a. and b. in existing reasoned justification already address the issues raised by the objector but above additions strengthen it in line with the spirit of the objection. SPG would expand on the type of information which the Council will expect the developer to provide to enable a full assessment to be made of the impact of any proposal. Any schemes likely to have significant environmental effects would also require an environmental assessment under the Town and Country Planning (Assessment of Environmental Effects) Regulations 1988.

0106/1/002/O Friezland Residents' Association

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Opposed to wind farms

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Oldham is required to contribute to regional and national targets aimed at providing energy by renewable methods and wind has been identified as one of the known renewable resources in the area. It is, therefore, considered appropriate to have a policy relating to wind energy.

0149/1/012/O

English Nature

Summary of objection:

There is no mention of the impact that wind turbines may have on bird habitat or migratory patterns.

Recommended Change:

Add "Wildlife" under criterion a) of NR3.2

Reason :

So that birds not covered under policies OE2.3 and OE2.4 can be considered, including migratory patterns. This will be explained in the reasoned justification.

0165/1/003/O

Cllr Brian Lord

Summary of objection:

Policy should be amended so as not to give the impression that wind farms are accepted as a "fait accompli".

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

NR3 seeks to support all types of renewable energy. The additional criteria in NR3.2, which wind developments will need to meet, in addition to those in NR3.1, should ensure that wind farms are not accepted as a "fait accompli".

0175/1/016/O

West Pennine Bridleways Association

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Other authorities have refused to include policies relating to wind turbines, making Oldham a major target for such proposals.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Statement is considered to be incorrect -Neighbouring Rochdale has a policy on wind development. Tameside, to which the objector refers, had originally excluded wind developments from consideration but their energy policy has been amended in the 2nd deposit plan and now includes reference to wind development. It is not considered, therefore, that Oldham should become a particular target for such proposals. Oldham intends to guide development by providing areas of search for the different renewable technologies on the proposals map, and by having a criteria based policy (NR3.2) to address the particular planning considerations arising from wind developments.

0243/1/005/O

Alan Roughley

Summary of objection:

The proposed distance of wind turbines from other developments is too low.

Recommended Change:

Agree there is a need to re-consider the issue of distance but minded to omit any specific reference to distance in policy.

Reason :

If anything, 500m is not low enough for some types of wind turbine - it would preclude all small turbines at farms for example. Appropriate distances will vary according to proposal and will need to be considered on individual basis. Also, other criteria, particularly b. will affect what is an appropriate distance in each case.

0243/1/007/O

Alan Roughley

Summary of objection:

Need to ensure that any concrete or other foundations to a mast be removed and natural predevelopment drainage restored.

Recommended Change:

Include guidance in SPG on de-commissioning of redundant turbines.

Reason :

Agree clearer guidance is needed on action expected when turbines are removed. However, each case would need to be assessed as there could be instances when it may be more destructive to remove foundations than to leave them. ie. need to be sure action is in the best interest of the local environment.

Initial Responses to Objections

0543/1/002/O

Denshaw Community Association

Summary of objection:

Renewable energy sources other than wind should be given enhanced emphasis as they are less intrusive.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

The plan seeks to support the full range of renewable technologies, subject to the criteria listed in policies NR3.1 and NR3.2. Policy NR3.2 contains additional criteria which wind developments will need to meet in recognition that they give rise to particular planning considerations due to their locational requirements and potential impact on the environment.

0654/1/001/O

Margaret Ulyatt

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

The Council is obliged to consider how it can contribute towards national and regional objectives on producing energy from renewable resources. Wind is one of the known potential resources in Oldham. Policy NR3.2 recognises that wind developments give rise to particular planning considerations because of their locational requirements and potential impact on the environment. The policy therefore includes additional criteria, over and above those which need to be met in policy NR3.1, in recognition of these considerations.

0655/1/001/O

Barry Ulyatt

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

The Council is obliged to consider how it can contribute towards national and regional objectives on producing energy from renewable resources. Wind is one of the known

Initial Responses to Objections

impact on the environment. The policy therefore includes additional criteria, over and above those which need to be met in policy NR3.1, in recognition of these considerations.

0656/1/001/O**Mrs E Eddison*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

The Council is obliged to consider how it can contribute towards national and regional objectives on producing energy from renewable resources. Wind is one of the known potential resources in Oldham. Policy NR3.2 recognises that wind developments give rise to particular planning considerations because of their locational requirements and potential impact on the environment. The policy therefore includes additional criteria, over and above those which need to be met in policy NR3.1, in recognition of these considerations.

0658/1/001/O**Mrs G Travis*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

The Council is obliged to consider how it can contribute towards national and regional objectives on producing energy from renewable resources. Wind is one of the known potential resources in Oldham. Policy NR3.2 recognises that wind developments give rise to particular planning considerations because of their locational requirements and potential impact on the environment. The policy therefore includes additional criteria, over and above those which need to be met in policy NR3.1, in recognition of these considerations.

0659/1/001/O**P.A. Coates*****Summary of objection:***

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

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

No change

Reason :

The Council is obliged to consider how it can contribute towards national and regional objectives on producing energy from renewable resources. Wind is one of the known potential resources in Oldham. Policy NR3.2 recognises that wind developments give rise to particular planning considerations because of their locational requirements and potential impact on the environment. The policy therefore includes additional criteria, over and above those which need to be met in policy NR3.1, in recognition of these considerations.

0660/1/001/O**Joan Dean*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

The Council is obliged to consider how it can contribute towards national and regional objectives on producing energy from renewable resources. Wind is one of the known potential resources in Oldham. Policy NR3.2 recognises that wind developments give rise to particular planning considerations because of their locational requirements and potential impact on the environment. The policy therefore includes additional criteria, over and above those which need to be met in policy NR3.1, in recognition of these considerations.

0661/1/001/O**Susan Travis*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

The Council is obliged to consider how it can contribute towards national and regional objectives on producing energy from renewable resources. Wind is one of the known potential resources in Oldham. Policy NR3.2 recognises that wind developments give rise to particular planning considerations because of their locational requirements and potential impact on the environment. The policy therefore includes additional criteria, over and above those which need to be met in policy NR3.1, in recognition of these considerations.

Initial Responses to Objections

0662/1/001/O**Eileen Shaw*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

The Council is obliged to consider how it can contribute towards national and regional objectives on producing energy from renewable resources. Wind is one of the known potential resources in Oldham. Policy NR3.2 recognises that wind developments give rise to particular planning considerations because of their locational requirements and potential impact on the environment. The policy therefore includes additional criteria, over and above those which need to be met in policy NR3.1, in recognition of these considerations.

0668/1/001/O**Bernard Wright*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

The Council is obliged to consider how it can contribute towards national and regional objectives on producing energy from renewable resources. Wind is one of the known potential resources in Oldham. Policy NR3.2 recognises that wind developments give rise to particular planning considerations because of their locational requirements and potential impact on the environment. The policy therefore includes additional criteria, over and above those which need to be met in policy NR3.1, in recognition of these considerations.

13.56**Objections:****0040/1/014/O****Saddleworth Parish Council**

Agent : Eagland Planning Associates

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Not opposed in principle to wind farms, but concerned about targets in para. 13.56, omissions in the Policy, and Saddleworth being asked to carry an unreasonable share of the targets. Policy should require visual and environmental impact assessments.

Recommended Change:

Many issues are raised by the objector which are too lengthy to include in the summary comment, but are addressed individually below:

Those to which no change is proposed:

1. Concern about targets set out in para. 13.56.
2. Onus should be on developer to prove need as in D1.12 (telecommunications developments)
3. Formal design statement/impact should be required.
4. Requirement for traffic impact assessment during construction.
5. Impact on tourist trade/local access should be recognised.
6. Increased protection of archaeological sites needed.
7. Objects to wording "the applicant can show that there is no other suitable site".
8. Policy NR1 should be incorporated into NR3.2.
9. Pre-amble to NR3.2 should make clear that these installations are very large scale and often controversial.
10. The issue of noise emissions needs to be considered.

Those to which partial change is proposed:

11. Developer should provide life-cycle analysis of turbine
12. Onus is on applicant to demonstrate development is a safe distance from existing land uses. Distance for safety, etc should be judged in each case on its merits depending on type of installation.
13. Need to assess long term effect on ground and water table.
14. Policy should include requirement for visual and environmental impact assessments.
15. All significant habitats, bird migration and wildlife should be considered.

Reason :

- 1 These are targets set by the North West Regional Assembly for the North West region and indicate those to which Oldham could contribute. They include different types of renewable resources based on known resources, not just wind.
2. There is no requirement for developer to prove need. The principle of developing renewable energy resources is established in Government policy.
3. Formal design statement not appropriate for this type of development. Assessment of visual impact is covered under a.(i) and will be expanded in SPG.
4. Highway safety and traffic impact would be a consideration of any proposed development.
5. Impact on tourism is difficult to assess. Turbines can in some cases attract visitors. Access is unlikely to be affected as turbines occupy little land area.
6. Archaeology is covered by policy NR3.1 point g. and policies C1.11 and C1.12. May be need to mention particularly significant sites in SPG, eg Roman Road. Generally, however, turbines affect small areas of land.
7. It has to be accepted that location is limited to areas with high enough wind speeds. This criteria is about ensuring that sites not adjacent to the National Park are considered before those which are.

Initial Responses to Objections

added as a criterion in policy NR3.2 to ensure that issues such as bird migration are addressed.

0175/1/017/O**West Pennine Bridleways Association*****Summary of objection:***

Wind turbine targets are unrealistic because turbines are so unpopular and intrusive.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Point a. in para. 13.56 refers to possible wind development targets for the North West Region, towards which Oldham could contribute. These have been identified by the North West Regional Assembly. The Council is obliged to consider how it can contribute towards national and regional objectives on producing energy from all renewable resources. Wind is one of the known potential resources in Oldham. Areas of search will identify parts of the Borough within which wind and other renewable technologies may be appropriate, subject to meeting the criteria in policies NR3.1 and NR3.2. Until this is done it cannot be assumed that no sites are suitable for wind development as the objector suggests.

Initial Responses to Objections

NR4 The Need for Minerals

Supporting Representations:

0746/1/001/S

Greater Manchester Geological Unit

Objections:

0521/1/002/O

Derbyshire County Council

Summary of objection:

Policy is too restrictive in terms of requiring that need for minerals must be 'clearly established'.

Recommended Change:

Seek further clarification (negotiation?) with Derbyshire CC, but at this stage minded to retain existing wording.

Reason :

Derbyshire CC appear to place great reliance on all mineral working proposals entailing "some adverse environmental effect" (Inspector's words) and thus, coming under scrutiny from the need perspective. DCC's objection to our draft policy is that we are saying that establishing need should be a pre-requisite before judging the proposal against the range of criteria as set out in NR4.3. If it fails this "first test", then it will be refused, regardless of how minimal an impact the proposal may be perceived to have. DCC say (now, though perhaps not at the time of their own Local Plan Inquiry) that this conflicts with Para. 40 of MPG1. DCC do not suggest an alternative wording; therefore it can be assumed that the objection is to the thrust of sub-para. "A".

It will be important to assess the "need" for every proposal in the context of the prevailing regional guidelines for aggregates provision and the current aggregates landbank for Greater Manchester as a whole. The draft guidelines were published for consultation in August 2002, with the remainder of MPG6 due to be revised shortly. The Regional Aggregates Working Party (RAWP) will apportion these regional guidelines on a sub-regional basis. It is clear that the total demand for all aggregates for the 16-year period 2001-2016 will be significantly lower (the draft guidelines suggest by 24%) than the forecast made for the period 1992-2006 incorporated into the 1994 version of MPG6. An over-provision of consented reserves would create unnecessary blight.

0602/1/001/O

Aggregate Industries UK Ltd

Summary of objection:

Mineral resource zone map is unclear - should either be produced at a 1:2500 scale, or areas should be shown on the proposals map.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

Minded to agree with comment relating to clarity of MRZ map; however, not minded to incorporate MRZs into Proposals Map (see para. 13.69 of reasoned justification). Suggest producing supplementary map to a larger scale (say, 1:25,000?) and using colour to differentiate areas of sand, sandstone/gritstone and gravel. However, resist re-introduction of MRZ boundaries on to Proposals Map, as per 1996 version.

Reason :

Improve clarity of MRZ map, but avoid reverting to inclusion of MRZs on Proposals Map, as this is likely to convey the wrong message to mineral operators.

13.69**Objections:****0021/1/047/O****Government Office for the North West*****Summary of objection:***

It is unclear whether any proposals for mineral working are likely to come forward during the Plan period.

Recommended Change:

None

Reason :

Minded to retain existing wording. No-one can be sure whether or not proposals for mineral working are likely to come forward during the Plan period. The response to any such proposal would be largely influenced by the prevailing landbank situation for the mineral concerned. Defining, say, Areas of Search does not really "provide a measure of certainty" over the location of future development, as these cover large areas of the Borough with geologically homogenous mineral reserves. The definition of MRZs still provides an indication of which areas are underlain by viable reserves, and thus, where proposals for future working would not be dismissed out of hand (even though we would give little more encouragement in principle, if the landbank situation remained favourable).

Initial Responses to Objections**NR4 a)****Objections:****0021/1/046/O****Government Office for the North West*****Summary of objection:***

The requirement to demonstrate need is contrary to guidance set out in MPG1.

Recommended Change:

Seek further clarification (negotiation?) with GONW, but at this stage minded to retain existing wording.

Reason :

The Council's view is that establishing "need" should be a pre-requisite for all new mineral working proposals, before the proposal is then judged against the range of criteria as set out in NR4.3. If it fails this "first test", then it will be refused, regardless of how minimal an impact the proposal may be perceived to have. GONW say (as do Derbyshire CC) that this runs counter to the advice contained in MPG1.

It will be important to assess the "need" for every proposal in the context of the prevailing regional guidelines for aggregates provision and the current aggregates landbank for Greater Manchester as a whole. The draft guidelines were published for consultation in August 2002, with the remainder of MPG6 due to be revised shortly. The Regional Aggregates Working Party (RAWP) will apportion these regional guidelines on a sub-regional basis. It is clear that the total demand for all aggregates for the 16-year period 2001-2016 will be significantly lower (the draft guidelines suggest by 24%) than the forecast made for the period 1992-2006 incorporated into the 1994 version of MPG6. An over-provision of consented reserves would create unnecessary blight.

Initial Responses to Objections

NR4.1 Prevention of Mineral Sterilisation

Supporting Representations:

0746/1/002/S

Greater Manchester Geological Unit

Objections:

0021/1/048/O

Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

Should be a clearer commitment to the safeguarding of mineral deposits which are, or may become, of economic importance.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Minded to retain existing wording (plus omitted initial sentence - see 002/1/049/O). It is unlikely that major built development proposals will be brought forward in those areas where economically important mineral reserves are likely to be worked - which are in the rural, upland areas of the Borough. The existing form of words provides adequate protection, in our view - putting a blanket protection over all known mineral reserves of potential economic importance against all development would be unreasonable. We would prefer to leave the wording of the reasoned justification as it stands, rather than "lifting" the second sentence out and inserting it into the policy text itself. It is not accepted that the policy wording as it stands is in conflict with the sections of MPG1 and MPG6 quoted by the objector.

0021/1/049/O

Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

Currently worded the meaning is unclear.

Recommended Change:

Insert the following words to precede "Where such development is permitted,":

"In determining a planning application for major new development the Council will endeavour to protect known significant mineral resources from sterilisation."

Reason :

These initial words have been inadvertently omitted from the First Deposit Draft.

13.74

Initial Responses to Objections

Objections:**0021/1/050/O****Government Office for the North West***Summary of objection:*

Paragraph should be re worded as seems to run counter to the terms of Policy NR4.1

Recommended Change:

Amend wording of 13.74(b) by omitting the words "and releasing it for other productive uses".

Reason :

The intention was not to suggest that, by encouraging increased use of secondary and recycled aggregates and thus, minimising land take for primary aggregate extraction, the mineral-bearing land would then be available for some form of built (and by implication, mineral sterilising) development; rather, it could remain in (say) agricultural or recreational use, but remain physically able to be worked, should circumstances change in the future. However, to explain this in the reasoned justification text is likely to over-complicate the issue, and it would be simpler to omit these words.

Initial Responses to Objections

NR4.2 Primary, Secondary & Recycled Aggregates

Supporting Representations:

0746/1/003/S

Greater Manchester Geological Unit

Initial Responses to Objections

NR4.3 Criteria for Assessing Proposals for Mineral Working and Processing**Supporting Representations:**

0149/1/013/S English Nature

Objections:**0021/1/043/O Government Office for the North West***Summary of objection:*

Should reconsider requiring the demonstration of need.

Recommended Change:

Seek further clarification (negotiation?) with GONW, but at this stage minded to retain existing wording.

Reason :

The issues raised are essentially the same as those raised by Derbyshire CC (Ref. 0521/1/003/O) and by GONW in their objection to NR4 (Ref. 0021/1/046/O). In the case of NR4.3 there is a reference in the policy wording itself to the intention to assess any particular proposal against current landbanks (and the prevailing advice in MPG6). However, this is evidently not sufficient to prevent the objection being lodged.

It will be important to assess the "need" for every proposal in the context of the prevailing regional guidelines for aggregates provision and the current aggregates landbank for Greater Manchester as a whole. The draft guidelines were published for consultation in August 2002, with the remainder of MPG6 due to be revised shortly. The Regional Aggregates Working Party (RAWP) will apportion these regional guidelines on a sub-regional basis. It is clear that the total demand for all aggregates for the 16-year period 2001-2016 will be significantly lower (the draft guidelines suggest by 24%) than the forecast made for the period 1992-2006 incorporated into the 1994 version of MPG6. An over-provision of consented reserves would create unnecessary blight.

0038/1/032/O**Greater Manchester Ecology Unit***Summary of 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.

Recommended Change:

Initial Responses to Objections

Amend wording of Policy NR4.3 (e) to read as follows:

- i) areas of recreational use or potential;
- ii) local landscape character, as defined in other policies of this Plan;
- iii) woodlands;
- iv) designated wildlife sites;
- v) species protected by law and their habitats;
- vi) areas covered by Tree Preservation Orders;
- vii) other land and features of historical, archaeological or geological interest; or
- viii) other sites which make a significant contribution to the Borough's biodiversity;

Reason :

Protected species are found not only on designated wildlife sites (SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, SBIs, Local Nature Reserves), as the GMEU have pointed out. The addition to the list set out in NR4.3 (e) of "Species protected by law and their habitats" will rectify an omission.

0521/1/003/O

Derbyshire County Council

Summary of objection:

Policy is too restrictive in terms of requiring that need for minerals must be 'clearly established'.

Recommended Change:

Seek further clarification (negotiation?) with Derbyshire CC, but at this stage minded to retain existing wording.

Reason :

The issues raised in this objection are the same as those raised by GONW (Ref. 0021/1/043/O) and by Derbyshire CC in their objection to Policy NR4 (Ref. 0521/1/002/O). In the case of NR4.3 there is a reference in the policy wording itself to the intention to assess any particular proposal against current landbanks (and the prevailing advice in MPG6). However, even this is apparently not satisfactory to DCC.

It will be important to assess the "need" for every proposal in the context of the prevailing regional guidelines for aggregates provision and the current aggregates landbank for Greater Manchester as a whole. The draft guidelines were published for consultation in August 2002, with the remainder of MPG6 due to be revised shortly. The Regional Aggregates Working Party (RAWP) will apportion these regional guidelines on a sub-regional basis. It is clear that the total demand for all aggregates for the 16-year period 2001-2016 will be significantly lower (the draft guidelines suggest by 24%) than the forecast made for the period 1992-2006 incorporated into the 1994 version of MPG6. An over-provision of consented reserves would create unnecessary blight.

Initial Responses to Objections

Open Environment

Objections:

0149/1/019/O **English Nature**

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Agree plan should take into account need to protect features of the landscape which are important for wild flora and fauna (Further negotiation needed as to whether OE2.3, as now amended, meets objection or whether new policy is required)

Reason :

In accordance with Conservation Regulation 37 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats & c.) Regulations 1994.

11.40-11.45

Objections:

0691/1/001/O **W A Tomlinson**

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

In line with PPG7, the plan seeks to encourage diversification but includes criteria to ensure that such activities do not threaten the character of rural areas. PPG7, even as amended, advises of the need to weigh the encouragement of rural enterprise (including the diversification of farm businesses) alongside other considerations such as the need to protect landscape, the need to safeguard best and most versatile agricultural land and the need to respect the local character.

Initial Responses to Objections

11.42**Supporting Representations:**

0726/1/002/S

Energy Technology Support Unit (ETSU)

Park and ride in Green Belt**Objections:****0026/1/002/O****GMPTE***Summary of objection:*

Add policy in Open Environment chapter on development of Park and Ride sites in Green Belt in accordance with PPG13

Recommended Change:

Not proposed to include separate policy on park and ride in Green Belt.

Reason :

Policy T1.1 includes reference to proposed park and ride at Diggle. Para 4.9 states that this will be developed in line with relevant national planning guidance, which will include annex E of PPG 2 (Greenbelts).

Initial Responses to Objections

OE1. 10

Supporting Representations:

0174/1/010/S

Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn

Initial Responses to Objections

OE1.1 Criteria for Development in the Green Belt**Supporting Representations:**

0106/1/004/S	Friezland Residents' Association
0124/1/006/S	Lancashire Wildlife Trust
0174/1/001/S	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0730/1/001/S	Jeff Garner

Objections:**0021/1/054/O Government Office for the North West***Summary of objection:*

- 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.

Recommended Change:

1. Add "where possible" before "enhances the appearance of the surrounding area." as suggested.
2. Expand on the exceptional circumstances which have given rise to two changes to the Green Belt boundary.

Reason :

1. Requirement goes beyond the provisions of PPG2 (Greenbelts).
2. To more fully justify the changes to the boundary as PPG2 states that once approved the boundary should only be changed in exceptional circumstances. These relate to a small area which has been removed from the Green Belt at Lower Fullwood, Shaw which no longer performs a Green Belt function because a warehouse now exists there, and a small area added at Waterside Mill, Greenfield, to give the Green Belt a more defensible boundary along the rear of a new development.

0023/1/003/O**P. Wilson & Company***Summary of objection:*

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Government guidance in PPG 2 (Greenbelts) (para 1.6) outlines the positive role green belt land plays in providing opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population, and in providing opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near

Initial Responses to Objections

urban areas. This criteria, which carries forward the Council's current adopted policy approach, seeks to ensure that development does not adversely affect this role. It is not, therefore, considered to be too vague or subjective.

0031/1/002/O**Mr J Wood**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

There is a presumption against designating sites such as this in the Green Belt for development on the basis that they have been previously developed. The presence of existing unsightly buildings on the land is not sufficient justification to merit its allocation for development which, unless needed in connection with agriculture or forestry, would be contrary to green belt policy.

0038/1/018/O**Greater Manchester Ecology Unit*****Summary of objection:***

Broad support. Need for cross referencing to other open environment policies.

Recommended Change:

Make clear in the "Understanding the UDP Section" in the Introduction that cross referencing has been deliberately kept to a minimum in the plan.

Reason :

To make clear that the plan needs to be read as a whole document.

0040/1/006/O**Saddleworth Parish Council**

Agent : Eagland Planning Associates

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Initial Responses to Objections

Reason :

Existing vacant business premises in the Green Belt would not require planning permission to be re-used for business use. Policy B2.3 essentially has the same aim of supporting businesses in the Green Belt by allowing limited alterations/extensions.

0108/1/008/O**The House Builders Federation****Summary of objection:**

Policy misquotes the purposes of green belts set out in PPG2. The words '...and villages..' should be deleted from point (iv) of OE1.1a.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

It is considered that in the case of some of the villages in Saddleworth, the green belt does serve to preserve their setting and special character, and the plan seeks to continue this protection.

0461/1/002/O**Oldham and District Model Aero Club****Summary of objection:**

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

UDP reflects national policy guidelines which strictly govern what type of development is or is not acceptable in the Green Belt.

Land at Brownhill, Uppermill**Objections:****0125/1/002/O****Mr. M. Farrand****Summary of objection:**

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Initial Responses to Objections

Reason :

There is a presumption against change to the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (para. 2.1). Further, draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that, in Greater Manchester, Green Belt boundaries should not need to be reviewed before 2011. Also, this particular site is serving a purpose of Green Belt in checking sprawl.

Land at Dale Farm, Delph**Objections:**

0830/1/002/O **Mrs J.R. Whitehead**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

New buildings, other than those needed in connection with agriculture or forestry, are contrary to green belt policy. The fact that sites lie within existing settlements in the green belt is not considered to be sufficient justification to permit such inappropriate development.

Land at Higher Quick Farm, Lydgate**Objections:**

0470/1/001/O **Mr G Heathcote**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

New buildings, other than those needed in connection with agriculture or forestry, are contrary to green belt policy. The fact that sites lie within existing settlements in the green belt is not considered to be sufficient justification to permit such inappropriate development.

Initial Responses to Objections

Land at Long Lane, Dobcross**Objections:****0098/1/001/O Mr A. Bate**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

Change policy to allow limited development in, or close to, existing settlements in Green Belt, specifically on this site where development would have little impact on landscape and be near services in Dobcross.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

New buildings, other than those needed in connection with agriculture or forestry, are contrary to green belt policy. The fact that sites lie within existing settlements in the green belt is not considered to be sufficient justification to permit such inappropriate development.

Land at New Barn, Delph**Objections:****0463/1/001/O Mr C P Dawson**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

New buildings, other than those needed in connection with agriculture or forestry, are contrary to green belt policy. The fact that sites lie within existing settlements in the green belt is not considered to be sufficient justification to permit such inappropriate development.

Land at Poplar Avenue, Lydgate**Objections:****0178/1/001/O Mr D. Hind**

Initial Responses to Objections

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

New buildings, other than those needed in connection with agriculture or forestry, are contrary to green belt policy. The fact that sites lie within existing settlements in the green belt is not considered to be sufficient justification to permit such inappropriate development.

Land at Stonebreaks, Springhead**Objections:**

0472/1/001/O

Mr D Cox

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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)

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

New buildings, other than those needed in connection with agriculture or forestry, are contrary to green belt policy. The fact that sites lie within existing settlements in the green belt is not considered to be sufficient justification to permit such inappropriate development.

Land at Victoria Works, Dobcross**Objections:**

0123/1/001/O

Chapman Saddleworth Ltd

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

No change

Reason :

There is a presumption against designating sites in the green belt for development on the basis that they are previously developed. Other than those needed in connection with agriculture or forestry, new buildings are contrary to green belt policy. Also, although it is a brownfield site, it would still need to meet sustainability objectives in relation to accessibility to local services and public transport. It is not accepted that housing would be the only use compatible with its location. Employment uses or tourism related development would be equally, if not more, compatible and would contribute more to the local economy.

Land at Woodbrook, Springhead**Objections:**

0167/1/001/O Frost (Exors. of late Mr R.)

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

There is a presumption against designating green belt sites for development on the basis of their being previously developed or having been allowed to become unsightly. Buildings, other than those needed in connection with agriculture or forestry, would therefore be contrary to green belt policy. If applicants were to claim that exceptional circumstances exist where otherwise inappropriate development would be merited in order to benefit an area, the Council would wish to consider any such proposal as a departure rather than allocate the site for development, in order to maintain tight control over such development to protect the Green Belt functions of the land.

Initial Responses to Objections

OE1.2 New Building in Green Belt**Supporting Representations:**

0174/1/002/S Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn

Objections:

0008/1/007/O Countryside Agency

Summary of objection:

Policy should also allow for new buildings required for diversification of existing rural enterprises

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Proposals for new buildings required for diversification schemes would be assessed against policy OE1.9.

0038/1/019/O Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Summary of objection:

Broad support. Need for cross referencing to other open environment policies.

Recommended Change:

Make clear in the "Understanding the UDP Section" in the Introduction that cross referencing has been deliberately kept to a minimum in the plan.

Reason :

To make clear that the plan needs to be read as a whole document.

Land at Brownhill, Uppermill**Objections:**

0125/1/003/O Mr. M. Farrand

Summary of objection:

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

No change

Reason :

Development within existing historic settlements would be assessed against other policies in the plan, particularly those relating to the design of new development and, if appropriate, policies relating to conservation areas. A further policy is not considered to be necessary. Further, new buildings, other than those needed in connection with agriculture or forestry, are contrary to green belt policy. The fact that sites lie within existing settlements in the green belt is not considered to be sufficient justification to permit such inappropriate development.

Land at Dale Farm, Delph**Objections:**

0830/1/001/O Mrs J.R. Whitehead

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Development within existing historic settlements would be assessed against other policies in the plan, particularly those relating to the design of new development and, if appropriate, policies relating to conservation areas. A further policy is not considered to be necessary. Further, new buildings, other than those needed in connection with agriculture or forestry, are contrary to green belt policy. The fact that sites lie within existing settlements in the green belt is not considered to be sufficient justification to permit such inappropriate development.

Land at Higher Quick Farm, Lydgate**Objections:**

0470/1/002/O Mr G Heathcote

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Development within existing historic settlements would be assessed against other policies in the plan, particularly those relating to the design of new development and, if appropriate, policies relating to conservation areas. A further policy is not considered to be necessary. Further, new buildings, other than those needed in connection with agriculture or forestry, are contrary to green belt policy. The fact that sites lie within existing settlements in the green belt is not considered to be sufficient justification to permit such inappropriate development.

Land at Long Lane, Dobcross**Objections:****0098/1/002/O****Mr A. Bate**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Development within existing historic settlements would be assessed against other policies in the plan, particularly those relating to the design of new development and, if appropriate, policies relating to conservation areas. A further policy is not considered to be necessary. Further, new buildings, other than those needed in connection with agriculture or forestry, are contrary to green belt policy. The fact that sites lie within existing settlements in the green belt is not considered to be sufficient justification to permit such inappropriate development.

Land at New Barn, Delph**Objections:****0463/1/002/O****Mr C P Dawson**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Development within existing historic settlements would be assessed against other policies in the plan, particularly those relating to the design of new development and, if appropriate, policies relating to conservation areas. A further policy is not considered to be necessary. Further, new buildings, other than those needed in connection with agriculture or forestry, are contrary to green belt policy. The fact that sites lie within existing settlements in the green belt is not considered to be sufficient justification to permit such inappropriate development.

Land at Poplar Avenue, Lydgate**Objections:**

0178/1/002/O Mr D. Hind

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Development within existing historic settlements would be assessed against other policies in the plan, particularly those relating to the design of new development and, if appropriate, policies relating to conservation areas. A further policy is not considered to be necessary. Further, new buildings, other than those needed in connection with agriculture or forestry, are contrary to green belt policy. The fact that sites lie within existing settlements in the green belt is not considered to be sufficient justification to permit such inappropriate development.

Land at Stonebreaks, Springhead**Objections:**

0472/1/003/O Mr D Cox

Initial Responses to Objections

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Development within existing historic settlements would be assessed against other policies in the plan, particularly those relating to the design of new development and, if appropriate, policies relating to conservation areas. A further policy is not considered to be necessary. Further, new buildings, other than those needed in connection with agriculture or forestry, are contrary to green belt policy. The fact that sites lie within existing settlements in the green belt is not considered to be sufficient justification to permit such inappropriate development.

Land at Victoria Works, Dobcross**Objections:**

0123/1/003/O

Chapman Saddleworth Ltd

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Development within existing historic settlements would be assessed against other policies in the plan, particularly those relating to the design of new development and, if appropriate, policies relating to conservation areas. A further policy is not considered to be necessary. Further, new buildings, other than those needed in connection with agriculture or forestry, are contrary to green belt policy. The fact that sites lie within existing settlements in the green belt is not considered to be sufficient justification to permit such inappropriate development.

Initial Responses to Objections

OE1.3 Domestic Extensions in Green Belt

Supporting Representations:

0174/1/003/S

Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn

Initial Responses to Objections**OE1.4 Garden Extensions in Green Belt****Supporting Representations:**

0038/1/020/S	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0174/1/004/S	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn

Initial Responses to Objections

OE1.5 Replacement Dwellings in Green Belt**Supporting Representations:**

0174/1/005/S

Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn

Objections:**0023/1/001/O****P. Wilson & Company***Summary of objection:*

Delete a. and b. as they are unduly restrictive in respect of replacement buildings in the Green Belt.

Recommended Change:

Not proposed to delete criteria a. and b. as requested. (although it is proposed to change criteria a. to read "it is substantially intact but repair is impracticable")

Reason :

The criteria are not considered to be unduly restrictive and are felt to be necessary to enable an assessment to be made about when it is acceptable for a replacement dwelling to be permitted, as PPG2 requires that the openness and visual amenity of the Green Belt be protected.

0113/1/018/O**Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd**

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Do not propose to delete criteria a. as requested, although it is proposed to delete reference to structural condition in criteria a. and replace it with "it is substantially intact but repair is impracticable".

Do not propose to exclude dwellings not of a permanent construction, although it is proposed to delete the word "substantial" from para. 11.30.

Reason :

It is considered that the replacement of dwellings which are not substantially intact could have an unacceptable impact on the openness of the green belt and that such a criterion should therefore remain in the policy.

It is considered appropriate to include reference in the reasoned justification to non-permanent dwellings. Whilst the permanence of dwellings would need to be considered on a case by case basis, it should be made clear that buildings of a clearly temporary nature are not covered by the policy.

Initial Responses to Objections

Initial Responses to Objections

OE1.6 Change of Use of Existing Buildings in Green Belt**Supporting Representations:**

0174/1/006/S Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn

Objections:

0008/1/006/O Countryside Agency

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Criterion a. aims to ensure that economic uses which are appropriate in the Green Belt are considered in preference to residential conversion. Criteria aim to ensure that the use is appropriate in the Green Belt and does not compromise purposes of including land in it. Policy OE1.9 specifically relates to farm diversification.

0021/1/053/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

Recommend replacing 'Change of use' in the title with 'Re-use' to be consistent with the policy content and PPG2

Recommended Change:

Change "Change of use" in title to "Re-use"

Reason :

Agree is more consistent with policy content and PPG 2 (Greenbelts).

11.31**Supporting Representations:**

0117/1/009/S North West Tourist Board

Initial Responses to Objections

OE1.7 Land Reserved for Future Development**Supporting Representations:**

0174/1/007/S Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
 0740/1/030/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0021/1/055/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

Clarify that no development on Land Reserved for Future Development will be permitted in the Plan period which would prejudice later comprehensive development.

Recommended Change:

Include wording in policy to clarify that no development on Land Reserved for Future Development will be permitted in the Plan period which would prejudice later comprehensive development.

Reason :

To accord with PPG2 (Greenbelts), Annex B: Safeguarded Land, para B.5.

11.37**Objections:**

0175/1/013/O West Pennine Bridleways Association

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

The issue of safeguarded land is considered in the main report. If it is to be retained in principle then the plan needs to clarify when land might be released, and also make clear that it will be protected from development until such time as the plan is next reviewed.

Reason :

There is an apparent contradiction between para. 11.37 and 2.13.

0263/1/002/O CPRE - Lancashire

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Agree that this sentence should be deleted. However would maintain that a review may eventually be needed to ensure that future development is in most sustainable locations, and that this could involve reserved and/or green belt land.

Reason :

There is currently a contradiction between this sentence and the first sentence of the paragraph, and also with para 2.13

11.38 LR10 Ryefields Drive, Uppermill**Objections:****0043/1/001/O****Mr Frank Mallalieu*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Change allocation to Local Green Gap.

Reason :

The site is locally significant for its visual amenity being an area of mature woodland which serves to separate Ryefields Drive from the wider built up area of Uppermill to the south. It also provides a link to the wider open land to the east. The site is considered to have limited development potential due to its restricted size and slope. Development would also involve the loss of mature woodland which has considerable visual amenity and habitat value. It is, therefore, considered that the site should be protected from development which would threaten its openness, visual amenity and habitat value.

Land north of Coal Pit Lane, land at Ashton Road**Objections:****0815/1/005/O****Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL**

Agent : Cordingleys

Summary of objection:

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)

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

No change

Reason :

There is a presumption against changing the Green Belt boundary. PPG2 states that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1). Draft Regional Planning Guidance indicates that, in Greater Manchester, Green Belt boundaries should not need revision before 2011.

LR1 Cowlshaw**Objections:****0002/1/001/O****Ms Liz Buckley*****Summary of objection:***

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.

0038/1/003/O**Greater Manchester Ecology Unit*****Summary of objection:***

Objects to allocation as site contains SBI

0042/1/003/O**Shaw & Crompton Parish Council*****Summary of objection:***

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).

0100/1/001/O**Amanda Hill*****Summary of objection:***

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.

0124/1/005/O**Lancashire Wildlife Trust**

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

Redefine boundary of Land Reserved for Future Development to protect SBI, provide buffer zones around SBI and include SBI as wildlife corridor.

0152/1/012/O

Oak Street Area Community Group

Summary of objection:

Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development (No change or reason given)

0183/1/001/O

Stuart Bradbury

Summary of objection:

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.

0184/1/001/O

Groundwork Oldham & Rochdale

Summary of objection:

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.

0185/1/001/O

John Holt

Summary of objection:

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.

0186/1/001/O

Mary Holt

Summary of objection:

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.

0187/1/001/O

Lucy Bennett

Summary of objection:

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

0188/1/001/O**Patricia Hodson***Summary of objection:*

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.

0189/1/001/O**Graham Bennett***Summary of objection:*

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.

0190/1/001/O**Collette Bennett***Summary of objection:*

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.

0191/1/001/O**Alan Joannidi***Summary of objection:*

Objects to development of land - area satisfies definition of Local Green Gap

0192/1/001/O**Mr S. Chadwick***Summary of objection:*

Protect area from development - well used valuable amenity. Lot of money spent on tree planting which has attracted wildlife.

0193/1/001/O**Mrs N. Abbott***Summary of objection:*

Protect as green belt. Suggests renovating derelict houses and improving rundown areas of the Borough.

0194/1/001/O**Mr D. Nield***Summary of objection:*

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

Initial Responses to Objections

0195/1/001/O**Mr N. Cash***Summary of objection:*

Objects to allocation (Change and Reason not known - attachment missing)

0196/1/001/O**Mark Barrett***Summary of objection:*

Protect as green area. Already shortage of green areas. Building would be detrimental to the area. Traffic problem if developed.

0197/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs Whatmough***Summary of objection:*

Protect as Green Belt - separates 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.

0198/1/001/O**Mr M.J. Lemmings***Summary of objection:*

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.

0199/1/001/O**Paul Hicklin***Summary of objection:*

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.

0200/1/001/O**Mrs G.K. Whittleworth***Summary of objection:*

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.

0201/1/001/O**Dorothy Barrow**

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

Allocate area as a Green Gap to protect natural history value of site. Refers to traffic problems in area.

0202/1/001/O**Mr A.D. Ball***Summary of objection:*

Keep area as it is - great natural importance. Need to preserve habitats. Also Shaw cannot cope with any more traffic.

0203/1/001/O**Mrs J. Clark***Summary of objection:*

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.

0204/1/001/O**MA & TJ Lord & Field***Summary of objection:*

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.

0205/1/001/O**Mr F Jagger***Summary of objection:*

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.

0206/1/001/O**L Battersby***Summary of objection:*

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.

0207/1/001/O**Mrs C.S. Barrow***Summary of objection:*

Allocate as Green Belt to protect wildlife. Also schools and health centres in area are already oversubscribed and site traffic would be horrendous.

0208/1/001/O**R & G Vance**

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

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.

0209/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs W Daley***Summary of objection:*

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.

0210/1/001/O**Derek Sheard***Summary of objection:*

Reduce size of proposed development to preserve wildlife habitat. Unsuitable access to the site. Prime area of nature conservation. Trees planted by Groundwork

0211/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs R.H White***Summary of objection:*

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.

0212/1/001/O**Harry Hamer***Summary of objection:*

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.

0213/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs P.J O'Donnell***Summary of objection:*

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.

0214/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs R. Thompson***Summary of objection:*

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

0215/1/001/O

M.G. Hill

Summary of objection:

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.

0216/1/001/O

Nigel Cooper

Summary of objection:

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.

0217/1/001/O

Ian Taylor

Summary of objection:

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.

0218/1/001/O

Dr A. Butterworth

Summary of objection:

Allocate as Local Green Gap to protect open grassland - contains SBI, plants and wildlife. Peaceful place for walks. Demarcates and separates built up areas.

0219/1/001/O

Paul Monaghan

Summary of objection:

No details provided

0220/1/001/O

Harry Bowker

Summary of objection:

Protect as open space. Existing traffic problems. Land boggy and unsuitable for housing. Would undo work done by Groundwork on Cowlshaw Woods.

0221/1/001/O

Robert Hilton

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

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.

0222/1/001/O**Joan L. Corlett***Summary of objection:*

No details submitted on Change or Reason

0224/1/001/O**Mrs Butterworth***Summary of objection:*

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.

0225/1/001/O**Mark Tracey***Summary of objection:*

Retain as Local Green Gap. Development would destroy wildlife/nature. Would affect view from property and reduce value. Access/traffic will be horrendous.

0226/1/001/O**Alan T. Marsden***Summary of objection:*

No details of change/reason provided.

0227/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs P Fielding***Summary of objection:*

Area should be re-designated as Green Belt. Development would increase traffic and destroy valuable wildlife habitat. Potential drainage problems if site is developed.

0228/1/001/O**Mr G. Jackson***Summary of objection:*

Keep as Local Green Gap - SBI, blight existing houses, traffic, not evenly spread around Borough.

0230/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs B&J Holt**

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

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.

0231/1/001/O**A&J Howard***Summary of objection:*

Protect as Green Gap. Increased traffic would cause problems on roads not made to carry it.

0232/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs Coleman***Summary of objection:*

Object to development of area as schools are already oversubscribed and traffic would be unacceptable on Denhigh Drive. See no reason to build on only small green area - bad for environment and wildlife.

0233/1/001/O**Dan Faulkner***Summary of objection:*

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.

0234/1/001/O**Miss K. Faulkner***Summary of objection:*

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.

0235/1/001/O**Mr A. Faulkner***Summary of objection:*

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

0237/1/001/O**J.M. Evans***Summary of objection:*

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

0239/1/001/O**M Horritt***Summary of objection:*

Should be allocated as Green Belt or Green Gap. Area is rural, separates 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.

0240/1/001/O**Mr P&Mrs H Bradbury***Summary of objection:*

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 sites. Council should not sacrifice another local green gap.

0241/1/001/O**A.I. Long***Summary of objection:*

Leave area as it is - objects to development. Only open space and fields in area. Edward Rd not wide - extra traffic is unthinkable.

0242/1/001/O**K. McMunn***Summary of objection:*

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.

0244/1/001/O**G.& M. Lowe***Summary of objection:*

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

0245/1/001/O**Miss A. Maguire***Summary of objection:*

Maintain and develop Site of Biological Importance for present and future children

0246/1/001/O**Simon Mathews***Summary of objection:*

Initial Responses to Objections

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.

0248/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs P. Mellor***Summary of objection:*

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.

0249/1/001/O**David Nield***Summary of objection:*

Objects to development of the area on traffic grounds.

0250/1/001/O**Mr D.A. Orchard***Summary of objection:*

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.

0252/1/001/O**Norman Preece***Summary of objection:*

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.

0253/1/001/O**Mr K.H. Richardson***Summary of objection:*

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.

0254/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs S. Peers***Summary of objection:*

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.

0255/1/001/O**V. Scholes**

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

Allocate area as Green Gap. Increased traffic. Loss of wildlife. 'Green belt'. Too much building in Shaw.

0257/1/001/O**Mr K.C. Shaw***Summary of objection:*

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.

0272/1/001/O**Margaret Shaylor***Summary of objection:*

Allocate as Green Belt and develop as a wildlife space, trees, walks, etc. Traffic already a problem. Inadequate facilities to cope with more people.

0273/1/001/O**Stephen Smythe***Summary of objection:*

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.

0274/1/001/O**Carole Tasker***Summary of objection:*

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.

0275/1/001/O**F.L. Tasker***Summary of objection:*

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.

0276/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs D. Taylor***Summary of objection:*

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

Initial Responses to Objections

0277/1/001/O**Douglas Toop***Summary of objection:*

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.

0278/1/001/O**J. Townhill***Summary of objection:*

No details submitted.

0279/1/001/O**F.M. Whitehead***Summary of objection:*

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.

0280/1/001/O**Norman Whitehead***Summary of objection:*

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.

0281/1/001/O**Mr R. Whittles***Summary of objection:*

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.

0282/1/001/O**Barry Woodhouse***Summary of objection:*

Objects to development of the site. Area is by far the largest in the Borough for future development. Traffic in the area is already at a standstill. Soon there will be no green sites in this area.

0283/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs P. Wright***Summary of objection:*

Initial Responses to Objections

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.

0284/1/001/O**Kenneth Wylie***Summary of objection:*

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.

0285/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs LJ Shore***Summary of objection:*

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.

0286/1/001/O**Mrs M. Wild***Summary of objection:*

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.

0287/1/001/O**Norman Moores***Summary of objection:*

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.

0288/1/001/O**Nicola Lever***Summary of objection:*

Protect from development to prevent area being overpopulated and spoiling cultural amenities.

0290/1/001/O**David Golding***Summary of objection:*

No details provided.

0291/1/001/O**Harvey Hinchliffe**

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

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.

0292/1/001/O**Mrs D. Howard***Summary of objection:*

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.

0293/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs S. Holden***Summary of objection:*

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.

0297/1/001/O**James Fitton***Summary of objection:*

No information on Change or Reason provided.

0298/1/001/O**T & I Davies***Summary of objection:*

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.

0300/1/001/O**B. Whitehead***Summary of objection:*

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.

0301/1/001/O**R & J Ashworth***Summary of objection:*

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

0302/1/001/O**Andy Czakow***Summary of objection:*

Protect from development as infrastructure cannot cope with more housing development. Does 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

0303/1/001/O**C. Goodinson***Summary of objection:*

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.

0304/1/001/O**Gordon Allen***Summary of objection:*

Retain as green belt/gap to protect Shaw's natural environment.

0305/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs R. Kennedy***Summary of objection:*

Objects to any building on site.

0306/1/001/O**R.& P. Heywood***Summary of objection:*

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.

0307/1/001/O**Harry Bidwell***Summary of objection:*

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.

0308/1/001/O**Glenys Hinton**

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

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.

0309/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs C. Jones***Summary of objection:*

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.

0310/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs Yates***Summary of objection:*

Allocate as Local Green Gap because of volume of traffic.

0311/1/001/O**Jane Bidwell***Summary of objection:*

Allocate as Local Green Gap or Green Belt to protect green land, wildlife and place for children to learn about nature.

0312/1/001/O**Ms&Mr Hadi***Summary of objection:*

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.

0313/1/001/O**Alan Backhouse***Summary of objection:*

Redevelop land for agriculture because any building in the area would create over-loading on all services.

0314/1/001/O**J. & D. Stokes***Summary of objection:*

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.

0315/1/001/O**Trevor Dunkerley**

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

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.

0316/1/001/O**Fred Dunkerley***Summary of objection:*

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.

0317/1/001/O**Martin Bell***Summary of objection:*

Land should be allocated as Green Belt as it separates built up areas and is valuable amenity. Not one of Council's priority locations for development. Inaccessible to public transport. Strain on schools and other services if developed.

0318/1/001/O**Mrs J. Moran***Summary of objection:*

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.

0319/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs F. Hollingworth***Summary of objection:*

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.

0320/1/001/O**Robert Holland***Summary of objection:*

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.

0321/1/001/O**Michael Carrighan***Summary of objection:*

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 separates built up areas and has wildlife/botanical importance. Traffic problems.

Initial Responses to Objections

0322/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs J. Abson***Summary of objection:*

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.

0323/1/001/O**Mrs Joan Pedder***Summary of objection:*

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.

0327/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs J. Heather***Summary of objection:*

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.

0328/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs M. Pritchard***Summary of objection:*

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

0329/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs A. Ellis***Summary of objection:*

Protect from development to protect wildlife, ponds and walking area. Traffic problem.

0330/1/001/O**Miss C. Bailey***Summary of objection:*

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.

0331/1/001/O**Mr R. Blackman**

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

Allocate as green belt as there are few green areas within walking distance. Area already over-populated. Traffic problems would be worsened.

0332/1/001/O**W.A. Blackman***Summary of objection:*

Leave area as it is or build only a few houses - traffic problems

0333/1/001/O**Mrs B. Brown***Summary of 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.

0334/1/001/O**Mrs A. Browne***Summary of objection:*

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.

0335/1/001/O**Mr A. Dyson***Summary of 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.

0336/1/001/O**MrSM&Mrs C Durr***Summary of 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.

0337/1/001/O**Marie Dixon***Summary of 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.

0338/1/001/O**T. & W.J. Leach**

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

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.

0339/1/001/O**Fiona Hall***Summary of objection:*

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.

0340/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs S.T Hallett***Summary of objection:*

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.

0341/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs Harrison***Summary of objection:*

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.

0342/1/001/O**M. & T. Hilton***Summary of objection:*

Allocate as Green Belt to protect from development. Existing roads are narrow, further traffic would be hazardous and cause further congestion.

0353/1/001/O**Mr P.J Whybrow***Summary of objection:*

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.

0354/1/001/O**C.J. Holt***Summary of objection:*

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

0355/1/001/O

Mr A. Howard

Summary of objection:

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.

0357/1/001/O

Keith Jackson

Summary of objection:

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.

0358/1/001/O

Susan Jackson

Summary of objection:

Define area as Local Green Gap - natural belt separating 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.

0360/1/001/O

K. Jones

Summary of objection:

Protect as Green Belt to separate sprawl of urban development. Traffic - infrastructure can barely cope with traffic at present. Safety of children gaining safe access to schools.

0361/1/001/O

Paul Jones

Summary of objection:

Minimise land for residential development to protect green areas. Develop part of area as public park. Improve access- traffic already congested. More traffic would increase pollution. Develop public transport system. Pressure on schools.

0362/1/001/O

Mr & Mrs Kobyra

Summary of objection:

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.

0363/1/001/O

Mrs M. Newton

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

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.

0364/1/001/O**A. Barlow***Summary of objection:*

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

0365/1/001/O**Mr Brian Hunt***Summary of objection:*

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.

0366/1/001/O**Mrs L. Radcliffe***Summary of objection:*

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.

0367/1/001/O**Mrs M. Fletcher***Summary of objection:*

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.

0369/1/001/O**Mrs Asha Gulati***Summary of objection:*

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.

0370/1/001/O**Bill Friend***Summary of objection:*

Objects to possible development - not a brown field site

Initial Responses to Objections

0371/1/001/O**Caroline Glennie***Summary of objection:*

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.

0372/1/001/O**Walter Glennie***Summary of objection:*

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.

0373/1/001/O**J.A. Hassan***Summary of objection:*

Objects to possible development - protect land. Lived in Longfield Park and brought children up there.

0374/1/001/O**C. Barnett***Summary of objection:*

Land should have policy to protect it as agricultural/recreational land. Also to protect natural habitats and wooded areas.

0375/1/001/O**Mr D. Westwood***Summary of objection:*

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.

0376/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs Winterbottom***Summary of objection:*

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.

0377/1/001/O**Mrs Lucy Carroll***Summary of objection:*

Opposed to development. Why cause more problems for Shaw than we already have - traffic, children, crime.

Initial Responses to Objections

0378/1/001/O

Paul Turner

Summary of objection:

Scale down or stop the plan. Need for green belt land in inner cities. Traffic use.
Need for walking areas.

0379/1/001/O

Mr C. Whybrow

Summary of objection:

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.

0380/1/001/O

V. Daubney

Summary of objection:

Refers to traffic and crime but no Change indicated.

0381/1/001/O

J. Hart

Summary of objection:

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?

0382/1/001/O

Eric Suddaby

Summary of objection:

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.

0383/1/001/O

Mr&Mrs M. Gaffey

Summary of objection:

Protect as green land- only green site left in area. Place for children to play and see wildlife and to walk dog.

0385/1/001/O

G.P. Martin

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

Keep land rural/ wildlife sanctuary

0386/1/001/O**Roger Dunkerley***Summary of objection:*

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.

0387/1/001/O**Mrs H.I. Smith***Summary of objection:*

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 spaces between Shaw & Manchester. Lack of facilities, school places. Traffic problems.

0388/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs Lees***Summary of objection:*

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.

0389/1/001/O**Mrs F. Fitton***Summary of objection:*

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.

0390/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs S. Gilbert***Summary of objection:*

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.

0391/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs D. Connor***Summary of objection:*

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

0392/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs T. Stevenson***Summary of objection:*

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.

0393/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs J. Bowker***Summary of objection:*

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.

0394/1/001/O**G.F. Wrigley***Summary of objection:*

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.

0395/1/001/O**C.H. Watson***Summary of objection:*

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.

0396/1/001/O**Mrs V. Oldfield***Summary of objection:*

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.)

0397/1/001/O**Martyn Edwards***Summary of objection:*

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

0398/1/001/O**Mrs D. Dowd***Summary of objection:*

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

0399/1/001/O**Diane Broome***Summary of objection:*

Keep area as nature reserve to preserve for beauty and wildlife. Many parts of Shaw already developed with loss of green areas.

0400/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs Horton***Summary of objection:*

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.

0401/1/001/O**Michael Warburton***Summary of objection:*

Leave as it is - only green area left. Increase in traffic. More children, more school places - schools struggling as it is.

0402/1/001/O**R. Smalley***Summary of objection:*

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.

0403/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs S. Seddon***Summary of objection:*

Allocate as Green Belt - separates Cowlshaw and High Crompton. Would create considerable traffic problems and pollution for sake of oneoff multi million pound windfall.

0404/1/001/O**Deborah Dyson***Summary of objection:*

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.

0405/1/001/O**Mr S. Horritt***Summary of objection:*

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

0406/1/001/O**N.H. Wright***Summary of objection:*

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.

0407/1/001/O**P. Dodd***Summary of objection:*

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.

0408/1/001/O**M.T. Dodd***Summary of objection:*

Make area Green Belt. Insufficient infrastructure.

Need lung of green belt between built up areas.

0409/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs Fitton**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

0410/1/001/O**Paul Doney***Summary of objection:*

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.

0411/1/001/O**T.J. O'Regan**

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

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.

0412/1/001/O**Mr A. Bardsley***Summary of objection:*

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.

0413/1/001/O**David Lochery***Summary of objection:*

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.

0414/1/001/O**Darren Cunliffe***Summary of objection:*

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.

0415/1/001/O**Lorraine Cunliffe***Summary of objection:*

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.

0416/1/001/O**Ian Waterhouse***Summary of objection:*

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 gap. Would generate unacceptable levels of traffic.

0418/1/001/O**C. Cochrane***Summary of objection:*

Supports views of Cowlshaw Action Group

Initial Responses to Objections

0419/1/001/O**Mark Shuttleworth***Summary of objection:*

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.

0420/1/001/O**Mr M. Schofield***Summary of objection:*

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.

0421/1/001/O**Mrs Rita O'Neill***Summary of objection:*

Keep area as it is - need open spaces

0423/1/001/O**Mrs T. O'Neill***Summary of objection:*

Area should remain as it is unless further schools are to be built.

0424/1/001/O**Zoe O'Neill***Summary of objection:*

Area should remain as it is: green land for recreational use.

0425/1/001/O**J.D. Summers***Summary of objection:*

Protect from development. Wildlife would be lost. More and more traffic on Shaw Rd/Manchester Rd. Schools already over full.

0426/1/001/O**Mrs L.M. Fawns***Summary of objection:*

Protect as open land to prevent further housing development.

Initial Responses to Objections

0427/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs B. Butterfield***Summary of objection:*

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.

0428/1/001/O**Mr H. Kenyon***Summary of objection:*

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.

0430/1/001/O**Mr P. Weaver***Summary of objection:*

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 Cowlishaw and Higher Crompton.

0431/1/001/O**Mrs J. Weaver***Summary of objection:*

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.

0432/1/001/O**Mrs C. Abbott***Summary of objection:*

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.

0439/1/001/O**Marilyn Guest***Summary of objection:*

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.

0440/1/001/O**Pamela Platt**

Initial Responses to Objections*Summary of objection:*

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.

0441/1/001/O**Wright Platt***Summary of objection:*

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.

0442/1/001/O**Julie Patterson***Summary of objection:*

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

0443/1/001/O**Mrs Beryl Faulkner***Summary of objection:*

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

0445/1/001/O**Mrs K. Moss***Summary of objection:*

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.

0446/1/001/O**Mrs J. Korny***Summary of objection:*

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.

0447/1/001/O**Mrs Nora Sumner***Summary of objection:*

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

0448/1/001/O**Valerie Brocklehurst***Summary of objection:*

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.

0449/1/001/O**James Saville***Summary of objection:*

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.

0450/1/001/O**Mrs Doris Smith***Summary of objection:*

Protect as open space. Development would lead to increased traffic. Schools not able to cope with increased number of pupils.

0451/1/001/O**W. Tylor***Summary of objection:*

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.

0452/1/001/O**Mr A.H. Lees***Summary of objection:*

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.

0453/1/001/O**Mrs A. Spence***Summary of objection:*

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

0454/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs Stead**

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

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.

0455/1/001/O**Tracey Bromiley***Summary of objection:*

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.

0456/1/001/O**Mr C. Walker***Summary of objection:*

Objects to development of the area on traffic grounds.

0457/1/001/O**Mr A.P. Summersgill***Summary of 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.

0458/1/001/O**Ann Yazici***Summary of 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.

0459/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs T Hewson***Summary of objection:*

Development should go elsewhere. Too much traffic congestion already. Need to keep open spaces. Not enough Green Belt in Shaw.

0460/1/001/O**Diane Stott***Summary of objection:*

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

0462/1/001/O**L. Casey***Summary of 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.

0464/1/001/O**Joyce Donoghue***Summary of objection:*

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.

0465/1/001/O**Michael Patterson***Summary of objection:*

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.

0468/1/001/O**Cllr Val Pemberton***Summary of objection:*

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.

0469/1/001/O**Mr M. Cassidy***Summary of objection:*

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..

0471/1/001/O**B & T Warburton & Johnson***Summary of objection:*

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.

0475/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs A.J Conroy**

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

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.

0476/1/001/O

Mr&Mrs A. Anderson

Summary of objection:

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.

0477/1/001/O

Mr&Mrs D. Thackeray

Summary of objection:

No comments submitted.

0478/1/001/O

P. & S. Bolton

Summary of objection:

Allocate as green belt or make into a wood to preserve wildlife and promote social inclusion.

0480/1/001/O

M. & J. Lamb

Summary of objection:

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.

0481/1/001/O

Cllr A.J. Dillon

Summary of objection:

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.

0482/1/001/O

M. Hambley

Summary of objection:

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

0484/1/004/O**Ramblers' Association, Oldham Group***Summary of objection:*

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.

0485/1/001/O**Neil Cooper***Summary of objection:*

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.

0486/1/001/O**Mrs J. Byrne***Summary of objection:*

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.

0487/1/001/O**Derek T. Oldham***Summary of objection:*

Make the land a park. Shaw should be left as a village. Too much traffic. The local green land should stay the way it is.

0488/1/001/O**Mrs K. Howard***Summary of objection:*

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?

0489/1/001/O**D.W. Laws***Summary of objection:*

Objects to any further development in the Cowlshaw Area. Only LRFD site containing an SBI. Valuable wildlife habitat. Valuable and picturesque amenity would be lost. Few remaining green areas in west of the Borough should be preserved.

0490/1/001/O**R.&H.I. Ashworth**

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

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.

0491/1/001/O**Mr T. Bithell***Summary of objection:*

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.

0492/1/001/O**Mr Stephen Judge***Summary of objection:*

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.

0494/1/001/O**Mr K.J. Watson***Summary of objection:*

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.

0496/1/001/O**J. & K. Wales***Summary of objection:*

Designate as Local Green Gap - separates the built up areas of High Crompton and Cowlshaw. Existing traffic problems would be worsened.

0497/1/001/O**David Norbury***Summary of objection:*

Allocate as Green Belt to protect from development - should develop on 'wasteland' not green belt land.

0498/1/001/O**Mrs N.A. Bickerton***Summary of objection:*

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

0499/1/001/O**Steve Buckley***Summary of objection:*

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.

0500/1/001/O**S.& F. Eades***Summary of objection:*

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.

0501/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs SK Thornton***Summary of objection:*

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.

0502/1/001/O**Mr P. Buckley***Summary of objection:*

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.

0503/1/001/O**Brenda Robertson***Summary of objection:*

Protect from development. Objects to possible increase in traffic and effect on wildlife.

0504/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs A Horsfall***Summary of objection:*

Traffic/Wildlife

0505/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs D Colton***Summary of objection:*

Initial Responses to Objections

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.

0506/1/001/O**Kevin O'Regan***Summary of objection:*

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.

0507/1/001/O**Mrs C. Schofield***Summary of objection:*

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.

0508/1/001/O**Jean Harrison***Summary of objection:*

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.

0509/1/001/O**B. Wood***Summary of objection:*

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.

0510/1/001/O**Mr B. Mellor***Summary of objection:*

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.

0511/1/001/O**Mr J. Morris***Summary of objection:*

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

0512/1/001/O

J. Koulouri*Summary of objection:*

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.

0513/1/001/O

Mr&Mrs E.G Smith*Summary of objection:*

Protect as Green Gap - only green area left in area.Damage to wildlife.Traffic congestion already at boiling point.Over population of Shaw/Royton.

0514/1/001/O

Mrs P. Mellor*Summary of objection:*

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.

0515/1/001/O

L. & D. Pilling*Summary of objection:*

Change not specified. Reason: Would spoil the area, ruin wildlife. Would be more pollution. Road accidents would increase with more cars.

0516/1/001/O

Mr T. Kolakowski*Summary of objection:*

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.

0517/1/001/O

Miss S. Bennett*Summary of objection:*

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.

0518/1/001/O

E. McDermott*Summary of objection:*

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

0519/1/001/O

Cllr P Dillon

Summary of objection:

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.

0520/1/001/O

Mr K. Walker

Summary of objection:

Develop site as nature reserve to further improve on work carried out by Groundwork 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.

0522/1/001/O

F.W. Hopkinson

Summary of objection:

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?

0523/1/001/O

M. Barnett

Summary of objection:

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.

0524/1/001/O

Mrs E.M. Walker

Summary of objection:

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.

0525/1/001/O

Mr G. Walker

Summary of objection:

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.

0533/1/001/O

Mr E. Lumley

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

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 seperating built up areas.SBI would be lost. Traffic already heavy in area.

0534/1/001/O**C. & A. Kobyra & Iwanko***Summary of objection:*

No comments given

0535/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs F Healey***Summary of objection:*

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.

0536/1/001/O**Karen Broome***Summary of objection:*

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.

0537/1/001/O**Nigel Broome***Summary of objection:*

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.

0538/1/001/O**Mrs B. Paterson***Summary of objection:*

No change to area. Few remaining green areas in and around this part of the Borough need to be preserved. Already over-developed. ContainsSBI - valuable wildlife habitat. Largest area allocated for future development.Traffic would be problem.

0539/1/001/O**Mr R. Dearden***Summary of objection:*

Protect from development and keep and enhance area as natural green gap. Picturesque amenity. Infrastructure could not cope with more pressure.

Initial Responses to Objections

0540/1/001/O**Linda Argyle***Summary of objection:*

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.

0541/1/001/O**Emma Argyle***Summary of objection:*

Site should be made a nature area to protect wildlife and plants. Development would put strain on local amenities and cause extra traffic.

0542/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs Whitehead***Summary of objection:*

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.

0544/1/001/O**Mark Argyle***Summary of objection:*

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?

0545/1/001/O**San Argyle***Summary of objection:*

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.

0546/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs Chadwick***Summary of objection:*

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.

0547/1/001/O**Mrs Doris Ragg***Summary of objection:*

Initial Responses to Objections

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.

0548/1/001/O**Mrs B. Gilmartin***Summary of objection:*

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.

0549/1/001/O**Mr F. Dowd***Summary of objection:*

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.

0550/1/001/O**Brian Lord***Summary of objection:*

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.

0551/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs J Simcock***Summary of objection:*

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.

0552/1/001/O**Paul Kenyon***Summary of objection:*

Protect from development. Traffic problems close to school. Environmental issues/health issues. Lot of wildlife on site and ponds, area used for walking. Crime rate will go up.

0553/1/001/O**Ivan Tokaryk***Summary of objection:*

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

0554/1/001/O**Louise Farrimond***Summary of objection:*

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.

0555/1/001/O**Mrs B. Mearns***Summary of objection:*

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 accommodate the children that live in this area.

0556/1/001/O**Tonu Barik***Summary of objection:*

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

0557/1/001/O**Mrs B. Broadbent***Summary of objection:*

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.

0558/1/001/O**T. & P. Stansfield***Summary of objection:*

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.

0559/1/001/O**J.F. Kinder***Summary of objection:*

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.

0560/1/001/O**Crompton & Royton Golf Club***Summary of objection:*

Concerned about impact of further houses adjacent to golf course - possible encroachment on golf club land and effluence from adjacent houses.

Initial Responses to Objections

0561/1/001/O**Marjorie Johnson***Summary of objection:*

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.

0562/1/001/O**Daniel Ward***Summary of objection:*

Allocate as Green Belt. Not many places left of such natural beauty and it would be criminal to turn it into a concrete mass.

0563/1/001/O**J. & S. Earnshaw***Summary of objection:*

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.

0564/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs P Todd***Summary of objection:*

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.

0565/1/001/O**E.J. Flynn***Summary of objection:*

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.

0566/1/001/O**J. & C. Mallon***Summary of objection:*

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?

0567/1/001/O**Robin Hardman**

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

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.

0568/1/001/O**Mr M. Hutchinson***Summary of objection:*

Objects to allocation as land reserved for future development - traffic grounds

0569/1/001/O**Mrs L. Hilton**

Agent : Mr M. Hutchinson

Summary of objection:

Objects to development of the land on traffic grounds.

0570/1/001/O**Mr G. Lindsay***Summary of objection:*

Keep as openland/farmland/grazing land as area already at saturation point with vehicular traffic, and proposal will reduce environmental wellbeing.

0571/1/001/O**Mrs M. Baker***Summary of objection:*

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.

0573/1/001/O**Mrs Hebden***Summary of objection:*

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.

0574/1/001/O**Ms T. Gibson***Summary of objection:*

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

0575/1/001/O**Jeffrey Harrison***Summary of objection:*

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.

0576/1/001/O**Stuart Dyson***Summary of objection:*

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.

0577/1/001/O**Ian Nadin***Summary of objection:*

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.

0578/1/001/O**S.P. Woodhead***Summary of objection:*

Objects to any development which would worsen existing access/traffic problems. Concern about traffic safety on Edward Road. Loss of valuable nature haven.

0579/1/001/O**I. & C. Sutcliffe***Summary of objection:*

Leave as it is - Development would cause more traffic problems. Been enough new housing built in Shaw. Need green areas which are left.

0580/1/001/O**K.M. Oates***Summary of objection:*

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

0583/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs PK Humphrys***Summary of objection:*

Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development to allow garden extension.

Initial Responses to Objections

0584/1/001/O**John Southern***Summary of objection:*

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.

0586/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs J. Bennett***Summary of objection:*

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.

0587/1/001/O**G.M. Bickerstaffe***Summary of objection:*

Protect land from any building. Existing traffic problems would be worsened. Proposal contrary to Plan's key objectives.

0589/1/001/O**V. Bickerstaffe***Summary of objection:*

Protect land from any building. Traffic problems would be worsened. Proposal contrary to Plan's key objectives.

0590/1/001/O**G. Bickerstaffe***Summary of objection:*

Protect land from any building. Existing traffic problems would be worsened. Proposal contrary to Plan's key objectives.

0600/1/001/O**Peter E. Kewn***Summary of objection:*

Not known - Incomplete information

0691/1/004/O**W A Tomlinson**

Initial Responses to Objections

Summary of objection:

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

0796/1/002/O
Shaw and Royton Area Committee
Summary of objection:

Request further consideration be given to allocation, particularly in the vicinity of the park area on Moor Street (Details of change/reason not submitted)

0808/1/001/O
Mr & Mrs Grumbridge
Summary of objection:

Satisfies definition of local green gap. Contains SBI. Valuable & picturesque. This part of the Borough already saturated by development therefore green areas should be preserved. Huge site compared with housing allocations. Traffic issues.

0814/1/001/O
Mrs V. Riley
Summary of objection:

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.

0823/1/001/O
Mrs Gail Holden
Summary of objection:

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.

LR10 Ryefields Drive, Uppermill

Objections:

0007/1/020/O
Uppermill Residents Association
Summary of objection:

Site not suitable for development - should be Local Green Gap or Site of Special Scientific Interest

Recommended Change:

Allocate as Local Green Gap

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

The site is locally significant for its visual amenity being an area of mature woodland which serves to separate Ryefields Drive from the wider built up area of Uppermill to the south. It also provides a link to the wider open land to the east. The site is considered to have limited development potential due to its restricted size and slope. Development would also involve the loss of mature woodland which has considerable visual amenity and habitat value. It is, therefore, considered that the site should be protected from development which would threaten its openness, visual amenity and habitat value.

0040/1/015/O**Saddleworth Parish Council**

Agent : Eagland Planning Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

The site is locally significant for its visual amenity being an area of mature woodland which serves to separate Ryefields Drive from the wider built up area of Uppermill to the south. It also provides a link to the wider open land to the east. The site is considered to have limited development potential due to its restricted size and slope. Development would also involve the loss of mature woodland which has considerable visual amenity and habitat value. It is, therefore, considered that the site should be protected from development which would threaten its openness, visual amenity and habitat value.

0105/1/009/O**Dobcross Village Community*****Summary of objection:***

Change allocation from Land Reserved for Future Development to Local Green Gap due to value as woodland and wildlife habitat

Recommended Change:

Change allocation to Local Green Gap.

Reason :

The site is locally significant for its visual amenity being an area of mature woodland which serves to separate Ryefields Drive from the wider built up area of Uppermill to the south. It also provides a link to the wider open land to the east. The site is considered to have limited development potential due to its restricted size and slope. Development would also involve the loss of mature woodland which has considerable visual amenity and habitat value. It is, therefore, considered that the site should be protected from development which would threaten its openness, visual amenity and habitat value.

Initial Responses to Objections

0160/1/001/O

Brian Lee

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Allocate as Local Green Gap.

Reason :

The site is locally significant for its visual amenity being an area of mature woodland which serves to separate Ryefields Drive from the wider built up area of Uppermill to the south. It also provides a link to the wider open land to the east. The site is considered to have limited development potential due to its restricted size and slope. Development would also involve the loss of mature woodland which has considerable visual amenity and habitat value. It is, therefore, considered that the site should be protected from development which would threaten its openness, visual amenity and habitat value.

0161/1/001/O

Anita Lilley

Summary of objection:

LR10 should not be allocated as Land Reserved for Future Development - it is an area covered by Tree Preservation Orders

Recommended Change:

Remove LRFD allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap.

Reason :

The site is locally significant for its visual amenity being an area of mature woodland which serves to separate Ryefields Drive from the wider built up area of Uppermill to the south. It also provides a link to the wider open land to the east. The site is considered to have limited development potential due to its restricted size and slope. Development would also involve the loss of mature woodland which has considerable visual amenity and habitat value. It is, therefore, considered that the site should be protected from development which would threaten its openness, visual amenity and habitat value.

0162/1/001/O

Mr S.V. Sedgwick

Summary of objection:

Delete LR10 designation and extend LGG16 to include the wooded clough and Pickhill Brook. Development would be contrary to existing tree protection orders, Green Corridor designation, and protection of watercourses (NR2.3).

Recommended Change:

Change allocation to Local Green Gap.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

The site is locally significant for its visual amenity being an area of mature woodland which serves to separate Ryefields Drive from the wider built up area of Uppermill to the south. It also provides a link to the wider open land to the east. The site is considered to have limited development potential due to its restricted size and slope. Development would also involve the loss of mature woodland which has considerable visual amenity and habitat value. It is, therefore, considered that the site should be protected from development which would threaten its openness, visual amenity and habitat value.

0345/1/003/O**David Sanderson*****Summary of objection:***

Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect wildlife habitat and due to land's unsuitability for development

Recommended Change:

Allocate as Local Green Gap.

Reason :

The site is locally significant for its visual amenity being an area of mature woodland which serves to separate Ryefields Drive from the wider built up area of Uppermill to the south. It also provides a link to the wider open land to the east. The site is considered to have limited development potential due to its restricted size and slope. Development would also involve the loss of mature woodland which has considerable visual amenity and habitat value. It is, therefore, considered that the site should be protected from development which would threaten its openness, visual amenity and habitat value.

0526/1/001/O**James Grimwood*****Summary of objection:***

Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development because of existing tree preservation orders and woodland's value as wildlife habitat

Recommended Change:

Remove LRFD allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap.

Reason :

The site is locally significant for its visual amenity being an area of mature woodland which serves to separate Ryefields Drive from the wider built up area of Uppermill to the south. It also provides a link to the wider open land to the east. The site is considered to have limited development potential due to its restricted size and slope. Development would also involve the loss of mature woodland which has considerable visual amenity and habitat value. It is, therefore, considered that the site should be protected from development which would threaten its openness, visual amenity and habitat value.

Initial Responses to Objections

0528/1/001/O**Kevin Sanders*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Allocate site as Local Green Gap as requested.

(Request to alter Conservation Area cannot be considered as part of the UDP process)

Reason :

The site is locally significant for its visual amenity being an area of mature woodland which serves to separate Ryefields Drive from the wider built up area of Uppermill to the south. It also provides a link to the wider open land to the east. The site is considered to have limited development potential due to its restricted size and slope. Development would also involve the loss of mature woodland which has considerable visual amenity and habitat value. It is, therefore, considered that the site should be protected from development which would threaten its openness, visual amenity and habitat value.

0529/1/001/O**E McCarthy*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Remove LRFD allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap.

Reason :

The site is locally significant for its visual amenity being an area of mature woodland which serves to separate Ryefields Drive from the wider built up area of Uppermill to the south. It also provides a link to the wider open land to the east. The site is considered to have limited development potential due to its restricted size and slope. Development would also involve the loss of mature woodland which has considerable visual amenity and habitat value. It is, therefore, considered that the site should be protected from development which would threaten its openness, visual amenity and habitat value.

0606/1/002/O**Saddleworth Conservation Action Group*****Summary of objection:***

Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect mature woodland and wildlife habitat.

Recommended Change:

Allocate as Local Green Gap.

Initial Responses to Objections

Reason :

The site is locally significant for its visual amenity being an area of mature woodland which serves to separate Ryefields Drive from the wider built up area of Uppermill to the south. It also provides a link to the wider open land to the east. The site is considered to have limited development potential due to its restricted size and slope. Development would also involve the loss of mature woodland which has considerable visual amenity and habitat value. It is, therefore, considered that the site should be protected from development which would threaten its openness, visual amenity and habitat value.

0828/1/005/O

Saddleworth Civic Trust

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Allocate as Local Green Gap.

Reason :

The site is locally significant for its visual amenity being an area of mature woodland which serves to separate Ryefields Drive from the wider built up area of Uppermill to the south. It also provides a link to the wider open land to the east. The site is considered to have limited development potential due to its restricted size and slope. Development would also involve the loss of mature woodland which has considerable visual amenity and habitat value. It is, therefore, considered that the site should be protected from development which would threaten its openness, visual amenity and habitat value. Not able to allocate as SBI, SSI, etc, as requested, under UDP process.

LR2 Shawside, Shaw (Moss Hey)**Objections:**

0124/1/002/O

Lancashire Wildlife Trust

Summary of objection:

Boundary of LR2 allocation should be altered to ensure it falls outside adjacent SBI, preferably including buffer zone.

Recommended Change:

Will review boundary, and assess developability of site if boundary is to be changed. (General issue of safeguarded land is dealt with in main report).

Reason :

Need to reassess site in light of comment.

Initial Responses to Objections

0152/1/011/O**Oak Street Area Community Group***Summary of objection:*

Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development

Recommended Change:

Will reassess boundary and developability of site in light of objection ref 0124/1/002/o regarding adjacent SBI. (General issue of safeguarded land is dealt with in main report)

Reason :

Need to reassess site.

0166/1/002/O**P & D Northern Steels Ltd**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Will reassess site boundary and developability of site in light of comment ref 0124/1/002/o regarding adjacent SBI. (General issue of safeguarded land is dealt with in main report).

Reason :

Need to reassess site, however even if considered to have development potential, its allocation for housing would be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

LR3 Land at Foxdenton Lane, Chadderton**Objections:****0673/1/001/O****Mr J C Blakeman**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Remove allocation of land shown on (attached) plan as Land Reserved for Future Development to accommodate short-medium term development needs

Recommended Change:

Minded not to change although the optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

The site is considered to provide an important area of open space within a relatively built up

Initial Responses to Objections

development needs. Its allocation for housing would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

LR3, LR4 Land at Foxdenton Lane, Chadderton
Objections:

0006/1/018/O **Highways Agency**

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Covered elsewhere in the plan. Policy T1.3 identifies the trunk road mentioned, and T2.1 states that development proposals that access, or affect the traffic flow on, trunk roads must be submitted to the Highways Agency for review.

0181/1/006/O **Oldham Labour Group**

Summary of objection:

Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect as open space

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

0653/1/002/O **Mr G&Mrs J Horn**

Summary of objection:

Redesignate as Local Green Gap to prevent loss of open space and because the need to reserve land for future development is not proven

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Initial Responses to Objections

Reason :**0657/1/001/O**

Mrs Enid Johnson**Summary of objection:**

Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development to protect Foxdenton Hall and Park, and link area to restored Rochdale canal

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :**0663/1/001/O**

John A Shaw**Summary of objection:**

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

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :**0666/1/001/O**

Shirley Hamer**Summary of objection:**

Change allocation to protect land for use as a nature reserve and leisure park

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :**0667/1/001/O**

Mr Donald Easton

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :**0670/1/001/O****Mr Ronald Dawson*****Summary of objection:***

Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development to protect open space and absent compelling reasons for development

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :**0684/1/001/O****T Gaunt*****Summary of objection:***

Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect farmland and prevent more traffic problems

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

LR4 Land at Foxdenton Lane (North), Chadderton

Objections:

0124/1/011/O**Lancashire Wildlife Trust*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

Not proposed to include a green corridor link allocation through LR4.

Reason :

The issue of safeguarded land is dealt with in the main report. If retained as safeguarded land, the designation would retain the openness of this site until such time as the UDP were to be further reviewed. The SBI is located within a site designated as Recreational Open Space and is also, therefore, afforded protection under ROS policies. It is difficult at present to anticipate how LR4 would be developed, if it were ever deemed to be needed for development, therefore it is considered to be premature to identify a corridor route through the site as part of this plan.

0664/1/001/O**David S Owen*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

0673/1/003/O**Mr J C Blakeman**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Remove allocation of land shown on (attached) plan as Land Reserved for Future Development to accommodate short-medium development needs of the Borough

Recommended Change:

Minded not to change although the optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

The site is considered to provide an important area of open space within a relatively built up area therefore it is not considered to be appropriate to allocate the area for short term development needs. Allocation of the site for housing would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

LR5 Moston Brook, Failsworth

Initial Responses to Objections

Objections:**0236/1/004/O****BAE Systems Properties Ltd**

Agent : Fuller Peiser

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Minded not to change although the optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

The site is considered to provide an important area of open space within a relatively built up area therefore it is not considered to be appropriate to allocate the area for short term development needs. A large proportion of the site is currently in use as Recreational Open Space and is therefore also protected by ROS policies. Allocation of the site for housing would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

LR7 Haven Lane North, Moorside**Objections:****0614/1/002/O****Mr P&Mrs P Glynn***Summary of objection:*

Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect open land and prevent an increase in traffic

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

*Reason :***0632/1/001/O****Mr J Gregory***Summary of objection:*

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

LR7, LR8 Haven Lane, Moorside
Objections:**0096/1/002/O** **North Ainley Halliwell Solicitors**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

Change allocation to housing as there is no housing allocation in Moorside and the sites are suitable for this use

Recommended Change:

Minded not to change although the optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

The site is considered to provide an important area of open space within a relatively built up area therefore it is not considered to be appropriate to allocate the area for short term development needs. Allocation of the site for housing would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

0610/1/001/O**E Leeks***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

0611/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs H Pearson**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Object to allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development on traffic grounds and because playing area is needed for children

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

0612/1/001/O**J Brears*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

0613/1/001/O**Moorside East Residents Association*****Summary of objection:***

Reallocate as Local Green Gap to prevent future development with an associated increase in traffic

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

0616/1/001/O**Mr Trevor Cash*****Summary of objection:***

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)

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Initial Responses to Objections

*Reason :***0619/1/001/O**

C Ambrose & D Johnson*Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

*Reason :***0620/1/001/O**

Mr & Mrs P Bailey*Summary of objection:*

Reallocate as Local Green Gap to protect open environment of the area

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

*Reason :***0622/1/001/O**

Mr & Mrs D Beard*Summary of objection:*

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

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

*Reason :***0623/1/001/O**

I J Bolton

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

0625/1/001/O**Mr G Brand*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

0628/1/001/O**James Donohoe*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

0629/1/001/O**Ronald Graham*****Summary of objection:***

Change allocation from Land Reserved for Future Development to Local Green Gap on traffic grounds

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Initial Responses to Objections

Reason :**0642/1/001/O**

Edith Mary Larder**Summary of objection:**

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.

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :**0643/1/001/O**

Mr & Mrs E Ogden**Summary of objection:**

Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect the farmland which provides an important break between built-up areas

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :**0644/1/001/O**

Mr & Mrs M Seddon**Summary of objection:**

Change allocation to Local Green Gap on traffic grounds

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :**0645/1/001/O**

Mr&Mrs D J Shore

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

0646/1/001/O**C & D Tennant*****Summary of objection:***

Change allocation to Local Green Gap on traffic grounds and to protect farmland

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

0647/1/001/O**Jean Tennant*****Summary of objection:***

Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect well-maintained agricultural land

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

**LR8 Haven Lane South, Moorside
Objections:****0101/1/001/O****Mr R. Cocking**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Minded not to change although the optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

The site is considered to provide an important area of open space within a relatively built up area therefore it is not considered to be appropriate to allocate the area for short term development needs. Allocation of the site for housing would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

0614/1/001/O**Mr P&Mrs P Glynn*****Summary of objection:***

Change allocation to Local Green Gap to protect open land and prevent increase in traffic

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :**0624/1/001/O****Mr&Mrs A C Bradbury*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :**0632/1/002/O****Mr J Gregory*****Summary of objection:***

Initial Responses to Objections

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.

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

0638/1/001/O**A & J Haigh*****Summary of objection:***

Change to an allocation that prevents any development for a range of reasons

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

0648/1/001/O**Marie Trainer*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Reason :

0651/1/001/O**Harold D Whitby*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

Initial Responses to Objections

*Reason :***0652/1/001/O****I & L Wormald***Summary of objection:*

Allocate as Local Green Gap to protect Moorside area and prevent an increase in traffic.

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

*Reason :***0821/1/001/O****M. Lynes***Summary of objection:*

Green land is scarce in Oldham. Should look at developing derelict/unused buildings before valuable countryside.

Recommended Change:

The optional approaches to safeguarded land, and the pros and cons of each option, are set out in the main report. The response to this objection will depend on which option is chosen.

*Reason :***LR9 Summershades Lane, Grasscroft****Objections:****0040/1/008/O****Saddleworth Parish Council**

Agent : Eagland Planning Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt boundary proposed in this location, but propose to change allocation to Local Green Gap.

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the

Initial Responses to Objections

involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness. (Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the Green Belt in Greater Manchester before 2011.)

0052/1/001/O**Mr T. McCabe*****Summary of objection:***

Remove allocation for Land Reserved for Future Development. Site has poor access and development would be visually intrusive, destroy mature woodland, result in loss of amenity (used by walkers and supports flora and fauna).

Recommended Change:

Remove LRFD allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0053/1/001/O**Harry Kershaw*****Summary of objection:***

Objects to allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development because of the extra traffic and noise development would create

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0054/1/001/O**Miss Marga Ward**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Should be Green Belt because it is unsuitable for building (drainage and access problems, habitat value and lack of facilities).

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt boundary proposed in this location, but propose to change allocation to Local Green Gap.

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness. (Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the Green Belt in Greater Manchester before 2011.)

0055/1/001/O**Samantha Durr*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Remove LRFD allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap.

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0057/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs R Coverdale*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Allocate as Local Green Gap.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0058/1/001/O**Anne Hughes*****Summary of objection:***

Remove allocation for Land Reserved for Future Development as narrow, congested roads could not accommodate further development

Recommended Change:

Remove LRFD allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap.

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0059/1/001/O**A. Mattinson*****Summary of objection:***

Remove allocation of Land Reserved for Future Development. Site is used for recreation, has mature woods and wildlife. Problems with development include drainage, school unable to take increased numbers, lanes too narrow for heavy traffic.

Recommended Change:

Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development and allocate as Local Green Gap.

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

Initial Responses to Objections

0060/1/001/O**Mr Barry Parkin***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

Allocate as Local Green Gap.

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0061/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs R Howarth***Summary of objection:*

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

Recommended Change:

Allocate as Local Green Gap.

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0062/1/001/O**Mr J.C. Budding***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

Allocate as Local Green Gap.

Initial Responses to Objections

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0063/1/001/O**Mr B. Byram****Summary of objection:**

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

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt boundary proposed in this location, but propose to change allocation to Local Green Gap.

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness. (Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the Green Belt in Greater Manchester before 2011.)

0064/1/001/O**J.M. Jackson****Summary of objection:**

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.

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt boundary proposed in this location, but propose to change allocation to Local Green Gap.

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness. (Draft RPG advises that there is no need

Initial Responses to Objections

for a strategic review of the Green Belt in Greater Manchester before 2011.)

0065/1/001/O

Jill Beswick

Summary of objection:

Allocate as Local Green Gap or Green Belt to protect local amenity, woodland area and wildlife. Poor access to site and onto Oldham Road.

Recommended Change:

Allocate as Local Green Gap.

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0066/1/001/O

Bernard Keeley

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Allocate as Local Green Gap.

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0067/1/001/O

Mr & Mrs A Mercer

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Allocate as Local Green Gap.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0068/1/001/O**Pamela Hilton*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0069/1/001/O**Jack Wild*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

Initial Responses to Objections

0070/1/001/O

Mr & Mrs A Cook

Summary of objection:

Keep site as public open space to protect wooded area

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0071/1/001/O

Mr E. Moss

Summary of objection:

Delete allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development. Leave land undisturbed for environmental reasons. Development would increase traffic in Summershades estate.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0072/1/001/O

Leatherbarrow

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0073/1/001/O**Mrs J. Farrar*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0074/1/001/O**John Farrar*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

Initial Responses to Objections

0075/1/001/O

Mr & Mrs Hulme

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0076/1/001/O

Mrs Joan E Thompson

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0077/1/001/O

J. Lawton

Summary of objection:

Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development to protect this well-used open space and stop the encroachment of development on the countryside

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0078/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs G Dickinson*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0079/1/001/O**A & P M Edwards*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

Initial Responses to Objections

0081/1/001/O

Dr S. Keba

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt boundary proposed in this location, but propose to change allocation to Local Green Gap.

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness. (Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the Green Belt in Greater Manchester before 2011.)

0083/1/001/O

Dr A.W. Taylor

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0084/1/001/O

C. & C. Nicholson

Summary of objection:

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0085/1/001/O**Terence Farmer*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0086/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs DG Tyrrell*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt boundary proposed in this location, but propose to change allocation to Local Green Gap.

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it

Initial Responses to Objections

is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness. (Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the Green Belt in Greater Manchester before 2011.)

0087/1/001/O**Mrs J. Byram*****Summary of objection:***

Allocate area as Green Belt to protect the site for its wildlife, woodland and recreational value and because development would be visually intrusive

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt boundary proposed in this location, but propose to change allocation to Local Green Gap.

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness. (Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the Green Belt in Greater Manchester before 2011.)

0088/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs A W Andrews*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0089/1/001/O**D.N&T.P. Rigby*****Summary of objection:***

Initial Responses to Objections

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0090/1/001/O**Mr Malcolm Gelder*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0139/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs H&E Hammond*****Summary of objection:***

Access to site unsuitable - should be from Oldham Road

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would

Initial Responses to Objections

local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0174/1/017/O**Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0177/1/002/O**David Chadderton*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0299/1/001/O**Mrs BJ Lund**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0585/1/001/O**G Bentley*****Summary of objection:***

Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development due to recreational, woodland and wildlife value, and the land's unsuitability for development.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0588/1/001/O**Alan Fletcher*****Summary of objection:***

Object to future development on this site unless direct access from Oldham Road were provided and a weight limit on local roads were imposed.

Recommended Change:

Proposed to remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the

Initial Responses to Objections

involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0591/1/001/O**Dr&Mrs K S MacKenzie*****Summary of objection:***

Change allocation to Local Green Gap or Green Belt to protect recreational area, trees and wildlife and due to poor access (for development)

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap. (Do not propose to change green belt boundary in this location)

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness. (Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the Green Belt in Greater Manchester before 2011.)

0592/1/001/O**R & M E Patriarca*****Summary of objection:***

Object to any development in this area, in particular as it would be prejudicial to the safety of highway users

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0593/1/001/O**David R Pollitt**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0594/1/001/O**P E Schofield*****Summary of objection:***

Remove allocation as Land Reserved for Future Development on various grounds, including environmental protection and highway safety

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0595/1/001/O**Brian R. Smith*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt boundary proposed in this location, but propose to change allocation to Local Green Gap.

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would

Initial Responses to Objections

local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness. (Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the Green Belt in Greater Manchester before 2011.)

0596/1/001/O**Mr&Mrs D S Wareing*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0597/1/001/O**Peter Wood*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0598/1/001/O**Brian Jowle**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Redesignate land as Green Belt as it is totally unsuitable for development and should be left in its natural state

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt boundary proposed in this location, but propose to change allocation to Local Green Gap.

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness. (Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the Green Belt in Greater Manchester before 2011.)

0599/1/001/O**Mr Michael Hilton*****Summary of objection:***

Change to an allocation that will protect the land and wildlife for all time

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness. (The plan cannot guarantee protection of land for all time as requested).

0601/1/001/O**Mr Adamson*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0603/1/001/O**B & J Read*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0606/1/001/O**Saddleworth Conservation Action Group*****Summary of objection:***

Reallocate as Local Green Gap in recognition of site's value as woodland and varied wildlife habitat

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

Initial Responses to Objections

0805/1/001/O

B. P. Howarth

Summary of objection:

Do not want to lose any more Green Belt area at the woods

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt boundary proposed in this location, but propose to change allocation to Local Green Gap. (NB the site is not currently Green Belt land as objector implies)

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness. (Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the Green Belt in Greater Manchester before 2011.)

0817/1/001/O

Mr&Mrs D Hancock

Summary of objection:

Object to any possible building, due to loss of amenity and woodland and to site development problems (access and geologically unstable ground)

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0826/1/001/O

D. Hollins

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

0828/1/008/O**Saddleworth Civic Trust*****Summary of objection:***

Stongly opposed to LR designation. Presently a greenfield site. Its development can only contribute to further urbanisation of this part of the district.

Recommended Change:

Remove LRDF allocation and allocate as Local Green Gap

Reason :

This is a sloping site, the southern part of which is heavily wooded. Development on the northern part would be visually prominent, whereas development of the southern part would involve the loss of mature trees and their habitat. The potential for the site to be developed in a satisfactory manner is therefore considered to be limited. In light of this, and given its local significance as an area providing visual amenity and an area for informal recreation, it is considered that the site should be allocated as Local Green Gap to protect it from development which would threaten its openness.

Initial Responses to Objections

OE1.7 & OE1.8

LR10 & LGG16 Ryefields Drive, Uppermill

Objections:

0095/1/001/O Mr S. Howarth

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Minded to allocate whole of site as Local Green Gap

Reason :

In adopted UDP the site was allocated as Other Protected Open Land. It is not clear whether this was because it could be needed for development or because it was valued as an open space. It is considered that the north eastern end of the site is important open land linking to the disused railway to the east, and the western end contains valuable woodland habitat. It also forms part of a green corridor. It is therefore considered to be more appropriate to allocate the site as Local Green Gap. Also allocation of the site for housing would be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

Initial Responses to Objections

OE1.8 Local Green Gaps**Supporting Representations:**

0105/1/006/S	Dobcross Village Community
0106/1/005/S	Friezland Residents' Association
0124/1/007/S	Lancashire Wildlife Trust
0174/1/008/S	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0724/1/001/S	Dr & Mrs G Read
0740/1/031/S	North West Regional Assembly

Objections:**0021/1/056/O Government Office for the North West***Summary of objection:*

Set out circumstances in which development might be permitted in Local Green Gaps, as the policy is too restrictive

Recommended Change:

Change wording to "The Council will protect Local Green Gaps, as identified on the proposals map, which provide locally significant open areas between, or on the edge of, built up areas. Planning permission on these sites will be refused unless: it is development which would be acceptable if it were in the Green Belt. Exceptionally planning permission may be allowed where there are over-riding reasons of public interest to permit development, and if such development would not adversely affect the openness or visual amenity of the Local Green Gap."

Reason :

In order to differentiate between the level of protection afforded to Local Green Gaps as opposed to Green Belt land.

0038/1/006/O Greater Manchester Ecology Unit*Summary of objection:*

The key should provide an explanation for policy allocations such as Local Green Gaps

Recommended Change:

Provide indication in key of which policies in the plan relate to each allocation, as in current UDP, but space limitations would not allow for a full explanation of each allocation, eg Local Green Gap, as requested.

Reason :

There is limited space in the proposals map key for lengthy explanations, however, the plan and glossary should provide adequate explanation of allocations/terms used.

Initial Responses to Objections

0038/1/021/O

Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Summary of objection:

Strong support, but should be cross-referenced to other open environment policies.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Cross referencing has deliberately been kept to a minimum in recognition that the plan needs to be read as a whole document. This will be made clearer in the "Understanding the UDP Section" of the Introduction to the Plan.

Former H22, Wall Hill**Objections:**

0105/1/005/O

Dobcross Village Community

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Minded not to change, but will assess on site.

Reason :

Local Green Gaps are sites formerly allocated as Other Protected Open Land. Where judged to provide valuable open areas they have been reallocated as LGG's. They have been allocated for more than their habitat value although this may be one feature of them. They primarily perform a local green belt function by providing locally important open spaces with significant visual amenity. It is not considered necessary to add this site to the LGG as it is less visible, but this will be assessed on site. Even if unallocated, any proposed development of the site would still need to be assessed against other policies in the plan.

Hull Mill, Delph**Objections:**

0112/1/007/O

Mr G Bayley

Summary of objection:

The Hull Mill site to the north east of LGG19, should become part of LGG19 (or the Green Belt, see separate representation) as it is illogical to leave it unallocated.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

Minded not to change subject to site assessment.

Reason :

Local Green Gaps are sites formerly allocated as Other Protected Open Land. Where judged to provide valuable open areas they have been reallocated as LGG's. They primarily perform a local green belt function by providing locally important open spaces with significant visual amenity. This site is a relatively small area of land left over after development and is not considered to provide a Green Gap function, however this will be assessed on site. Even if unallocated, any proposed development of the site would still need to be assessed against other policies in the plan.

Land at Malby Street, Oldham**Objections:****0701/1/001/O****Miss L Armstrong*****Summary of objection:***

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)

Recommended Change:

Not proposed to allocate as Local Green Gap (Although it is proposed to allocate it as Recreational Open Space and Green Corridor)

Reason :

Local Green Gaps are locally significant open spaces which essentially perform a local green belt function by virtue of their openness and visual amenity. This site is a relatively small area of amenity open space and is not considered to provide a Green Gap function. It is, however, considered to be worthy of protection as Recreational Open Space, and it also contributes to the wider adjoining Green Corridor.

0702/1/001/O**J & A Patterson*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Not proposed to allocate as Local Green Gap (Although it is proposed to allocate it as Recreational Open Space and Green Corridor)

Reason :

Local Green Gaps are locally significant open spaces which essentially perform a local green belt function by virtue of their openness and visual amenity. This site is a relatively

Initial Responses to Objections

contributes to the wider adjoining Green Corridor.

0799/1/001/O**Mr P Siddall*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Not proposed to allocate as Local Green Gap (Although it is proposed to allocate it as Recreational Open Space and Green Corridor)

Reason :

Local Green Gaps are locally significant open spaces which essentially perform a local green belt function by virtue of their openness and visual amenity. This site is a relatively small area of amenity open space and is not considered to provide a Green Gap function. It is, however, considered to be worthy of protection as Recreational Open Space, and it also contributes to the wider adjoining Green Corridor.

0800/1/001/O**Ernest Fleming*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Not proposed to allocate as Local Green Gap (Although it is proposed to allocate it as Recreational Open Space and Green Corridor)

Reason :

Local Green Gaps are locally significant open spaces which essentially perform a local green belt function by virtue of their openness and visual amenity. This site is a relatively small area of amenity open space and is not considered to provide a Green Gap function. It is, however, considered to be worthy of protection as Recreational Open Space, and it also contributes to the wider adjoining Green Corridor.

0801/1/001/O**Anne Marrington*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Not proposed to allocate as Local Green Gap (Although it is proposed to allocate it as Recreational Open Space and Green Corridor)

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

Local Green Gaps are locally significant open spaces which essentially perform a local green belt function by virtue of their openness and visual amenity. This site is a relatively small area of amenity open space and is not considered to provide a Green Gap function. It is, however, considered to be worthy of protection as Recreational Open Space, and it also contributes to the wider adjoining Green Corridor.

0803/1/001/O**Cllr M Sharif*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Not proposed to allocate as Local Green Gap (Although it is proposed to allocate it as Recreational Open Space and Green Corridor)

Reason :

Local Green Gaps are locally significant open spaces which essentially perform a local green belt function by virtue of their openness and visual amenity. This site is a relatively small area of amenity open space and is not considered to provide a Green Gap function. It is, however, considered to be worthy of protection as Recreational Open Space, and it also contributes to the wider adjoining Green Corridor.

0804/1/001/O**Mr & Mrs Kershaw*****Summary of objection:***

Would like the land designated as Local Green Gap to prevent permission for building of any type.

Recommended Change:

Not proposed to allocate as Local Green Gap (Although it is proposed to allocate it as Recreational Open Space and Green Corridor)

Reason :

Local Green Gaps are locally significant open spaces which essentially perform a local green belt function by virtue of their openness and visual amenity. This site is a relatively small area of amenity open space and is not considered to provide a Green Gap function. It is, however, considered to be worthy of protection as Recreational Open Space, and it also contributes to the wider adjoining Green Corridor.

Land at Oldham Road/Delph New Road, Delph

Objections:

0040/1/010/O**Saddleworth Parish Council**

Initial Responses to Objections

Agent : Eagland Planning Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Minded not to change, subject to site assessment.

Reason :

Local Green Gaps primarily perform a local green belt function by providing locally important open spaces with significant visual amenity. This site is a relatively small area partially fronted by houses and is not considered to perform the functions of a Local Green Gap. This will, however, be assessed on site. There is a presumption against changing the green belt boundary at present. Draft RPG advises that a strategic review of the green belt is not needed before 2011. It is not therefore considered appropriate to include this site within the green belt. Even if unallocated, any proposed development of the site would still need to be assessed against other policies in the plan.

Land Below Ladcastle Farm**Objections:****0828/1/006/O****Saddleworth Civic Trust*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Undecided as to merits of site - requires site visit to assess proposal.

Reason :

Not familiar with site

Land bet. LGG17 Stoneswood & H1.1.15 Bailey Mill**Objections:****0112/1/008/O****Mr G Bayley*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

Minded not to change, but site will be assessed.

Reason :

Local Green Gaps primarily perform a local green belt function by providing locally important open spaces with significant visual amenity. This site is a relatively small area partially fronted by houses and is not considered to perform the functions of a Local Green Gap. This will, however, be assessed on site. There is a presumption against changing the green belt boundary at present. Draft RPG advises that a strategic review of the green belt is not needed before 2011. It is not therefore considered appropriate to include this site within the green belt. Even if unallocated, any proposed development of the site would still need to be assessed against other policies in the plan.

**Land between LGG18 and PEZ30, Delph
Objections:****0112/1/010/O****Mr G Bayley*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Change unlikely

Reason :

The small piece of land between PEZ30 and Local Green Gap 18 and to the north of the mixed use allocation H1.1.14 was omitted from the Local Green Gap as it appears to be domestic garden. However, this will be checked.

**Land in vicinity of Prospect Farm
Objections:****0828/1/014/O****Saddleworth Civic Trust*****Summary of objection:***

Area under threat from small developments. Land from Coverhill Road to the Lydgate conservation area should be designated as a local green gap if this will enhance the degree of protection.

Recommended Change:

No change proposed, although it needs to be clarified exactly which area the objector is referring to.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

The area lying behind properties fronting Coverhill Rd and Prospect Farm is already green belt and therefore protected by green belt policy. This area extends up to, and includes, Lydgate conservation area.

Land west of Bailey Mill, Delph**Objections:****0718/1/006/O****Cllr C M Wheeler*****Summary of objection:***

Allocate the land as Local Green Gap

Recommended Change:

Minded not to change, but site will be assessed.

Reason :

Local Green Gaps primarily perform a local green belt function by providing locally important open spaces with significant visual amenity. This site is a relatively small area partially fronted by houses and is not considered to perform the functions of a Local Green Gap. This will, however, be assessed on site. Any proposed development of the site would still need to be assessed against other policies in the plan even if the site is not allocated.

LGG1 Royley Clough, Royton**Objections:****0031/1/003/O****Mr J Wood**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This site has been designated as Local Green gap in recognition of its importance in providing a significant open area within a relatively built up part of the Borough. It also provides a corridor link to the Green Belt. It is not, therefore considered to be appropriate to designate such an area for development purposes. Allocation of the site for housing

Initial Responses to Objections

would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

LGG10 Shawside, Shaw (Moss Hey)**Objections:**

0166/1/003/O **P & D Northern Steels Ltd**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This site has been designated as Local Green gap in recognition of its importance in providing a significant open area on the edge of the urban fringe. It is not, therefore considered to be appropriate to designate such an area for development purposes. Allocation of the site for housing and employment would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

LGG11 Land at Greenacres, Lees**Objections:**

0116/1/001/O **Mr K. Payne**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This site has been designated as Local Green gap in recognition of its importance in providing a significant open area within an otherwise relatively built up part of the Borough. It is not, therefore considered to be appropriate to designate such an area for development purposes. Allocation of the site for housing would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

Initial Responses to Objections

LGG12 Thornlee Brook**Supporting Representations:**

0828/1/011/S

Saddleworth Civic Trust

LGG13 Stonebreaks, Springhead**Supporting Representations:**

0828/1/012/S

Saddleworth Civic Trust

Objections:**0027/1/001/O****Norman Thompson***Summary of objection:*

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This site has been designated as part of a Local Green gap in recognition of its importance in providing a significant open area within an otherwise relatively built up part of the Borough. It is not, therefore considered to be appropriate to designate such an area for development purposes. Allocation of the site for housing would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

0040/1/013/O**Saddleworth Parish Council**

Agent : Eagland Planning Associates

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Undecided - further investigation needed to establish use of sites suggested. Part of area east of Old Croft appears to be a private garden, condition of quarry not known.

Reason :

Not familiar with site.

0115/1/001/O**L. Perrins**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Exclude southern edge of Local Green Gap allocation to allow access to a residential site off Radcliffe Street (proposed in a separate representation).

Recommended Change:

No change proposed.

Reason :

This objection relates to part of a site which was formerly allocated as Other Protected Open Land and has now been allocated as Local Green Gap as it provides a locally important open space with significant visual amenity. It is also allocated as Green Corridor and Link and whilst this in itself does not preclude development, policy OE2.2 seeks to ensure that any development does not sever the open land corridor.

0115/1/002/O**L. Perrins**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This site has been designated as part of a Local Green gap in recognition of its importance in providing a significant open area within an otherwise relatively built up part of the Borough. It is not, therefore considered to be appropriate to designate such an area for development purposes. Allocation of the site for housing would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

LGG15 Wall Hill, Dobcross**Supporting Representations:**

0092/1/001/S	Elizabeth Stott
0105/1/003/S	Dobcross Village Community
0707/1/001/S	Carl Woodhead
0719/1/001/S	Mr D. Hoare
0722/1/001/S	Mr&Mrs G. Bamforth
0738/1/001/S	Mr D.C. Marshall
0741/1/001/S	D.& E. Ford
0742/1/001/S	Miss D. Fennell
0743/1/001/S	Mr & Mrs G Deakin
0744/1/001/S	T.E.& E.C. Arran
0745/1/001/S	N & M Bocking

Initial Responses to Objections

0806/1/001/S T.J. Hinchcliffe
0824/1/001/S Yvonne Dawson
0828/1/004/S Saddleworth Civic Trust

Objections:

0040/1/009/O Saddleworth Parish Council

Agent : Eagland Planning Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Minded not to change, but will assess on site.

Reason :

Local Green Gaps are sites formerly allocated as Other Protected Open Land. Where judged to provide valuable open areas they have been reallocated as LGG's. They primarily perform a local green belt function by providing locally important open spaces with significant visual amenity. It is not considered necessary to add this site to the LGG as it is less visible, but this will be assessed on site. Even if unallocated, any proposed development of the site would still need to be assessed against other policies in the plan.

0734/1/001/O N J Halliley

Summary of objection:

Supports continued use as agricultural land, providing fodder and pasture for horses and a riding school. Suggests consideration for full Green Belt designation.

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt proposed in this location.

Reason :

Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the green belt in Greater Manchester before 2011. There is, therefore, a presumption against adding such areas of land to the green belt as part of this plan review.

LGG17 Land behind 29-33 Oldham Rd, Delph**Objections:**

0153/1/001/O Mr P. Buckley

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Allocate land west of Bailey Mill, Oldham Rd, Delph as Green Belt or Green Gap in order to link it with LGG17, as land is rural and supports varied wildlife.

Recommended Change:

Minded not to change, but will assess on site.

Reason :

Local Green Gaps primarily perform a local green belt function by providing locally important open spaces with significant visual amenity. This site is a relatively small area partially fronted by houses and is not considered to perform the functions of a Local Green Gap. This will, however, be assessed on site. There is a presumption against changing the green belt boundary at present. Draft RPG advises that a strategic review of the green belt is not needed before 2011. It is not therefore considered appropriate to include this site within the green belt. Any proposed development of the site would still need to be assessed against other policies in the plan even if it is not allocated.

LGG17 Stoneswood, Delph**Supporting Representations:**

0627/1/004/S	Joanne Clague
0630/1/002/S	Alun Morgan
0689/1/004/S	Mr O. Morgan-Clague

Objections:

0039/1/001/O **Mr B.H. Tomlinson**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This site has been designated as Local Green Gap in recognition of its importance in providing a significant local area of open space and it provides a link with the green belt. It is not, therefore, considered to be appropriate to designate such an area for development purposes. Allocation of the site for housing would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

0157/1/001/O

Mr&Mrs M. Bowker

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt proposed in this location.

Reason :

Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the green belt in Greater Manchester before 2011. There is, therefore, a presumption against adding such areas of land to the green belt as part of this plan review.

0164/1/001/O**Mr M. Buckley*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Minded not to change, but will assess on site.

Reason :

Local Green Gaps primarily perform a local green belt function by providing locally important open spaces with significant visual amenity. This site is a relatively small area partially fronted by houses and is not considered to perform the functions of a Local Green Gap. This will, however, be assessed on site. There is a presumption against changing the green belt boundary at present. Draft RPG advises that a strategic review of the green belt is not needed before 2011. It is not therefore considered appropriate to include this site within the green belt. Any proposed development of the site would still need to be assessed against other policies in the plan even if the site is unallocated.

0714/1/001/O**Karen Mather*****Summary of objection:***

Change allocation from Local Green Gap to Green Belt.

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt proposed in this location

Reason :

Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the green belt in Greater Manchester before 2011. There is, therefore, a presumption against adding such areas of land to the green belt as part of this plan review.

Initial Responses to Objections

0716/1/001/O**Mr M. Kenny***Summary of objection:*

Change allocation from Local Green Gap to Green Belt

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt proposed in this location.

Reason :

Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the green belt in Greater Manchester before 2011. There is, therefore, a presumption against adding such areas of land to the green belt as part of this plan review.

0748/1/001/O**Martin Capper***Summary of objection:*

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

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt proposed in this location.

Reason :

Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the green belt in Greater Manchester before 2011. There is, therefore, a presumption against adding such areas of land to the green belt as part of this plan review.

LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph**Supporting Representations:**

0007/1/021/S	Uppermill Residents Association
0130/1/003/S	Janet Bottomley
0627/1/003/S	Joanne Clague
0630/1/004/S	Alun Morgan
0631/1/003/S	Nathan Berry
0633/1/003/S	Charmaine Berry
0634/1/003/S	W Berry
0635/1/003/S	Sarah Gaskell
0637/1/002/S	Mrs A.R. Webster
0639/1/002/S	Peter Webster
0640/1/003/S	Dr. M.J. Schwarz
0641/1/003/S	Mr. R. Hitchcock
0669/1/003/S	Ms G Malone
0671/1/003/S	R Walker
0672/1/003/S	R and A Parker

Initial Responses to Objections

0674/1/003/S	Adam Smart
0675/1/003/S	Mrs. L. Smart
0676/1/003/S	Mr. B.L. Smart
0677/1/003/S	Mr Eric Wild
0678/1/003/S	Mr P. Whitworth
0679/1/003/S	Mr C.J. Dockray
0680/1/003/S	Mrs E. Dockray
0681/1/003/S	P. Harrison
0682/1/003/S	Mrs P. Hurst
0683/1/003/S	Mr W. Hurst
0685/1/003/S	R Rumacre
0686/1/003/S	Mr R. Randerson
0687/1/003/S	J. Young
0688/1/003/S	Mrs P. Waterhouse
0689/1/003/S	Mr O. Morgan-Clague
0693/1/002/S	Mr P. Whitehead
0694/1/002/S	Mr Anthony Fisher
0696/1/002/S	Allison Beever
0699/1/003/S	Mr & Mrs H Moore
0700/1/003/S	Mrs S. Whitworth
0718/1/002/S	Cllr C M Wheeler
0758/1/002/S	Kieran Berry
0819/1/003/S	Joanna Leggett
0828/1/003/S	Saddleworth Civic Trust

Objections:**0099/1/001/O John Saxon Ltd**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This site has been designated as Local Green Gap in recognition of its importance in providing a significant local area of open space. It is not, therefore, considered to be appropriate to designate such an area for development purposes. Allocation of the site for housing would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

0157/1/002/O**Mr&Mrs M. Bowker**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt proposed in this location.

Reason :

Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the green belt in Greater Manchester before 2011. There is, therefore, a presumption against adding such areas of land to the green belt as part of this plan review.

0473/1/001/O**Mrs V Ward*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This site has been designated as Local Green Gap in recognition of its importance in providing a significant local area of open space. It is not, therefore, considered to be appropriate to designate such an area for development purposes. Allocation of the site for housing would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

0527/1/001/O**Andrew Clark*****Summary of objection:***

Change designation to Green Belt as the site should not be "greenfield"

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt proposed in this location.

Reason :

Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the green belt in Greater Manchester before 2011. There is, therefore, a presumption against adding such areas of land to the green belt as part of this plan review.

0636/1/003/O**Jennifer Clark**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

This site must remain as a green buffer zone, although preferably as Green Belt.

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt proposed in this location.

Reason :

Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the green belt in Greater Manchester before 2011. There is, therefore, a presumption against adding such areas of land to the green belt as part of this plan review.

0714/1/002/O**Karen Mather*****Summary of objection:***

Change allocation from Local Green Gap to Green Belt.

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt proposed in this location.

Reason :

Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the green belt in Greater Manchester before 2011. There is, therefore, a presumption against adding such areas of land to the green belt as part of this plan review.

0716/1/002/O**Mr M. Kenny*****Summary of objection:***

Change allocation from Local Green Gap to Green Belt

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt proposed in this location.

Reason :

Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the green belt in Greater Manchester before 2011. There is, therefore, a presumption against adding such areas of land to the green belt as part of this plan review.

0721/1/001/O**Joyce Castle*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

No change to green belt proposed in this location.

Reason :

Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the green belt in Greater Manchester before 2011. There is, therefore, a presumption against adding such areas of land to the green belt as part of this plan review. Policy wording distinguishes the difference between Local Green Gap and Land Reserved for Future Development. Agree that distinction on proposals map between the two allocations needs to be reconsidered.

0748/1/002/O

Martin Capper

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt proposed in this location.

Reason :

Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the green belt in Greater Manchester before 2011. There is, therefore, a presumption against adding such areas of land to the green belt as part of this plan review.

LGG18 Rumbles Lane, Delph (?)**Supporting Representations:**

0697/1/002/S

Stella Hardy

LGG19 Ainley Wood, Delph**Objections:**

0040/1/011/O

Saddleworth Parish Council

Agent : Eagland Planning Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Minded not to change subject to site assessment being carried out.

Initial Responses to Objections**Reason :**

Local Green Gaps are sites formerly allocated as Other Protected Open Land. Where judged to provide valuable open areas they have been reallocated as LGG's. They primarily perform a local green belt function by providing locally important open spaces with significant visual amenity. This site is a relatively small area of land left over after development and is not considered to provide a Green Gap function. Also, any proposed development of the site would still need to be assessed against other policies in the plan. It is proposed that an assessment be carried out of the site, however to confirm its function.

0097/1/001/O**Kirstail Properties**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This site has been designated as Local Green Gap in recognition of its importance in providing a significant local area of open space and it provides a link with the green belt. It is not, therefore, considered to be appropriate to designate such an area for development purposes. Allocation of the site for housing would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

0157/1/003/O**Mr&Mrs M. Bowker****Summary of objection:**

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.

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt proposed in this location

Reason :

Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the green belt in Greater Manchester before 2011. There is, therefore, a presumption against adding such areas of land to the green belt as part of this plan review.

0714/1/003/O**Karen Mather**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt proposed in this location.

Reason :

Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the green belt in Greater Manchester before 2011. There is, therefore, a presumption against adding such areas of land to the green belt as part of this plan review.

0716/1/003/O**Mr M. Kenny*****Summary of objection:***

Change allocation from Local Green Gap to Green Belt

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt proposed in this location.

Reason :

Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the green belt in Greater Manchester before 2011. There is, therefore, a presumption against adding such areas of land to the green belt as part of this plan review.

0748/1/003/O**Martin Capper*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

No change to green belt proposed in this location.

Reason :

Draft RPG advises that there is no need for a strategic review of the green belt in Greater Manchester before 2011. There is, therefore, a presumption against adding such areas of land to the green belt as part of this plan review.

0828/1/002/O**Saddleworth Civic Trust**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Supports LGG designation but would like to see it extended to Hull Mill Lane for historic integrity.

Recommended Change:

Minded not to change subject to site assessment being carried out.

Reason :

Local Green Gaps are sites formerly allocated as Other Protected Open Land. Where judged to provide valuable open areas they have been reallocated as LGG's. They primarily perform a local green belt function by providing locally important open spaces with significant visual amenity. This site is a relatively small area of land left over after development and is not considered to provide a Green Gap function. Also, any proposed development of the site would still need to be assessed against other policies in the plan. It is proposed that an assessment be carried out of the site, however to confirm its function.

LGG2 Land off Ferney Field Road, Chadderton**Objections:**

0126/1/001/O Holroy Developments

Agent : Hall Needham Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This site has been designated as Local Green Gap in recognition of its importance in providing a significant local area of open space within a relatively built up area. It is not, therefore, considered to be appropriate to designate such an area for development purposes. Allocation of the site for housing would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

LGG20 Land south of Oaklands Road, Grasscroft**Supporting Representations:**

0106/1/003/S Friezland Residents' Association

0730/1/002/S Jeff Garner

Objections:

Initial Responses to Objections

0051/1/001/O **Mr W.A. Fleming**

Agent : Macdonald & Son

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This site has been designated as part of a Local Green Gap in recognition of its importance as a locally significant open area which is particularly prominent from a visual point of view. It is not, therefore considered to be appropriate to designate such an area for development purposes. Allocation of the site for housing would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

LGG3 Land at Foxdenton Lane, Chadderton**Objections:****0041/1/001/O** **Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Ltd***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This site has been designated as a Local Green Gap in recognition of its importance locally as an open area within a predominantly built up area. It is not, therefore considered to be appropriate to designate such an area for development purposes. Allocation of the site for development would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

LGG6 Moston Brook, Failsworth**Objections:****0236/1/005/O** **BAE Systems Properties Ltd**

Agent : Fuller Peiser

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This site has been designated as a Local Green Gap in recognition of its importance as a significant open area within what is a predominantly built up area. It is not, therefore considered to be appropriate to designate such an area for development purposes. Allocation of the site for development would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

LGG8 Oldham Edge**Objections:****0779/1/001/O****The Blue Coat School*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Leave area unallocated.

Reason :

Outline Planning permission granted for sports hall (22.04.02)

LGG8 Oldham Edge, Oldham**Objections:****0032/1/004/O****Lattice Property*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Need to assess site to determine whether it should have been included in Local Green Gap. (Most of owner's site is in PEZ to the north)

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

Boundary follows former boundary of area allocated as Other Protected Open Land (OL14) in adopted plan. May be appropriate to include area involved as PEZ if it does not actually perform Local Green Gap/Green Corridor function.

LGG9 Bullcote Lane, Royton**Objections:**

0169/1/001/O **Messrs Halliwell & Douglas**

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This site has been designated as a Local Green Gap in recognition of its importance as a locally significant open area which links to the Green Belt and is particularly prominent from a visual point of view. It is not, therefore considered to be appropriate to designate such an area for development purposes. Allocation of the site for housing would also be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

Lydgate tunnel/land adj. to Oaklands estate**Objections:**

0174/1/016/O **Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn**

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Minded to include area as a green corridor/link. (This needs further clarification with correspondent at it is not clear whether he/she is seeking allocation as green corridor or Local Green Gap, and site needs further appraisal to assess its function)

Reason :

Appears to perform function of a green corridor, but further investigation required to assess function of land.

Initial Responses to Objections

0177/1/003/O

David Chadderton

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Minded to include area as a green corridor/link. (This needs further clarification with correspondent at it is not clear whether he/she is seeking allocation as green corridor or Local Green Gap, and site needs further appraisal to assess its function)

Reason :

Appears to perform function of a green corridor, but further investigation required to assess function of land.

0776/1/001/O

David O Haines

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Minded to include area as a green corridor/link. (This needs further clarification with correspondent at it is not clear whether he/she is seeking allocation as green corridor or Local Green Gap, and site needs further appraisal to assess its function)

Reason :

Appears to perform function of a green corridor, but further investigation required to assess function of land.

0827/1/001/O

G Winterbottom

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Minded to include area as a green corridor/link. (This needs further clarification with correspondent at it is not clear whether he/she is seeking allocation as green corridor or Local Green Gap, and site needs further appraisal to assess its function)

Reason :

Appears to perform function of a green corridor, but further investigation required to assess function of land.

Initial Responses to Objections

**Springhead Quarry/Land off Cooper St, Springhead
Objections:****0049/1/001/O Mr G.F. Wood**

Agent : Simpsons

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Not decided - further investigation needed to establish use of quarry - condition not known.

Reason :

Not familiar with site.

Initial Responses to Objections

OE1.9 Farm Diversification**Supporting Representations:**

0174/1/009/S	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0263/1/012/S	CPRE - Lancashire
0740/1/032/S	North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0008/1/005/O Countryside Agency

Summary of objection:

Amend policy to reflect revised PPG7 and Countryside Agency policy, as it is too constrained by criteria which could stifle rural diversification in practice.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Whilst wishing to encourage diversification, it is considered that criteria are needed to ensure that such activities do not threaten the character of rural areas. This accords with PPG7 which, even as amended, advises of the need to weigh the encouragement of rural enterprise (including the diversification of farm businesses) alongside other considerations such as the need to protect landscape, the need to safeguard best and most versatile agricultural land and the need to respect the local character.

0023/1/002/O P. Wilson & Company

Summary of objection:

Delete g. in policy on farm diversification as wording is too vague and subjective

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This criterion reflects the fact that rural areas play an important part in providing opportunities for outdoor recreation near to urban areas. This criteria seeks to ensure that development does not adversely affect the wider public enjoyment of such areas. It is not, therefore, considered to be too vague or subjective.

0038/1/022/O Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Welcomes cross-referencing, however this should be located in the main policy text.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

It is not considered necessary to include cross references in the main policy text as the reasoned justification should be read in conjunction with it. In general, cross referencing has deliberately been kept to a minimum in recognition that the plan needs to be read as a whole document.

11.45**Objections:****0825/1/003/O****English Heritage*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Consider making reference in reasoned justification to need to ensure that the character of any traditional farm buildings are respected.

Reason :

Policy OE1.6 on the re-use of buildings in the Green Belt has a criteria which requires that proposals respect any features of historic or architectural interest of the original building but OE1.9 could relate to buildings not in the green belt.

11.46-11.49**Objections:****0691/1/002/O****W A Tomlinson*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

In line with PPG7, the plan seeks to encourage diversification but includes criteria to ensure that such activities do not threaten the character of rural areas. PPG7, even as amended, advises of the need to weigh the encouragement of rural enterprise (including the diversification of farm businesses) alongside other considerations such as the need to protect landscape, the need to safeguard best and most versatile agricultural land and the need to respect the local character.

11.47**Objections:**

0117/1/004/O North West Tourist Board

Agent : Paul Butler Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Para 11.49 already states that diversification can enhance tourism opportunities. It is not felt to be appropriate to list possible types of diversification scheme, such as the ones suggested, as each would need to be judged on its own merits, and in relation to other policies in the plan. Policy B1.4 encourages appropriate tourism developments including those which lead to the diversification of an existing business, and which accord with other policies and proposals of the plan.

Initial Responses to Objections

OE2 Nature & Landscape

Supporting Representations:

0008/1/004/S	Countryside Agency
0038/1/023/S	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit
0149/1/015/S	English Nature
0152/1/009/S	Oak Street Area Community Group
0174/1/011/S	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0740/1/033/S	North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0036/1/005/O Peak District National Park

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Agree that reference should be made to the strategic importance of the Peak District National Park and the need to protect the park from harmful developments, probably in the introduction to the plan rather than as a policy.

Reason :

In recognition of the importance of the National Park and the need to consider its proximity to the plan area.

Initial Responses to Objections

OE2.1 Landscape**Supporting Representations:**

0174/1/012/S	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0263/1/013/S	CPRE - Lancashire
0543/1/003/S	Denshaw Community Association
0740/1/034/S	North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0021/1/057/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

Amend the policy on Landscape to introduce some flexibility in considering development proposals

Recommended Change:

Introduce some flexibility to policy, to indicate that there may be exceptional circumstances when development which intrudes on the landscape may be acceptable if it brought substantial benefits to the local community which outweighed the value of preserving the landscape.

Reason :

Most developments arguably intrude, to some extent, on the landscape. Therefore there is a need to indicate instances when this may be acceptable. Landscape Character Assessment should give guidance on the sensitivity of landscapes and which areas are more likely to be able to accommodate such development.

Initial Responses to Objections

OE2.2 Green Corridors & Links

Supporting Representations:

0149/1/016/S	English Nature
0174/1/013/S	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0175/1/018/S	West Pennine Bridleways Association
0263/1/014/S	CPRE - Lancashire
0740/1/035/S	North West Regional Assembly

Objections:**0038/1/024/O Greater Manchester Ecology Unit***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

Agree plan should take into account need to protect features of the landscape which are important for wild flora and fauna (Further negotiation needed as to whether OE2.3, as now amended, meets objection or whether new policy is required)

Reason :

In accordance with Conservation Regulation 37 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats & c.) Regulations 1994.

0046/1/002/O Broadhurst Engineering (UK) Ltd

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This policy recognises the importance of linear green features and "stepping stones" which link larger open areas. They are identified in recognition of their importance in assisting the movement of people (for recreational purposes or to provide green routes away from roads) and/or wildlife. This network of green space is of particular importance to biodiversity, provides welcome green networks within built up areas and can provide links out into the wider countryside. They are considered to be intrinsically different from areas protected solely for their recreation or wildlife value hence their distinct designation. The allocation does not necessarily preclude development, but policy OE2.2 seeks to ensure that any

Initial Responses to Objections

development incorporates links through the site to facilitate the movement of wildlife and/or people.

0179/1/002/O**Commhoist Ltd**

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

Policy should be deleted due to lack of clear criteria to justify its inclusion. Also overlaps with other policies.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This policy recognises the importance of linear green features and "stepping stones" which link larger open areas. They are identified in recognition of their importance in assisting the movement of people (for recreational purposes or to provide green routes away from roads) and/or wildlife. This network of green space is of particular importance to biodiversity, provides welcome green networks within built up areas and can provide links out into the wider countryside. They are considered to be intrinsically different from areas protected solely for their recreation or wildlife value hence their distinct designation. The allocation does not necessarily preclude development, but policy OE2.2 seeks to ensure that any development incorporates links through the site to facilitate the movement of wildlife and/or people.

0617/1/003/O**Medlock Limited**

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This policy recognises the importance of linear green features and "stepping stones" which link larger open areas. They are identified in recognition of their importance in assisting the movement of people (for recreational purposes or to provide green routes away from roads) and/or wildlife. This network of green space is of particular importance to biodiversity, provides welcome green networks within built up areas and can provide links out into the wider countryside. They are considered to be intrinsically different from areas protected solely for their recreation or wildlife value hence their distinct designation. The allocation does not necessarily preclude development, but policy OE2.2 seeks to ensure that any development incorporates links through the site to facilitate the movement of wildlife and/or people.

Initial Responses to Objections

0711/1/002/O**U-Aerials & Communications Ltd**

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This policy recognises the importance of linear green features and "stepping stones" which link larger open areas. They are identified in recognition of their importance in assisting the movement of people (for recreational purposes or to provide green routes away from roads) and/or wildlife. This network of green space is of particular importance to biodiversity, provides welcome green networks within built up areas and can provide links out into the wider countryside. They are considered to be intrinsically different from areas protected solely for their recreation or wildlife value hence their distinct designation. The allocation does not necessarily preclude development, but policy OE2.2 seeks to ensure that any development incorporates links through the site to facilitate the movement of wildlife and/or people.

0712/1/002/O**Medlock Communications Ltd**

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This policy recognises the importance of linear green features and "stepping stones" which link larger open areas. They are identified in recognition of their importance in assisting the movement of people (for recreational purposes or to provide green routes away from roads) and/or wildlife. This network of green space is of particular importance to biodiversity, provides welcome green networks within built up areas and can provide links out into the wider countryside. They are considered to be intrinsically different from areas protected solely for their recreation or wildlife value hence their distinct designation. The allocation does not necessarily preclude development, but policy OE2.2 seeks to ensure that any development incorporates links through the site to facilitate the movement of wildlife and/or people.

0713/1/002/O**Medlock Construction**

Initial Responses to Objections

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

This policy recognises the importance of linear green features and "stepping stones" which link larger open areas. They are identified in recognition of their importance in assisting the movement of people (for recreational purposes or to provide green routes away from roads) and/or wildlife. This network of green space is of particular importance to biodiversity, provides welcome green networks within built up areas and can provide links out into the wider countryside. They are considered to be intrinsically different from areas protected solely for their recreation or wildlife value hence their distinct designation. The allocation does not necessarily preclude development, but policy OE2.2 seeks to ensure that any development incorporates links through the site to facilitate the movement of wildlife and/or people.

Adjacent Royton Waste Water Treatment Works**Objections:**

0024/1/001/O **United Utilities Properties Ltd**

Agent : Initiatives Architects Ltd

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Green Corridor allocation does not preclude development but seeks to ensure that any development incorporates links through the site to facilitate the movement of wildlife and/or people.

Disused railway line, Grasscroft**Objections:**

0040/1/012/O **Saddleworth Parish Council**

Initial Responses to Objections

Agent : Eagland Planning Associates

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Minded to include area as a green corridor. (and possibly extend it further east of High Grove Lane to link in with railway line corridor south of Oaklands Park) subject to further consideration of the function of the area .

Reason :

Appears to perform function of a green corridor but other objectors have raised possibility of area being allocated as Local Green Gap. Requires further consideration.

**Land adjacent to The Blue Coat School, Oldham
Objections:****0779/1/002/O****The Blue Coat School*****Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Leave unallocated

Reason :

Outline planning permission granted for sports hall 22.04.02.

**Land at Birchinlee Mill, Royton
Objections:****0046/1/001/O****Broadhurst Engineering (UK) Ltd**

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

Site provides valuable green corridor, including pond and footpaths, within largely built up area. The Inspector's report on the adopted UDP recommended deletion of the area as Recreational Open Space and Other Protected Open Land. The Green Corridor allocation does not preclude development but seeks to ensure that any development incorporates links through the site to facilitate the movement of wildlife and/or people.

0179/1/001/O**Commhoist Ltd**

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

Objects to designation of site as Green Corridor and Link - no particular recreational or wildlife interest

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Site provides valuable green corridor, including pond and footpaths, within largely built up area. The Inspector's report on the adopted UDP recommended deletion of the area as Recreational Open Space and Other Protected Open Land. The Green Corridor allocation does not preclude development but seeks to ensure that any development incorporates links through the site to facilitate the movement of wildlife and/or people.

0617/1/002/O**Medlock Limited**

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

Objects to designation of site as Green Corridor and Link - no particular recreational or wildlife interest

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Site provides valuable green corridor, including pond and footpaths, within largely built up area. The Inspector's report on the adopted UDP recommended deletion of the area as Recreational Open Space and Other Protected Open Land. The Green Corridor allocation does not preclude development but seeks to ensure that any development incorporates links through the site to facilitate the movement of wildlife and/or people.

0711/1/001/O**U-Aerials & Communications Ltd**

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Objects to designation of site as Green Corridor and Link - no particular recreational or wildlife interest

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Site provides valuable green corridor, including pond and footpaths, within largely built up area. The Inspector's report on the adopted UDP recommended deletion of the area as Recreational Open Space and Other Protected Open Land. The Green Corridor allocation does not preclude development but seeks to ensure that any development incorporates links through the site to facilitate the movement of wildlife and/or people.

0712/1/001/O**Medlock Communications Ltd**

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

Objects to designation of site as Green Corridor and Link - no particular recreational or wildlife interest

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Site provides valuable green corridor, including pond and footpaths, within largely built up area. The Inspector's report on the adopted UDP recommended deletion of the area as Recreational Open Space and Other Protected Open Land. The Green Corridor allocation does not preclude development but seeks to ensure that any development incorporates links through the site to facilitate the movement of wildlife and/or people.

0713/1/001/O**Medlock Construction**

Agent : Robert Turley Associates

Summary of objection:

Objects to designation of site as Green Corridor and Link - no particular recreational or wildlife interest

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Site provides valuable green corridor, including pond and footpaths, within largely built up area. The Inspector's report on the adopted UDP recommended deletion of the area as Recreational Open Space and Other Protected Open Land. The Green Corridor allocation does not preclude development but seeks to ensure that any development incorporates links

Initial Responses to Objections

through the site to facilitate the movement of wildlife and/or people.

Land at Higginshaw Lane**Objections:****0032/1/001/O****Lattice Property*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Undecided - not familiar with site. Need to assess site to determine whether it should have been included in Local Green Gap. (Most of owner's site is in PEZ to the north)

Reason :

Boundary follows former boundary of area allocated as Other Protected Open Land (OL14) in adopted plan. May be appropriate to include area involved as PEZ if it does not actually perform Local Green Gap/Green Corridor function.

Land at Huddersfield Road, Diggle (B1.1.28)**Objections:****0127/1/001/O****Mr Andy Friedrich*****Summary of objection:***

Would like to see the 'green corridor' extended from Diggle brook along north boundary and the Huddersfield Road boundary, thereby creating a buffer zone for the residential properties.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

The designation of a Green Corridor along the road frontage of B1.1.28 could be unduly restrictive in terms of its future development given that access to the road would be needed, which would sever such a corridor. There is already a corridor running through PEZ 31 which links Diggle Brook to the north to the Green Belt in the south. The buffering of the site from residential properties opposite would be likely to be addressed as part of any planning application by way of landscaping requirements.

Land at John Street, Lees**Objections:**

Initial Responses to Objections**0708/1/001/O Phyllis Lord & John K Shaw**

Agent : P A Dust Chartered Architect

Summary of objection:

Site, which is part of a Green Corridor, should be allocated as a housing site

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

The site links to the wider Local Green Gap to the north which was formerly allocated as Other Protected Open Land. This is a relatively small area which in itself does not perform the function of a Local Green Gap. It is, nonetheless, a greenfield site which forms part of the wider Green Corridor and Link to the north. It has, therefore, been allocated as a Green Corridor and whilst this in itself does not preclude development, policy OE2.2 seeks to ensure that any development does not sever the open land corridor. Also, as it is a greenfield site, its allocation for housing would be contrary to the general aim of maximising the amount of development on brownfield land.

Initial Responses to Objections

OE2.3 Habitat Protection**Supporting Representations:**

0174/1/014/S	Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
0735/1/001/S	RSPB
0740/1/036/S	North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0038/1/005/O **Greater Manchester Ecology Unit**

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Agree that consideration should be given to showing the boundaries of designated sites on the proposals map.

(alternative would be to indicate locations on proposals map, as now, but to provide supplementary map in annex of plan showing actual site boundaries - this would help to keep proposals map simple) Whichever method would require a rider that these can only be indicative as the boundaries are subject to change. If shown on proposals map, designations should be shown in map key.

Reason :

Indicative labels can be misleading, particularly for designated sites which are linear, such as the canals. PPG 9 (Nature Conservation) para. 25 does advise that areas to which nature conservation policies apply should be identified on plan proposals maps, but does not specifically state that actual boundaries should be shown.

0038/1/025/O **Greater Manchester Ecology Unit**

Summary of objection:

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 SBI's.

Recommended Change:

1. Add reference to special scrutiny being required of proposals affecting sites of European importance (SPA and candidate SAC's) in para. 11.75.
2. Correct inaccuracies in list of SBI's.

Reason :

1. In recognition of their importance.
2. To bring list up to date.

0149/1/017/O **English Nature**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

Not proposed to split into three separate policies.

Reason :

It is considered that the policy adequately differentiates between the different levels of protection according to type of designation.

0149/1/018/O**English Nature*****Summary of objection:***

Add a paragraph to raise the profile of the Rochdale Canal cSAC and the protection afforded to it in law and policy

Recommended Change:

Add sentence at end of para. 11.75 on importance of Rochdale canal in light of its candidate SAC status, based on wording provided by English Nature: "These areas have been designated as being of European importance. Proposals affecting such areas will be subject to strict scrutiny, including consultation with English Nature. Rochdale canal in particular, given the recreational opportunities it offers and the focus it provides for urban regeneration, as well as its nature conservation value, is of particular importance. The Council will therefore liaise closely with English Nature in considering proposals which might impact upon the scientific integrity of the site to ensure harm is avoided."

Reason :

To ensure that developers are aware of the significance of the designation.

11.76 Ladcastle and Den Quarries, Uppermill**Supporting Representations:**

0007/1/022/S

Uppermill Residents Association

Crompton Moor**Supporting Representations:**

0543/1/004/S

Denshaw Community Association

Oozewood Clough**Objections:****0091/1/001/O****Thornham Area Neighbourhood Council**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Oozewood Clough should be labelled as an SBI

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Oozewood Clough has not been designated as an SBI, although Oozewood Flushes have been designated as an SBI and this is indicated on the proposals map. SBI's are designated by the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit, not through the UDP process. They are shown on the proposals map because there are policies in the plan relating to their protection.

Shawside SBI**Objections:**

0166/1/004/O P & D Northern Steels Ltd

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

- 1.Consideration will be given to identifying the boundaries of designated sites on the proposals map. (although boundaries can be subject to change) Policies OE2.3 and D1.4 give guidance on development affecting designated sites or sites with substantive nature conservation interest.
- 2.It is not appropriate for advice on maintenance agreements in relation to development affecting SBI's to be included in the plan, nor can the designation of sites necessarily be carried out prior to development being planned.

Reason :

- 1.To make clear the location of designated sites.
 2. Development affecting SBI's and their maintenance thereafter must be considered on a case by case basis, with advice being sought, as necessary, from the Ecology Unit. (The objector appears to think that SBI's are allocated as part of the UDP process whereas they have already been designated by Greater Manchester Ecology Unit as explained in para 11.77, with new ones being designated as appropriate)
-

0166/1/005/O P & D Northern Steels Ltd

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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 expansion plans of company that owns the site.

Recommended Change:

Do not propose to delete SBI sites from proposals map. Consideration will be given to identifying the boundaries of designated sites on the proposals map. (although boundaries can be subject to change)

Reason :

SBI's are designated by the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit, not through the UDP process. Identification of their boundaries will give more certainty to owners of affected land. Policies OE2.3 and D1.4 advise on development which affects designated sites or sites with substantive nature conservation interest.

Initial Responses to Objections

OE2.4 Species Protection Policy**Supporting Representations:**

0174/1/015/S Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn
 0740/1/037/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0038/1/026/O Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Include reference in policy to rare species as well as protected species. The term protected species covers European Protected species, but specific reference to European Protected Species will be made in reasoned justification. Para.s 11.84-11.88 already refer to Oldham Biodiversity Action Plan species.

Reason :

To clarify what species are protected by the policy.

0124/1/001/O Lancashire Wildlife Trust

Summary of objection:

Policy should include reference to rare species as well as protected species.

Recommended Change:

Include reference in policy to rare species.

Reason :

To ensure protection of rare as well as protected species.

0149/1/020/O English Nature

Summary of objection:

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)

Recommended Change:

Initial Responses to Objections

1. Include further clarification in reasoned justification on European Protected Species to make clear that the policy applies to all European Protected Species. Also make reference to need for licence, in addition to planning permission, to derogate from the provisions of the Habitats Directive.

2. Provide advice to developers on surveys, etc which would be expected in the course of considering proposals affecting such a species, although the request that surveys and mitigation be carried out on site prior to granting of planning permission is considered to be too onerous. The implementation of mitigation measures would be more appropriately addressed through the use of planning conditions or legal agreements.

Reason :

1. To clarify which species are covered by the policy, and to ensure that developers are aware of the need for a separate licence to capture, disturb, damage or destroy a European Protected Species or its breeding or resting place, as well as planning permission.

2. To clarify the level of information which will be required of developers in the course of considering applications affecting such species.

11.81-11.88**Supporting Representations:**

0727/1/001/S Ruth Clamp

0728/1/001/S Alan Clamp

11.86**Supporting Representations:**

0036/1/004/S Peak District National Park

Initial Responses to Objections

Recreation**Objections:****0495/1/002/O Sport England***Summary of objection:*

The title of the chapter should be changed to Sport, Recreation and Open Space

Recommended Change:

Title of Draft Policy amended to encompass sport.

Reason :

Amend title of chapter to Open Space, Sport and Recreation. In recognition of the importance and value of sport as supported by PPG17, in view of the fact that this document is the only land use planning guidance relating to sport, and to recognise that an important function of open space is for sporting activities. Sport, together with recreation and other visual and amenity benefits are functions of open space. The title of the chapter is now proposed to be the same as PPG17. Open space is the land - use whilst sport and recreation are functions of open space.

10.1**Objections:****0495/1/003/O Sport England***Summary of objection:*

The term "sport" has been omitted from this para.

Recommended Change:

Amend wording of introductory paragraph to make reference to sport.

Reason :

To acknowledge the value and importance of the role of sport as supported by PPG17, in view of the the only guidance which relates to sport and to recognise that an important function of open land is for sporting activities.

Initial Responses to Objections

10.2**Objections:****0495/1/010/O****Sport England***Summary of objection:*

The term sport as well as recreational should be mentioned in the first sentence.

Recommended Change:

Amend text to include reference to sport in first sentence.

Reason :

To acknowledge the value and importance of sport as supported by PPG17, in view of the fact that this is the only planning guidance relating to sport, and to recognise that an important function of open land is for sporting activities.

10.5**Objections:****0495/1/012/O****Sport England***Summary of objection:*

This para. should make reference to the term sport as well as to recreation and open space.

Recommended Change:

Amend the list of main planning objectives within paragraph to include reference to sport.

Reason :

To acknowledge the value and importance of sport as supported by PPG17, in view of the fact that this document is the only planning guidance relating to sport, and in recognition that an important function of open land is for sporting activities.

Initial Responses to Objections

R1 Protection & Enhancement of Existing Facilities**Supporting Representations:**

0008/1/022/S	Countryside Agency
0124/1/008/S	Lancashire Wildlife Trust
0175/1/003/S	West Pennine Bridleways Association

Objections:

0495/1/004/O	Sport England
---------------------	----------------------

Summary of objection:

Policy does not refer to the term "sport"

Recommended Change:

Amend wording of policy and reasoned justification to include sport.

Reason :

To acknowledge the value and importance of sport as supported by PPG17, in view of the fact that this document is the only land use planning guidance relating to sport, and which reflects the raised profile of sport. Also in recognition that an important function of open land is for sporting activities. Local Authorities have a key role to play in defending and delivering sport facilities.

10.13**Supporting Representations:**

0175/1/004/S	West Pennine Bridleways Association
--------------	-------------------------------------

10.9**Objections:**

0495/1/011/O	Sport England
---------------------	----------------------

Summary of objection:

Para. should be deleted or significantly amended to include reference to the undertaking of a local assessment of sport, recreation facilities and open space.

Recommended Change:

Initial Responses to Objections

It is intended to amend Policy R1 to reflect the recently published PPG17. This will require reference to the need for the Council to undertake a Local Assessment of Needs with a view to setting local standards to respond to varying circumstances across the Borough. The paragraph confirms that until such time, the Council will continue as an interim measure, to use the existing standards. Subsequent policies within the Chapter have been amended and policies added to reflect the strengthening of open space protection proposed at National level. Amend paragraphs in the reasoned justification to Draft Policy R1 to amplify the reason for, the method and the objectives of the Local Assessment of Needs, and that it is the Council's intention (as a matter of priority) to undertake one.

Reason :

This objection has somewhat been overtaken by the publication of the revised PPG 17 entitled Open Space, Sport and Recreation. Sport England quotes from the superceded PPG17.

The revised PPG now expects local authorities to set local standards of provision, and to no longer rely on the national standards so far used. Therefore the objection can now be successfully addressed through revised Draft Policies to reflect this latest guidance, and the revised Policy will be more in line with Sport Englands Planning Policy Objective 8 .

10.9 Oak Street Area**Objections:****0152/1/002/O****Oak Street Area Community Group*****Summary of objection:***

Space should be found within area for 2.4 hectares open/recreational space per 1000 population, as this is virtually non existent.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

The identification of land for new public open space will only be reasonable where there is evidence that the provision will come forward. In this instance, although the objector has put forward three sites for consideration, a clear mechanism for delivery has to be identified. Until such a time as the Council has prepared a Local Assessment of Needs, it is proposed to continue to use the current adopted standards to maintain an appropriate supply of facilities. This will involve resisting development on sport and recreation facilities and open space, and through its own improvement plans and contributions from new developments.

Lancaster Sports and Social Club, Chadderton**Objections:****0236/1/003/O****BAE Systems Properties Ltd**

Initial Responses to Objections

Agent : Fuller Peiser

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

The land appears to be in use or has been in use as a cricket ground and bowling green, and currently enjoys protection as an open space under Draft Policy R1.1. It is considered that the land, at this stage should continue to be protected as a site for Recreational Open Space. Indeed, it is proposed to amend Draft Policy R1.1 to reflect a stronger stance taken by the Government regarding protection of open space, in PPG17.

Land at Huddersfield Road, Denshaw**Objections:**

0099/1/003/O

John Saxon Ltd

Agent : Chorlton Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Planning permission has been granted on part of the site for a village hall. It is also proposed to amend Policy R1.1 regarding the protection of open spaces in accordance with the revised PPG17. Taking these two factors into account, it is considered that the site should remain as designated, as recreational open space

Land at Malby Street, Oldham**Objections:**

0702/1/002/O

J & A Patterson

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Designate the land as Recreational Open Space

Recommended Change:

Amend Proposals Map to designate as Recreational Open Space.

Reason :

The land would appear as a natural extension to the adjacent recreational open space shown on the First Deposit Draft Proposals Map. It is also proposed to extend the green corridor and link to include the site within it. See responses under Open Environment Chapter (O.E.)

0799/1/002/O**Mr P Siddall*****Summary of objection:***

Include the land in the Recreational Open Space at Oldham Edge

Recommended Change:

Amend Proposals Map to designate as Recreational Open Space.

Reason :

The land would appear as a natural extension to the adjacent recreational open space shown on the First Deposit Draft Proposals Map. It is also proposed to extend the green corridor and link to include the site within it. See responses under Open Environment Chapter (O.E.)

0800/1/002/O**Ernest Fleming*****Summary of objection:***

Include land in Recreational Open Space at Oldham Edge to compensate for the lack of green in front of terraced houses in the area

Recommended Change:

Amend Proposals Map to designate as recreational open space.

Reason :

The land would appear as a natural extension to the adjacent recreational open space shown on the First Deposit Draft Proposals Map. It is also proposed to extend the green corridor and link to include the site within it. See responses under Open Environment Chapter (O.E.)

0801/1/002/O**Anne Marrington**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Include land in Recreational Open Space at Oldham Edge

Recommended Change:

Amend Proposals Map to designate as recreational open space.

Reason :

The land would appear as a natural extension to the adjacent recreational open space shown on the First Deposit Draft Proposals Map. It is also proposed to extend the green corridor and link to include the site within it. See responses under Open Environment Chapter (O.E.)

0803/1/002/O**Cllr M Sharif*****Summary of objection:***

Include the land in the proposed Recreational Open Space at Oldham Edge

Recommended Change:

Amend Proposals Map to designate as recreational open space.

Reason :

The land would appear as a natural extension to the adjacent recreational open space shown on the First Deposit Draft Proposals Map. It is also proposed to extend the green corridor and link to include the site within it. See responses in Open Environment Chapter (O.E.)

Initial Responses to Objections

R1.1 Protection of Existing Facilities**Supporting Representations:**

0124/1/009/S Lancashire Wildlife Trust
 0263/1/011/S CPRE - Lancashire

Objections:

0038/1/033/O Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Summary of objection:

Inclusion of ponds supported, but unclear as to why they have been highlighted above other habitats. Could include woodlands given their sparsity in Oldham. Does the term "ponds" cover mill lodges? Support for recreation routes & their wildlife value

Recommended Change:

Amend Draft Policy R1.1 to include urban woodlands and open and running water, (which would include mill lodges) within the typology of open spaces and sport and recreational facilities to which the Council intends to apply its policies.

Reason :

The scope regarding the protection of open space is now much broader in that the definition as advised in PPG 17 of open space should be taken to mean all open space of public value, including not just land but water which offers important opportunities for sport and recreation and can also offer visual amenity and fulfill other functions, irrespective of ownership, condition or whether or not accessible.

0113/1/009/O Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

Delete part B of policy R1.1 or provide a much clearer definition of amenity open space, formal gardens and landscaped areas.

Recommended Change:

Amend Draft Policy R1 to introduce the typology in the revised PPG17. The objectors' concerns will be met by re - drafting Policy R1 to include the typology set out in PPG17.

Reason :

PPG17 advocates a broader definition of open space to the one which has been used so far as defined in the Town and County Planning Act 1990, and advises that open space should be taken to mean, for the purposes of applying the Policies of the PPG, and in this case also the UDP, all open space of public value. It promotes the use of a typology which gives a clearer definition of the type of land which should be protected.

0266/1/003/O The Clayton Action Group

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Where areas are already deficient in open space, commuted sums should be refused in preference to alternate land.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

Policy R1.1 will be re -drafted in the light of the revised PPG17. It is intended to amend the policy wording to make it clear that when it has been agreed in principle that open space can be used for alternative purposes, preference is for a replacement facility on another site. However, there may be circumstances when the provision of a replacement facility on another site is neither practical or desirable. It is proposed to re - draft Policy R1.1 to clarify the circumstances in which the provision of a capital or commuted sum would be acceptable.

0406/1/002/O
N.H. Wright
Summary of objection:

Mark the 'Crompton Way' as a recreational route on the plan.

Recommended Change:

Include Crompton Circuit on Proposals Map and make reference to route in Policy R1.1

Reason :

This is an established local recreational route created by the Oldham, Rochdale and Tameside Groundwork Trust in partnership with the local community as part of its Countryside Recreational Programme. The route links the urban area with the nearby countryside, and is already protected in the First Deposit UDP under Policy R1.1 as an 'other recreational route'. The route should be shown on the Proposals Map for the avoidance of doubt and in recognition that the route should be regarded equally as important a route as those already shown on the Proposals Map.

0484/1/002/O
Ramblers' Association, Oldham Group
Summary of objection:

Add the Crompton Circuit to the proposals map and para. 10.15

Recommended Change:

Include Crompton Circuit on Proposals Map and make reference to route in Policy R1.1

Reason :

This is an established local recreational route route, created by the Oldham, Rochdale and Tameside Groundwork Trust in partnership with the local community as part of its

Initial Responses to Objections

'other recreational route'. The route should be shown on the Proposals Map for the avoidance of doubt and in recognition that it should be regarded equally as an important recreational route, as those already shown on the Proposals Map.

0495/1/005/O**Sport England*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Amend Draft Policy R1 to make reference in Policy to the types of open space which will be subject to protection and policies within the Chapter. Specific reference will be made to tennis courts and bowling greens as examples of outdoor sports facilities.

Reason :

In the light of PPG17, as revised, it is intended to list the typology in Policy R1. PPG17 promotes a list of open spaces and sport and recreation facilities of public value. The policy now protects from development those types within the typology. It is also intended to re - draft Policy R1.1, however, although it is the intention of the policy to protect all open space of value or to achieve replacement provision or facilities where development is in principle acceptable, there may still be circumstances where it would be unreasonable to do so. This will be clarified in the re - worded policy.

10.13**Objections:****0495/1/006/O****Sport England*****Summary of objection:***

The inclusion of para 10.13, specifically the second sentence, could if allowed to go unchecked, lead to the incremental loss of playing fields.

Recommended Change:

Amend Draft Paragraph and include it as reasoned justification for amended Draft Policy R1.1 which includes the protection of playing fields. Amend the sentence referred to by objector and state that playing fields may now not be developed unless it can be demonstrated that there would be no detriment to existing provision either on - site, or where provision is replaced under the amended policy.

Reason :

Recent Government guidance highlights a strengthened approach to the protection of playing fields in view of increasing pressures to build on them. The policy ensures that playing fields will not be lost incrementally as feared by Sport England. Any proposal on a

Initial Responses to Objections

playing field or other open space for that matter would only be allowed in certain circumstances, and this is made clear in re - drafted Policy R1.1.

10.15**Objections:****0175/1/006/O****West Pennine Bridleways Association***Summary of objection:*

Strategic routes currently specified as cycleways should be for multi-use and recognised as Recreation Routes rather than cycleways

Recommended Change:

Amend Draft Policy R1.1 so the word cycleway to four routes in the list of routes is replaced by the phrase recreational route

Reason :

Many parts of most of the routes listed are in fact bridleways in their own right and therefore benefit from that legal status. The routes currently defined as cycleways are not necessarily intended for the exclusive use of cyclists. Some of them happen to be referred to in the Oldham Cycling Strategy. For the purposes of the Plan, as referred to in the reasoned justification, they are important strategic routes for the use of walkers, cyclists, horse - riders and other non - motorised traffic.

0581/1/001/O**Peter Jones***Summary of objection:*

Part of the Oldham Way route is incorrectly shown on the Proposals Map. Also the Crompton Circuit is not shown.

Recommended Change:

Amend Draft Proposals Map as required to show correct route for Recreational route 3, Oldham Way around Pingot. Amend Proposals Map to indicate Crompton Circuit and add it to list of recreational routes in Paragraph of Draft Policy R1.1

Reason :

The change is self explanatory. Crompton Circuit is an established recreational route created by the Oldham, Rochdale and Tameside Groundwork Trust in partnership with the local community as part of its Countryside Recreational Programme. The route links the urban area with the nearby countryside, and is already protected in the First Deposit UDP under Draft Policy R1.1 as an 'other recreational route'. The route is now to be shown on the Draft Proposals Map for the avoidance of doubt and in recognition that the route should be regarded equally as important a route as those already shown on the Draft Proposals Map.

Initial Responses to Objections

Area between Travis St., Oak St. and Crossley St.**Objections:****0152/1/003/O****Oak Street Area Community Group***Summary of objection:*

Site should be allocated as a 'pocket park' or 'recreational open space' to prevent future development.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

The identification of land for new public open space will only be reasonable where there is evidence that the provision will come forward. In this instance, although the objector has put forward three sites for consideration, a clear mechanism for delivery has to be identified. Until such time as the Council has undertaken a Local Assessment of Needs, it is proposed to continue to use the current adopted standards to maintain an appropriate supply of facilities. This will involve resisting development on open space and sport and recreation facilities, and through its own improvement plans and contributions from new developments.

Bowling Club off Oakview Road, Greenfield**Objections:****0174/1/020/O****Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

New Draft Policies will protect built sport and recreational facilities from redevelopment subject to criteria.

Reason :

The site does not need to be specifically designated since it will be protected through a new Draft Policy of the Plan as a facility currently or last used for sport and recreation. This will include built facilities in accordance with the revised PPG17.

Clayton Playing Fields, Chadderton**Objections:****0091/1/003/O****Thornham Area Neighbourhood Council**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Site should be notated on Proposals Map as a Town Green rather than Recreational Open Space

Recommended Change:

No change. Further consideration will be given to the boundary of Clayton Playing Fields.

Reason :

The site already enjoys protection as an open space under current Draft Policy R1.1, notwithstanding its status as a town green. It is now proposed to amend Policy R1 to include the typology of facilities which should be protected as promoted by the revised PPG17, and this will include town and village greens. Therefore it is not necessary to specifically designate the site as such.

0266/1/002/O**The Clayton Action Group*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Further consideration will be given to the boundary of Clayton Playing Fields.

Reason :

The site already enjoys protection as an open space under current Draft Policy R1.1, notwithstanding its status as a town green. It is now proposed to amend Policy R1 to include the typology of facilities, which should be protected as promoted by the revised PPG17, and this will include town and village greens. Therefore it is not necessary to designate the site specifically as such. For the sake of clarity, the boundary will be investigated.

0484/1/003/O**Ramblers' Association, Oldham Group*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Further consideration will be given to the boundary of Clayton Playing Fields.

Reason :

The site already enjoys protection as an open space under current Draft Policy R1.1, notwithstanding its status as a town green. It is now proposed to amend Policy R1 to include the typology of facilities, which should be protected as promoted by the revised

Initial Responses to Objections

PPG17, and this will include town and village greens. Therefore it is not necessary to designate the site specifically as such. For the sake of clarity, the boundary will be investigated.

Hanging Chadder, Royton**Objections:****0091/1/002/O****Thornham Area Neighbourhood Council***Summary of objection:*

Should be special notation on Proposals Map to identify sand-pit & former football ground as Village Green

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

The site already enjoys protection as an open space under current Draft Policy R1.1, notwithstanding its status as a village green. It is now proposed to amend Policy R1 to include the typology of facilities, which should be protected as promoted by the revised PPG17, and this will include town and village greens. Therefore it is not necessary to specifically designate the site as such.

Land at Broadway north of Fire Station**Objections:****0181/1/003/O****Oldham Labour Group***Summary of objection:*

ROS designation should be varied to allow Police Station development to proceed

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

There is currently an outstanding planning application lodged with the Council which the Authority is minded to approve subject to both parties entering into a section106 agreement. Assuming planning permission is eventually granted for the police station which is planned to occupy approximately one third of the site area, the allocation in the First Deposit Draft Proposals Map would not prejudice the implementation of the planning permission since the latter would take precedence over the allocation. On the other hand, there is no guarantee that this or any successful planning proposal would be implemented, (a planning permission lasts for five years) and so the land would continue to enjoy the protection as an open space

Initial Responses to Objections

under Draft UDP Policy R1.1 in the event that planning permission is not implemented.

Land between Milnrow Road and Oak Street**Objections:****0152/1/004/O****Oak Street Area Community Group***Summary of objection:*

This derelict land should be allocated as Recreational Open Space as there is a lack of provision in the area

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

The identification of land for new public open space will only be reasonable where there is evidence that the provision will come forward. In this instance, although the objector has put forward three sites for consideration, a clear mechanism for delivery has to be identified. Until such time as the Council has undertaken a Local Assessment of Needs, it is proposed to continue to use the current adopted standards to maintain an appropriate supply of facilities. This will involve resisting development on sport and recreation facilities or open space, and through its own improvement schemes and contributions through new developments.

Oldham Way, adjacent Brushes Clough, Crompton Moor**Objections:****0484/1/001/O****Ramblers' Association, Oldham Group***Summary of objection:*

Check the route of RR3, the Oldham Way.

Recommended Change:

Amend route of Oldham Way as appropriate on Proposals Map

Reason :

To clarify one of the recreational routes identified on the Plan and referred to in the text.

Saddleworth Cricket and Bowling Club, Calf Lane**Objections:**

Initial Responses to Objections

0174/1/019/O

Greenfield & Grasscroft Residents Assocn

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

It is not appropriate to show open space, sport and recreation facilities, including land which is attached to sports premises, within the greenbelt, since such sites are already subject to the strict, restrictive green belt policies within the Open Environment Chapter of the UDP. Amend / new policy interpreting the latest PPG17 which includes premises used for sport and recreation being also afforded an element of protection.

Reason :

Even though a facility is not shown on the Proposals Map, it does not mean that it does not enjoy protection by policies contained within the Plan's Adopted and Draft Written Statement. The facility would enjoy the protection as a sports and recreation facility under proposed new Draft UDP Policy R1.3.

Tandle Hill Park**Objections:**

0091/1/004/O

Thornham Area Neighbourhood Council

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

It would be inappropriate to insert a paragraph stating that the Council will ensure continuous use and availability of a particular Recreational Route 3 Oldham Way since the UDP which is a land use plan cannot address such matters. Ensuring public rights of way are not obstructed is a highways enforcement matter dealt with through other legislation. Recreational routes are however protected from development under the same Draft Policy subject to the route being replaced or diverted.

Town and Village Greens**Objections:**

0266/1/004/O

The Clayton Action Group

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Add a designation for all town and village greens, including Clayton, Hanging Chadder, Greenacres, and show them on the Proposals Map

Recommended Change:

Amend Proposals Map to show areas, 0.2ha and above, to be covered by amended Draft Policy R1 which will list those types of areas and facilities to be protected in accordance with the typology promoted in PPG17.

Reason :

The sites already enjoy protection as an open space under current Draft Policy R1.1, notwithstanding their status as town and village greens. It is now proposed to amend Draft Policy R1 to include the typology of facilities, which should be protected as promoted by the revised PPG17, and this will include town and village greens. Therefore it is not necessary to specifically designate the site as such.

Wibsey Playing Fields**Supporting Representations:**

0828/1/016/S

Saddleworth Civic Trust

Initial Responses to Objections

R1.1 c.**Luzley Brook allotments, Royton****Objections:****0570/1/002/O****Mr G. Lindsay***Summary of objection:*

Indicate allotments on the Proposals Map, specifically the Luzley Brook allotments, and distinguish them from recreation ground

Recommended Change:

Amend Draft Proposals Map to include amongst other additions, allotments.

Reason :

The site has no allocation on the Draft Proposals Map. Allotments are specifically identified in the re-defined typology of open space, sport and recreational facilities which would be included in revised Draft Policy R1. They do not need to be distinguished from recreation grounds on the Plan. The reason for this is because under the terms of the Policy, areas to be protected are interchangeable in so much as a developer would have to consider whether a particular facility was surplus to the requirements also for any alternative use within the typology, and also any other function open space could perform.

Initial Responses to Objections

R1.2 Improvement of Existing Facilities**Supporting Representations:**

0007/1/008/S Uppermill Residents Association
 0124/1/010/S Lancashire Wildlife Trust

Objections:

0175/1/005/O West Pennine Bridleways Association

Summary of objection:

Needs of horse-riders should be taken into account when certain parks are improved (refers specifically to Waterhead Park)

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The improvement of facilities is not a land use issue as such and therefore cannot be addressed through the UDP. Such matters of a management nature would normally be addressed in the Council's Greenspace Strategy which is currently in Draft form.

Crompton Circuit**Objections:**

0042/1/002/O Shaw & Crompton Parish Council

Summary of objection:

Crompton Circuit should be identified as Recreation Route on Proposals Map

Recommended Change:

Add Crompton Circuit to other Recreational Routes shown on Proposals Map and add to list of routes in Draft Policy R1.1.

Reason :

This is an established local recreational route, created by the Oldham, Rochdale and Tameside Groundwork Trust in partnership with the local community as part of its Countryside Recreational Access Programme. The route links the urban area with the nearby countryside and is already protected in the First Deposit Draft UDP under Policy R1.1 as an 'other recreational route'. The route should be shown on the Proposals Map for the avoidance of doubt and in recognition that it should be regarded equally as an important recreational route, as those already shown on the Map and listed in the Draft Policy.

Initial Responses to Objections

Initial Responses to Objections

R2 Provision of New Areas of Open Space**Objections:**

0461/1/001/O Oldham and District Model Aero Club

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change

Reason :

Existing policies of the Plan provide a framework for determining applications for such pastimes. At such time, such a proposal would be judged against the Policies of the UDP, Draft Policies of the Replacement Plan and on its own merits.

0495/1/007/O Sport England

Summary of objection:

The title of this policy solely refers to provision of new areas of open space. The actual policy also refers to other recreational facilities.

Recommended Change:

Amend title of section as suggested to 'Provision of New Areas of and Enhancements to Open Space, Sport and Recreational Facilities and amend Draft Part 1 Policy as follows. 'The Council will where appropriate require the provision of new Open spaces and / or enhancements of existing open space and / or sport and recreation facilities through New Developments'.

Reason :

To achieve consistency between the intentions of the section of the Chapter and the wording of Draft Policy R2. Also to make explicit reference to sport in the text, which follows suit with the wording in PPG17, the only land use planning guidance relating to sport, and which now gives recognition to the importance of open space for sport and recreation, and also amenity.

10.19**Objections:**

0495/1/008/O Sport England

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Para. fails to acknowledge the term "sport".

Recommended Change:

Amend wording of Draft Policy in text to include sport.

Reason :

To acknowledge the value and importance of sport as supported in PPG17, in view of the fact that this document is the only land use planning guidance relating to sport, and in recognition that an important function of open land is for sporting activities.

**Frenches Wharf/Wellington Road, Greenfield
Objections:****0007/1/029/O****Uppermill Residents Association*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

See covering report to Executive.

Reason :

The proposals for Frenches Wharf / Wellington Road are set out in the report for consideration by The Executive.

Initial Responses to Objections

R2.1 New Recreation Sites**Supporting Representations:**

0007/1/009/S Uppermill Residents Association

Objections:

0181/1/002/O Oldham Labour Group

Summary of objection:

Designate more potential recreational sites, particularly in more densely populated parts of the Borough

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The identification of land for new recreational open spaces will only be reasonable when there is evidence that the provision will come forward, for which there needs to be a mechanism. The UDP is not that mechanism. Until such a time as the Council has prepared a Local Assessment of Needs which is the process required to identify deficiencies in quantity and quality of provision, and which will inform strategies to facilitate the delivery of facilities, the Council will continue to use the adopted standards to maintain an appropriate supply of facilities, by resisting development on open space or facilities, and also through its own improvement plans and contributions from new developments.

0467/1/001/O

Mrs C. Hollern

Summary of objection:

Object to the omission of any green spaces in Hollinwood. Also want trees and grassed areas.

Recommended Change:

Amend Draft Proposals Map to show smaller areas of open space including a broader range of open space types, which should in fact result in more areas being shown. Amend draft policies to reflect strengthening of protection of existing open spaces.

Reason :

Open Space features more prominently in Government guidance issued in July 2002 and this promotes a typology of areas which should be protected and circumstances whereby development may be acceptable. The identification of land for new recreational open spaces or green spaces will only be reasonable when there is evidence that the provision will come forward, for which there needs to be a mechanism. The UDP is not that mechanism. Until such a time as the Council has prepared a Local Assessment of Needs which is the process required to identify deficiencies in quantity and quality of provision, and which will inform strategies to facilitate the delivery of facilities, the Council will continue to use the

Initial Responses to Objections

adopted standards to maintain an appropriate supply of facilities, by resisting development on open space or facilities, and also through its own improvement plans and contributions from new developments.

Initial Responses to Objections

R2.2 Open Space & New Residential Developments**Supporting Representations:**

0543/1/012/S

Denshaw Community Association

Objections:

0007/1/010/O

Uppermill Residents Association

Summary of objection:

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 or with no visible evidence of other provision.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

It is proposed to re - draft Policy 2.2 to be re - numbered R2.1 which sets out the circumstances in which the Local Authority may require the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities in new developments. Although preference is for on - site provision, the policy will set out the circumstances in which off- site provision or a financial contribution to the Council will be acceptable. Any contributions made by the developer to the Council in lieu of what they would otherwise have provided on or off - site, would be used to remedy a deficiency in quantity or quality of a facility listed in the typology within the area, for the benefit of existing and prospective residents.

0021/1/022/O

Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

Open space provision/commuted sum should only be required where existing provision is insufficient to meet the needs of residents of the new development.

Recommended Change:

No change at present.

Reason :

It is proposed to re - draft Policy 2.2 to be re - numbered R2.1 which sets out the circumstances in which the Local Authority may require the provision of open space, sport

Initial Responses to Objections

Assessment of Needs which is now expected by the Government, and which would reveal areas of deficiency in quality and quantity of provision, therefore more readily identifying needs of local residents. Although the re - drafted policy states a preference for on - site provision, the policy will set out the circumstances in which off- site provision or a financial contribution to the Council will be acceptable. Any contributions made by the developer to the Council in lieu of what they would otherwise have provided on or off - site, would be used to remedy a deficiency in quantity or quality of a facility listed in the typology within the area, for the benefit of existing and prospective residents. Further negotiation is required with the objector to clarify how this can best be achieved.

0021/1/023/O**Government Office for the North West*****Summary of objection:***

Policy should take account of the fact that housing for elderly people will not generate the same need for open space

Recommended Change:

No change at present.

Reason :

It is proposed to re - draft Policy 2.2 to be re - numbered R2.1, (amended as far as practical to reflect latest Government advice in PPG17), which sets out the circumstances in which the Local Authority may require the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities in new developments. The policy takes into account that the Council has as yet not undertaken a Local Assessment of Needs which is now expected of local authorities by the Government, from which local standards could be set, and which would reveal areas of deficiency in quality and quantity of different types of provision, therefore more readily identifying needs of local residents. Further negotiation is required with the objector to clarify how this best can be achieved in the interim.

It is likely that the amended policy will refer to the Council's intention to revise the current Supplementary Planning Guidance to reflect PPG17 and to give more advice on its interpretation. It is possible that the SPG will contain guidance which distinguishes between the various types of residential developments. For example, elderly persons' dwellings may not necessarily generate a demand for most forms of sports facilities, but may warrant on - site green space serving an important visual or amenity purpose.

0021/1/032/O**Government Office for the North West*****Summary of objection:***

Open space provision (or a commuted sum) should only be required where existing provision insufficient to meet the needs of the new development.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

No change at present.

Reason :

It is proposed to re - draft Policy 2.2 to be re - numbered R2.1 which sets out the circumstances in which the Local Authority may require the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities in new developments. It reflects recent advice given in the revised PPG17, but takes into account that the Council has as yet not undertaken a Local Assessment of Needs which is now expected by the Government, and which would reveal areas of deficiency in quality and quantity of different types of provision, therefore more readily identifying needs of local residents.

Although the re - drafted policy states a preference for on - site provision, the policy will set out the circumstances in which off- site provision or a financial contribution to the Council will be acceptable. Any contributions made by the developer to the Council in lieu of what they would otherwise have provided on or off - site, would be used to remedy a deficiency in quantity or quality of a facility listed in the typology within the area, for the benefit of existing and prospective residents. Further negotiation is required with the objector to clarify how this best can be achieved.

0104/1/007/O**Bellway Homes**

Agent : Drivers Jonas

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change at present

Reason :

It is proposed to re - draft Policy 2.2 to be re - numbered R2.1 which sets out the circumstances in which the Local Authority may require the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities in new developments. It reflects recent advice given in the revised PPG17, but takes into account that the Council has as yet not undertaken a Local Assessment of Needs which is now expected of councils by the Government, and which would reveal areas of deficiency in quality and quantity of different types of provision, therefore more readily identifying needs of local residents, existing and proposed.

Until this information is available, it is proposed to remain of the view that for larger residential developments, useable and well-located open space and /or sport and recreation facilities could be laid out within the development and that the requirement for on site provision should be applicable to 30 or more newly built units, (other than for proposals involving a change of use) however further negotiation is requested with the objector regarding how to achieve provision in the interim.

0109/1/004/O**Austin Timber Company Ltd (ref 4110)**

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

It is proposed to re - draft Policy 2.2 to be re - numbered R2.1, (amended as far as practical to reflect latest Government advice in PPG17), which sets out the circumstances in which the Local Authority may require the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities in new developments. Under the revised PPG17, there is no justification for retaining the threshold for requiring on - site provision at 30 dwellings since the PPG does not stipulate a minimum number of units.

It is not proposed to show areas of deficiency on the Proposals Map. It is the Council's intention to carry out a Local Assessment of Needs from which local standards can be set. It will be comprehensive, and which will lead to the identification, amongst other things, of areas of deficiency by quantity, type or quality of provision, using also an accessibility component. This information will inform the UDP including the open space requirements for new housing developments. Requirements are currently based on national standards of provision, which have not so far been as accurate assessment as would be possible with local standards, and which will not necessarily be applicable to every case in reality. The Council will be looking forwards to relying on local standards and therefore it is not considered to be helpful, meaningful, or technically practical to identify areas of deficiency on the Proposal Map using standards which will probably be superseded long before the end of the Plan period, as the objector requests.

It is not proposed to change the area required per dwelling as indicated in the reasoned justification to Draft Policy R2.1. The adopted rate of 30 square metres per dwelling was derived using the 1991 average occupancy rates within the Borough of 2.52 persons per household. It was considered that given the prevalence of a mix of house sizes being built, account should be taken of this, particularly that smaller dwellings (or the occupants) would not generate as much demand for facilities as larger units. The draft requirements of 25 m2 for one and two bed units, and 35 m2 for three and more bed units takes this into account, and are proposed for inclusion in the amended Draft Policy R2.1.

The Draft Policy has been amended from bed units to bedrooms for clarification.

The issue of maintenance still needs to be considered although it is not proposed to reduce the duration in the Draft Policy.

0113/1/010/O

Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd

Agent : Bolton Emery Partnership

Summary of objection:

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

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

No change.

Reason :

It is proposed to re - draft Policy 2.2 to be re - numbered R2.1, (amended as far as practical to reflect latest Government advice in PPG17), which sets out the circumstances in which the Local Authority may require the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities in new developments. Under the revised PPG17, there is no justification for retaining the threshold for requiring on - site provision at 30 dwellings since the PPG does not stipulate a minimum number of units.

It is not proposed to show areas of deficiency on the Proposals Map. It is the Council's intention to carry out a Local Assessment of Needs from which local standards can be set. It will be comprehensive, and which will lead to the identification, amongst other things, of areas of deficiency by quantity, type or quality of provision, using also an accessibility component. This information will inform the UDP including the open space requirements for new housing developments. Requirements are currently based on national standards of provision, which have not so far been as accurate assessment as would be possible with local standards, and which will not necessarily be applicable to every case in reality. The Council will be looking forwards to relying on local standards and therefore it is not considered to be helpful, meaningful, or technically practical to identify areas of deficiency on the Proposal Map using standards which will probably be superseded long before the end of the Plan period, as the objector requests.

It is not proposed to change the area required per dwelling as indicated in the reasoned justification to Draft Policy R2.1. The adopted rate of 30 square metres per dwelling was derived using the 1991 average occupancy rates within the Borough of 2.52 persons per household. It was considered that given the prevalence of a mix of house sizes being built, account should be taken of this, particularly that smaller dwellings (or the occupants) would not generate as much demand for facilities as larger units. The draft requirements of 25 m2 for one and two bed units, and 35 m2 for three and more bed units takes this into account, and are proposed for inclusion in the amended Draft Policy R2.1.

The text of the Draft Policy has been amended from bed units to bedrooms for clarification.

The issue of maintenance still needs to be considered although it is not proposed to reduce the duration in the Draft Policy at this stage.

0181/1/001/O
Oldham Labour Group
Summary of objection:

Delete policy wording from 'or to enhance...'

Recommended Change:

Amend Draft Policy R2.2 and re -number R2.1 to reflect guidance in revised PPG17 which effectively tightens up what is expected from developers of residential development by way of maintaining and / or providing open space, sport and recreational facilities.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

The revised draft Policy, which reflects recent Government advice effectively tightens up on what is expected from developers of residential development by way of maintaining and / or providing open space, sport and recreational facilities. The policy is a refinement on that in the First Deposit Draft. It is proposed to retain in the policy the possibility of off - site enhancements where the Council considers that special circumstances prevail preventing a developer providing new on - site facilities. For developments over 30 units, there will be a requirement for on - site open space, sport and / or recreation provision with no possibility to contribute to off - site enhancements. Furthermore, for smaller developments of between 5 - 29 units, it is proposed to retain the possibility for either off - site provision or improvements / enhancement of existing facilities as an alternative to on - site provision as in the First Deposit Draft, only in cases where the Council considers that there are exceptional circumstances. Enhancement is an effective way of increasing overall provision and also provides the opportunity to ensure that the right kind of facility is provided according to the needs of the local community. Enhancement is not necessarily a soft option for developers. It ensures that new housing provides open space but that this may not necessarily have to be by way of additional area or facility; it may be that upgrading an existing facility would be of greater benefit to the local community than new provision. A declining facility can sometimes lead to its eventual demise and usually once open space is developed, it is lost forever. Enhancements also can constitute a visual improvement to an area. The revised PPG17 gives clear guidance that agreements between developers and the Council can be used to remedy both qualitative deficiencies and quantitative deficiencies, in recognition of the importance of enhancing existing open spaces and facilities.

0495/1/009/O**Sport England*****Summary of objection:***

The policy should be applied to all residential development except sheltered accommodation or residential care homes.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

It is proposed to re - draft Policy 2.2 to be re - numbered R2.1, (amended as far as practical to reflect latest Government advice in PPG17), which sets out the circumstances in which the Local Authority may require the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities in new developments. The policy takes into account that the Council has as yet not undertaken a Local Assessment of Needs which is now expected of local authorities by the Government, from which local standards could be set, and which would reveal areas of deficiency in quality and quantity of different types of provision, therefore more readily identifying needs of local residents. Further negotiation is required with the objector to clarify how this best can be achieved in the interim.

It is likely that the amended policy will refer to the Council's intention to revise the current Supplementary Planning Guidance to reflect PPG17 and to give more advice on its interpretation. It is possible that the SPG will contain guidance which distinguishes between the various types of residential developments. For example, elderly persons'

Initial Responses to Objections

0582/1/001/O**McCarthy & Stone (Development) Ltd**

Agent : The Planning Bureau

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

It is proposed to re - draft Policy 2.2 to be re - numbered R2.1, (amended as far as practical to reflect latest Government advice in PPG17), which sets out the circumstances in which the Local Authority may require the provision of open space, sport and recreation facilities in new developments. The policy takes into account that the Council has as yet not undertaken a Local Assessment of Needs which is now expected of local authorities by the Government, from which local standards could be set, and which would reveal areas of deficiency in quality and quantity of different types of provision, therefore more readily identifying needs of local residents. Further negotiation is required with the objector to clarify how this best can be achieved in the interim.

It is likely that the amended policy will refer to the Council's intention to revise the current Supplementary Planning Guidance to reflect PPG17 and to give more advice on its interpretation. It is possible that the SPG will contain guidance, which distinguishes between the various types of residential developments. For example, elderly persons' dwellings may not necessarily generate a demand for most forms of sports facilities, but may warrant on - site green space serving an important visual or amenity purpose.

Initial Responses to Objections

S1 Town & District Centre Shopping & Leisure Facilities**Supporting Representations:**

0740/1/028/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0011/1/001/O Somerfield Stores Ltd.

Agent : Roger Tym and Partners

Summary of objection:

Policy implies that food retailing could be permitted within retail parks (out of centre)

Recommended Change:

Amend Policy S1 by inserting following sentence as the final paragraph:

"ONLY NON-FOOD RETAIL DEVELOPMENT WILL BE PERMITTED ON THE OUT OF CENTRE RETAIL PARKS."

Reason :

PPG6 aims to concentrate food retailing in defined town, district and local centres and not out of centre locations.

0021/1/001/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

Reference to retail centres does not comply with PPG6.

Recommended Change:

Amend Policy S1 to incorporate the retail hierarchy within this policy as follows:

3rd Paragraph, Line 2: Delete "WITHIN THE TOWN AND DISTRICT CENTRES AND RETAIL PARKS INDICATED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP" and insert "WHERE THERE ARE AVAILABLE, SUITABLE AND VIABLE DEVELOPMENT SITES, OR BUILDINGS SUITABLE FOR CONVERSION, WITHIN THE FOLLOWING HIERARCHY, CONSIDERED SEQUENTIALLY, "

and

3rd Paragraph, Line 4: After "EXCEPT AS PROVIDED FOR IN THIS PLAN" insert "
":

- (i) TOWN CENTRE
- (ii) EDGE OF TOWN CENTRE
- (iii) DISTRICT CENTRE
- (iv) EDGE OF DISTRICT CENTRE
- (v) LOCAL CENTRE
- (vi) EXISTING OUT OF CENTRE RETAIL PARKS THAT HAVE GOOD PUBLIC TRANSPORT ACCESSIBILITY, AS DEFINED ON THE PROPOSALS MAP."

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

GO-NW indicated in their objection that the retail hierarchy should be included within this policy and that reference to the out of centre retail parks could be included within the reasoned justification rather than the policy. It is proposed to include the retail hierarchy within this policy, but to retain the reference to existing out of centre retail parks within the retail hierarchy although to modify it to indicate that these have been included only because they have good public transport accessibility. The reference to out of centre retail parks will be amended to refer only to Alexandra and Centre Retail Parks and not Housing Units of Hollinwood and Morrisons, as the latter two do not accord to the PPG6 definition of retail parks.

The other part of the recommended change for this policy is the inclusion of "local centres" within the retail hierarchy. Local Centres are smaller than District Centres and are groupings of shops of a significant local nature. PPG6 suggests the inclusion of local centres within the retail hierarchy. Oldham has not previously identified local centres and this recommended change may be subject to change in the light of the practicalities of designating local centres within the Borough.

Failsworth district centre**Supporting Representations:**

0725/1/001/S

Elsie M. Hamilton

Huddersfield Road district centre**Objections:**

0018/1/001/O

Standedge Limited***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Not known at present. (See reason for explanation)

Reason :

Part of this alternative proposal was subject to a planning appeal relating to the land uses of the car dealership site. The outcome of that appeal is being considered and will inform the final response to this objection.

0019/1/001/O

Lookers PLC

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

Not known at present. (See reason for explanation)

Reason :

Part of this alternative proposal was subject to a planning appeal relating to the land uses of the car dealership site. The outcome of that appeal is being considered and will inform the final response to this objection.

Initial Responses to Objections

S1.2 Oldham Town Centre

Objections:

0021/1/002/O

Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Amend the title to clarify that the policy is concerned with retail and leisure developments outside the Central Shopping Core but within the wider Town Centre area and that new proposals are to be treated as edge of centre developments. Reword the policy as follows to offer greater clarity:

"Within the Town Centre as defined by the Proposals Map but outside the Central Shopping Core, the Council will permit the following uses:

- a. a new retail store over 300 square metres gross selling primarily comparison goods, including a retail warehouse; or
- b. a new retail store over 300 square metres gross selling primarily convenience goods, to be limited by condition; or
- c. a new leisure development.

Proposals will have to be judged acceptable against the following considerations:

- i) there is a proven need for the development;
- ii) there are no suitable, viable and available alternative sites within the Central Shopping Core;
- iii) the cumulative effect of such development would not have a significant adverse impact on the vitality and viability of the Central Shopping Core and District Centres; and
- iv) the proposed development does not conflict with the policies of the Town Centre section of this Plan.

Proposals for new shopping floorspace of less than 300 square metres gross will be permitted."

Reason :

Change of policy title is designed to better reflect its content and to offer clarity that the area covered by the policy is, for PPG6 purposes, considered edge of centre and therefore retail and leisure developments have to be subject to the PPG6 tests of demonstration of need, sequential approach and assessment of impact.

Reference to bullet points "d" and "e" of the First Deposit policy are to be deleted from the policy as these uses are sui generis.

Reference has been included in the revised policy wording to "retail warehouses" and "new leisure developments" to ensure the policy covers all aspects relating to this issue.

References to the size threshold have been lowered to 300 square metres from 500 square metres to ensure consistency with the other shopping policies of the Replacement UDP.

Initial Responses to Objections

0119/1/008/O

Oldham Town Centre Partnership

Summary of objection:

Developments should complement existing usages directly when outside the core area of the Town Centre and should link.

Recommended Change:

No Change

Reason :

The policy indicates all retail uses (Classes A1, A2 and A3) are acceptable outside the Central Shopping Core. Given this policy stance, it is not possible to then distinguish between acceptable developments that complement existing usages and those that do not.

0119/1/018/O

Oldham Town Centre Partnership

Summary of objection:

Generally supportive, but concern expressed at percentage of non food retail that would be allowed within a supermarket proposal

Recommended Change:

No Change

Reason :

The 25% limit on the amount of comparison goods permitted within new convenience stores is designed to recognise and take account of the trend of modern developments within the retail sector, whilst at the same time recognising the wider objective of maintaining the vitality and viability of the Central Shopping Core.

0795/1/003/O

Watermill Estates Limited

Agent : GL Hearn Planning

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No Change

Reason :

There is no evidence of any need for additional retail floorspace in Oldham Town Centre at this point in time.

Initial Responses to Objections

Initial Responses to Objections

S1.3 District Centre Shopping**7.21/7.22****Objections:****0012/1/001/O Deez Wine Bar**

Agent : Paul Butler Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

In relation to the three specific points made in the objection letter:

- 1) No Change
- 2) No Change
- 3) Amend the policy to allow A2 and certain A3 uses within Primary Shopping Frontages as well as A1 uses. The policy to be combined with Policy S1.1 that covers Primary Shopping Frontages within Oldham Town Centre, as both policies set the same threshold limit. The new combined policy should be amended as follows:

Line 4: Delete "retail use" and insert "A1, A2 and A3 use, excluding pubs, snack bars, wine bars and shops for sale of hot food" and delete "Class A1".

After the opening paragraph, list all Primary Shopping Frontages for Oldham Town Centre and all District Centres.

Reason :

In relation to the three specific points made in the objection letter:

- 1) The objector has referred to 2-28 Market Street in the objection and has asked for its removal as a Primary Shopping Frontage. However, 2 - 28 Market Street is not classed as a Primary Shopping Frontage in the Replacement UDP and, as such, it cannot be deleted as a Primary Shopping Frontage. It is believed that the objector has made an error in his objection and that he was referring to 2-28 Market Square which is classed as a Primary Shopping Frontage. Notwithstanding this, it is not appropriate to remove the Primary Shopping Frontage designation as this would undermine the general thrust of the policy which is concerned with ensuring the vitality and viability of Royton District Centre.
- 2) The percentage level set in the policy is a continuation of the policy approach in the Adopted UDP. Primary Shopping Frontages have been designated to assist in maintaining and improving the District Centres by concentrating shopping facilities and preventing fragmentation of the most important frontages. There is no evidence to support the suggestion that the percentage should be lowered to 45% combined with a flexible approach to applying this percentage when using the policy.
- 3) The range of acceptable uses within the Primary Shopping Frontages have been expanded from A1 to include A2 and certain A3 uses in recognition of the contribution that these activities bring to increasing the pedestrian flow within Primary Shopping Frontages during the day. As both policies set the same threshold for Primary Shopping Frontages and the only difference is the list of areas classed as Primary Shopping Frontages, then both policies have been combined for greater clarity and easier use of the Replacement UDP.

Initial Responses to Objections

7.23**Objections:****0007/1/001/O****Uppermill Residents Association***Summary of objection:*

Clarification is required of 'the flexible approach' proposed for primary shopping frontages in Uppermill district centre.

Recommended Change:

At the end of paragraph 7.23, insert the following sentence:

"If the Council considers there are sufficient numbers of non-retail uses within the District Centre already, and that the overall effects of allowing further non-retail uses will be harmful to its continued well-being, there may be cases in which applications for such uses will be refused."

Please note that it is proposed to combine this policy and the reasoned justification with Policy S1.1 to form a single policy dealing with Primary Shopping Frontages. The recommended change will be included within the reasoned justification of the combined policy.

Reason :

To offer clarity on the interpretation of the "flexible approach".

Initial Responses to Objections

S1.4 Food & Drink Premises**Supporting Representations:**

0143/1/003/S

Jean Stretton

Objections:

0119/1/009/O

Oldham Town Centre Partnership

Summary of objection:

Encourage diversity in Yorkshire Street area of the Town Centre.

Develop family night time economy.

Recommended Change:

No Change

Reason :

In relation to the two specific points, Policy S1.4 deals specifically with the requirements that food and drink proposals have to satisfy. It is important to recognise that Policy S1.2 also deals with developments in the wider Town Centre outside the Central Shopping Core and the two policies taken together create a framework which permits a range of retail uses that would contribute towards diversity and the night time economy.

Initial Responses to Objections

S1.4 c)

Objections:

0006/1/001/O

Highways Agency*Summary of objection:*

Paragraph on food and drink uses needs a reference to protecting the safe and efficient operation of the trunk road network.

Recommended Change:

Delete existing text in bullet point "c" and insert replacement text: "it would have no adverse impact on the free flow of traffic and highway and pedestrian safety, particularly on main roads."

Reason :

To accommodate the point made by the Highways Agency and to ensure consistency with other policies on this particular matter.

Initial Responses to Objections

S1.5 Taxi & Vehicle Hire

Supporting Representations:

0143/1/004/S

Jean Stretton

Initial Responses to Objections

S1.6 Out of Centre Retail Development**Supporting Representations:**

0008/1/001/S Countryside Agency

Recommended Change:**Reason :**

Please note that although it is recommended that this policy be deleted (see recommendation below to objection 0021/1/004/O) following advice from GO-NW that PPG6 does not allow exceptions to the sequential approach for new retail developments, the specific reference mentioned by this letter of support - farm shops - would be covered by Policy OE1.9 (Farm Diversification) of the Replacement UDP.

Objections:

0021/1/004/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Delete the policy.

Reason :

PPG6 does not allow exceptions to the sequential approach. Policy S1.7 already outlines how retail developments outside the defined centres should be assessed. Use classes in bullet points "a" to "c" are sui generis. Farm shops would be covered by Policy OE1.9 (Farm Diversification) of the Replacement UDP.

7.29**Objections:**

0011/1/002/O Somerfield Stores Ltd.

Agent : Roger Tym and Partners

Summary of objection:

Text implies food retail is acceptable in retail parks. This should be amended to exclude food.

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

Delete the policy and reasoned justification.

Reason :

The policy should be deleted following advice from GO-NW that it does not accord with PPG6.

Initial Responses to Objections

S1.7 Development Outside Town or District Centres**Supporting Representations:**

0119/1/010/S Oldham Town Centre Partnership

Objections:**0021/1/003/O Government Office for the North West***Summary of objection:*

PPG6 does not apply any size criteria to the sequential approach and retail parks should be removed from the hierarchy.

Recommended Change:

Merge Policies S1.7 and S1.8 as both deal with out of centre retail and leisure developments and, as such, are covered by the key PPG6 tests of demonstration of need, sequential approach and assessment of impact. The retail hierarchy has been incorporated into Policy S1, as already suggested by GO-NW. Therefore, bullet point "b" should be deleted and replaced in the combined policy with a new bullet point as follows: "there is no sequentially preferable and viable development site, or building suitable for conversion, available: and". Delete reference to "large to medium scale" in relation to leisure developments within the revised wording of the combined policy. Clarify within the reasoned justification that new retail developments will have to satisfy the key PPG6 tests.

Reason :

Both policies deal with retail and leisure developments outside the defined centres and, as such, require the test of need, sequential approach and assessment of impact to be applied to proposals. Therefore, as the policies deal with similar issues, they have been combined for greater clarity and easier use of the UDP. The changes in the wording of the combined policy will be made to reflect the other changes made to the retail and leisure policies, particularly the retail hierarchy, and to accord with PPG6.

7.36**Objections:****0010/1/001/O Wm Morrison Supermarkets PLC**

Agent : Peacock and Smith

Summary of objection:

- Sequential approach does not fully accord with PPG6.
- factors associated with need should be expanded.
- need should be established on edge of centre sites.

Recommended Change:

Initial Responses to Objections

In consideration of the specific points:

1) The retail hierarchy has been amended already and is now included within Policy S1. This will be reflected within the revised wording of this policy which is now to be merged with Policy S1.8, as explained in the recommended response to Objection 0021/1/003/O.

2) No Change.

3) No Change.

Reason :

1) The retail hierarchy has been incorporated into Policy S1, as already suggested by GO-NW.

2) The list of factors associated with "need" already includes "quantitative, qualitative, geographic, regenerative and commercial" (paragraph 7.36). These cover the points raised in the objection with the exception of "development of a brownfield site and facilitating development of adjoining land". However, PPG6 (paragraph 3.24) states that retail development should not be used simply as a mechanism to bring vacant or derelict sites into development, unless it would assist in supporting the health of town centres.

3) Bullet point "a" of the policy already requires new development to establish "need".

Initial Responses to Objections

S1.7 c. ii)

Supporting Representations:

0026/1/020/S

GMPTE

Initial Responses to Objections

S1.8 Development Adjacent to Town or District Centres**Objections:****0021/1/005/O****Government Office for the North West***Summary of objection:*

If this policy refers to 'edge of centre' sites, would suggest use of this term rather than "adjacent to town and district centres"

Recommended Change:

Merge policies S1.8 and S1.7 and change the title of the new policy to "Development At The Edge Of Or Outside District and Local Centres" Within the revised policy, the PPG6 terminology "edge of centre" to be used instead of "adjacent to town and district centres".

Reason :

As policies S1.8 and S1.7 deal with retail developments outside defined centres, i.e. both refer to the key PPG6 tests of demonstration of need, sequential approach and assessment of impact, then the two policies can be merged to offer greater clarity and ease of use of the Replacement UDP. The appropriate PPG6 terminology is to be used within the policy for purposes of clarity.

Initial Responses to Objections

S1.9 Customer Facilities**Objections:****0021/1/006/O****Government Office for the North West***Summary of objection:*

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

Recommended Change:

No Change.

Reason :

The Adopted UDP contains the same policy. Therefore, it has been demonstrated that this matter does have an appropriate planning dimension to merit its continuation in the Replacement UDP.

Initial Responses to Objections

S2.1 Local Shops

Supporting Representations:

0008/1/002/S

Countryside Agency

Initial Responses to Objections**S2.2 Protection of Local Shop Premises****Supporting Representations:**

0008/1/003/S	Countryside Agency
0263/1/010/S	CPRE - Lancashire

Initial Responses to Objections

S2.3 New Shops Serving Local Needs

Objections:**0013/1/001/O Keith Lowe***Summary of objection:*

Increase local needs shopping threshold from 300 to 400m2 as it is unduly restrictive.

Recommended Change:

No Change

Reason :

The local shopping needs threshold has already been increased from 100 square metres in the Adopted UDP to 300 square metres in the Replacement UDP. There is no evidence to support the suggestion that this increased threshold is unduly restrictive.

0263/1/016/O CPRE - Lancashire*Summary of objection:*

Wording appears to discourage proposals in more rural areas.

Recommended Change:

No Change

Reason :

The term "within the urban area" also refers to the built up settlements in the Green Belt, i.e. the more rural settlements.

Initial Responses to Objections

Transport**Objections:****0136/1/001/O****General Aviation Awareness Council***Summary of objection:*

Include a criteria-based policy to consider proposals for landing strips and helipads, in accordance with national planning policy (PPG13, PPG24) and because General Aviation is a growing economic and leisure activity

Recommended Change:

Suggest no change but should investigate further the guidance on the issue.

Reason :

The plan cannot and should not contain a policy for every eventuality. Other policies of the plan, such as those protecting the Green Belt and residential and workplace amenity, provide a framework within which such applications could be considered.

4.4**Supporting Representations:**

0026/1/011/S

GMPTE

Objections:**0037/1/001/O****Railtrack Property***Summary of objection:*

Add an objective around encouraging the transfer of goods from road to rail.

Recommended Change:

Further consideration of adding an objective to promote non-road based freight.

Reason :

There will be few opportunities over the Plan period for a transfer to rail-based freight in the Borough, given the conversion of the Oldham Loop line to Metrolink, limited capacity on the Trans-pennine route and limited funds for new rail infrastructure generally. This leaves the Calder line via Mills Hill. However, the Council may wish to include an objective to transfer freight to non-road based means, which would include canals as well as rail.

Initial Responses to Objections

4.4 (b)**Supporting Representations:**

0152/1/014/S

Oak Street Area Community Group

4.5**Objections:****0021/1/021/O****Government Office for the North West***Summary of objection:*

Typing error: insert "Developments" at end of PPG title

Recommended Change:

Add 'Developments' at end of criterion b.

Reason :

For accuracy

4.5 i.**Objections:****0036/1/006/O****Peak District National Park***Summary of objection:*

It would be appropriate to include a statement of support for the South Pennines Integrated Transport Strategy (SPITS) proposals.

Recommended Change:

None

Reason :

The SPITS is included in the list of relevant policies that form the framework for the UPD's transport policies. However, the UDP is not the appropriate document to express support for a strategy. The Council is represented on the body that develops and implements the strategy.

Initial Responses to Objections

T1 The Transport Network**Supporting Representations:**

0026/1/012/S	GMPTE
0740/1/014/S	North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0005/1/001/O	Manchester Airport plc
---------------------	-------------------------------

Summary of objection:

Policy should refer to improving the accessibility of Manchester Airport.

Recommended Change:

Add a reasoned justification: 'The network does not stop at the boundaries of the Borough and should provide access to regional and national routes and to key destinations, such as Manchester Airport, strategic employment sites and centres of higher education. These links are important for residents, employers and visitors alike.'

Reason :

To explain that the local transport network provides, or should provide, links to destinations outside the Borough which are important for residents and the local economy.

0006/1/002/O	Highways Agency
---------------------	------------------------

Summary of objection:

Define *convenient* and refer to public transport.

Recommended Change:

Add a reasoned justification: 'The policy applies to the land use needs associated with all means of transport, including private vehicles, public transport and non-motorised travel. The various modes need to be considered comprehensively to optimise safety and convenience for the range of users across the network and to facilitate the interchange between modes. Convenience in this context is characterised by the ease of access to the network and the directness of routes.'

Reason :

To clarify the scope of the policy and explain what is meant by 'convenient'.

Initial Responses to Objections

T1.1 Transport Infrastructure

Supporting Representations:

0037/1/004/S	Railtrack Property
0740/1/015/S	North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0006/1/003/O	Highways Agency
---------------------	------------------------

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Add a reference in the reasoned justification to the need for liaising with the Highways Agency on the possible implications for trunk roads of the strategic park and ride at Hollinwood and the Quality Bus Corridors.

Reason :

For completeness and clarity.

0008/1/032/O	Countryside Agency
---------------------	---------------------------

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The Council may indeed want to promote rural bus services, but the UDP is not the appropriate vehicle for doing so, unless there are land take or land use implications for provision.

0021/1/009/O	Government Office for the North West
---------------------	---

Summary of objection:

With respect to Trans-Pennine rail routes, refer to the GMLTP rather than draft RPG.

Recommended Change:

Delete 'draft' in line 1 of policy and, under a., replace 'draft RPG' with 'the GMLTP'.

Initial Responses to Objections

Reason :

To update the reference to RPG and refer to the more local document.

4.10**Supporting Representations:**

0119/1/014/S

Oldham Town Centre Partnership

Objections:**0021/1/010/O****Government Office for the North West****Summary of objection:**

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.

Recommended Change:

Insert in para 4.10 after 'boundaries of the highway': 'for example the loss of a structure or landscaping to accommodate the creation of a bus lane or lay-by.' Make last phrase a sentence beginning with 'This will be considered....'

Reason :

For clarity.

4.11**Objections:****0016/1/004/O****STORM****Summary of objection:**

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.

Recommended Change:

No change at present, but further discussion with GMPTE is advised.

Reason :

Inclined not to reinstate a stop at Wren's Nest as it was not included in the tender. However, negotiations with preferred bidders are still underway as the Metrolink contract will be finalised in late 2003.

0042/1/001/O**Shaw & Crompton Parish Council**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Include a possible Metrolink station at Bridge Street (Wren's Nest) which would allow replacement of footbridge with a pedestrian level crossing.

Recommended Change:

No change at present, but further discussion with GMPTE is advised.

Reason :

Inclined not to reinstate a stop at Wren's Nest as it was not included in the tender. However, negotiations with preferred bidders are still underway as the Metrolink contract will be finalised in late 2003. Nevertheless, a station would not be justified on the sole grounds that it would enable a local infrastructure improvement.

0152/1/001/O**Oak Street Area Community Group*****Summary of objection:***

Wren's Nest Metrolink stop should not be abandoned.

Recommended Change:

No change at present, but further discussion with GMPTE is advised.

Reason :

Inclined not to reinstate a stop at Wren's Nest as it was not included in the tender. However, negotiations with preferred bidders are still underway as the Metrolink contract will be finalised in late 2003.

Initial Responses to Objections

T1.1 b.**Supporting Representations:**

0797/1/001/S

David Abbot

Objections:**0026/1/003/O****GMPTE*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The Council wishes to retain the site for a strategic park and ride at Derker rather than at Mumps as the facility would be more viable and beneficial for Oldham for various reasons: the land is in Council ownership; the location would be accessible to a sizable population of the Borough, to the North as well as West; on the other hand, a facility at Mumps would exacerbate traffic congestion at a prominent gateway to the Town Centre without benefiting the Town Centre, since people using a park and ride at Mumps are unlikely to be going into the Town Centre.

0180/1/001/O**Siemens Real Estate Ltd**

Agent : Colliers Conrad Ritblat Erdman

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

Land should be safeguarded for a park and ride near the future Hollinwood Metrolink stop as the location meets the criteria in the emerging GM Park and Ride strategy and has been agreed by the GMPTE and the Council. It is off the M60 and the journey by Metrolink to either Manchester or Oldham centres is a realistic alternative to the car. The planning brief for redevelopment of the land between the rail/tramline, the M60 and the A62 calls for an element of park and ride.

The code 'PR' used on the Proposals Map is meant to indicate that a strategic park and ride will be associated with a particular station or stop, rather than indicate the precise site for a

Initial Responses to Objections

facility.

0653/1/001/O

Mr G&Mrs J Horn

Summary of objection:

Relocate Metrolink stop at South Chadderton to junction with either Stanley Road or Washbrook

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

The location of the Metrolink stop in the Chadderton area has already been agreed with Council input but through a process external to the UDP review. The location is unlikely to change, although negotiations with preferred bidders are still underway and the Metrolink contract will only be finalised in late 2003.

0747/1/001/O

King Street Baptist Church, Trustees

Agent : A. Gould Solicitor

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

The legal issue with relation to the land has not yet been resolved and is outside the Council's remit. However, the tender for the Metrolink extension includes the route through the Town Centre and discussions with preferred bidders on that basis are underway.

0794/1/001/O

Mossbridge Mill Co Ltd

Agent : Roger Hannah & Co

Summary of objection:

Remove the park and ride designation from the property at Albert Mill, Cromford Street near Derker

Recommended Change:

Inform the objector that the designation on the Proposals Map was only indicative and that their premises were not allocated for a park and ride.

Reason :

To correct a misunderstanding.

Initial Responses to Objections**0796/1/001/O****Shaw and Royton Area Committee*****Summary of objection:***

Seek reinstatement of a Metrolink halt at Wren's Nest, Shaw in the Plan to facilitate provision of a facility at that location.

Recommended Change:

No change at present, but further discussion with GMPTE is advised.

Reason :

Inclined not to reinstate a stop at Wren's Nest as it was not included in the tender. However, discussions with preferred bidders are still underway and the Metrolink contract will not be finalised until late 2003.

Initial Responses to Objections

T1.1 c.

Supporting Representations:

0007/1/002/S

Uppermill Residents Association

4.9**Objections:**

0037/1/002/O

Railtrack Property*Summary of objection:*

More details needed about the proposed location and scale of Diggle station and the strategic park and ride.

Recommended Change:

Make the designation of a future station at Diggle indicative rather than identify a precise location on the Proposals Map.

Reason :

Subsequent to the first deposit stage, a study was commissioned by the GMPTE to assess the feasibility of new rail stations proposed in the GMLTP. The Ward Lane site identified in the Replacement UDP was deemed unsuitable due to physical constraints and an alternative site was suggested at Station Road. In addition, the Government is curtailing funds for new rail infrastructure in their current 10 year plan. It is therefore not possible at this stage to specify the location and scale of a future rail station and associated park and ride, although it is recommended to retain an indicative designation for both.

Diggle Station**Objections:**

0016/1/008/O

STORM*Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

Make the designation of a future station at Diggle indicative rather than identify a precise location on the Proposals Map.

Reason :

Feasibility studies were undertaken by the GMPTE since the first deposit stage of the UDP review, which revealed physical constraints at the Ward Lane site identified on the Proposals Map and suggested an alternative location at Station Road.

Initial Responses to Objections

Initial Responses to Objections

T1.2 Local Park & Ride**Supporting Representations:**

0007/1/026/S	Uppermill Residents Association
0026/1/019/S	GMPTE
0119/1/015/S	Oldham Town Centre Partnership
0543/1/013/S	Denshaw Community Association

Objections:

0008/1/033/O **Countryside Agency**

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The Council may indeed want to promote rural bus services, but the UDP is not the appropriate vehicle for doing so, unless there are land take or land use implications for provision.

0016/1/003/O

STORM

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Further discussion to consider whether to eliminate or amend the policy.

Reason :

It is deemed inappropriate and unduly pessimistic to exclude bus-based park and ride entirely, as services on QBCs provide a sufficiently frequent and high quality travel experience to provide an alternative to car travel for some journeys. However, further discussion is advised of whether the policy can fulfil its objectives.

0021/1/012/O

Government Office for the North West

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

If retained as a policy, must be redrafted to include criteria for judging the acceptability of development proposals.

Recommended Change:

Further discussion to consider whether to eliminate or amend the policy.

Reason :

Retaining the policy would underline the importance of park and ride facilities for increasing patronage of public transport and reducing overall traffic. However further discussion of 'deliverability' is needed.

0040/1/001/O**Saddleworth Parish Council**

Agent : Eagland Planning Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Further discussion is being advised in the first instance, to consider whether to eliminate or retain the policy.

Reason :

Retaining the policy would underline the importance of park and ride facilities for increasing patronage of public transport and reducing overall traffic. However further discussion of 'deliverability' is needed.

0180/1/002/O**Siemens Real Estate Ltd**

Agent : Colliers Conrad Ritblat Erdman

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Further discussion to consider whether to eliminate or amend the policy.

Reason :

Retaining the policy would underline the importance of park and ride facilities for increasing patronage of public transport and reducing overall traffic. However further discussion of 'deliverability' is needed.

0263/1/018/O**CPRE - Lancashire**

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Adopt a more cautious approach to park and ride to ensure facilities do not encourage additional car use.

Recommended Change:

Further discussion is being advised in the first instance, to consider whether to eliminate or amend the policy.

Reason :

Further discussion is needed of whether the policy can help deliver the desired facilities. If the policy is retained, park and ride facilities will have to meet certain criteria, including that of reducing car trips on congested routes and increasing public transport patronage.

4.13**Objections:****0016/1/005/O****STORM*****Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Park and ride facilities at Mumps and Waterhead would have a somewhat different catchment area, and connect to different public transport services. They are not mutually exclusive.

Initial Responses to Objections

T1.3 The Road Network**Supporting Representations:**

0119/1/016/S Oldham Town Centre Partnership

Objections:

0036/1/001/O Peak District National Park

Summary of objection:

Add that special care is needed with the appearance of any highway schemes that could impact on the Peak National Park

Recommended Change:

Insert before last sentence in paragraph 4.16: "Special care will be needed with the appearance of any highway schemes which could have an impact upon areas of the Peak National Park."

Reason :

To draw attention to the significant impact of cross Park traffic.

4.17**Objections:**

0006/1/004/O Highways Agency

Summary of objection:

Include a statement on the role of the Highways Agency

Recommended Change:

Replace first line of para 4.17 with: "The Highways Agency is the executive agency responsible for trunk roads in England. As of July 1998, the agency's strategic aim is to contribute to sustainable development by maintaining, operating and improving the trunk road network in support of the Government's integrated transport and land use planning policies. In Oldham, it is responsible for:"

Reason :

To provide more detail on the agency's purpose.

4.18**Objections:**

Initial Responses to Objections

0175/1/008/O

West Pennine Bridleways Association

Summary of objection:

Where traffic lanes are designated for use by a combination of transport modes, including cycles, these should not exclude horse-riders

Recommended Change:

Clarify in this and/or the following policy (T1.4) that designating traffic lanes for cyclists does not exclude horse-riders from using them.

Reason :

For clarity and completeness.

Initial Responses to Objections

T1.4 The Network of Routes for Non Motorised Travel**Supporting Representations:**

0026/1/013/S	GMPTE
0543/1/014/S	Denshaw Community Association

4.19**Supporting Representations:**

0175/1/007/S	West Pennine Bridleways Association
--------------	-------------------------------------

4.21**Objections:**

0182/1/001/O	Oldham Friends of the Earth
---------------------	------------------------------------

Summary of objection:

The Walking Bus scheme for school travel should be mentioned in the Plan.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Walking bus schemes are a matter for the LTP rather than the UDP, which focuses on land use and the more direct physical implications of development. The policy does however aim to protect pedestrian routes, including routes to schools which a Walking Bus could use. The Council is promoting school travel plans through means other than the UDP, in order to provide sustainable, safe alternatives to the school run by car.

4.22**Objections:**

0015/1/001/O	Leesfield Parish Schools
---------------------	---------------------------------

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

The policy's primary aim is to protect pedestrian routes serving key destinations such as schools from other development. The objector refers to the need for pavement access to an existing school. This is a matter for the Council to consider implementing through the LTP. Other policies in this Plan, D1.1 in the Design Section and T2.1, cover the objector's concern in relation to new development.

4.26**Objections:****0182/1/002/O****Oldham Friends of the Earth*****Summary of objection:***

The Plan should do more to encourage cycling, including signposting of cycleways and improving surfaces

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The policy aims to protect cycle routes from other development. However, improving and completing cycle routes can be supported by new development under policies T2.1 or T2.2. Otherwise, this is a matter for the Council to implement through the LTP.

Initial Responses to Objections

T1.5 Canal Corridors**Supporting Representations:**

0007/1/003/S	Uppermill Residents Association
0008/1/030/S	Countryside Agency
0422/1/002/S	British Waterways
0543/1/015/S	Denshaw Community Association

Objections:

0007/1/004/O Uppermill Residents Association

Summary of objection:

The matter of cyclists on canal towpaths is not addressed.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Canal towpaths are mentioned under policy T1.4 paras 4.23 and 4.24. It is not clear what the objector's concern is, but it may be about conflict between different users of canal towpaths. If so, the matter would be outside the remit of the UDP.

0038/1/001/O Greater Manchester Ecology Unit

Summary of objection:

Include: the canals' importance for nature conservation; consultation with English Nature (and the GM Ecology Unit); cross-references to relevant Open Environment policies.

Recommended Change:

Add at the end of para 4.27: "The Council will also consult with English Nature and the GM Ecology Unit to ensure the nature conservation interests of the canals are protected, as explained in the Open Environment section."

Reason :

To clarify that the nature conservation interests of the canals must also be considered, in consultation with the relevant agencies. However, the approach in the Plan is to minimise cross-references to other policies.

0117/1/005/O North West Tourist Board

Agent : Paul Butler Associates

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

The policy is limited to the transport aspects of canals. The Plan recognises their tourism potential under policy B1.4 in the Business & Industry section and their nature conservation value under OE2.3 and OE2.4 in the Open Environment section. A number of Primary Employment Zones and a mixed use site are also allocated on the canals which allow tourism uses.

0149/1/001/O

English Nature

Summary of objection:

Mention English Nature as they are also involved in canal restoration work.

Recommended Change:

Add at the end of para 4.27: "The Council will also consult with English Nature and the GM Ecology Unit to ensure the nature conservation interests of the canals are protected, as explained in the Open Environment section."

Reason :

To clarify that the nature conservation interests of the canals are also considered, in consultation with the relevant agencies.

0149/1/002/O

English Nature

Summary of objection:

Include cross-reference to habitat protection policy (OE2.3) as Rochdale Canal is a designated nature conservation site.

Recommended Change:

The wording of this policy will be reconsidered, including a reference to the need for boating-related development to take account of habitat and species protection (with specific reference to the Rochdale Canal).

Reason :

The general approach taken in the Plan is to minimise cross-references to other policies. However, an exception is proposed here given the significant nature conservation value of the Rochdale Canal and the fact we are encouraging the use of canals for navigation.

0771/1/001/O

The Inland Waterways Association - NW

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The policy already makes reference to freight as well as leisure navigation. In the Business & Industry section, a number of business and industrial sites, Primary Employment Zones, and one mixed use site are allocated on the canals. These designations would allow uses related to navigation.

Initial Responses to Objections

T1.6 Disused Rail Infrastructure**Supporting Representations:**

0008/1/031/S	Countryside Agency
0037/1/005/S	Railtrack Property
0175/1/009/S	West Pennine Bridleways Association
0543/1/016/S	Denshaw Community Association

Objections:

0016/1/002/O STORM

Summary of objection:

Policy should also identify and protect former and potential sites for rail freight facilities.

Recommended Change:

No change at present. Further investigation advised.

Reason :

Rail freight facilities are strategic regional developments and none has been identified in draft RPG within the Borough. However, there are industrial sites which could theoretically be connected to rail, east of Greengate and west of Broadgate in Chadderton. Whether connections are feasible would require further investigation.

0040/1/002/O Saddleworth Parish Council

Agent : Eagland Planning Associates

Summary of objection:

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 .

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The policy does protect disused railways, which have been identified in relevant transport studies and strategies, for re-use for transport. For example, the GMPTE has a feasibility study underway of disused railways' potential for reuse for public transport, whose results will be taken into account. Certain lines are already being protected as recreational routes.

0112/1/002/O Mr G Bayley

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

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.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

Government guidance requires that disused lines only be protected where there is a reasonable prospect of re-use. This is why the policy refers to relevant transport studies and strategies in order to justify protection. Inevitably, timetables for completion of such studies and strategies will not always fit with the UDP review. Re-use of disused lines in Oldham for rail transport is very unlikely in light of conversion of the Loop line to Metrolink, the rail refranchising process underway and the Government's curtailment of funding for new rail infrastructure in their 10 year plan.

0112/1/004/O

Mr G Bayley

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

No change at present. Further investigation advised for section of disused line in Grasscroft.

Reason :

The sections of disused railway from Mumps to Grotton (RR7) and from the north end of Uppermill to Delph (RR11) are protected as recreational routes. A section in Grasscroft is protected as Local Green Gap (LGG20) and therefore not as a transport route. Government guidance requires that disused lines only be protected where there is a reasonable prospect of re-use. This is why the policy refers to relevant transport studies and strategies to justify protection. It may be advisable to protect the remaining unprotected section of line in Grasscroft for the time being. However, re-use of the line for rail is very unlikely in light of the the Government's limited investment in new rail infrastructure and services.

4.31**Objections:**

0016/1/001/O

STORM

Summary of objection:

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.

Initial Responses to Objections

Recommended Change:

Amend para 4.31.

Reason :

To more accurately represent status of Oldham Loop line in reasoned justification. However, policy remains unchanged.

0026/1/001/O

GMPTE

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Amend para 4.31

Reason :

To more accurately represent the status of the Oldham Loop line.

0112/1/003/O

Mr G Bayley

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Amend para 4.31

Reason :

To more accurately represent the status of the Oldham Loop line. However, re-use of the line for rail is unlikely in light of the line's conversion to Metrolink, the rail refranchising process underway and the Government's curtailment of funding for new rail infrastructure in their 10 year plan.

Initial Responses to Objections

T2 Transport & Developments**Supporting Representations:**

0026/1/014/S	GMPTE
0543/1/017/S	Denshaw Community Association
0740/1/016/S	North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0006/1/005/O Highways Agency

Summary of objection:

Include a reference to protecting the safe and efficient operation of trunk roads.

Recommended Change:

Include the reference proposed by the objector in a reasoned justification.

Reason :

To clarify that a development proposal's impact on the operation of the road network, including trunk roads, will be considered.

0138/1/001/O Lawrence Watson

Summary of objection:

In assessing developments that generate HGV traffic, the impact of noise and air pollution on residential amenity should be given more consideration

Recommended Change:

No change to this policy, although advise consideration of other relevant policies in Plan.

Reason :

To consider whether the objector's concern is addressed by relevant policies in the Transport and Natural Resources section.

0815/1/002/O Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL

Agent : Cordingleys

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Initial Responses to Objections

Amend policy.

Reason :

For the sake of clarity and consistency between part 1 and part 2 policies.

Initial Responses to Objections

T2.1 Access to New Developments**Supporting Representations:**

0026/1/015/S GMPTE
 0740/1/017/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0045/1/008/O Wiggett Construction Ltd

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Requiring pedestrian access to canal towpaths from sites adjacent to canals is excessive

Recommended Change:

Retain criterion d. but amend it, by explaining under what circumstances access would be required.

Reason :

For clarity

0110/1/002/O Paul Speak Properties Ltd

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

Requiring pedestrian access to the canal towpath from sites adjacent to canals is excessive

Recommended Change:

Retain policy but amend it to explain under what circumstances access will be required.

Reason :

For clarity

4.32&4.35**Supporting Representations:**

0016/1/006/S STORM

4.33**Supporting Representations:**

0008/1/010/S Countryside Agency

Initial Responses to Objections

4.34**Objections:****0006/1/006/O****Highways Agency***Summary of objection:*

Add that the Highways Agency will carry out improvements to trunk roads under a S. 278 if they so desire.

Recommended Change:

Amend paragraph as proposed.

Reason :

To clarify the role and powers of the Highways Agency .

4.38**Objections:****0263/1/017/O****CPRE - Lancashire***Summary of objection:*

Make a 'home zone' approach in proposals for housing developments a requirement unless the developer can demonstrate why it would be inappropriate.

Recommended Change:

No change at present. Further consideration required.

Reason :

Further consideration needed of whether to cover the issue in more detail in the UDP or through other means, e.g. SPG. However, it is unlikely that all housing developments would be suitable for a home zone approach.

Initial Responses to Objections

T2.2 Developments with Significant Transport Implications**Supporting Representations:**

0026/1/016/S GMPTE
 0740/1/018/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:

0021/1/013/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

Define major developments below the policy (in a reasoned justification)

Recommended Change:

Amend para 4.42 to incorporate the definition of major developments.

Reason :

For clarity.

4.43**Objections:**

0006/1/007/O Highways Agency

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Amend policy and reasoned justification, and discuss with objector:

- In criterion a. ii), replace "accessing trunk roads" with "which have a material impact upon the operation of trunk roads"
- Replace sentence in para 4.43 with " Developments that have a material impact upon the operation of trunk roads may include developments other than those directly accessing trunk roads and smaller developments that may have a significant cumulative impact. The Highways Agency will be consulted to determine whether a transport assessment is required."

Reason :

To clarify which development proposals may be reviewed by the Highways Agency and trigger the need for a transport assessment and travel plan.

Initial Responses to Objections

Initial Responses to Objections

T2.2 a. i)

Objections:**0180/1/003/O Siemens Real Estate Ltd**

Agent : Colliers Conrad Ritblat Erdman

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

No change in response to objection, but amend reasoned justification to clarify how the policy will be applied.

Reason :

The aim of the policy is to consider the impact of traffic generated by new development, including cumulative impact. Redevelopments should therefore be considered in terms of the total area proposed in order to determine whether they trigger the requirements of the policy.

Initial Responses to Objections

T2.3 Developer Contributions for Sustainable Transport**Supporting Representations:**

0026/1/017/S GMPTE

Objections:**0045/1/009/O Wiggett Construction Ltd**

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

The policy should be reworded to more closely reflect Circular 1/97, particularly that regarding necessity.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

GONW did not object to this policy and new Government policy on developer contributions is awaited. The Council intends to produce supplementary planning guidance on transport (with regard to transport assessments, travel plans and developer contributions) pending further Government guidance on these matters, which should address the objector's concerns.

0110/1/003/O Paul Speak Properties Ltd

Agent : Michael Courcier & Ptrs Ltd

Summary of objection:

The policy should be reworded to more closely reflect Circular 1/97, particularly that regarding necessity.

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

GONW did not object to this policy and new Government policy on developer contributions is awaited. The Council intends to produce supplementary planning guidance on transport (with regard to transport assessments, travel plans and developer contributions) pending further Government guidance on these matters, which should address the objector's concerns.

0180/1/004/O Siemens Real Estate Ltd

Agent : Colliers Conrad Ritblat Erdman

Initial Responses to Objections***Summary of objection:***

Policy should more closely follow the advice in Circular 1/97

Recommended Change:

None at present.

Reason :

GONW did not object to this policy and new Government policy on developer contributions is awaited. The Council intends to produce supplementary planning guidance on transport (with regard to transport assessments, travel plans and developer contributions) pending further Government guidance on these matters, which should address the objector's concerns.

0815/1/003/O

Mrs E. Bissill's Fund, Trustees/SDL

Agent : Cordingleys

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

It is proposed to include the definition of major developments in a new part 1 policy on Accessibility in the Transport section .

Reason :

For clarity

Initial Responses to Objections

T2.4 Parking**Supporting Representations:**

0026/1/018/S

GMPTE

Objections:

0021/1/014/O

Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

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

Recommended Change:

Include updated parking standards in the Plan as an appendix.

Reason :

To provide clarity and give them more weight to deliver parking policies.

4.48**Objections:**

0021/1/015/O

Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

Car parking standards will have to reflect PPG3 para 62 as well as PPG13.

Recommended Change:

Insert at end of first sentence of para 4.48 "and the approach to residential parking in PPG3".

Reason :

To redress the omission of other relevant national policy.

Initial Responses to Objections

TC1 The Role of the Town Centre

Supporting Representations:

0119/1/001/S Oldham Town Centre Partnership
 0740/1/029/S North West Regional Assembly

Objections:**0117/1/001/O North West Tourist Board**

Agent : Paul Butler Associates

Summary of objection:

There is no specific mention of tourism within the Policy.
 Believe the sites identified need to include tourism as an acceptable use.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

Tourism is not a use of land as such. Many other uses contribute to tourism. Additionally the Town Centre is arguably not the main focus of tourism in the town.

The reasoned justification of Policy TC 1.1 already acknowledges that secondary uses other than retail may be acceptable as part of a mixed use scheme for this site.
 Policies TC 1.2 and 1.3 already refer to a range of uses which would contribute to tourism.

0119/1/002/O Oldham Town Centre Partnership*Summary of objection:*

Would also like to see the old Co op site allocated [currently: Mecca Bingo, King Street]

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

The existing policy framework would permit the reuse or redevelopment of this site for a range of uses.

0119/1/013/O Oldham Town Centre Partnership*Summary of objection:*

The policy should designate TC1.1 Clegg Street and TC1.3 Union Street South as the priority sites for development in the Town Centre

Initial Responses to Objections***Recommended Change:***

No change.

Reason :

The Council sees no merit in seeking to prioritise one or more of the three sites specifically allocated for development in the Town Centre as all are important and the uses provided for in each instance should ensure new developments that complement each other and strengthen the attraction of the Town Centre in overall terms.

0795/1/001/O Watermill Estates Limited

Agent : GL Hearn Planning

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

Amend policy to read "The Council will seek to sustain and enhance the Town Centre's role as a sub-regional shopping centre. It will be the main focus of shopping, business, cultural,....."

Reason :

It is intended that the Town Centre, and specifically the Central Shopping Core, should be the main focus for shopping activity in the Borough.

8.13**Supporting Representations:**

0119/1/019/S Oldham Town Centre Partnership

The Mumps, Oldham**Objections:**
0795/1/002/O Watermill Estates Limited

Agent : GL Hearn Planning

Summary of objection:

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 to regeneration of east end of town centre. Accessible by public transport.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Initial Responses to Objections***Reason :***

The policy framework as currently proposed would permit redevelopment of this site for a range of uses including A2 and A3 use, and A1 use subject to compliance with the relevant shopping policies.

Initial Responses to Objections

TC1.2 Union Street Site

Supporting Representations:

0119/1/003/S

Oldham Town Centre Partnership

Initial Responses to Objections

TC1.4 Town Centre Car Parking

Objections:

0119/1/005/O

Oldham Town Centre Partnership

Summary of objection:

Lack of car parking facilities on South Union Street site, taking in the Business Centre, Cultural Quarter and future developments.

Recommended Change:

No change.

Reason :

Policy TC1.5 permits new short stay, shared use car parks within this area of the Town Centre. Planning permission has been granted (November, 2002) for a new foodstore in the South Union Street area incorporating a 590 space short-stay car park that will permit a significant degree of shared use.

Initial Responses to Objections

TC1.5 Additional Car Parking

Objections:**0021/1/007/O****Government Office for the North West***Summary of objection:*

Change wording to reflect that the Council may "seek" rather than "require" a Section 106 obligation

Recommended Change:

Amend the penultimate sentence of the policy to read "Where the pedestrian links referred to in (c) above are considered to be inadequate, the Council may seek a Section 106 obligation with the developer to fund their improvement to a satisfactory standard."

Reason :

To reflect the fact that Section 106 planning obligations should be secured by agreement rather than imposed.

0119/1/004/O**Oldham Town Centre Partnership***Summary of objection:*

General support for issues relating to car parking, but pricing policies need to be addressed.

Recommended Change:

Amend criterion a. of the policy to delete the reference to charging and otherwise amend the wording as follows: "in the case of stand alone car parks and those serving retail, cultural or leisure uses, that the car park is primarily intended to accommodate short-stay use and that it will be reasonably available for use by all sectors of the general public at all times"

Amend paragraph 8.27 of the reasoned justification to read as follows ".....by ensuring that major car parks serve the centre as a whole and can be used by both shoppers and others who require short stay parking. The Council will endeavour to secure such use by the imposition of suitable planning conditions or Section 106 planning obligations as appropriate."

Reason :

Policy TC 1.5 (criteria a.) in the draft plan requires new car parking permitted under the provisions of this policy to be restricted to short stay and priced in line with charges for equivalent Council run car parks at the time in question.

However, on reconsideration, the Council is of the opinion that, as indicated in PPG 6 and PPG 13, the relevant planning objectives in this regard are to ensure (i) an adequate supply of parking for shopping and leisure trips that will reinforce the attractiveness and competitiveness of the town centre; (ii) that the level of any new car parking provision does not exceed maximum standards, and (iii) that it is predominantly used for short-stay

Initial Responses to Objections

Initial Responses to Objections

TC1.6 Pedestrian Permeability/Public Space**Supporting Representations:**

0119/1/006/S Oldham Town Centre Partnership

Objections:

0021/1/008/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

Policy does not appear to fully comply with Circular 1/97

Recommended Change:

- (i) Amend the wording of the first paragraph of the policy to read: "All redevelopment proposals involving a site area in excess of 0.1 hectares within Oldham Town Centre shall be designed to make a positive contribution to maintaining and, where possible, increasing pedestrian permeability and to enhancing the extent and quality of the public realm. To this end new developments will, where reasonably practicable and desirable, be required to both maintain and enhance existing provision and/or incorporate provision for new public spaces and/or routes as an integral part of the proposals";
- (ii) Delete the second and third paragraphs of the policy.

Delete the word major from the start of the first sentence of paragraph 8.30

Add to paragraph 8.31 of the reasoned justification: "The proposed space must be appropriate to its context, safe, secure, attractive and accessible to the general public at large. As Oldham Town Centre occupies an elevated and exposed position, it may be appropriate to consider the provision of shelter. Wherever possible and appropriate, the inclusion of trees, planting and green areas should be a design priority.

Delete paragraphs 8.32, 8.33 and 8.34 of the reasoned justification.

Add an additional paragraph to the reasoned justification as follows "Where appropriate and where consistent with the tests in Circular 1/97 (Planning Obligations), the Council will seek to facilitate delivery of any public realm provision or enhancements through the medium of a Section 106 planning obligation."

Reason :

This policy reflects the Council's belief that it is important that all substantive town centre developments should make an appropriate contribution to the enhancement of the quality and extent of the public realm, either within and/or adjoining the site in question, in the interests of enhancing the permeability and attractiveness of the Town Centre as a whole. In broad terms the policy is considered to be consistent with current Government exhortations to enhance the standard of urban design for new developments (notably but not exclusively in PPG 1 and the associated companion guide By Design) and to enhance the attractiveness of Town Centres as advocated in PPG 6.

Initial Responses to Objections

requirement may not in all cases be reasonable and/or necessary (as opposed to desirable).

A less inflexible policy is therefore proposed that it is felt will be more workable in practice and thus more robust in the long term. It is however suggested that as a consequence the definition of a qualifying development be amended to include smaller sites (i.e. greater than 0.1 hectares) where, in particular, important issues of permeability may still well arise.

Initial Responses to Objections

TC1.8 Residential Development within the Town Centre

Supporting Representations:

0119/1/007/S

Oldham Town Centre Partnership

Initial Responses to Objections

Waste Management

Supporting Representations:

0008/1/024/S Countryside Agency

Initial Responses to Objections

W1 Waste

Supporting Representations:

0007/1/012/S	Uppermill Residents Association
0113/1/008/S	Roland Bardsley Homes Ltd
0543/1/007/S	Denshaw Community Association
0746/1/004/S	Greater Manchester Geological Unit

Objections:

0021/1/038/O Government Office for the North West

Summary of objection:

The first sentence does not read clearly.

Recommended Change:

Insert the following to precede "Development are carried out" :

"The Council is committed to ensuring that all forms of".

Reason :

The intended initial wording has inadvertently been omitted in the First Deposit Draft.

Initial Responses to Objections

W1.1 Waste Management Options

Supporting Representations:

0746/1/005/S

Greater Manchester Geological Unit

Initial Responses to Objections

W1.2 Provision of Sites for Waste Management Facilities**High Moor Landfill, Scouthead****Objections:****0007/1/030/O****Uppermill Residents Association***Summary of objection:*

Queries the inference that the landfill site at High Moor Quarry which is not used for the disposal of waste for Oldham reads as though it is.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

There is no suggestion in the existing wording of Policy W1.2 that the High Moor landfill facility takes waste either exclusively or partly from any specific local authority area.

High Moor Quarry, Scouthead**Objections:****0602/1/002/O****Aggregate Industries UK Ltd***Summary of objection:*

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Minded to retain existing wording. Aggregate Industries appear to want High Moor quarry highlighted as a prospective future mineral working/waste disposal site (i.e. beyond the scope of the existing planning consent). It would be unwise to pre-judge the merits of such a proposal as opposed to alternative sites, particularly when the Plan makes no other site-specific allocations (apart from Arkwright Street).

Initial Responses to Objections

W1.3 Criteria for Assessing Proposals for Waste Manage**Supporting Representations:**

0149/1/010/S English Nature

Objections:**0038/1/027/O Greater Manchester Ecology Unit****Summary of objection:**

Broad support, but should be a reference to not harming species protected by law or their habitats.

Recommended Change:

Amend wording of Policy W1.3 (e) to read as follows:

- i) areas of recreational use or potential;
- ii) local countryside character, as defined in other policies of this Plan;
- iii) woodlands;
- iv) designated wildlife sites;
- v) species protected by law and their habitats;
- vi) areas covered by Tree Preservation Orders;
- vii) other land and features of historical, archaeological or geological interest, or
- viii) other sites which make a significant contribution to the Borough's biodiversity;

Reason :

Protected species are found not only on designated wildlife sites (SPAs, SACs, SSSIs, SBIs, Local Nature Reserves), as the GMEU have pointed out. The addition to the list set out in NR4.3 (e) of "Species protected by law and their habitats" will rectify an omission.

0040/1/004/O Saddleworth Parish Council

Agent : Eagland Planning Associates

Summary of objection:

The Parish Council would like to see tourism assets added to the list of matters worthy of protection under e).

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Minded to retain existing wording. The elements of both the rural landscape and the built environment which attract tourists are encompassed in the features listed in W1.3 (e) - and in (d) also. What would a "tourist asset" be defined as if not already included in these two sub-paragraphs? It would be preferable to restrict the list to the clearly defined features listed rather than introduce this rather more nebulous concept.

Initial Responses to Objections

0521/1/001/O

Derbyshire County Council

Summary of objection:

Consider that the need to demonstrate a clear shortfall in waste treatment or disposal capacity in the first paragraph of this Policy is inappropriate.

Recommended Change:

Seek further clarification (negotiation?) with Derbyshire CC, but at this stage minded to retain existing wording.

Reason :

Given the capital investment in constructing/commissioning a waste treatment plant, there is little prospect of there emerging a "variety of waste management and treatment options" - developers are unlikely to seek to establish competing treatment plants with no guarantee of an adequate throughput of waste to run the plant economically.

OMBC's preferred approach is to avoid making site-specific allocations (for unknown numbers/scale of facilities) until a Waste Management Strategy for Greater Manchester emerges from the work of the North-West Regional Technical Advisory Body (RTAB) (and is incorporated into revised Regional Planning Guidance?)

Unimplemented planning consents for waste treatment facilities would have a significantly blighting effect on the areas within which they are located - these may be industrial areas but even so, affected occupiers may suffer.

It is highly unlikely that waste will find its way for processing in Derbyshire, given the options available within Greater Manchester, and the future provision of additional capacity as a consequence of the finalising of the Waste Management Strategy.

Derbyshire CC's suggested alternative wording is confusing - what waste do they mean which would be "treated at a lower level in the hierarchy than at present"? In any event, the BPEO for some waste streams may be landfill or incineration - options low down in the hierarchy.

NB: Unlike the objection from Derbyshire CC in relation to the inclusion of need considerations in the equivalent Minerals policy, in this instance there is no parallel objection from GONW. This is a significant omission.

Initial Responses to Objections

W1.4 Provision of Civic Amenity & Other 'Bring' Recycling Sites**Objections:****0543/1/008/O Denshaw Community Association***Summary of objection:*

Supports general theme of policy but wishes to see policy reference to doorstep recycling. More needs to be done to educate people & make it easier for people to participate.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Increasing the scope of doorstep recycling, whilst potentially offering benefits in terms of source separation of different household waste streams, is not a land use-based policy and is not, therefore, appropriately included within the UDP.

14.19**Objections:****0040/1/005/O Saddleworth Parish Council**

Agent : Eagland Planning Associates

Summary of objection:

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.

Recommended Change:

None.

Reason :

Saddleworth Parish Council have been asked to clarify the thrust of their objection, which at first appeared to be based on a misunderstanding, i.e. that Policy W1.4 was seeking to establish a further landfill facility within Saddleworth, rather than addressing the issue solely of the provision of Civic Amenity facilities. It now transpires that the concern is that Civic Amenity sites could develop into large-scale landfill operations. This is not a realistic scenario, as C.A. sites tend to be located within built-up areas, to maximise accessibility, and are fairly restricted in size. The former C.A. site at High Moor was an exception, but nevertheless, it did not 'grow' into a landfill site - the proposal to develop such a facility in tandem with an extended area of mineral working was a separate proposal from the already-established C.A. site - the two sites simply happened to be physically adjacent.

Initial Responses to Objections

Initial Responses to Objections