

# **SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF THE OLDHAM UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

## **APPRAISAL OF THE REVISED DEPOSIT CHANGES TO THE DRAFT PLAN**

OCTOBER 2003

The Council would like to thank those people who have assisted at both stages in the sustainability appraisal of the draft replacement Unitary Development Plan.

## INTRODUCTION

In August 2001, the Council published a report of the sustainability appraisal of the first deposit draft replacement Unitary Development Plan. The appraisal was undertaken in order to ensure that:

- the first deposit draft replacement Unitary Development Plan would contribute positively to sustainability objectives, as far as possible;
- any internal conflicts or inconsistencies would be exposed and discussed; and
- essential links to other strategies and policy documents would be identified, thereby supporting a more “joined up” approach to sustainability that extended beyond the land use plan.

Undertaking the appraisal reflects Oldham MBC’s commitment to sustainability, as expressed in the Corporate Plan (and now also the Community Strategy), and as demonstrated through its support of the Oldham Agenda 21 process. Whilst it is not a legal requirement, the Government encourages local planning authorities to undertake sustainability appraisal of their development plans.

The Unitary Development Plan (UDP) review is an ongoing process and at each stage a check needs to be made that the individual policies and proposals, and the plan as a whole, are working towards sustainability objectives and are internally consistent.

The UDP review has now reached the revised deposit stage. This means that objections submitted during the first deposit stage have been considered by the Council, and changes made to the draft plan where appropriate. At the revised deposit stage, those changes are placed “on deposit” for public comment in the form of formal objection or support.

This report explains the sustainability appraisal process applied to those changes.

## THE APPRAISAL TEAM - WHO TOOK PART

The sustainability appraisal of the first deposit draft replacement UDP was carried out by a diverse panel of people from a range of organisations. The appraisal of the *changes* proposed to the first deposit draft built on this collaborative approach, which was felt to have a range of positive benefits both for the plan, and in terms of building the depth of understanding of those involved.

The starting point for membership of the sustainability appraisal sounding board and working group was the original membership, updated to reflect changes within the Council and changes in personnel at other organisations. Those invited to take part were:

Oldham MBC Councillors:

Councillor Shoab Akhtar.  
Councillor Veronica Clayton.  
Councillor Jeremy Sutcliffe.  
Councillor Howard Sykes.

External Members:

Julia Kirkman, Oldham Chamber.  
Tony Hams, independent "critical friend".  
Tania Lewis, Rochdale and Oldham Groundwork.  
Gemma Lee, Rochdale and Oldham Groundwork.  
Bill Edwards, Oldham Environment Forum.  
Stuart Donaldson, Government Office for the North West.  
Gary Morris, Environment Agency.

Oldham MBC Officers:

Simon Robinson, Environmental Policy, Chief Executive's.  
Adele Hayes, Development Control, Environmental Services.  
Sarah Barker, Strategic Planning & Information, Chief Executive's.  
Policy authors as appropriate:  
Len Harris (housing, community facilities), Strategic Planning & Information.  
Carol Toffaleti (business, transport), Strategic Planning & Information.  
Paul McGrath (retail), Strategic Planning & Information.  
Lorna Goulding (open space), Strategic Planning & Information.  
Pauline Goodhall (natural resources, open environment), Strategic Planning & Information.  
Phil Sweet (design, conservation, Oldham Town Centre), Development Control.  
Peter Taylor (minerals and waste), Development Control.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The methodology was determined largely by the original approach, which developed out of a view of sustainability appraisal as a process carried out independently of the people preparing the plan, and led by clear sustainability objectives. This stage would inevitably be more limited than the first stage, because of its narrower focus on changes to the plan, rather than the whole strategy and all the detailed policies.

This is consistent with the key characteristic of the approach, whereby the appraisal process operates in parallel with policy development or, in this case, policy amendment. The appraisal process is iterative and influences policy thinking as it develops.

In the first phase there were two groups (the Sounding Board and the Working Group), but for this stage they were combined into one, for what was planned

as a short series of meetings chaired by the Senior Sustainability Officer, Simon Robinson.

## **STEPS IN THE PROCESS**

Five meetings of the Sustainability Group were held, each taking between three and four hours. It proved impossible to get the whole Group together, and, therefore, a separate meeting was held with the Council's "critical friend", Tony Hams. The timing of this meeting, following on from the group discussions, allowed any outstanding issues to be aired.

| Date                           | Matters covered   |
|--------------------------------|---|
| 13 <sup>th</sup> February 2003 | Introductory meeting and appraisal of preferred options set out in report to Executive, 17 <sup>th</sup> February 2003.                   |
| 6 <sup>th</sup> March 2003     | Appraisal of policies for business, retail, and town centre.  |
| 10 <sup>th</sup> April         | Appraisal of policies for retail, design and housing.   |
| 14 <sup>th</sup> April         | Appraisal of policies for open environment, natural resources, open space, and general strategy.  |
| 24 <sup>th</sup> April         | Appraisal of policies for community facilities, conservation, recreation, transport.  |
| 7 <sup>th</sup> May 2003       | Meeting with Tony Hams – the agenda covered renewable energy, environmental design, and health. The Planning reforms were also discussed. |

## **KEY FINDINGS FROM THE APPRAISAL**

### **Changes to the Sustainability Objectives**

The starting point for this second phase of appraisal was to revisit the sustainability objectives that the original groups had chosen as having relevance both for a development plan and for Oldham. Additions and

alterations to the objectives, which are fundamentally what the draft plan is assessed against, were made as follows:

#### LIVE

- An objective was added “To improve social connections between people” to reflect the commitment in Oldham to improving community cohesion, and ensure that any role that the UDP may have in supporting cohesion would be considered. Work is still underway to identify suitable indicators and targets for this objective.
- Under an existing objective about improving health and healthy life expectancy, the Group added an indicator relating to health inequalities, again to link to community cohesion issues. Work is still underway to check whether this type of indicator is already being used, so that the UDP can link into other policies on health inequalities.
- Emergency planning and risk was raised, but this was considered to be a non-UDP matter.

#### PROTECT

- Under “protect”, the reference to protecting and improving “river quality” was changed to “water quality” to bring into consideration a much wider range of water bodies, including the canals and ponds.

#### GROW

- The Group considered there to be a gap in objectives relating to promoting enterprise. Therefore, an objective was added “To create a supportive climate for business”. This was stimulated by the desire to see a revised UDP which supports “home grown” businesses as well as providing a land use framework for inward investment. Again, as a new addition, indicators and targets need to be devised for this objective.

#### SAVE

- No changes were proposed to the objectives in this category.

### **Appraisal of options for key sites (Executive Report of 17<sup>th</sup> February)**

The second task for the Group was to appraise a draft report that set out an initial response to the objections made to the first deposit draft of the plan, and explored options on certain controversial sites. The timing of the discussion allowed the Group’s comments to be fed into the meeting of the Council’s Executive, at which the report was due to be considered.

#### Options for safeguarded land

The report set out four options for the future treatment of land at Cowlshaw, which was identified in the first deposit draft of the Unitary Development Plan as Land Reserved for Future Development. The Group supported the recommendation in the report that the site should be re-designated as Local Green Gap. Positive impacts of this change in designation were considered

to be: protection of an open space close to where people live, with related positive impacts on health, positive impacts on the “protect” objectives, such as protecting valued habitats, (indeed, under water quality, the change protects the source of the River Irk), and helping to keep the focus of development on re-using brownfield land. One potential negative impact was identified: *if* the future use of the land or any part of it may have been housing, then the change to a protective designation meant that fewer good quality affordable homes may become available in future. However, it was pointed out that the precise future use of the site had not been a matter for this plan. Overall, the Group considered that the change would have a positive impact on local quality of life

#### Options for Mixed Use allocations

The report set out four different approaches to the allocation of two sites in Saddleworth which are currently Primary Employment Zone, but which the first deposit draft of the UDP allocated as mixed use sites – Lumb Mill, Delph, and Frenches Wharf, Greenfield. Again, the Group supported the recommendation in the report to retain the mixed use allocations, but specify more clearly the mix and balance of uses to be permitted. It was considered that improved clarity may be the way to ensure that development is delivered, and that this could impact positively on poverty by offering employment opportunities during construction and in the employment elements of the end uses. However, here the Group identified a need for a link with local recruitment policies to ensure that the benefit of local jobs goes to local people.

Impacts around the need to travel were less clear. However, in principle, a mix of uses including housing on each site should at the minimum provide an opportunity to work near home, thereby reducing the need to travel. In terms of impacts on water quality, the way in which the site at Greenfield is redeveloped will be critical to protecting the water quality of both the River Tame and the Huddersfield Canal. This is another area of linkage, this time with national policy on the reclamation of contaminated land, and it also illustrates the importance of avoiding considering draft UDP policies in isolation – the UDP policy on contaminated land will ensure that these matters are taken into account. Negative impacts were identified on local distinctiveness and re-using the built heritage through the likely loss of the existing stone mill building at Frenches Wharf/Wellington Mill. However, the Group accepted that, in the absence of listing or Conservation Area designation, the mill could be demolished without permission under the existing land designation.

*Link to local recruitment policies – Oldham Chamber, Business Link, Colleges.*

#### **Changes to the draft policies.**

Substantive proposed changes to the first deposit draft UDP policies were appraised by the Group, section by section. The main points to emerge from

those discussions are outlined below. With the focus on changes to the draft policies, many of the objectives may have registered neutral impacts.

## Section 2 General Strategy for Development

There was a discussion around the rewording of GS2 (moved to OE1) on the protection of agricultural land. The revised clause A should be clearly explained in the Plan, and officers were alerted to a forthcoming Government Food and Farming Strategy, to which Plan policies may need to link. The section's objectives were considered to need expansion, but in fact they have been deleted in the revised deposit version of the Plan and superseded by the revised Introduction and the new "Planning Strategy" Section. Concerns were expressed about the definition of derelict land and the importance of recognising the biological or historic interest, or recreational use, in making decisions about its future use. Finally, the Group was keen to see references to health and health impact assessment retained – these were moved to the revised Introduction.

*Link – Food and Farming Strategy.*

## Section 3 Design

The main change in this Section was the "step back" from the first deposit draft UDP's requirements for environmental performance in new buildings (Policy D1.2). The change was made in response to a Government Office objection to the first deposit draft policy. The revised draft of the policy saw the emphasis changed from all-round environmental performance including water consumption, waste minimisation and using recycled materials, to simply the energy efficiency of the building in terms of its orientation and layout. This was justified in terms of being more realistic and achievable, and therefore potentially having a greater impact by concentrating on matters that planning can definitely influence. The wider environmental performance objectives may be achievable through other non-planning means, such as regeneration initiatives and procurement policy.

The first deposit draft of this policy was the result of the topic being a key recurring theme for the Sustainability Appraisal Group during the first round of UDP work, therefore its loss was significant. The Group accepted the arguments, but felt that this remains a key area in which conventional planning thinking needs to be challenged. To ensure that these important aspirations do not get overlooked, the Group suggested that the Borough needs an award scheme for sustainable new buildings, which could be publicised in sellers' packs. This could be taken on by the New Oldham Civic Trust, the Local Strategic Partnership, or the Environment Forum.

There was a discussion about the scope to influence internal built form, which at present falls mainly to the Building Regulations. Also it was requested that active solar power should have more emphasis in future. A concern about this policy and broader changes to policies in the Design Section was the use of the phrase "where reasonably practicable", which was perceived as



potentially weakening policies. A challenge was issued to “be braver” in UDP policy.

*Link – environmental building award scheme needed – Civic Trust/LSP/Environment Forum. Also need to link to Housing Market Renewal and OMBC procurement/land sales on environmental performance requirements for new buildings.*

#### Section 4 Transport

Changes to the transport section were generally considered neutral in their impacts, although the better incorporation of the Cycling Strategy supported the objective to reduce the need to travel and improve choice of modes.

#### Section 5 Business, Industry and the Local Economy

The section stimulated a discussion about another recurring theme – the aspiration to attract good quality jobs to the Borough, and how the land use plan can contribute to achieving it. The proposal to limit the allocations of key gateway sites around the Town Centre and at Hollinwood, to rule out lower intensity uses such as warehousing and distribution, was supported. Discussion of the mixed use allocation at Frenches Wharf Greenfield, which includes tourism in the mix of uses, led to the suggestion that the Council should require “Green Globe” standards for tourism developments. It also drew the comment that the draft UDP must protect the qualities that visitors come to see. The Group acknowledged the potential role of the Tourism Strategy, alongside the draft UDP, in steering and shaping tourism developments.

Changes to the policy on freight-generating developments (B1.7) attracted comment. The Group was concerned that the changes could permit development that may worsen conditions on congested roads, and suggested as an alternative reference to such developments having suitable road access. However the policy has not been further amended, as it is considered that suitability is already covered in the existing wording.

The theme of health emerged once again in a discussion about Primary Employment Zones. The Group emphasised the importance of buffers between Primary Employment Zones and housing areas for protecting residents’ health. Finally the question was raised as to how an urban regeneration company might fit into UDP policy. This could not be considered in any great depth in the absence of detailed information as to what such a company may look like and how it might operate.

*Links to training policies and provision in terms of attracting and retaining higher quality jobs, and to the Borough’s Tourism Strategy to ensure that new tourism development is done in a sustainable way.*

#### Section 6 Housing

The Group had a lengthy discussion about housing clearance, in response to uncertainty about the scale of housing clearance likely to result from Housing

Market Renewal. Key points to emerge from the discussion were the ideal of keeping communities together physically during renewal programmes, and accepting the principle of less than 100% replacement for cleared housing. The former requires a planning response in terms of identifying sites for housing locally to provide replacement housing for families in dwellings to be demolished. It also needs to be fed through to the management of the Housing Market Renewal process. Another key point on housing was the need for a policy on housing mix in every development, in order to meet sustainability objectives, particularly on social connections. This policy was added to the revised draft plan (policy H1.4).

A debate on housing densities raised the question as to what the density of a typical late 19<sup>th</sup> Century terraced street may be. A test of two sample areas found it to be, typically, between 70 and 80 dwellings per hectare. The Group concluded that a housing density of 50 per ha should be pursued in both “very good” and “good” public transport areas. In fact the density policy (H1.4) adopts figures of 50% and 40% respectively. Housing affordability was also discussed in connection with policy H2.1. It was suggested that affordability should relate to whole life costs, not just the purchase cost of a home, and that affordability could be defined in relation to the minimum wage. Finally the importance of designed in flexibility for new housing was made, with encouragement both for live/work units, and for all homes to have built in adaptability so that at some stage residents could work from home if need be. *Links to Housing Market Renewal on issues of managing physical and social aspects of housing clearance, and on the need for land for housing arising from clearance.*

#### Section 7 and 8 Retail and Leisure, and Town Centre

During the initial phase of work appraising the first deposit draft UDP, the role of local shopping facilities in sustaining communities was debated at some length, and considered to be important. This proved to be the case again, with considerable discussion of both individual local shops and the best approach to protecting small, local centres. The Group supported the approach of guiding proposed small, local needs shops to existing parades or clusters of shops, where there is one within 400m and it has premises available (Policy S2.3). The idea of imposing planning conditions on local shops, to ensure that they remain as shops serving local everyday needs, was also discussed and enjoyed support. The Group debated the idea of defining local centres within the shopping hierarchy and identifying them on proposals map, concluding that this could have positive benefits in terms of protecting them. However, when this was explored in further detail, officers concluded that it would not be possible, as local shopping facilities vary greatly in nature across the Borough. The role local centres can play as a focus for communities and a place for social connection was recognised.

#### Section 9 Community Facilities

The question raised in the discussion about changes to the community facilities policies was whether there is a need to distinguish between local

facilities and more strategic ones, because they could have different impacts on the sustainability objectives (the draft policies do not distinguish between them). For example, a facility that is good for the Borough may not necessarily be good for the local community in which it is located. Concern was expressed that the locational criteria for facilities should not be so challenging as to make it impossible for the less accessible parts of the Borough to get new facilities. The need for links to the area strategies and Community Strategy was identified as a means to discover the community's need for facilities. On the policy requiring developer contributions to new teaching spaces (CF1.5), the group supported a higher threshold than in the first deposit draft plan but queried how the cumulative impacts on schools of smaller developments could be addressed.

*Link to area strategies and Community Strategy to ascertain need for community facilities and/or level of usage of existing facilities.*

### Section 10 Open Space, Sport and Recreation

As with the community facilities, the need to link to the area strategies and Community Plan to identify what is used and valued by the community quickly became clear. Indeed, there could be overlap between built recreation facilities in the typology, and community facilities. The Group did not want blanket protection of open spaces, preferring some flexibility to allow, for example, partial development or remodelling to make facilities better and more usable, or even to remodel neighbourhoods to provide more appropriate and versatile, or better located open spaces. The Group questioned whether teenagers are catered for in the children's play standards, and considered this group to be under-provided for (indeed, this was a key finding of Oldham's Local Agenda 21 process).

*Links to the area strategies and the Council's Green Space Strategy.*

### Section 11 Open Environment

The proposed allocation of a major developed site in the Green Belt was discussed (Policy OE1.8). Positive impacts for the economy were envisaged, and also for the environment although these were less clear cut. It may be difficult to fully assess the impacts of this policy until the precise nature of the redevelopment scheme is known. There may be issues around accessibility, and concern was raised about contamination. The revised policy for Local Green Gaps was also considered (OE1.10), and concern expressed over a change introduced to distinguish the level of protection extended to the Green Gaps from that given to Green Belt. This proposed additional clause was subsequently changed to clarify the policy. In the policies for nature conservation, the Group urged the inclusion of references to sites identified for their geological or biological value (Policy OE2), and to the Greater Manchester Biodiversity Action Plan (paragraph 11.71). The plan should also mention other Local Nature Reserves planned at Strinesdale and Crompton. They have not been named, but a reference added in paragraph 11.95.

*Links again to local recruitment policies in terms of tackling poverty and reducing the need to travel.*

## Section 12 Conservation of the Historic Environment

There were no substantive changes to these policies.

## Section 13 Natural Resources and Environmental Quality

The Group was informed about changes to water legislation. The Water Framework Directive is now UK law, and river basin management plans will become statutory, although they are unlikely to be in place before 2009. Most of North Manchester will probably be within 1 river basin management plan. Clearly planning policy will need to link to the management plans. While the Group supported the policy approach of encouraging the opening up of culverts, the point was made that this would be difficult where they are privately owned. We were also asked to show the indicative flood risk areas on the Proposals Map.

Revised draft renewable energy policies were discussed at some length. At this early redrafting stage, draft policies for each renewable technology were being tested. The view was expressed that the Energy White Paper (February 2003) indicates the Government's seriousness about renewable energy. Evidence may also be found in the DTI's promotion of the renewables agenda, e.g. through the Clear Skies initiative. These indications should give us confidence in the UDP's positive approach to renewables. However, from another quarter concern was expressed that the policy for hydro electricity schemes could impact on river flow and fish movement, and the wider river corridor. It was also pointed out that such schemes would need an Environment Agency land drainage consent. This policy has subsequently been dropped, and a more general renewables policy included.

The new draft policy requiring some renewable energy generation in large new developments was strongly supported, and the threshold development size to include within the policy was debated. It was felt that the incorporation of passive solar within schemes should count as meeting the terms of the policy. It was proposed that the policy should include developments such as hospitals, colleges and other major energy users, as well as housing. The Group recognised that the great potential value of this policy would be dependent upon its successful implementation – one way to implement it may be through requesting a statement of the development's energy rating from developers.

Although not proposed for revision itself, the draft UDP's Part 1 policy on energy, NR3, also came under scrutiny. It was felt that it was confusing to combine electricity generation and energy efficiency and that the latter would be better covered separately. It was also suggested that the plan could adopt an approach based on carbon neutrality or reducing carbon dioxide emissions. In response to these suggestions, energy efficiency has been removed from NR3 and included in plan objective c, climate change picked up in new paragraph 1.14, and efficiency has become the focus of revised policy D1.2.

*Link to river basin management plans.*

## Section 14 Waste

There were no substantive changes to these policies.

### **PROCESS ISSUES ARISING FROM THIS STAGE**

From a policy author's point of view, this was once again a valuable process. It provided scrutiny for the draft changes to the UDP from a range of different viewpoints, challenged our thinking, and ensured a rigorous assessment of changes against the sustainability objectives.

However, there were some shortcomings in the approach to this phase of the appraisal:

- The length of time between the two stages of the UDP appraisal (phase 1 June 2000 to July 2001, and phase 2 February 2003 to May 2003) meant that many of the people involved in the initial round of work had moved on, taking with them the understanding gained about the development plan system and their specific background knowledge of the Oldham UDP. Thus many Group members were joining the process part way through, at a stage of very targeted appraisal (of changes only), without any background from previous involvement. It is a credit to the participants that we were able to cover all the sections over a reasonably short period, without backtracking to cover issues explored during the initial phase, and that the process was so productive and valuable.
- It proved difficult to find times to get the whole Group together, given other work commitments - this process is demanding of people's time.
- Staff changes at the Council meant that the Strategic Planning Section, responsible for preparing the draft UDP, was more heavily involved during this phase, resulting in a potentially less independent process.
- This stage of the development plan review requires a focus purely on proposed changes to the plan, but ultimately the changes could not be detached from issues about wider approach and strategy.
- There is still a great need for more baseline data to be established, and targets for many of the indicators, to facilitate future monitoring of plan impacts.
- More work is still needed to fully engage the business sector in the process.
- The Oldham approach to sustainability appraisal, as part of an iterative process of policy development, is firmly believed to deliver benefits to the resulting plan, and to those who take part. However this stage of the plan review between first and revised deposit involved ongoing negotiation with objectors, and policy revision. Work on some policies, therefore,

continued after the series of meetings had finished. The Sustainability Appraisal Group would ideally have been given an opportunity to comment upon a complete final draft of the revised UDP prior to its approval by the Council.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

Sustainability appraisal is a complex process, as the potential impacts of policies are not always clear cut. Often the impacts will depend on other factors, which may relate to other policies in the plan, or alternatively to linked or even unrelated matters. One of the advantages of the sustainability appraisal process, quite apart from the obvious weighing of different objectives in considering the plan policies, is in exposing these matters and enabling essential links to other areas of policy or activity to be identified. Many of these are beyond the influence of planning, but the links can be highlighted and action urged.

In other areas planning can respond, and one such response to the first phase of UDP appraisal was the preparation of a draft Housing Checklist, to raise awareness about what is meant by environmentally sustainable design in buildings, and encourage developers to consider improving the environmental performance of new dwellings.

Other answers lie in the joined up thinking needed between different policy areas and activities, particularly within the Council and the Local Strategic Partnership. Particularly pertinent now will be links to the Community Plan and the emerging area strategies. There will be a very direct link in subjecting the Community Strategy to the same appraisal process as the UDP, which will be significant in ensuring their full integration.

The process does not end here. There may be a further modifications stage to the UDP review, at which point changes will again need appraising. Links to other strategies once again need to be communicated to those involved and other means sought to ensure "joined up government", for example through extending sustainability appraisal to more plans and strategies.

Work must also continue on the information gathering and monitoring activities needed to support the sustainability indicators.

For more information please contact:

Ms S. Barker, Strategic Planning and Information, Tel. 0161 911 4153 or

Simon Robinson, Environmental Policy, Tel. 0161 911 3439

Oldham MBC

e-mail [ce.sarah.barker@oldham.gov.uk](mailto:ce.sarah.barker@oldham.gov.uk) / [ce.simon.robinson@oldham.gov.uk](mailto:ce.simon.robinson@oldham.gov.uk)

**Appendix 1 – The Revised Sustainability Appraisal Tables.**

| OBJECTIVE  | MENU OF INDICATORS  | COMMENTS | TARGETS   |
|--|---|----------|---|
| <p><b>Live</b></p> <p>To reduce poverty;</p> <p>To encourage communities to be actively involved in local decision making and voluntary activities;</p> <p>(Note: not thought to be a relevant objective in terms of the outcome of the UDP, but very important indeed in terms of the UDP process.)</p> | <p>a) % of children in receipt of free school meals (local SI).</p> <p>b) Level of unemployment in Oldham (%age unemployed for more than a year) (CLIP).</p> <p>c) % of people of working age who are in work (CLIP<sup>1</sup>).</p> <p>d) Number of people in receipt of working family tax credit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• number of voluntary group representatives co-opted onto council committees or sub-committees (Local SI)</li> <li>• % of electorate voting in local elections (Local SI)</li> <li>• social and community enterprises (survey) (CLIP)</li> <li>• social participation (survey) (CLIP)</li> <li>• community well being (survey) (CLIP)</li> <li>• Companies with IIP/social accreditation.</li> </ul> |          | <p>a) Was 26.7% in 1995.(free school meals).</p> <p>b) Reduce unemployment to the national average by 2005? (Regional target).</p> <p>a) and d) Reduce the dependence upon income support to the regional average by 2005 (Regional target).</p> <p>UDP to be on web page.<br/>UDP to be simple to read.</p> <p>%age increase in the number of public contributions to the next review of the UDP. Establish a baseline for community involvement mechanisms for planning, particularly “Village Mapping” type exercises</p> <p>% references to UDP policies in response to planning applications</p> |

<sup>1</sup> CLIP refers to indicators from “Local Quality of Life Counts”. SI stands for Sustainability Indicator.



|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| <p>To improve access to jobs, basic goods, services and amenities;</p>  | <p>e) Percentage of population living in walking distance (within 400m) of basic services (Local SI) - <i>Need to add access to public transport routes to the list of basic services.</i><br/> f) % of population living within walking distance (400m) of accessible, usable open space (Local SI)<br/> g) Level of unemployment (CLIP)<br/> h) New business start ups and closures (CLIP) - <i>need baseline data.</i><br/> i) Overall traffic volumes (CLIP).<br/> j) Number of allotment sites in use in Oldham (<i>new indicator added by Sounding Board</i>).<br/> k) Travel to school.<br/> l) Travel to work.</p> |  | <p><i>e) Data on this indicator will have to be re calculated because of the addition of access to public transport. Target can then be set.</i><br/> f) Open space - 79% in 1995 <i>Need 2000 data before a target can be decided.</i><br/> g) Dealt with above<br/> h) <i>Target needed for new business start ups and closures</i><br/> i) <i>dealt with elsewhere.</i></p> <p>k) and l) Establish a baseline figure for travel to school and to work for use in next review.</p> |
| <p>To improve health and healthy life expectancy;</p>   | <p>m) Number of good air quality days per year at a variety of sites (local SI and CLIP)<br/> n) % of properties judged unfit to live in (CLIP)<br/> o) Accident rates.<br/> p) <i>New indicator needed for health inequalities (added by Sustainability Appraisal Group).</i></p>   |  | <p>Targets covered elsewhere in other objectives.</p>  |
| <p>To increase the proportion of the population in good quality, affordable and resource efficient housing;</p> | <p>q) Percentage of homes in the borough with an energy rating of 5 or above (local SI).</p>   |  | <p>q) 54% of properties with a rating of 5 or above in 1995 <i>Need to know results of 2000 housing survey before setting target.</i></p>  |

|  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p>To reduce crime, disorder and fear of crime against people and property;</p> <p>To improve social connections between people.</p> | <p>r) Percentage of homes in the borough with an energy rating of 7 or above (<i>new indicator added by the Sounding Board</i>).</p> <p>s) % of homes judged unfit to live in (CLIP)</p> <p>t) Fuel poverty/affordable warmth (<i>new indicator added by the Sounding Board – no means of measurement as yet identified</i>).</p> <p>u) % Vacant housing (<i>new indicator added by Sounding Board</i>).</p> <p>v) Recorded crime per 1000 population, (Local SI and CLIP).</p> <p>w) Fear of crime (local SI and CLIP)</p> <p>x) Reported violent crimes per 1000 population (Local SI).</p> <p>y) Objective added by Sustainability Appraisal Group - indicators and targets to be developed.</p> |  | <p>s) Unfitness- 11%<br/>9.5% private sector<br/>1.5% public sector<br/>Target?<br/>Regional target - reduce to 7.1% in 2010 (current baseline 9.7%)</p> <p>t) Ensure at least 30% of new homes are affordable - regional target</p> <p>u) 3% of total housing stock vacant/ unused - national target.</p> <p>v) Recorded crime - 103 in 1998<br/>National target - reduce vehicle crime by 30% by 2005</p> <p>w) Fear of crime - 36% (burglary), 32% (theft of vehicle), 32% (theft from vehicle), 26% (mugging/street robbery).<br/>31.5% - average</p> |
|--|---|--|---|

| OBJECTIVE   | MENU OF INDICATORS  | COMMENTS | TARGETS  |
|---|---|----------|--|
| <p><b>Protect</b></p> <p>To protect and enhance endangered and valued species and habitats;</p> <p>To increase tree cover in the Borough and ensure active and sustainable management of woodland;</p> <p>To protect and improve water quality;</p> | <p>a) number of non- domestic ponds with frogs or newts (Local SI).</p> <p>b) Gains/losses to designated habitats.</p> <p>c) Net change in natural/semi- natural habitats (CLIP).</p> <p>d) Changes in population of selected characteristic species as highlighted by Biodiversity Action Plan (CLIP).</p> <p>e) Percentage/area tree cover in borough.</p> <p>f) Rivers of good or fair quality (CLIP).</p> <p>g) <i>Additional indicator needed for other water bodies to reflect Sustainability</i></p> |          | <p>a) Ponds with frogs - 176 ponds, 52% with amphibians in 1995, 183 ponds, 56% with amphibians in 1997<br/>65% ponds with amphibians by 2010.<br/>No loss of ponds.</p> <p>b) <i>No net loss of habitat / increase in habitat - need to investigate.</i></p> <p>c) Carry out 5 yearly surveys of changes in habitats.</p> <p>d) Establish baselines for BAP's for next UDP review.</p> <p>e) Current baseline 3% and current target - Increase woodland cover to 5% by 2010. Regional target - 10% by 2010 (baseline 6%).<br/>Need to investigate the current area of woodland. Whatever it is, seek to double it by 2010.</p> <p>f) 90% in 1997<br/>100% by 2010</p> |

|  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| <p>To protect, or where necessary improve local air quality.</p> | <p><i>Appraisal Group's change to the objective?</i></p> <p>h) Number of days of air pollution (CLIP).</p> |  | <p>h) No. of poor air quality days measured:-<br/> Sulphur dioxide 13 days in 1998<br/> Fine particles 9 days in 1998<br/> Targets – national air quality targets are used locally – concentrations of certain pollutants.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| OBJECTIVE   | MENU OF INDICATORS  | COMMENTS | TARGETS   |
|---|---|----------|---|
| <p><b>Grow</b></p> <p>To reclaim dereliction, accelerate regeneration and optimise the beneficial use of brownfield sites;</p> <p>To reduce the need to travel and improve choice and use of sustainable transport modes;</p> | <p>a) New homes built on previously developed land (including conversions) (CLIP)</p> <p>b) Net change in area of green field sites (any land which is not built on and is covered with some sort of vegetation).</p> <p>c) Number of passenger kilometres miles on public transport (bus, rail and Metrolink passenger km for Oldham).</p> <p>d) Volume of motorised traffic – vehicle kms on motorway, “a” and “b” roads</p> <p>e) Kms of cycle routes in the borough (<i>added by the Sounding Board</i>)</p> <p>f) Kms of continuous cycle routes in the borough (<i>added by the sounding board</i>)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How children get to school</li> <li>• Travel to work.</li> </ul> |          | <p>a) National target is 60%<br/>Regional target is now 80% from 1996-2021 (RPG March 2003).<br/>Current local performance is 70-80%<br/>Target in revised deposit UDP 80% average over the plan period.</p> <p>b) Baseline for green field areas still needed. Land use change statistics?</p> <p>c) Target? – still no information – can present vehicle km but not passenger km.</p> <p>d) Baseline in 1998:-<br/>17million vehicle kilometres - motorway<br/>449 million vehicle kilometres - A roads<br/>108 million vehicle kilometres - B roads<br/><i>No net increase in traffic by 2010 - Greater Manchester target.</i></p> |

|   |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|---|
| <p>To increase investment in and development of sustainable leisure and tourism;</p> <p>To improve the image and conserve the local historical and cultural distinctiveness of the Borough;</p> <p>To create a supportive climate for business.</p> | <p>g) % change in public and private recreational spaces (<i>added by the sounding board</i>)</p> <p>h) Use of public transport by visitors (<i>added by the Sounding Board</i>).</p> <p>i) Street cleanliness index.</p> <p>j) Public attitude survey (CLIP) – attractiveness of the Borough, why, improving or declining, buildings and landscapes to protect?</p> <p>k) Objective added by Sustainability Appraisal Group - indicators and targets to be developed.</p> |  | <p>Targets?</p> <p>g) <i>No net loss/ increase in %.</i></p> <p>h) <i>Reducing no. of car borne visitors - need to check if possible to measure</i></p> <p><i>No. of overnight stays?</i></p> <p>i) Street Cleanliness Index 70.</p> <p>j) To establish a baseline for the attitude survey.</p> |
|---|--|--|---|

| OBJECTIVE   | MENU OF INDICATORS   | COMMENTS | TARGETS   |
|---|--|----------|---|
| <p><b>Save</b></p> <p>To reduce emissions of gases which contribute to climate change;</p> <p>To reduce energy and water consumption;</p> | <p>a) Number of good air quality days at a variety of sites (local SI)</p> <p>b) Number of passenger km on public transport (bus, rail and Metrolink) for Oldham (local SI)</p> <p>c) Annual energy use per head (gas and electricity) (CLIP)</p> <p>d) Emissions of greenhouse gases by sector</p> <p>e) Vehicle fuel use (<i>added by the Sounding Board</i>).</p> <p>f) % of homes in the borough with an energy rating of 5 or above (local SI)</p> <p>g) Kwhr of power produced by CHP in the borough</p> <p>h) Companies with an environmental management system (CLIP)</p> <p>i) Domestic consumption of water.</p> |          | <p>a) Air quality - see previous section</p> <p>b) Public transport - see previous section.</p> <p>c) and d) National target - to reduce CO2 emissions by 20% by 2010 using 1990 as the baseline.</p> <p>c) and d) To obtain information about energy use from the power suppliers</p> <p>d) To establish a baseline of emissions by sector by taking a representative sample.</p> <p>e) Target needed once we have a baseline.</p> <p>f) Dealt with in other section. Regional target - to improve the energy efficiency of public and private sector housing by 30% by 2010.</p> <p>g) CHP target? <i>Starting from zero.</i></p> <p>h) <i>Need a baseline of activity - need to work with Chamber and Groundwork.</i></p> <p>i) Regional target to ensure no</p> |

|  |   |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>To increase the proportion of energy generated from sustainable and renewable sources;</p> <p>To minimise the production of waste and increase recycling and recovery rates</p> | <p>j) % consumption of renewable energy resources by sector.</p> <p>k) Kilowatt potential of renewable energy installations in the borough.</p> <p>l) Household recycling rate.</p> <p>m) % of properties with regular kerbside collection service or within 1km of a recycling site.</p> <p>n) Number of companies participating in recycling or waste minimisation schemes.</p> <p>o) Companies with an environmental management system.</p> <p>p) Tonnage of household waste collected per year.</p> |  | <p>more than a 5% growth in water consumption by 2025 (no local information available).</p> <p>j) and k) 10% of energy to come from renewable sources by 2010.<br/><i>Separate target for solar power?</i></p> <p>l) Domestic recycling rate 1999 - 4.9%<br/>Target - 25% by 2005, 30% by 2006, 33% by 2010.<br/>Target - municipal waste recovery of 35% by 2006 and 70% thereafter</p> <p>m) Baseline re. kerbside being calculated<br/>Target - 99%</p> <p>n) Establish baseline for no. of companies involved in waste recycling /reduction schemes</p> <p>p) Tonnage of household waste arisings in 1999 - 92427. Increasing by 2% per year<br/>Target - to slow increase to 1%</p> |
|--|---|--|--|



|  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p>To ensure the preservation, sensitive adaptation and re-use of the built heritage</p> | <p>q) Number of listed buildings on the English Heritage buildings at risk register.<br/>r) Public attitude survey.</p> |  | <p>per year by 2005?<br/><i>Do we want to have a landfill and a composting target?</i></p> <p>q) Regional target is to reduce the number at risk by 5 per year (demolition of the buildings does not count towards the target).<br/><i>Need to find baseline for Borough.</i><br/>r) <i>Need to find baseline of structures valued by local people.</i></p> |
|--|---|--|---|