



Rochdale Core Strategy

Report on Consultation on Preferred Options

Local Development Framework
November 2010

Report on responses on the Rochdale Core Strategy Preferred Options

Contents

| | Page |
|----------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| 2. SCHEDULE A | 3 |
| 3. SCHEDULE B | 27 |
| 4. TOWNSHIP MEETING NOTES | 281 |

1. INTRODUCTION

This report includes the representations received on the Core Strategy Preferred Options Report which was published for consultation in October 2009 . It includes the representations in full as they have been submitted against the policies/questions in the Preferred Options report.

In some cases representations have been made against a particular policy or question but which are also relevant to others. Consequently, we have attempted to move them to the most appropriate place. In a limited number of cases, representations appear in more than one place.

Against each representation, there is an officer response/action. It should be noted that the officer response was recorded as an initial response following receipt of the objections in order to identify the need or otherwise for changes. In some cases, the response refers to the need for further consideration and refinement without stating an actual change. All comments have now been considered.

The response is standardised to state if the representation is:

- Noted (may require further consideration but no specific change identified)
- Support Noted (no specific change necessary)
- Disagree (followed by a short explanation); and
- Agree (followed by a short explanation or proposed change)

It should be noted that all representations were considered based on the structure of the Preferred Options Report. In some cases the policy names and numbers have changed between the Preferred Options Report and the Publication Draft Core Strategy.

The Publication Draft Core Strategy has therefore been produced taking account of:

- Comments made on the Preferred Options Report;
- Changes to national guidance and the revocation of RSS;
- New evidence and studies; and
- The need to improve the structure and presentation of the Core Strategy.

The Report is in two parts:

Schedule A deals with the general thrust of the responses and the more contentious Options for open land release in South Heywood to meet development needs. It also covers those policies which are the subject of further significant changes.

Schedule B includes all representations made by stakeholders and the local community on the Preferred Options and a brief officer response except where it states there is a detailed response in Schedule A. The representations are grouped by policy, in chapter order as they appear in the Preferred Options document.

Appended are notes of public meetings held within the Rochdale, Middleton, Heywood and Pennines Townships to explain and discuss the Preferred Options with local residents.

2. SCHEDULE A

Chapter 2 – Spatial Portrait

Comments:

Most representations supported the Spatial Portrait as a reasonable description of the borough and its issues and challenges. Some suggested including additional points or changing emphasis and a number of changes have been made. Some felt the portrait was too long and detailed whilst others felt it should be shorter and more focuses on the key facts and issues.

Officers' Response:

This has been shortened and made more positive and focussed and more clearly linked to the Objectives.

Chapter 3 – Our Spatial Vision for the Borough

Comments:

There is strong support for the Vision. It is ambitious and takes into account comments made at Issues and Options stage. It is also more spatial.

Officers' Response:

Support is welcomed. Further review is necessary to ensure that it is consistent with the emerging vision in the Sustainable Community Strategy (Pride of Place 3). Whilst POP 3 is not yet finalised, the Vision in the Publication Core Strategy is consistent.

Chapter 4 - Strategic Objectives

Comments:

Most respondents supported the Strategic Objectives. There was a difference of opinion as to whether they are too detailed or not detailed enough. Some objectives required further justification.

Officers' Response:

General support for the Objectives is welcomed. The Objectives have been made shorter and more succinct to present a clear picture of the Council's direction. We disagree that further justification is required as the Objectives should clearly reflect the Spatial Portrait challenges. The revised objectives should also relate to the policy topics in the main policy chapters.

Chapter 5 - Spatial Strategy

Comments:

In general, representations and comments made at the public meetings supported the broad thrust of the Spatial Strategy. Most respondents understood and agreed with the Council's different approach in the northern and southern parts of the Borough. However, some representations sought clarification of north/south approach and particularly how the role of the Townships fit into that.

Officers' Response:

Consequently, some changes are proposed to improve clarity and presentation. These are:

- Policy SP2 'The Spatial strategy for the borough' – this has been changed to clarify the difference in approach in the north and south of the borough
- Policy SP3 (the south) and Policy SP4 (the north) have been deleted and replaced with Policy SP3 Strategy for each townships (with an indication of what's in the north and south)
- Policy SP5 The sequential approach to development -has been deleted because it duplicated government guidance and may confuse policy approaches for housing and town centre uses.

Key Diagram

Comments:

A number of respondents felt the Diagram was not detailed and clear enough in showing the boundaries of sites where development is proposed. Others felt there was unnecessary detail and confusion between the Key Diagram and the Township delivery maps.

Officers' Response:

It is not the role of a Core Strategy to define the exact boundaries of policy areas and development areas. This is the role of a separate allocations Plan. The Core Strategy should indicate the broad locations where development, regeneration and conservation should be focussed. Unnecessary detail, including some sites, have been deleted. Sites have been deleted because they are not strategic or they show options no longer being pursued.

Chapter 6 – Delivering a more prosperous economy

E3 – Focussing on economic growth corridors South Heywood / J19 economic growth corridor

Context:

The proposal, which is to deliver more jobs and housing in an economic growth corridor in south Heywood, appears in several places in the Preferred

Options Report under several inter-related policies. The proposal, through the relevant policies, is to:

- Develop existing employment sites within the urban area off Hareshill Road before releasing additional land (Policies E2, E3);
- Provide new employment development on land currently in the Green Belt off Hareshill Road following development of existing sites (Policies E3, R2);
- Deliver mixed use development (housing and employment) around Collop Gate Farm with a new local centre, providing an attractive new location attracting new residents (Policies E3, C1, R2);
- Provide a link road between Junction 19 of M62 and junction 3 of M66 to service new development and reduce heavy traffic in Heywood town centre (Policies E3, T1); and
- Deliver high quality development, landscaping and greenspace to improve the edge of the urban area (Policy P3).

Comments:

Two public meetings were held in Heywood, each attended by over 100 residents primarily objecting to these proposals. Notes of these meetings are set out in Appendix 1. 39 residents made objections in writing and these are set out in schedule B. The objections at the meetings, and made in writing, were on the following broad grounds:

1. There is no need for the J19 / Hareshill Road link road and it will have negative impacts on the environment / surrounding area
2. The location and type of development is inappropriate
3. There is no need for more employment land / development
4. It will employ people from outside Heywood, not benefit local people, and increase commuting
5. Object to loss of Green Belt and agricultural land
6. Damaging impact on air quality, noise and amenity
7. Damaging impact on environment and ecology
8. Proposals contradict other parts of the Core Strategy
9. Impact on the character of the area / loss of open space
10. Damaging impact on individual properties
11. Risk of further development in the Green Belt
12. Other issues

Representations in support of the proposals were received from Peel Holdings, Russell Homes, The Wilton Estate, The Casey Group and Rochdale Development Agency.

2 residents support the road proposal because of its benefits for residents on Manchester Road, Middleton Road and Coronation Avenue who have problems with traffic, mainly cars, and often at peak times, driven by workers from Pilsworth/Heywood Distribution Park driving through Hopwood to get to the motorway.

Representations on the proposals were also received from the Highways Agency and 4 NW and these are set out and responded to in Schedule B.

In order to respond to these objections several studies have been done, and the detailed findings and conclusions of these will be made available to the public during the public consultation on the draft Core Strategy. The studies are as follows:

- An Ecology Study of the ecology in the south Heywood area;
- An indicative design for the Hareshill Road – J19 link road and the J19 junction, and an examination of the work required to upgrade the existing stretch of Harehill Road to a satisfactory standard;
- A costing of the above highways work;
- An indicative Masterplan illustrating the possible type, location and scale of development in the growth corridor;
- An Environmental Impact Assessment of the development indicated in the above Masterplan, identifying any environmental mitigation measures required;
- A study into the market demand and need for employment development in this area;
- An economic viability assessment to determine whether the overall development (road, housing, employment and associated development) is viable.

All the above studies have informed the response to objections as set out below.

Objections in detail and officer response

A. There is no need for the J19 / Hareshill Road link road and it will have negative impacts on the environment / surrounding area.

Comments

1. What is the specific evidence on which the proposal for a link road from junction 19 to Hareshill Road has been put forward? What evidence is there that such a link would improve existing traffic flow in Heywood? The proposal will move more traffic into Heywood; it will not reduce the HGV problems.
2. There is the M66 J3 Pilsworth Road connection approx one kilometre from Heywood Industrial park. Any further development of the Pilsworth road area can be adequately served by the existing M66 Pilsworth link. This could be improved to dual carriageway standard. More signposting for HGV's. It would have no impact on residential properties. This is why that junction was put in.
3. The majority of HGV on Middleton Road appears to be from the Green Lane industrial estate. Why has this factor been ignored and why are there no proposals to address Green Lane traffic problems?
4. Why is there no investigation in the Core Strategy into the issue of HGV and commuter traffic entering, leaving or passing through Heywood from all routes.
5. There's already a problem with traffic congestion on Manchester Road. Proposals for traffic lights on the end of Hareshill Road will create more problems.

6. Hareshill Road residents complained there have been problems of traffic (HGV's) getting off M62 in the past. The proposals will create more problems.
7. Hareshill Road is very narrow at some points, is in a poor condition and not suitable for HGV's, and will require improvement.
8. People will use this as a 'rat run' between J3 M66 and J19 M62 to avoid congestion at Simister Island (J18 M62).
9. What will be the impact on the M62/M60/M66 motorway network and what evidence is there on this? There is already congestion on the wider network / M62/60/66, Heywood Old Road, Simister Island and this will make it worse.
10. Public transport should be improved instead.
11. The width restriction on Hareshill Road should be removed to improve traffic flow in the area.
12. Issue of school run traffic and child safety due to the proximity of Siddall Moor and Magdala Street schools.

Officers' Response

R1. The proposal was put forward because:

- South Heywood is already a major employment area which generates a lot of HGV traffic;
- For this traffic to go / come from east on the M62, and avoid going through Heywood, it has to take the route via the M62 and M66 adding 5.3 miles (8.5km) to the journey each way. There is therefore currently an incentive for HGV drivers to go through Heywood, causing conflict in the town centre and complaints from residents. The Council has tried to tackle this problem by other measures, working with businesses with regard to delivery times, putting width restrictions on Hareshill Road and Pilsworth Road and implementing a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) imposing a night time ban on HGV's;
- A direct route via a link road from Hareshill Road to J19 M62 will attract this HGV traffic cutting journey times and reduce distance travelled. This will reduce emissions from HGVs as they are travelling shorter distances and in an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) which covers the motorway network;
- It will also make South Heywood a more attractive location for businesses and help regenerate the Heywood, and borough wide, economy.

An indicative road and J19 design has been prepared and this shows that a satisfactory design for the road and junction is feasible. Traffic modelling work of the area is being carried out and preliminary results indicate that:

- The road attracts a substantial amount of traffic from the Pilsworth Road / south Heywood area, that is going to and coming from the east on the M62, and is also attracting traffic from existing routes through and around Heywood;
- The road will take traffic off Middleton Road (A6046 north of J19) heading north and south;

- It will reduce traffic on Coronation Avenue and other roads in south Heywood;
- It will reduce the number of vehicles going via the M62/M66 J18 to and from Pilsworth Road, thereby slightly reducing congestion and pollution in that area;
- In conclusion the road has the benefits that were expected.

The full findings of the Transport Assessment, examining the impact of the road and projected traffic flows, will be available when the Core Strategy goes out for public consultation.

- R2. Improvement of this route to the M66 would not reduce trip distances or travel costs for vehicles travelling to and from the east. However, it could provide a more direct route for some trips and result in a minor reduction in journey times for HGV's. There will still be a tendency for HGV's going east on the M62 to seek a more direct route through Heywood town centre. Additional signposting to use the M66 will not prevent this from happening.
- R3. It is accepted that this proposal will not directly reduce traffic from Green Lane. There are other proposals (not in the Core Strategy) to improve vehicular access to Green Lane and reduce congestion problems. Ultimately the Core Strategy seeks to reduce and re direct employment growth in inner Heywood, to south Heywood, with the possibility of additional housing development on Green Lane replacing existing employment uses.
- R4. The Core Strategy does refer to the need to reduce traffic through central Heywood and is one of the reasons for proposing the road. The traffic study, to support this road proposal, does consider the impact on flows through Heywood.
- R5. Work so far does not indicate there will be a major problem of congestion in this area.
- R6. The road is forecast to decrease traffic on Middleton Road. It is accepted that when there is a major congestion problem on the M62/M66/M60 (most commonly due to accidents) then traffic is diverted through Heywood and can cause congestion. No measures can stop this; however the proposed road would provide a more suitable diversion route away from existing residential areas if there is an incident on the motorway network.
- R7. The condition of Hareshill Road has been examined and it is recognised that some resurfacing and road widening improvements will be required to make the road suitable for the forecast level of traffic and its intended role (see next point below). The road will not be improved to an inappropriately high standard that could attract additional traffic due to rat running to avoid J18 M62.

- R8. The intention of the road scheme is to make the Pilsworth Road / south Heywood area more accessible for HGV's and employees. It is already a major employment area, and has the only SPZ designation in the north of England. It is not intended to significantly reduce journey times, and to create a short cut, between the M62 and M66, which could be opposed by the Highway's Agency (HA). The road may however marginally reduce traffic at the M62/M66 junction, by removing traffic that is going to / from Pilsworth Road to / from the east on the M62. It may therefore offer some benefit to the motorway network and assist the HA in addressing congestion on its network.
- R9. Traffic modelling indicates that the road will not create the problems that have been suggested.
- R10. The Core Strategy proposes to improve public transport and access by sustainable modes in this area and the Transport Assessment examines the opportunities to achieve this.
- R11. The proposal would include the removal of the width restriction on Hareshill Road, otherwise there would be no point in the road.
- R12. Early indications from the study assessing the road proposal show that it will slightly reduce traffic flows in the vicinity of these schools and thereby potentially increase safety.

B. The location and type of development is inappropriate

Comments:

- 13. Why is industrial development between Heywood industrial park and junction 19 being considered when it is green belt and it adjoins high value residential land? Instead the huge area of land adjoining either side of the M66 in the Heywood area and M66 Pilsworth/ Heywood Distribution Park area, a great deal of which is now completed landfill, should be used. Another option could be to consider developing land at the rear of the Birch service area and connect this with Whittle Lane.
- 14. Hopwood is a predominately high value sought after residential area surrounded by green fields, which if necessary, should be considered for housing, not industrial development.
- 15. Any retail provision is opposed.

Officers' Response:

- R13. A more detailed analysis of development opportunities has been carried out through the preparation of an indicative Masterplan. This indicates that no industrial development is proposed (appropriate or necessary) on any site adjoining housing, in particular the site at Collop Gate Farm which is proposed for housing. The alternative areas suggested for development would have a much more damaging effect

on the strategic role of the Green Belt, would be poorly related to the urban area and would be contrary to Green belt guidance.

- R14. The land adjoining existing housing is proposed for higher value, executive type, housing which will not detract from the existing housing area. It is in fact likely to improve the image and perception of the area as an attractive, high value, residential area.
- R15. There are no shops within easy walking distance of the proposed development. The proposed retail development is only to meet additional local top up retail need arising from the new housing development and will not be of a scale that attracts customers from a wider area or competes with the town centre. A retail study is being carried out and this will inform the appropriate scale of retail development.

C. There is no need for more employment land / development

Comments:

16. What evidence is there that more industrial land / development is needed in the Heywood and in particular Hopwood area? There are already a lot of unwanted industrial facilities on Heywood Distribution Park and in the general Heywood/Rochdale area. Stakehill Industrial Estate is half empty. Plenty of land on Kingsway Business Park.
17. Should use brownfield land first.
18. Why do we have to follow RSS targets for development?
19. Need more industry not distribution.
20. Businesses move from one site to another, so overall it does nothing to increase jobs.
21. There is contradictory information regarding how much of the land will be for employment.

Officers' Response:

- R16. The need for more employment land is based on the studies listed below. The findings from these studies are outlined in the Background Paper, and the full studies are / will be made available during the consultation period. The studies are:
- evidence prepared to support the NW RSS;
 - an Employment Land Study for RMBC;
 - a study carried out for AGMA examining the employment land requirements for Greater Manchester;
 - a detailed market assessment of the likely demand for employment development in south Heywood and the availability and suitability of land and sites elsewhere in the borough;
 - A study into the market demand for large employment sites in Greater Manchester for AGMA.

All of these indicate that:

- There is a need for additional employment land in GM;
- About an additional 30ha may be required in Rochdale Borough in the next 15 years to ensure the borough has a flexible and appropriate supply that can meet potential demand;

- That there is / will be strong market demand for employment land in this location;
- That the land and premises available elsewhere in the borough, for a variety of reasons outlined in the studies, will not satisfy all this demand.

The Core Strategy makes clear that in order to deliver our Vision for the borough increasing its level of prosperity is essential.

- R17. The Core Strategy policies generally seek to use brownfield sites first, however if we are to regenerate the local economy some greenfield development needs to be supported.
- R18. The RSS is now to be revoked and RMBC does not have to comply with its requirements. The Council never agreed with the full amount (possibly about 90 ha) of additional employment land that RSS implied had to be provided in Rochdale. The Council instead has consistently proposed around 30 ha additional land and it is considered appropriate to continue on that basis.
- R19. There is considerable evidence that Rochdale borough is an attractive location for the distribution industry and it would be unrealistic to oppose such development. The distribution industry supports a wide range of job types and skill levels and can support employment growth in supporting businesses in the wider economy. Other types of employment development, apart from pure offices, will also be supported in this location.
- R20. This concern is understood, and it is accepted that businesses do occasionally relocate to maximise their business opportunities. However, many business developments do also create new jobs (rather than relocate existing) and if the borough does not seek to compete effectively with other areas it will have a damaging effect on the local economy.
- R21. The Core Strategy clearly states that about 30ha of land in the Green Belt is sought for employment development, with about a further 20 for housing, adding up to a total of 50 – 55 ha.

D. It will employ people from outside, not benefit local people, and increase commuting

Comments:

22. Skilled jobs won't go to local people. How many jobs will there be for Heywood people? How many local people are employed in Heywood Distribution Park?
23. It will increase commuting.

Officers' Response:

- R22. The Council cannot directly control who gets jobs in any new development, however it will work with the developers, end users, and other relevant agencies to try and ensure that as many jobs as possible

go to local people. The Council is working to try to increase skill levels in the borough so that local residents can access better jobs.

- R23. The Core Strategy is seeking to achieve a sustainable balance between the supply of jobs and housing. It is acknowledged that a proportion of jobs in the borough are taken by, and could go to, people outside the borough and that adjoining districts are looking to Rochdale borough to increase its overall job offer. However, it should be recognised that Rochdale residents also can, and do, benefit from jobs outside the borough. A strong, thriving and interconnected economy across the Greater Manchester area, with each district best utilising its advantages of location, is ultimately of benefit to all residents in the city region.

E. Object to loss of Green Belt and agricultural land / risk of further development

Comments:

24. Good quality arable farmland is being ruined / lost.
25. These issues were discussed previously in the late 1980s as a part of the UDP. Fought to have this land kept in the green belt. We were misinformed about the last UDP and proposals for current development, which has not been as promised. Therefore why should we trust the LA this time?
26. Object to loss of greenspace / Green Belt regardless of its use. Other sites / land should be developed before Green Belt is lost. How much GB land will be lost?
27. The Regional Spatial Strategy envisages no strategic alteration to the green belt. Unless there is a direction to Local Authorities regarding green belt it follows therefore that there should be no alteration to the Green Belt.
28. Residents purchased their homes on the understanding that Collop Gate Farm was and would remain "Green Belt Land". This land is bounded on three sides by housing and should not be developed for industry.
29. It will kick start a process that will lead to yet further developments . This will effectively join the two towns into one continuous built up area and ultimately result in the loss of town identity and character.
30. Once land has been taken out of the Green Belt it could be developed differently from what currently is being suggested.

Officers' Response:

- R24. Whilst it is accepted that the farmland is relatively good quality for the borough (a mix of Class 3a and 3b) it is not of the highest quality nationally (agricultural land is classified in a range from 1 to 5, with 1 the best). It is therefore not high quality agricultural land, it is in fact mid range, and the overriding need for this development justifies the loss of this land.
- R25. The issue of possible development of any land can go on for many years. The complaint about having been mislead about the UDP allocation on Hareshill Road may refer to the fact that development has

taken longer than originally expected and is for mixed industry and warehousing rather than just manufacturing. The reason for this is that the site was restricted purely to manufacturing use but the owners never got any developer interest for that use, but did have continual interest in warehouse development. As a consequence the site has been granted permission for mixed B1b/B2/B8 employment development.

- R26. The proposals will take around 12% of the Green Belt in the area between Heywood and Middleton. The proposed land release is from the widest point of Green Belt, and the Green Belt will not be made any narrower at its narrowest point between Heywood and Middleton. The strategic role of the Green Belt in this location will be maintained.
- R27. The RSS is now to be revoked and its policies on Green Belt release are no longer relevant.
- R28. The designation of all land, including Green Belt, cannot be guaranteed to last in perpetuity. The land in question is proposed for housing, not industry.
- R29. The Council fully supports the strategic role of the Green Belt. It would not wish to see any spread of development that resulted in the complete loss of the Green Belt between, and resultant merging of, Heywood and Middleton. The Core Strategy runs to 2026, and the protection of the Green Belt beyond that time period will be a matter for future plans / generations. The current proposed strategy does not propose any additional land release above that indicated.
- R30. There would be no benefit for the Council to propose any alternative use for the land, as no other uses (e.g. large scale retail, built leisure, hotels etc) would be acceptable in policy terms.

F. Damaging impact on air quality, noise and amenity

Comments:

- 31. Air quality is already poor. This is going to make it worse. All of the proposed area of major development looks to be in the RMBC Air Quality Management Area, and it is evident that the Borough is committed to reducing the levels of such pollutants, especially, in this case Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂). The latest RMBC Action Plan states that the M62 Junction 19 requires a 25% reduction in NO₂ levels and that 'goods vehicles, whether on the motorway, or on major roads, are the main source of NO₂ emissions and this accounts for 82.3% of the total contribution' The proposal contradicts other statements about seeking to improve air quality.
- 32. Noise Pollution: Residents of Hopwood, who live close to the M62 and Junction 19, are already subjected to continual noise from this stretch of motorway, due to the continued increase in traffic on the UK roads, which over the years they have had no option but to learn to live with. It is not possible to sit outside, or indeed, have windows open without being subject to this continual noise pollution, and again, plans to develop a relief road to the level suggested will simply make this situation, and residents lives, significantly worse.

Officers' Response:

- R31. There is a strip of poor air quality along the motorway corridors. Some work has already been done to investigate the impact of the road and it has been concluded that it will not have a noticeably damaging impact on air quality in the area. The traffic levels are being forecast and more detailed forecasts of the impact on air quality will be made available during the consultation. The evidence to date indicates that there will be a significant reduction in traffic on Middleton Road, Heywood and the traffic will be moved to the new road which will be further away from existing housing, thereby improving air quality. In totality, because the road will reduce the distance all vehicles have to travel to get to Pilsworth Road, the impact of the road will be to reduce overall air pollution in the wider area.
- R32. The position on noise pollution is similar to that for air pollution (as set out in R31 above). In addition, the proposed road and built development will offer the opportunity to provide additional noise screening for existing housing from the M62 and the link road.

G. Damaging impact on environment and ecology

Comments:

33. The area is festooned with a whole variety of wildlife, including birds, which in addition to the more common varieties of British garden birds, include Thrushes, Jays, Dunocks, Chaff inches, Bullfinches, Woodpeckers, Sparrow Hawks, Redwings & even Fieldfares.
34. Problems of impact on the environment and increased flood risk /increased surface water run off.

Officers' Response:

- R33. An study has been carried out, by the GM Ecology Unit, of the ecology of the potential development sites and the wider area. They were provided with residents statements about the ecology of the area. The study concluded that there is insufficient ecological value within the area to prevent development if its impact is satisfactorily mitigated. This study will be made available during the consultation period.
- R34. An Environmental Impact Assessment has been carried out and it has concluded that any environmental and flood risk impacts can be satisfactorily mitigated. This study will be made available during the consultation period.

H. Proposals contradict other parts of the Core Strategy

Comments:

35. It contradicts the following statememnts: "In planning the next 15 years, we will need to build on our strengths: our proximity to Manchester and

the beauty of our countryside"and also from the Preferred Options consultation leaflet, specifically under Heywood, plans and objectives "To protect and promote the rural character and make better use of the countryside".

Officers' Response:

- R35. The Core Strategy makes clear that in order to deliver its Vision to improve the borough that the delivery of competing objectives will have to be carefully balanced. The statement quoted in the leaflet is a particular priority in the north of the borough (under the heading Restrict development in the north) and does not relate specifically to Heywood. Whilst the proposals will result in the loss of open countryside, any subsequent Allocations DPD will require a design that softens the impact on the countryside. There is also a commitment to maintain a strong green belt between Heywood and Middleton.

I. Impact on the character of the area / loss of open space

Comments:

- 36. A development on such a scale will have a massive impact of the local area, and these are losses that can never be reversed.
- 37. It will destroy the semi rural character of the area.
- 38. It will have a major impact on views from adjoining residential properties.
- 39. This natural open space is used by hundreds of local people from Heywood and Middleton for walking, jogging, cycling, horse riding and enjoyment of the great outdoors. It will affect and interrupt access to public footpaths, bridleways and rights of way.
- 40. Many people moved to area for quiet / open views / countryside. It will destroy the reason why a lot of people moved there.
- 41. It will have an adverse effect on peoples mental and physical health.

Officers' Response:

- R36. It is accepted that the proposed development will have a major impact on the appearance and character of the local area. However through appropriate design the appearance and character of the area can still be made attractive.
- R37. The semi rural character of the wider area will still be retained.
- R38. Residents do not have a right to a view.
- R39. The potential of the wider area for outdoor recreation will be retained, and potentially enhanced.
- R40. Unfortunately no area can be completely immune from change.
- R41. There is no reason why residential development in the area should have an adverse effect on peoples mental and physical health, especially if it is carefully and properly designed to provide additional attractive open space and facilities.

J. Damaging impact on individual properties

Comments:

- 42. Will there be a CPO on the houses on Hareshill Road? Will houses need to be demolished?
- 43. The quality of the environment on Hareshill Road will be poor given the noise, fumes and vibration from HGV's that will go along it. The houses do not have any foundations.

Officers' Response:

- R42. At present it is not considered to be essential to demolish any properties, although when preparing detailed proposals it may be found to be the best option for all concerned. In all likelihood, if any properties are required for the development, the prospective developers will first seek to acquire by agreement. A CPO would only be considered by the Council as a last resort if agreement cannot be reached. At present there is no need or proposal to CPO any properties.
- R43. It is accepted that the road proposal could have a damaging impact on the quality of the environment for residents on Hareshill Road. However, as indicated above, it is likely they will have the opportunity to move should they prefer.

L. Other issues

Comments:

- 44. There is only 1 primary school in Hopwood, already with not enough spaces.
- 45. Rochdale Infirmary and Fairfield Hospital (Bury) are set for closure. Which hospitals are going to serve so many people?
- 46. There are plenty of other housing sites. Who is going to buy expensive houses when there is so much industry, HGVs and pollution nearby? What has happened with the housing development on Gort?
- 47. Waste of time having a public enquiry, it's already been decided. What has changed from last time?

Officers' Response:

- R44. The Council will ensure through its Infrastructure Delivery Plan that sufficient school places are available. A financial contribution will be sought if required to provide additional school places.
- R45. The Council will ensure through its Infrastructure Delivery Plan that sufficient health facilities are available.
- R46. Housing developers are already interested in the site and are confident that there will be market demand for the proposed housing.
- R47. The Council does not consider that the outcome of the EIP is a forgone conclusion. The Inspector will carefully consider all representations on this matter to determine whether or not this proposal, and the Core Strategy, is sound.

Conclusions:

In conclusion, based on the extensive work carried out following the public consultation on the Preferred Options, it is considered that there is a very strong case for the Heywood South growth corridor proposals. In brief:

- The link road proposal will divert traffic from existing residential areas and considerably improve the environment for the vast majority of residents;
- The road will make south Heywood a very attractive employment location and support the growth of the Heywood economy;
- Housing development will benefit south Heywood, the town centre and the local economy and will not detract from the quality of life of existing residents;
- The concerns of residents directly affected by the proposals can be addressed;
- Good design can satisfactorily mitigate any potential environmental impacts;
- The Green Belt will still retain its strategic role; and
- The proposals are financially viable and deliverable and will benefit the whole town.

For all the above reasons it is proposed to retain the south Heywood growth corridor proposals in the pre submission Core Strategy.

Chapter 7 – Delivering successful and healthy communities

C1 - Delivering the right amount of housing in the right places

Comments:

The figure included in the preferred options report was the RSS housing target adjusted to take account of underperformance in previous years. This figure was not challenged.

Officer's response:

The revocation of RSS, which stated targets for each district, means that authorities have the opportunity to revisit their housing target. The Council is mindful of the evidence on which this was originally based and but considers that the target of 400 new homes per year should be applied differently. As the 400 per year has not been delivered in recent years, this would require the annual target to be raised to 456 homes per year up to 2026 to compensate for this underperformance. This is not considered deliverable but the Council is committed to achieving the 400 homes per year from here on in order to meet needs and support the regeneration of the borough. This figure is a minimum in any event.

C2 - Focusing on regeneration areas

Comments:

General support for the proposed approach. The opportunity to meet housing needs in economic growth areas and other areas should be referred to in the policy.

Officers' response:

Agreed. The policy has been expanded to include reference to Economic Growth Corridors and re-titled to reflect this.

Chapter 8 Improving design, image and quality of place

Policies P1 - Protecting character and heritage, P2 – Improving image, P3 – Improving design of new development

Comments:

Responses indicated a high level of support for the approach set out in the policies. Some minor points of detail were raised.

Officers' Response:

Minor changes have been made to improve the clarity of the policy.

Chapter 9 – Conserving and managing the natural environment and resources

R1 Tackling Climate Change

Comments:

A number of detailed comments were received and whilst the approach was supported, further detail was considered necessary – particularly to set out clear requirements for new development.

Officers' Response:

In response, R1 has been divided into three policies: Tackling climate change, Energy and new development and Renewable and low carbon energy developments. The energy policy is derived from the approach set out in the AGMA study, encouraging local networks and taking a flexible approach to how developers can achieve zero-carbon developments. This approach will be used by most of the GM authorities in their Core Strategies.

R2 – Managing Green Belt

Context:

This policy identified the need to identify the limited release of land from the green belt to meet development needs up to 2026 and beyond. The preferred

area of release is some 30 hectares of land south of Heywood, including land at Hareshill Road and south of Hopwood, east of Heywood Old Road. The justification for the release of this site, the representations received and officers' comments are discussed under policy E3.3 above. Whilst the area of green belt release identifies is significant, it is a local adjustment and would not undermine the strategic role of the green belt between Middleton and Heywood or in a wider Greater Manchester context.

However the policy also put forward options for adding land to the green belt with the intention of identifying new boundaries in a Site Allocations DPD. Two sites were put forward; open land at Rhodes Green Heywood and land at Hollins around St Anne's Academy, Middleton.

Local residents supported the inclusion of these areas within the green belt and also land north of Langley Lane.

Comments:

Representations showed strong support for the retention of a robust green belt boundary. However, local objections in Hopwood, Heywood objected to the proposed release of some green belt propose to facilitate employment and housing development. Landowners/development interests supported the release of land in the green belt in south Heywood; others sought the release of Green Belt in other locations to meet needs which cannot be met in the urban area or which are preferable to land at south Heywood. Some representations sought the inclusion of land in the green belt at Langley Lane and Bowlee, Middleton.

Officers' Response:

Following the advice from Government Office North West, the Government's Planning Inspectorate and NWRDA it is considered premature to nominate areas for additions to the green belt in this Core Strategy with a view to defining boundaries in a Site Allocations DPD until such time as the implications of new Regional Strategy are known, and the need for a review of green belt boundaries across Greater Manchester, along with a methodology for that review, is agreed. Consequently whilst local support for additions to the green belt is noted, it is not proposed to include these additions to the green belt in this Core Strategy.

R3 – Managing other protected / reserved land

Context:

This policy sought to identify where development on open land outside the urban area but not in the green belt might be permitted to meet development needs that cannot be met within the urban area. It acknowledged that although the release of green belt land at Hareshill Road is preferable for a number of reasons to other green belt and protected open land, this on its own may not be sufficient to meet development needs if land at Hareshill Road did not come forward, or if housing sites in the urban area were not

being delivered. Therefore, to provide flexibility in meeting future development needs and to provide greater certainty about what greenfield locations might be acceptable areas of land were identified as 'reserved for development' These were land at Langley Lane and Bowlee in Middleton and Broad Lane in south Rochdale. The sites were identified as 'options' with no assumption that all areas should be identified for development.

Comments:

Local objections were received in respect of two of the three areas and the specific grounds for those objections are dealt with below. However many objectors argued that there was no need to identify areas of greenfield land outside the urban area because development needs could be met within the urban area through existing vacant sites and premises. Objectors also argued that these areas had qualities which justify their protection as open land and that other areas of protected open land had less intrinsic value and should be considered instead. Another objection common to the 3 site options was that the extent of the reserved areas and their exact boundaries were not clearly shown and therefore impact could not be properly assessed.

In response to the first point, the justification for identifying reserved land to meet needs later in the plan period or immediately beyond is set out earlier in this schedule.

In response to the view that there are other areas which it may be more appropriate to reserve for development, it should be noted that all areas of protected open land have been considered. The three areas under this policy have been chosen because of their suitability in terms of developability and lack of physical, ownership constraints, their location and accessibility and their relatively limited value in landscape terms, biodiversity and their wider green infrastructure benefits. Other significant areas of protected open land have major access constraints, are poorly located or have physical constraints e.g. flood plain.

In response to the lack of clarity about boundaries, it is acknowledged that there is lack of clarity. However, government guidance states that Core Strategies should not identify site boundaries unless there is evidence that it can be fixed now, that the site is deliverable and is critical for the delivery of the Core Strategy. At present this is not the case. However, the Core Strategy needs to identify broad locations and establish the principle of how and in what circumstances land could be released so that a future Site Allocations plan can define boundaries, uses and development principles.

Land at Langley Lane

Comments

Local residents objected on the grounds: that development would:

1. harm the character of the area, views and tranquillity and feeling of openness

2. harm wildlife and reduce opportunities for appreciation of nature and wildlife
3. introduce traffic which would increase risk of accidents, reduce air quality, and increase noise
4. involve the loss of productive farmland.
5. be inappropriate given the availability of other less sensitive areas of open land
6. reduce the separation of Middleton and Heywood which is vital to maintain the character of the towns; the land performs a green belt role and should be designated green belt.

Conversely, landowners/developers support the need to reserve the land for development due to its accessibility, the contribution it could make to the regeneration of Langley by increasing housing choice, new jobs etc..

Officers' response (Langley Lane):

1. It is accepted that views would be restricted but disagree that it would have a negative impact on the character of Langley.
2. Biodiversity value is limited and in any event development would be subject to an assessment of ecological value. Development could provide the opportunity to increase public access to the wider countryside through improvements to footpaths and provision of accessible open space
3. A transport assessment would be necessary before land could be allocated so that its development capacity and impact could be assessed.
4. The farmland is not what government would describe as 'the best and most versatile land' which would justify protection.
5. Arguments in favour of reserving other protected areas of land have not been presented.
6. The site is not and has never been green belt; the green belt between Middleton and Heywood can function effectively without the land at Langley lane.
7. It is considered that some 35 ha of additional land will be required to meet employment and housing land needs, (see response to Chapter 6 above) and the preferred location is south of Heywood. Further assessment of the remaining supply and take up of housing and employment land suggests that sufficient land is available and could be delivered, particularly in the west of the borough and particularly for employment sites. This means that the likelihood of needing further reserve land is reduced. Langley Lane is an extensive area and would only be required for employment uses in the event that land south of Heywood is not identified or is not delivered. In terms of housing, a limited housing development would not sit well with existing development and a larger development (which would be able to contribute to open space, public transport and provide other benefits to the area) is not required. The necessary flexibility to ensure housing needs within the plan period can be met, if urban sites do not become available, could be provided by land at Hopwood, south Heywood or Broad Lane, Rochdale.

Conclusion

Consequently, an incursion into open land north of Langley Lane would not be justified and it is therefore proposed not to pursue this option as land 'reserved' for development in the Core Strategy and to delete it from the Key Diagram.

However, it is considered appropriate for the policy to acknowledge that some (though not all) areas of open land between the green belt and the urban area will have potential to meet development needs in the longer term (beyond the plan period). To provide clarity, the policy could identify which areas have potential for development and could be revisited in a future plan, assuming the spatial strategy and circumstances do not change.

Land at Bowlee

Context

Policy R3 included an option to reserve land at Bowlee (10ha) for development if required by 2026 or beyond. Residents opposed this but some objectives seemed to be based on the misunderstanding that this could involve wholesale development of Bowlee Community Park or was a resurrection of a previous UDP proposal (Middleton West Business Park - dropped in response to a Planning Inspector's recommendation) which was a much larger 36ha site. Whilst it is accepted that it is not clear from the key diagram what area the 10ha would cover, officers identified this at the public meetings as the hardstanding south of the playing fields and not the green corridor adjacent to Langley or the playing fields themselves. Development could provide an opportunity to fund significant improvements to Bowlee and the Community Park. The grounds for objection were as follows:

1. There was also a concern that the type of development envisaged (employment housing, leisure etc. was not clear) and that there was insufficient justification for the need for the land.
2. The development would detract from the soft edge to Langley, reduce open areas enjoyed by residents for recreation and appreciation of nature.
3. Development would increase traffic to the detriment of road safety and cause congestion at peak hours.
4. The retention of open space is important for health and well being and for clean air.
5. Development would disturb wildlife.

Officer's response (Land at Bowlee):

1. The site would have greatest potential for housing in the long term but with some limited potential for employment and other uses which could benefit local residents and regeneration of Langley.
2. A release of 10ha would allow the retention of a green corridor, fund improvements for wildlife and recreation and would not reduce the area of the playing fields.

3. Highway capacity to meet traffic needs could be met although traffic management measures would be required. A detailed transport assessment would be needed based on the mix of uses as and when development would take place to test capacity and inform measures. Bus accessibility is limited and would need to be explored further.
4. It is accepted that open land at Bowlee is a vital asset for Langley and Middleton but the scale of development that would be permitted would not be significant relative to the remainder of protected open land.
5. The area envisaged would not have significant nature conservation value whilst existing features, habitats could be enhanced.
6. As stated under point 7 in relation to Langley Lane, further assessment of the remaining supply and take up suggests that there is likely to be sufficient land to meet development needs if land south of Heywood and Bolwee could be identified. This means that the need for further reserve land is not required. Whilst land at Bowlee has development potential, it is less preferable than other protected open land sites due to issues of accessibility and connectivity.

Conclusion

It is therefore proposed to delete Bowlee as a reserved location in the policy and to delete it from the Key Diagram. However, it is considered appropriate for the policy to acknowledge that some areas of protected open land between the green belt and the urban area will have potential to meet development needs in the longer term (beyond the plan period) – but not all. To provide clarity, the policy could identify which areas have potential for development and could be revisited in a future plan, assuming the spatial strategy and circumstances do not change.

Land at Broad Lane

Context

Policy R3 included an option to reserve land at Broad Lane for development if required by 2026 or beyond. The land has the potential to meet future housing needs, is in an area of high demand and offers potential to complement the regeneration of this part of south Rochdale. In a previous UDP, the site was safeguarded/reserved for housing and therefore the principle of development has been debated and established. The land was not identified in the current UDP as this was not required to meet development needs up to now.

No objections have been received and two representations of support have been received (from a developer and from the Rochdale Development Agency).

Officer's Response (Broad Lane):

Whilst the focus for housing development in south Rochdale will be on urban brownfield sites, some flexibility is required to ensure that areas are available

to provide a suitable range of housing types throughout the period of the Core Strategy. Areas of land at Langley Lane and Bowlee, Middleton are not considered less preferable than Broad Lane. As stated above, this is an area of high demand and has potential to meet demand for higher value housing to complement the regeneration of south Rochdale.

Conclusion

It is therefore considered that land at Broad Lane should be identified as land 'reserved' to help meet housing needs up to 2026. It is proposed that the Site Allocations DPD identifies the extent of the site, a housing capacity based on physical, access and environmental considerations, the development and design principles to be applied and any constraints on the timing of its release. The capacity of this land would be limited as lower density housing will be appropriate given the character of the area and because development will need to step back from the motorway for environmental reasons (eg noise and air quality).

R4 – Enhancing Green Infrastructure

Comments:

The commitment to enhancing green infrastructure in supporting housing and economic growth and achieving environmental and social objectives was strongly supported. Some detailed changes are suggested to cover omissions.

Officers' Response:

It is proposed to restructure the policy to respond to suggestions and to make the policy more spatial (by identifying areas with a specific green infrastructure function) and to increased focus on how the policy will be delivered.

Chapter R/5 - Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity

Comments:

Comments are generally supportive but seek further clarity.

Officers Response:

Minor changes proposed.

Chapter 10 – Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport

Policy T1 – Delivering sustainable transport & Policy T2 – Improving Accessibility

Comments:

Most transport schemes listed in the policy are support. Some require further detail on priority, funding and how they help to deliver development and growth set out in the Core Strategy.

Officers' Response:

Noted. Some minor changes have been incorporated in response to the objections. The introduction to Policies T1 and T2 have been revised to provide a clearer context for the policies.

In Policy T2, the thresholds which trigger the need for transport assessments have been amended slightly to make them more consistent with national guidance and to include development size and traffic generation thresholds. This is aimed at preventing developers exploiting loopholes to try and avoid preparing transport assessments or travel plans.

Chapter 11 - Delivering the Core Strategy in our Townships

DM1 - Delivery and management of new development

Comments:

There were a number of minor comments on delivery in each of the Townships and these are answered in Schedule B. An inspector from the government's Planning Inspectorate advised that the role of this section is not clear; it repeats elements of policies and the reader may be confused as to whether this is new policy or about delivery. It may include too much detail.

Officers' response:

This chapter has been changed to 'managing delivery and monitoring progress'. Key area projects have been moved to the Spatial Strategy.

The implementation and monitoring table is amended to provide more information covering timescales, risks and contingencies.

Appendices

Comments:

The accessibility standards for new development had too many standards still to be decided.

Officers' response:

Agreed. The remaining accessibility standards / have been included

Car Parking Standards have been included due to revocation of RSS which previously included the car parking standards.

3. Schedule B

| Consultee ID / Comment ID | Consultee Name / Organisation / Agent | Comment | Response / Action |
|---|--|---|---|
| Chapter 1 – Introduction | | | |
| Question 1 - Do you understand our explanation of the Core Strategy? | | | |
| 161683/286 | Government Office North West - Mr Dave Arstall | Page 7 - It is best not to refer to the plan to be published as a draft, as it should be the plan that the Council proposes to submit and it is not anticipated that there should be a need for significant changes to it prior to submission. The background paper includes a housing trajectory. We suggest that this be included within the plan and it should also show a brownfield land trajectory (see PPS3 para 43). The Glossary might also include definitions of AA, AMR, SA and LTP. The document sets out a wide range of practical measures and improvements which the Council wishes to bring forward, but there needs to be greater certainty about these. The Inspector at the frontloading visit considered that the principle of including township policies was a reasonable one. It will be necessary to show that any policies which are included at publication stage are justified and can be delivered. Transport modelling work is currently being undertaken. It will be important to be clear on the impact of major proposals on the highway network and about how this impact will be dealt with to ensure that the Council's proposed option is deliverable. Appendix 2 suggests that the Council is proposing to only partially delete UDP policies H/8 and H9. See comments above re policy E2 3 (a). We would expect policies to be replaced, or retained, in their entirety. | Agree |
| 162038/319 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | Yes | Noted |
| 180811/442 | Natural England - Mr Stephen Hedley | Overall, we commend the quality of the Preferred Options report, which has set out locally-relevant and effective policy measures to protect and enhance environmental assets, improve public transport provision, and address pollution issues in the Borough. We are also pleased to see that a number of our recommendations from the previous consultation on the Issues and Options have been incorporated. | Noted |
| 204017/49 | Miss Jean Barlow | I wish to comment on the consultation process. I am very concerned about the lack of public consultation undertaken in the preparation of these proposals. If you review the comments received at the Issues and Options stage of the process, it is apparent that the vast majority of comments are from official bodies rather than from the residents of the borough. This is not through agreement or apathy on the part of residents, it is because the vast majority of residents | Noted A detailed account of measures taken to publicise the Core Strategy consultation will be published in the Statement of Consultation. |

| | | | |
|-----------|-------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>are completely unaware even of the existence of the proposals, let alone their content and the potential impact on their lives. At the Issues and Options stage of the process last year, I found out only from a colleague, and at the last moment, that this project was underway. None of my neighbours knew about it. We have a local paper of which I read every edition, but apparently I missed the small announcement about a consultation meeting. Previously a project of this kind would have had a multi-page spread in the newspaper, and displays in the public buildings such as the library, but none of this happened. Therefore the ability for residents to comment on their future was effectively curtailed. I also feel that the few residents' comments that were registered at the Issues and Options stage have been completely ignored. Now at the Preferred Options stage, again the publicity has been ineffective. The local newspaper has not been used at all, nor have any displays been put in public buildings. The only publicity was in the free "Local Matters" magazine delivered to households, but at the public meeting in Heywood on November 3rd, 2009, a show of hands indicated that approximately half the people present had never received a copy, and were aware of the meeting only because a concerned resident took it upon herself to print and distribute flyers to houses in the immediate area. The number and strength of negative comments expressed at this meeting is a real cause for concern for the consultation process. The meeting succeeded in forcing the hand of the planning department to extend the consultation period and to hold a further meeting in Heywood, but again this will bypass the vast majority of the population if it is not adequately publicised. There is little public confidence that residents' views matter, and concern that this is already a done deal.</p> | <p>Comments will be considered and continual improvements made within resource levels.</p> <p>Draft response to this objection as it could be used to argue we have not one of the tests of soundness</p> |
| 204017/73 | Miss Jean Barlow | <p>Due to the structure of this document I have found it difficult to decide where best to make my comments. As the document progresses through Spatial Vision, Strategic Objectives, Spatial Strategy and then into more detail, some of it objective-based and some geographically-based, the same comment applies to many sections of the report. I have tried not to duplicate my comments but hope that they will be considered in whichever sections of the report they apply.</p> | Noted. |
| 368001/23 | Miss Erin McIlroy | <p>I do not understand your explanation of the core strategy report. I have a degree, a post graduate qualification and work as a teacher for Manchester Local Authority. I work with policies and government documents daily if I cannot understand this how many people in</p> | Noted. The description of the Core Strategy and process will be considered |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Rochdale can understand it? This document seems to be set out to be confusing. Also in order to see this document you must have internet access and be quite competent at using a series of confusing links and downloads. Have Rochdale council checked how many residents have internet access and are able to do this? A small leaflet (which most people did not receive) was apparently sent out but contained none of the detail about the changes to Rochdale that are set out in this document. Why has the council not made residents more aware of this document and also made sure it is available for all residents to see? People who have been able to get a copy from this document other than from downloading it on the internet have had to phone up the council, have long winded conversations in which they have had to demand a copy. After this they have had to drive to Rochdale, pick up a copy from the reception which had not been put behind the reception as promised and then have to complain and wait for a copy before actually being given a hard copy which they were told had to be returned the next day. How many people would be able to take time out of working hours to do this? and all this before being able to actually understand the document. I would very much like to have the above questions answered. | <p>Copies of the document were available in libraries and information points.</p> <p>Consider presentation, try to make document clearer. Improve availability of document.</p> <p>See response in Schedule A</p> |
| 396108/392 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.9 Yes, the Council's explanation of the Core Strategy's role, position within the LDF and the layout of the document appears appropriate, subject to our more general comments set out at paragraph 3.3 above i.e. There are parts of the Core Strategy and the supporting background document which are inconsistent in detail, order and structure, and there are typographic errors throughout the text. None of these are considered to undermine the general thrust and understanding of the document. | Noted and will correct errors |
| 396108/466 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | We consider that the Core Strategy should be less dogmatic and provide a more flexible and positive approach to development. | Disagree – The document seeks to provide a clear, positive strategy, recognising priorities for development and providing flexibility |
| Chapter 2 – Spatial Portrait of the borough | | | |
| Question 2 Do you think this Spatial Portrait is a reasonable description of the borough, its issues, challenges and opportunities? If not what should be changed or included? | | | |
| 6682/113 | United Utilities - Mr David Hardman | United Utilities Water supports the principle of making best use of the potential of its reservoirs, however the opportunities which they present need to be balanced against operational needs. The Core Strategy should refer to these operational needs as the first priority. | Agree, although this is unnecessary detail in a Core Strategy. |
| 161663/305 | Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd - Mr | We support the importance of developing Kingsway Business Park (hereafter KBP) as a means of assisting the Borough to address its | Support noted |

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|--|
| | David Ward | <p>underperformance within the local and regional economy. To do this, planning policy must be flexible and adaptable to meet the needs of commerce and business. We are encouraged to see the importance which is attributed to KBP and the recognition that the site has a mixed use status. KBP is capable of meeting the full range of employment and commercial uses, together with other complementary residential, retail, leisure and recreational provision. A flexible approach, in partnership with the private sector, will enable this to be achieved. We also support the Core Strategy's recognition that there is a shortage of executive / higher value homes within the Rochdale area to attract and retain purchasers with higher incomes. Again, this is something that KBP can help to redress. Accessibility and transport are also key factors in attracting and retaining businesses. The M62 provides a good basis for effective road links, but the delivery of the Metro link is an important component of KBP's future. Securing a stop on the business park should be a high priority for all partners.</p> | |
| 161683/272 | Government Office North West - Mr Dave Arstall | <p>The spatial portrait does draw out a range of key issues affecting different parts of the Borough, which is useful at this stage. At publication stage it may be possible to condense this into a brief summary of the key issues affecting Rochdale. Consideration should also be given to reducing the document in length generally, for example by avoiding repetition. We do recognise that the Council has made a significant effort to present a document which is spatial in nature. There is a good deal of spatial material in the spatial strategy in section 5 and the area visions in section 11. We do accept that Section 11 gives a picture of how areas are expected to change over the lifetime of the plan and that the township approach gives a sense of place.</p> <p>However, as currently structured, much of section 11 appears to repeat policy content which is set out elsewhere in the document. The logic of the document might be improved by combining these elements into one section as the plan progresses. This might help to make the document more concise at publication stage.</p> | <p>Agree. Shorten Spatial Portrait.</p> <p>Agree – Will be addressed through editing and restructuring of the document</p> |
| 161697/18 | Greater Manchester Geological Unit - Ms Alethea Faulkner | <p>Text box called 'Environment and Natural Resources' in 'Spatial Portrait of the Borough' contains a sentence reading 'The borough has some mineral reserves which although not in high demand at present need to be protected for the future.' Mineral Reserves already benefit from planning permission and therefore would not require protecting. Therefore this sentence should refer to 'mineral resources' which will be protected through the Minerals Plan through</p> | <p>Agree. Amend 'Environment and Natural Resources' text box.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | the identification of Mineral Safeguarding Areas. | |
| 161779/268 | Manchester Airport - Ms Sarah Lee | <p>While the role Manchester Airport plays in the City Region is illustrated on Map 2 Rochdale borough's role in the City Region, neither the Spatial Portrait nor the Strategic Objectives mention this. And there is no mention of the local or regional contribution Manchester Airport makes to the local economy or the North West region as a whole. Manchester Airport is one of the key economic drivers for the whole of the North of England and is estimated to make an equivalent contribution of some £2.66 billion to national GVA. In 2008 it was the fourth busiest airport in the UK (and the sixteenth busiest in Europe). It is a major international gateway and is the largest airport outside the South East, handling over 21 million passengers in 2008. The Airport also acts as an important contributor to employment and economic development within the North West and across the Borough of Rochdale, with over 200 companies located on the Airport site, directly employing over 18,000 people. The Borough of Rochdale is well placed to contribute towards and benefit from economic growth at Manchester Airport. The Regional Spatial Strategy (GONW 2008) recognises that airports generate employment, attract business, open markets and encourage tourism and visitors. The value of good connectivity could be given a greater prominence in the Core Strategy document. In addition, the value of the Airport in terms of its economic contribution to the Borough is not so evident in the document as it currently stands. The Regional Economic strategy (NWDA 2006) states that key growth assets such as airports should be fully utilised. In terms of Rochdale, this could be to provide opportunities for the growth of businesses which complement those based on-site at the Airport, building on the excellent road connections and developing public transport opportunities to Manchester Airport. This is in addition to opening up local businesses to international markets and providing an attractive inward investment location. Tourism is identified within the Core Strategy as one of a number of expected growth sectors. The visitor economy is important to the North West. The region attracts around 18 million visitors every year, contributing almost £3 billion to the regional economy and is a major employer in the North West, with around 10% of the population employed on a job that is related to tourism. Access to an international airport is important in attracting both overseas visitors and businesses. And while the Core strategy recognises Rochdale is well placed to benefit from and contribute</p> | Noted – Will make brief reference within Spatial Portrait. Further detailed text is not considered necessary under objective SO5.. |

| | | | |
|------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>towards the growing tourism sector, the Core Strategy misses out the vital link between inward investment and inbound tourism and direct international air services.</p> <p>Manchester Airport is an officially safeguarded aerodrome and under ODPM Circular 112003 (Safeguarding Aerodromes, ~Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas: The Town and Country Planning (Safeguarded Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas) Direction 2002), there is an obligation on Local Planning Authorities to consult with the airport on certain planning applications. Safeguarding maps are supplied by the Civil aviation Authority to Local Planning Authorities and set out the requirements for statutory consultation with the Airport. The safeguarding process ensures that the Airport's operation and development is not inhibited by erections or works that infringe protected surfaces (such as buildings), developments which increase the risk of bird strikes on aircraft (such as large water features or landscaping), or developments which can interfere with electromagnetic transmissions and radar (such as wind turbines). There are large areas of the Borough that fall within the wind turbine safeguarding zone for Manchester Airport. Any wind turbine proposals within this area must be sent to the Safeguarding Authority for Manchester Airport (Manchester Airport) for a safeguarding assessment to be carried out.</p> | <p>Noted – But this reference to protection is unnecessary in the Core Strategy and is covered under separate legislation.</p> |
| 162038/320 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | <p>Having reviewed the majority of Core Strategy documents published to date across two Regions I would wish to record that the spatial portrait for Rochdale is especially well written – well done! The comments below mainly relate to the need to ensure that inter-connections between different parts of the portrait are made, and associated issues addressed.</p> <p>ECONOMY The statement “The rural economy is not significant in employment terms but has influenced the character of the rural area. In recent years, farming and rural businesses have declined and this has led to pressures for the re-use of rural buildings, especially mills.” is generally correct, but it is not only the case that the rural economy ‘has’ influenced the character of the rural area it is also true that it continues to do so – the decline in more recent times that has been identified does not only have consequences for redundant rural buildings but also for the future stewardship of the countryside. As stated on page 5 of the document this is one of the Borough’s greatest assets and there is therefore a key challenge in</p> | <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Agree – Make minor amendment to Spatial Portrait to reflect continuing influence on rural character</p> |

| | | | |
|-----------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>how the management and well being of the countryside will be secured in future years –</p> <p>the related issues concern matters such as: • Maintaining a living/working landscape • Protecting and enhancing the character of the landscape – including historic elements such as traditional field boundaries • Maintaining and enhancing access for wider community benefit (including the health benefits) • Securing biodiversity resources and enabling species to adapt to the unavoidable impacts of climate change • The wider functions of upland areas as water catchments and of peat lands as carbon stores Generally these matters are picked up under the ‘Environment and Natural Resources’ heading, but the connection is not.</p> <p>QUALITY OF PLACE The comments about housing being cheek by jowl with industry are correct and have led to some unsatisfactory impacts. However, it is also the case that this historic relationship had benefits, not least in reducing journey lengths – these days emissions associated with daily commuting are a significant issue. It is also the case that there are other related benefits from mixed uses, especially the provision of local services and facilities that can engender a sense of local community. So, yes there are some significant historic environmental issues that need to be addressed here, but equally more home working, including in purpose designed live/work units, will have a key role to play in the future as we embrace the benefits of improved IT capabilities.</p> <p>ACCESSIBILITY AND TRANSPORT This section could usefully include data on those households that do not have access to a private car – and their consequence reliance on other modes of transport and the associated increased importance of local services being available. Air quality issues could usefully be linked to the points made about congestion – over-busy roads are not simply a frustration to motorists but also a health issue.</p> | <p>Noted – these issues are addressed as far as is appropriate within the relevant policy sections</p> <p>Agree – The Core Strategy seeks to resolve some of these amenity issues whilst ensuring that new development is in accessible and sustainable locations.</p> <p>Disagree – However there needs to be reference to the Background Paper where this data is set out.</p> |
| 180804/52 | The Coal Authority - Miss Rachael Bust | <p>The Coal Authority was established by Parliament in 1994 to undertake specific statutory responsibilities associated with the licensing of coal mining operations in Britain; handle subsidence claims which are not the responsibility of licensed coalmine operators; deal with property and historic liability issues and provide information on coal mining. The Coal Authority set up a new Planning and Local Authority Liaison Department in 2008 to re-engage with the three planning systems across England, Scotland</p> | <p>Comments noted but much of this detail is not appropriate in the Core Strategy. Some references would be appropriate in the Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>and Wales. The main areas of planning interest to The Coal Authority in terms of policy making relate to: • the safeguarding of coal as a mineral in accordance with the advice contained in MPS1 and MPG3 in England; and • ensuring that future development is undertaken safely and reduce the future liability on the tax payer for subsidence and other mining related hazards claims arising from the legacy of coal mining in accordance with the advice in PPG14 and MPG3 in England. Surface Coal Resources and Prior Extraction As you will be aware, the Rochdale area contains coal resources which are capable of extraction by surface mining operations. This information is available to Mineral Planning Authorities free of charge from The Coal Authority following signing a data sharing licence. Further detail about this is set out in our letters to yourselves dated 6 June 2008 and 24 July 2009. The information will assist in identifying a Minerals Safeguarding Area for coal. The current Energy White Paper, published in May 2007, estimated that “by 2020 fossil fuels are expected to supply the great majority of UK energy needs and 14% of primary energy demand will be met by coal.” In March 2008, the Rt Hon. John Hutton MP, Secretary of State for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform stated that “...Fossil fuels will continue to play an important role in ensuring that flexibility of the electricity generation system as well. Electricity demand fluctuates continually, but the fluctuations can be very pronounced during winter, requiring rapid short term increases in production. Neither wind nor nuclear can fulfil that role. We therefore will continue to need this back up from fossil fuels, with coal a key source of that flexibility....” The UK Low Carbon Transition Plan White Paper builds on the 2007 White Paper, was published in July 2009 to set out the national strategy for climate and energy suggests that by 2020, clean coal will contribute 22% to the overall energy mix (this is actually an increase on that predicted in 2007 Energy White Paper). The 2009 White Paper re-confirms that “coal and gas will remain important to ensure our electricity supply is reliable and secure as we move towards greater dependence on intermittent sources like wind...The UK needs to main security of supplies of fossil fuels, which will remain an essential input to our electricity supplies for many years to come. Around a third of this is supplied by the UK coal industry.” The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unduly sterilised by new development. In instances where this may be the case, The Coal Authority would be seeking prior extraction of the coal. Prior</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | <p>extraction of coal also has the benefit of removing any potential land instability problems in the process. Contact details for individual operators that may be able to assist with coal extraction in advance of development can be obtained from the Confederation of Coal Producers' website at www.coalpro.co.uk/members.shtml. As The Coal Authority owns the coal on behalf of the state, if a development is to intersect the ground then specific written permission of The Coal Authority may be required. The changes which The Coal Authority would like to see in relation to mineral safeguarding are: Spatial Portrait: Environment and natural resources & Strategic Objective SO4 Test of Soundness Justified Effective Consistency With National Policy-X The Coal Authority supports the recognition in the Spatial Portrait and Strategic Objectives that the borough contains mineral reserves which need to be protected and safeguarded for the future. There are coal resources present that are capable of extraction using surface mining techniques across approximately 95% of the Rochdale area, so it is important that this nationally significant mineral resource is identified through the LDF and not unnecessarily sterilised by development. Reason – In order to highlight the importance of mineral resources in Rochdale, and set out the Council's commitment to safeguarding resources in line with MPS1.</p> | |
| 216477/220 | Mr John Lappin | <p>I suggest that Middleton does not have a strong connection with Rochdale. Middleton shared the wakes holiday with Oldham and was on a branch railway track from the "Manchester /Oldham line". Personally Rochdale comes after Bury in relation to shopping; the problem with Rochdale is that is farther away from Middleton, than Manchester, Oldham, Heywood and Bury. I cannot see how Rochdale can ever compete with Manchester, Bury or Oldham in any way what's so ever. You are correct; all the green land around Middleton has potential for longer term protection by being upgraded to Greenbelt status. The over-emphasis or regeneration of Langley causes a lot of jealousy around other parts of the town, who feel they are being ignored. Therefore the shift to East Middleton is welcomed, but do not ignore the older parts of Alkrington and Rhodes. Because there was not a scheme put in place to replace the jobs lost when the cotton trade collapsed, most Middletonians had to look to Manchester for work. Residents were led to believe that the proposed new Stakehill site would be where all the manufacturing would take place, but only what was delivered was warehousing. Modern day office work is now very hi-tech, would</p> | <p>Noted – New heavy rail link to Manchester is not feasible. However, as part of exploring opportunities for improved public transport the potential to bring Metrolink to Middleton is being explored (see explanation to policy T2)</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>local work force be qualified enough.</p> <p>Middleton must have a new rail link with Manchester, not just at Mills Hill, but from the town centre, near the bus station like Bury.</p> | |
| 216593/123 | SEGRO Industrial Estates Ltd (Barton Willmore - Mr John Pearce) | <p>We support the inclusion within the description of the spatial portrait of the Borough of south Heywood as a major employment location due to its strategic location for distribution businesses adjoining junction 19. We also support the inclusion within the description of the spatial portrait of Heywood for the potential for a new road link to junction 19 of the M62.</p> | Support noted |
| 361753/3 | Dr Marian Corns | <p>There is too much dependency on Kingsway to the detriment of the rest of the Borough. It is seen by teenagers as being a dead end. It is much more exciting - and easier - to go into Manchester for jobs, which are seen as being progressive jobs there.</p> | Disagree – the Strategy aims to improve job opportunities locally and improve access to job opportunities outside the borough e.g. Manchester |
| 368001/24 | Miss Erin McIlroy | <p>This spatial portrait is a reasonable description of the borough. It clearly sets out that the greenbelts and areas of open space give the borough its special 'character' and are very valuable both in terms of the health of the community and in adding to the value of house prices i.e. areas such as those in the North of Rochdale have better quality housing and higher house prices as well as more green belt and a better environment where as areas in the south such as Middleton have lower quality housing, house prices are lower, there is overcrowding and poor health. For this reason releasing land from the green belt particularly Bowlee Park to Rhodes Green in Middleton would result in lowering house prices even further and leave people in the south of the borough with no access to open spaces or green belt which the council in its report values so highly especially for those residents living in the North of the borough where the house prices are higher of a better a quality and where this good access to open spaces and green belt. Obviously there is a link between access to green belt and open space, house prices and quality of housing. So why build on the small amount of existing open space and green belt in the south of the borough, where house prices are already low and there is overcrowding?</p> | Disagree – Development would provide a wider choice of housing, providing a quality residential environment for new and existing residents. There are examples where good quality new housing has increased the popularity of an area with a positive knock on effect for existing house prices. |
| 389357/356 | MMC Developments Ltd - Mr Mark Russell (Knight Frank LLP - Sophie Taylor) | <p>Economy It is acknowledged that the manufacturing base for Rochdale is in decline and that business survival rates are low in comparison to elsewhere and also that there is also an under-representation of financial and business services within the Borough. It is agreed that the Council should address the decline in manufacturing by looking to identify 21st Century employment sites to attract new businesses. It is also acknowledged that manufacturing industries have left a legacy of old commercial</p> | Noted. Reference to the site as a major development opportunity should be deleted from the Core Strategy. There is insufficient evidence regarding the scope and scale of the potential development given contamination problems. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>properties which are not suitable for modern industrial needs and in particular, it is agreed that these sites have poor facilities and are generally in poor locations. This is characteristic of MMC's site at Rooley Moor Road. It is a former industrial site which is in decline and in a poor location to serve the requirements of industry going forward. Housing It is agreed that the Borough does not have enough housing of the right size, type and tenure. It is also noted that there is an over supply of old terraced housing, lack of large homes to meet the needs of large Asian families and a shortage of executive/high value homes to attract high Income families. It is also noted that there is insufficient provision of affordable housing. It is agreed that a more balanced range of housing is needed in regeneration areas to meet demand and also to create a balance of successful communities that retain and attract residents. This section acknowledges that regeneration initiatives have started to redress this imbalance and scope exists to increase housing, number and choice through remodelling and redevelopment. MMC's site at Rooley Moor Road is a brownfield site being promoted for regeneration and which could assist in meeting the demand for housing. Its location within the urban area residential is appropriate for this use and it is considered to be a more appropriate alternative to the current allocation of the site for mainly employment. Accessibility and Transport It is agreed that transport improvements need to be co-ordinated and development needs to be located where accessibility, particularly by public transport, is good. This section of the Core Strategy acknowledges that congestion is a problem in the North (and in the South) at peak times and solution needs to be found. it is also advises that local traffic problems need to be addressed. In bringing MMC's site forward for a housing lead development, it is acknowledged that there will be a requirement to properly understand how this can be accommodated within the existing highway structure and proposed measures required to accommodate the development.</p> | |
| 389694/297 | Clariant Ribble Limited - Mr Stephen Parkinson (Indigo Planning Limited - Mr Bill Davidson) | <p>Wording of Pennines Spatial Portrait It is accepted that Littleborough is an important settlement but additional focus should be placed on its role as the key service centre in the Pennine area and, as such, it should therefore be a focus for new development. The wording of the fifth paragraph should be revised to read: "Whilst Littleborough is largely a commuter settlement, there is a need to retain and widen existing employment opportunities and develop new housing. It has a mixture of both affluent and low income households and there is</p> | Disagree – The points raised seem to relate more to policy than the Spatial Portrait. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|---|
| | | demand for both affordable housing and high value housing, improving the attractiveness of the area and its social diversity. | |
| 396047/134 | Mr Gary Louden | <p>On the whole, I agree with the description of the borough. Although I do have some concerns regarding the negative opinion towards terrace properties. The majority of terrace properties are of sound construction and ample proportion. With sympathetic development and creation of communal green space, large terraced areas can be transformed into attractive living space with character and heritage appeal. Furthermore, the transformation of older properties into energy efficient homes is far more environmentally friendly than new builds, taking into consideration the carbon impact of new materials required. Furthermore, terrace properties can easily be 'knocked-through' into adjacent properties in order to create larger homes for extended families, although I personally believe that encouraging excessively large families in deprived overcrowded urban areas is to be avoided. We are an overcrowded island of finite resource. I also fully agree with Miss Erin McIlroy (ID: 368001) and her views on the green space within the borough, especially the area of greenbelt in question towards the South of Heywood, namely Birch, Bowlee and Rhodes. This area is super valuable for many reasons. It is the only accessible green space available to residents to the South of the borough. It offers Langley an immediate green area. It needs to remain attractive greenbelt to entice young professional types potentially looking to locate to borough. Dilution of the greenbelt will potentially lower the areas status and house prices which I see as a negative manoeuvre. On a general note, I think it would be useful to indicate the number of existing under-utilised and vacant properties in the borough, these buildings should be fully exploited, along with brownfield sites for development/housing opportunities before valuable greenbelt is threatened.</p> | <p>Agree – Refer to the potential of terraced properties and existing housing stock as a whole in the relevant policy section.</p> <p>Agree - Any development needs to enhance the area.</p> |
| 396098/287 | Woodford Land Limited - Mr Jason Parkinson (Garner Planning Associates - Mr Christopher Garner) | <p>Spatial Portrait: Housing - Proposed change to recognise that delivering a more balanced range of housing is needed in the Borough generally, not just in the regeneration areas. The northern and suburban areas have a role to play in delivering executive or higher value homes which the Core Strategy and the SHLAA recognise are in short supply in the Borough.</p> <p>Spatial Portrait: Townships Descriptions are provided of the four identified townships, but not the northern part of the Borough referred to in the Location and Setting section i.e. the north Pennines, north Rochdale (Norden and Bamford) and the role these areas are to play in the future of the Borough.</p> | <p>Agree – Make reference to delivering a better balance in the borough as a whole including higher value housing</p> <p>Agree – Amend to reflect north / south characteristics and issues more clearly</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---------------|
| 396108/393 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | <p>3.10 Broadly speaking we consider that the Spatial Portrait offers an objective description of the Borough, the challenges it faces and the opportunities available. 3.11 From the description our understanding is that the Borough is located in the north east of the Greater Manchester Conurbation on the Pennine Fringe. This provides an attractive setting, gives the Borough its special character and is an asset. As a general point there are indications elsewhere in the document which suggest that Rochdale has a poor image both within the District and externally. This presents a particular issue with which the Council appears to have taken a pragmatic and a positive approach. 3.12 There is a recognition that the local economy is underperforming in comparison with the remainder of the conurbation, the north-west region more generally and that employment levels are below the national average. Heywood Distribution Park along with Stakehill Industrial Estate, both located in the M62 corridor, provide the largest concentrations of employment and along with Kingsway provide some 180 hectares of good quality land and sites. 3.13 In the area addressing 'Economic Challenges' we support the Council's recognition of its key strategic strength in the field of storage and distribution. It is our view that the Council needs to build on the strength of this sector moving forward. The Portrait rightly considers that the Borough should look to attract new forms of economic development; we urge a balanced approach along with enhancement of existing sectors of strength - namely storage and distribution. 3.14 We would caution that Rochdale will face considerable competition when chasing 'high end' employment uses and may find it difficult to attract these uses to a Borough which currently lacks a university or other sources of 'high end' knowledge output. 3.15 While efforts to chase high end activities should remain, the main focus for the Council should be in developing existing and sustainable areas of strength; for example storage and distribution uses at accessible locations in particular, as per RSS Policy. 3.16 The identification of enough employment land and the proposed simplification of the planning process should be a main objective around Heywood as there is the real potential to grow a strong sector of the economy and to develop a cluster of complementary services. 3.17 Within the housing portrait the description is quite blunt, that the District does not have sufficient accommodation in terms of type, tenure, size and quality to meet current demand or anticipated future requirements. There is an oversupply of older terraced properties and a lack of executive/</p> | Support noted |
|------------|---|---|---------------|

| | | | |
|------------|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>higher value accommodation at one end and a shortage of affordable accommodation and low income starter homes at the other. We support the Council's view that a more balanced supply of housing is required to create a sustainable community and attract and retain people into the District. 3.18 We concur with the Council that the Borough is highly accessible, particularly the southern part with access to the M62 Transpennine, and M60 Manchester Orbital Motorways. 3.19 Furthermore we agree with the Council's view that transport improvements need to be coordinated with and support future development, while new development itself should be located in accessible locations. At the same time as there are low levels of car ownership there is a high level of commuting into the Borough with significant congestion at peak times. Around Heywood and Middleton it is acknowledged that car ownership levels are lowest (at around 65% of households). 3.20 Turning to the Township portraits, the Wilton Estate is a major landowner in the southern part of the Borough around Heywood and Middleton (Rhodes Green): 3.21 South Heywood is confirmed as a major employment location due to its strategic position adjoining Junction 19 of the M62. Two issues are raised: that there is potential for new employment in the area, although there is a need to diversify the range of employment. Existing HGV movements are considered to be a problem around the town centre. Proposals to resolve these issues include introducing traffic management measures, improving public transport links and removing HGV movements (through the construction of a new link road to J19). 3.22 In terms of the Middleton portrait the strategic role of the Green Belt is recognised as is the potential for release of land at Rhodes Green for future development.</p> | <p>This comment indicates a misunderstanding of the spatial portrait in relation to the future of the land at Rhodes Green. This text needs to be amended to make this clearer.</p> |
| 397168/464 | GMPTE - Mr Richard Clowes | <p>The 'Accessibility and transport' section of the Spatial Portrait does not just describe the Borough and any issues needing attention, it goes on to identify possible solutions such as further light and heavy rail improvements and provision of park and ride. This is not considered particularly helpful at this stage in the document and without reference to an evidence base, such statements appear subjective. The statement referring to a Metrolink stop at Kingsway Business Park should include "subject to developer I ERDF funding". The Heywood section states "There are opportunities to address the problems of heavy goods vehicles impacting on the town centre and housing areas by improving public transport links....". New freight rail facilities may help to address this issue but</p> | <p>Agree - Delete from Spatial portrait potential proposals. Definite proposals are however an appropriate part of the Spatial Portrait.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | | improving public transport links will not. The Middleton section proposes improved park and ride at Mills Hill and extending Metrolink to Middleton, again it is not considered helpful to put forward possible solutions to issues at this stage in the document particularly with no reference to the evidence base. | |
| 398423/522 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | <p>Page 12 the reference to the HMR pathfinder may soon be out of date if the programme is not funded after March 2011.</p> <p>Page 20 -final sentence. The statement that the need for intervention in Sparth & Falinge is 'more urgent' could imply that the current focus on Inner Rochdale and ECR is wrong. Can this be re-worded?</p> | <p>Noted – Whilst this is acknowledged, the past and current role of HMR is significant.</p> <p>Agree – Reword last sentence to avoid any implication that this area is now more of a priority than other existing intervention areas</p> |
| 401290/489 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | Housing - The Spatial Portrait of the Borough (p12) states that the latest SHLAA indicated that there is considerable scope to meet the 400 homes per year RSS requirement on previously developed sites. We are concerned that this evidence base is not fully reflected in the proposed policies and so consider stronger justification, supported by evidence base, will be needed for diverging from the SHLAA and the DP4 requirement to develop previously developed land in settlements first. | <p>Noted – However, given recent completion rates and element of flexibility is required in terms of identifying possible sites outside the urban area. The focus on regeneration and use of brownfield sites is still a priority within the strategy</p> |
| Chapter 3 – Our Spatial Vision for the borough | | | |
| Question 3 What do you think of our Spatial Vision? | | | |
| 60372/75 | British Waterways – Ms Sam Turner | British Waterways is pleased that the spatial vision highlights the Rochdale Canal as a major asset and a focus for regeneration and leisure, and supports the vision of the canal being a key feature of the Borough's character and its regeneration. | Support noted. |
| 161779/267 | Manchester Airport - Ms Sarah Lee | We fully support the direction of your Core Strategy and welcome the overall vision, which recognises the vital link between good transport links and a strong economy. | Support noted. |
| 161991/443 | Wainhomes (Development) Ltd - Mr Richard Chamberlain (Emery Planning Partnership - Mr Stephen Harris) | <p>2.2 The identified plan period in the vision is to 2026. Before we assess the spatial strategy, we have concerns over the plan period, as we consider that the end date of 2026 should be extended to at least 2031. 2.3 Our reasoning for this is that 2026, although some 17 years away, does not in our view accord with Government guidance. Paragraph 53 of PPS3 states: "Local Planning Authorities should set out in Local Development Documents their policies and strategies for delivering the level of housing provision, including identifying broad locations and specific sites that will enable continuous delivery of housing for at least 15 years from the date of adoption, taking account of the level of housing provision set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy." 2.4 PPS3 clearly advises that LDDs should plan</p> | Disagree. The Core Strategy is intended to look at least 15 years and this will be the case once adopted. There is an issue regarding evidence base in going beyond 2026. (see response under C1) |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>for at least 15 years from adoption. Therefore the 15 years should be used as a minimum, not a maximum. 2.5 The proposed adoption date for the Core Strategy is February 2011. However, there has been significant slippage in the production of the Core Strategy, and we consider that adoption prior to 2011 is unlikely. If the Core Strategy is adopted post 2011, then the plan will not have a plan period of at least 15 years from adoption and will not conform to national guidance. 2.6 Furthermore, work is not scheduled to start on the Land Allocations DPD until January 2011. On that basis, it would be extremely unlikely that the Land Allocations DPD would be adopted prior to 2013. This would result in that DPD only planning for allocations for the remaining 13 years of the Core Strategy plan period. Therefore an end date of 2031 provides the Land Allocations DPD with at least a 15 year plan period from adoption as well. 2.7 In addition, the North West Plan is in the early stages of review. That document (RS2010) will set out the regional policy context for a 20 year time horizon. Therefore although in the early stages, it nevertheless will have an end date of 2031. The Core Strategy should therefore also plan to this date. 2.8 A new plan period to 2031 would not be out of conformity with the RSS, as policy L4 specifically states that the annual housing requirement can be continued beyond 2021. We consider that this should be addressed in the Core Strategy at an early stage.</p> | |
| 162033/148 | Northwest Regional Development Agency - Mr Ian Wray | <p>The draft spatial vision has, to some extent, been amended to reflect the Agency's comments at the Issues and Options stage. In this regard it is now more 'Rochdale specific', but we suggest it could be made more so by incorporating the visions for the various townships which appear in Chapter 11. The draft vision refers to a stronger visitor economy and a more diverse economy in the context of the Pennine north of the Borough. We suggest these should be Borough-wide objectives. We welcome the vision's recognition of the need for executive housing as well as affordable housing.</p> | Noted – Vision is likely to be amended to reflect other comments and need for more consistent vision at a corporate level |
| 162038/321 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | <p>Overall good and supported. Two suggestions: • The reference in the fifth paragraph to “a better managed and more accessible landscape” may apply mainly to the north of the Borough, but it is still very relevant to other parts of the Borough and should be expressed in the overall vision for the whole of Rochdale, i.e. in the overall environmental dimension in the third paragraph, e.g. “It will offer locally distinctive places and towns and its image will have been lifted through better design, attractive gateways and corridors, and through the celebration of its cultural heritage and enhanced</p> | Agreed. Further amendments will be made. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | | landscapes”. • The very last sentence is less than clear as written – would: “The Rochdale canal will be a major asset and a focus for regeneration and leisure, and . Water, including the Rochdale canal, will be a key feature of the borough’s character and its regeneration” cover the intended points and be clearer? | |
| 216477/221 | Mr John Lappin | R.M.B.C. must concentrate in promoting all parts of the Borough, throughout the country, and deliver all they are promising, in this document. There could now be a trend, following the B.B.C. move out of London, of other large organisations re-locating to save money. When the B.B.C first initiated a move to Salford Quays did R.M.B.C target the staff at London B.B.C tempting them with what North of Manchester could offer? I doubt it, so get in there before the other Council’s do. To other firms from down South find a way to stop new firms only employing locals, to do the lower paid jobs. The current practice is for them to bring their own management staff who commute from outside of the Borough. All teachers must live locally to schools, not commuting for Yorkshire etc, via motorways. This would eliminate schools closing in bad weather, due to no staff. The green areas are our heritage, just as important as listed buildings, and must be protected and saved for own grand children, and all those following us, to admire and look after. The Rochdale Canal will be very important part of regeneration, but users do not want to see warehouses, factories, scrap yards etc. they want countryside on their way to Manchester and attractions nearby to make them stop and spend money. | Noted |
| 216593/124 | SEGRO Industrial Estates Ltd (Barton Willmore - Mr John Pearce) | We support the Spatial Vision particularly the reference to the borough having a wider range of jobs, with employment uses focused on accessible and sustainable sites. Heywood Distribution Park is an existing employment area and the creation of an SPZ at the Park will greatly assist with meeting this element of the spatial vision. | Support noted |
| 361753/4 | Dr Marian Corns | The vision is good - the people are too cynical to accept it. Too many promises but nothing to show have been the guiding light so far since the formation of the borough | Support noted |
| 368001/26 | Miss Erin McIlroy | The spatial vision when read out of context of the rest of the report is very persuasive however when read with the rest of this core strategy document it can quickly been to refer to only parts of the borough and be a 'vision' to benefit residents living in only the North of the borough where there will be lots of green belt and open space and hence where people will want to live and buy houses. However the south of the borough has its green belt released to be built upon | Noted. Changes to the vision will be considered. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | | and the only part of the vision which these residents get is industry! Which will result in lowering the already low house prices for people in the south of Rochdale, lowering the quality of environment people have access to here resulting in the south of Rochdale being a place where people do not want to live and only good place for people to work or to drive through for links to the motorway. This 'vision' statement is shows no vision for the residents in the south of the borough and is highly misleading when read in the context of the rest of the coument. | |
| 389694/298 | Clariant Ribble Limited - Mr Stephen Parkinson (Indigo Planning Limited - Mr Bill Davidson) | Object to: Statement (eighth paragraph) PPS3 (Housing), paragraph 9 'Strategic Housing Policy Objectives' seeks to "provide everyone with an opportunity to live in a decent home, which they can afford, where they would want to live'. As such, paragraph 8 should be expanded to read: 'The Council will promote development of a choice of housing to meet everyone's needs, including affordable housing, market housing, and up market executive housing'. | Disagree. Such a statement is insufficiently spatial for inclusion in a Spatial Vision. Such a statement could apply to anywhere. However, these issues are picked up in the strategic objective and relevant policies. |
| 396047/135 | Mr Gary Loudon | I think the Spatial Vision is good and would be a magnificent achievement once implemented. However, I do support Miss Erin McIlroy (ID: 368001) and her views towards the South of the borough. Infact, I believe that the greenbelt aspect of this area should be promoted, as it is potentially just as important as the North of the borough with respect to attracting high calibre families and residents to live within an easy commute of Manchester City. Therefore, the greenbelt to the South of the borough should not be industrialized but be encouraged in order to maintain an attractive enticement fringing on Manchester City and competing against the South Manchester leafy suburbs which are becoming too expensive for many professional individuals to afford. In addition, I would like to put forward the suggestion that these areas can be greatly enhanced to provide education and attraction to visitors and local residents. Birch Village is one of the few remaining isolated villages within close reach of Manchester and within the Rochdale borough. This village could be improved to attract residents and visitors to local farm shops, recreational facilities, local food and drink...all within a rural environment adjoining urban dwellings thus developing rural and visitor economies. | Agree. We could say more about the potential of the Green Belt in the south of the borough. |
| 396098/288 | Woodford Land Limited - Mr Jason Parkinson (Garner Planning Associates - Mr Christopher Garner) | The vision of regeneration in the south complemented by regenerated urban sites in the north is welcomed. The recognition that housing will be provided to meet everyone's needs including more affordable and up-market executive housing is welcomed. | Support noted |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---|
| 396108/394 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.23 Generally we support the Council's Spatial Vision. It is appropriate for the Vision to be aspirational and time related (i.e. "by 2026). 3.24 For consistency we would suggest that the Spatial Vision could include a brief paragraph reference to the aspirations for each of the townships. This would provide consistency with the previous section which provides the spatial portrait and provide a linkage and hook for delivering the Core Strategy in the town ships (Section 11). | Agree. Include introductory paragraph for each township vision. |
| 398409/539 | Peel Holdings (Management) Limited - Mr David Thompson | Peel supports the thrust of the Spatial Vision, in particular the aspirations to ensure that in 2026, Rochdale Borough is: '... an attractive, vibrant and thriving place where people want to live, work, visit and do business . . .' (page 23) and that: 'There will be a choice of housing to meet everyone's needs, including more affordable and up-market executive housing' (page 24). Peel believes that making provision for adequate levels of employment and housing land and supporting delivery will be key to ensuring long lasting social, economic and environmental regeneration. | Support noted |
| 398423/477 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | We support the overall vision for the Borough . However it ; - Could include reference to Kingsway reinforcing its significance within the spatial plan e.g. Rochdale will have established itself as an important strategic location for growth sector businesses providing high quality sites through the successful development of Kingsway. - Add reference to Kingsway, "fully capitalised on the proximity of the M62, key employment sites including Kingsway, Metrolink". The Inner Rochdale area (the HMR focus area) is mainly described in them CS as Milkstone & Deeplish and Newbold. This is fine, but there are a few anomalies - Page 24 uses the term 'Inner Rochdale' | Agree. Make changes to include reference to Kingsway and correct names of regeneration areas. |
| Chapter 4 – Strategic Objectives | | | |
| Question 4 Do you think these are the right objectives, and related policies, to deliver our Vision for a better future for Rochdale, Heywood, Middleton and Pennines? | | | |
| 6682/111 | United Utilities - Mr David Hardman | 'SO4 Conserve the natural environment and resources' should include "Conserve drinking water sources". Climate change will effect the availability of drinking water in the medium term and by 2014, the Habitats Directive will have a significant affect on our ability to extract from our drinking water sources. Therefore, it important to engage with partners to encourage conservation of drinking water supplies. | Agree, but this is implicit in the policy. |
| 161620/93 | Mr Steve Connell | S02 - add 'places of worship' to list | Disagree – to mention all types of community facilities would be unnecessary detail. |
| 161620/103 | Mr Steve Connell | Addition to previous comment: Add 'places of worship' in S02 'f' as these are necessary for a healthy community and vital to reach faith | Disagree – see above |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|--|
| | | groups | |
| 161663/306 | Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd - Mr David Ward | We broadly support the identified strategic objectives set out within the Core Strategy. KBP has already made a contribution to these objectives and has a role to play in securing outputs on each of the 5 identified objectives in the future. | Noted |
| 162033/149 | Northwest Regional Development Agency - Mr Ian Wray | The Agency has no fundamental concerns regarding the draft strategic objectives. | Noted |
| 162038/322 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | SO2 d – "...where there is a lack...", but more particularly health benefits are especially relevant in terms of access to the wider countryside, e.g. to de-stress and 'blow away the cobwebs' – it is suggested that the reference to 'open space' should be replaced with "open space including the wider countryside". SO3 – agreed and supported. SO4 – also mostly agreed and supported – j) might usefully be supplemented as follows "safeguard mineral resources, including through maximising re-cycling aggregates;". | Disagree. Unnecessary detail under this particular objective. Countryside is referred to under SO4 |
| 180811/426 | Natural England - Mr Stephen Hedley | SO4: To conserve and manage the natural environment and resources We are very supportive of this objective, and commend the breadth of measures that have been considered to deliver this objective. We recommend that the objective to manage flood risk (d) should instead aim to ensure appropriate flood prevention and management throughout the Borough. SO5: To improve accessibility and deliver sustainable transport We are very supportive of the priority of this objective to firstly locate development in suitable locations to enable access by sustainable transport. Landscape Character Appraisals We commend the recognition throughout the Preferred Options report of the importance and value of landscape character, quality and features (SO3(c); P1(a); and DM1(4)a) as well as the increased emphasis on enhancing the Borough's green infrastructure network (including seeking developer contributions towards this (DM2)). However, we strongly recommend that reference is made to a relevant Landscape Character Appraisal; please see our comments below (under Policy P1). | Noted Disagree. It does mean that, but mentions areas of particular importance. Noted. |
| 216477/222 | Mr John Lappin | SO1 All these should already be place, and why should Rochdale Town Centre be given extra attention? See SO1 (A) Many would say they all already do. SO2 (C) R.M.B.C had thousands of houses but sold them, then did not replace. SO2 (E) People should be safe and secure in "all areas" not just Council estates and inner areas SO2 (D) How many playing fields, open space has R.M.B.C sold off over the last 20/25 years? SO3 (B) Again you are putting more emphasis on Rochdale. SO3 (C) Protecting local heritage, what about the | Consider |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|---------------|
| | | neglect of Hopwood, Tonge Halls, Providence Church and Alkrington Hall before it was sold off by R.M.B.C. SO4 (H) Definitely air and water pollution in Middleton being at the hub of various main roads and surrounded by motorways, air pollution is a big problem, also by industry see the campaign by M.E.G. in early 1990's. Water pollution by McBrides in River Irk, and Wince Brook by sewage works in Chadderton see survey results by Salford University again work by M.E.G. SO4 (I) All brown fields and future brown field site in Middleton, to be fully developed before release of green sites. | |
| 216593/125 | SEGRO Industrial Estates Ltd (Barton Willmore - Mr John Pearce) | We support the strategic objectives and welcome the fact that SO1 Delivering a Prosperous Economy is identified as the first objective. In terms of how this is to be achieved, we support the objectives of making the Borough more attractive to investment, developing economic hubs, increasing the number, quality and choice of jobs and increasing employment levels and reducing worklessness. We also support SO5 and the objective of enhancing access in key development and employment areas, particularly in the M62 corridor. | Support noted |
| 336315/83 | Envirolink Northwest - Miss Denise Oliver | Envirolink Northwest is a not for profit organisation, funded by the Northwest Regional Development Agency (NWRDA) and European Union to develop and support the North West region's energy and environmental technology and services industry. Part of this role is to support the development and implementation of renewable energy technologies across the region, not only to support existing environmental technology businesses, but also to increase the amount of indigenous renewable energy generation. This contributes to the economic development of the North West and also to reducing our regional carbon dioxide emissions. We support the inclusion of Strategic Objective 4, criterion (e) and (f); sustainable development is at the heart of spatial planning, and every opportunity to reduce the carbon emissions associated with new development, encourage sustainable construction and increase the production of energy from renewable and low carbon sources is fully supported. | Support noted |
| 361753/5 | Dr Marian Corns | Rochdale is not seen as a shopping centre for people within the borough. For example, Bury and Bolton are seen as being more vibrant than Rochdale. Re access, the Metrolink will do absolutely nothing for Pennines, Heywood or Middleton people and will suck what little life there is in Rochdale out towards Manchester. | Disagree. |
| 361753/7 | Dr Marian Corns | Are these the 'improvements' the local people want - or what officers think they can get away with? | Noted. |
| 361753/9 | Dr Marian Corns | Just another rehash of things which never materialise | Noted. |

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| 368001/27 | Miss Erin McIlroy | These objectives are the right objectives for the borough however it is unfortunate the the rest of the document does not seem to relate to these objectives. Was this done purposefully? Are these objectives just here to persuade and confuse people to what the true objectives seem to be when reading the rest of the document? For example objective S03 sets out a plan for greening the environment and improving access to green space - yet in the rest of the document it is put forward that the small amount of green belt (Bowlee Park - Rhodes Green) in the south of the borough is to be made available for development - so for the residents in the south this objective does not seem to apply as there will be less green space and access to green space. Each of the other objectives put forward are similarly mis-leading as the rest of the document does not support the objectives which have been put forward. | Agree. Need to consider wording of the objectives and policies to resolve this contradiction. |
| 370270/90 | Mr Richard Atherton | S03-B Attractive gateways into Heywood Town Centre. Queens Park Road and Bamford Road are major routes into Heywood town centre that need upgrading to a more attractive gateway. The bridge on Queens park road needs repairs and the bollards removing. Hooley Bridge Mill on Bamford Road needs a complete overhaul on the outside after the fire since it seems to be left in disrepair. | Agree. Need to mention other gateways in the borough |
| 370270/92 | Mr Richard Atherton | SO1-A Thriving Town Centres? For the past 45 years I have lived in Heywood and run my own business within the borough. I have seen very little regeneration or investment for Heywood town centre and my gut feeling is this will continue even though you have purchased Boots warehouse with an aim to regenerate Heywood shopping centre. If this is to be done, we will need a proposal with imagination to capture most of the shoppers at Morrisons and Dunnes and to channel them towards the town centre area/amenities. Morrisons and Dunnes seems to have saved what little of the town centre area we have - both neighbouring Rochdale and Middleton have shopping centres built in the past, will it be Heywood next? I very much doubt this as in my view the allocation for town centre regeneration funds should be more open to public scrutiny on the allocation between the borough since Heywood always seems to be at the bottom of the list! | Noted |
| 370419/254 | Highways Agency - Mr Ian Tull | Strategic Objective 5 (SO5) RMBC has acknowledged the presence of Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA). The location of developments should be guided by such sites and caution taken when seeking to deliver development which could potentially affect AQMAs. SO5 has outlined that the delivery of the spatial strategy will tackle air quality and climate change, there may be further scope | Noted. Consider mentioning AQMAs. Noted. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|-------|
| | | to elaborate on the presence of AQMAs. The general themes in SO5 are generally consistent with the Agency's approach to focus upon accessibility and sustainable initiatives without the need for building new roads but through capitalising on existing opportunities and improving public transport. The next stage is to provide clearly defined initiatives to aid delivery and ensure sustainability is paramount when delivering development. The sequential approach identified in SP5 should ensure that under the 2nd stage that accessibility is appropriately weighted. There is an opportunity to directly reference the Agency's accessibility mapping undertakings (as discussed below) and ensure that the accessibility criteria is given appropriate weighting in the sequential exercise or ranked accordingly. The interrelated nature of the SOs is critical and should therefore see sustainable transport given an appropriately high agenda in the decision making process. | |
| 389357/357 | MMC Developments Ltd - Mr Mark Russell (Knight Frank LLP - Sophie Taylor) | Five strategic objectives have been identified in the Core Strategy that are essential. These are as follows: SO1 -To deliver a more prosperous economy. SO2 -To create successful and healthy communities SO3 - To improve design image and quality of place. SO4 - To conserve and manage the natural environment and resources SO5 – To improve accessibility and deliver sustainable transport. The general objectives set out within the Core Strategy under the above headings are supported and considered to be positive objectives and aspirations for the Rochdale Borough for the planned period. | Noted |
| 389357/374 | MMC Developments Ltd - Mr Mark Russell (Knight Frank LLP – Sophie Taylor) | In addition to the sections above, the Core Strategy also deals with the following: • Improving design, image and quality of place. • Conserving and managing a natural environment and resources. In relation to these specific sections, the general principles of sustainable development as set out in national and regional policies are supported. Specific comments have not been provided in this representation to these sections of the report, although detailed consideration will be afforded when proposals for the Rooley Moor Road site are progressed with Rochdale MBC. | Noted |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|--|
| 396047/136 | Mr Gary Louden | Overall, I think the objectives are sound. However, I do see major conflict with regard to the suggestion of developing greenbelt/protected open space land contrasting against the majority of the objective points. SO1 – To deliver a more prosperous economy b) Consideration to be given towards traffic flows from motorways into residential areas please. e) Developing rural and visitor economies – consideration towards South borough greenbelt please. SO2 – To create successful and healthy communities a) Dilution of South borough greenbelt will devalue house prices by removing local accessible green space to surrounding housing areas. b) Again, dilution of greenbelt surrounding Langley will not assist in regeneration of this estate. d) Dilution of South borough greenbelt will not assist this objective point f) Dilution of South borough greenbelt will not assist in health or pollution reduction. g) Dilution of South borough greenbelt will not assist in increasing the number of residents who like living in the borough. SO3 – To improve design image and quality of space b. Dilution of South borough greenbelt will not improve the image of borough gateways, note, the South borough greenbelt adjoins the main motorway infrastructure and Manchester City transportation routes. c. Dilution of South borough greenbelt strongly conflicts with this objective point. d. Making use of built and natural heritage. Birch Village improvements would support this objective. e. Dilution of South borough greenbelt would conflict with this objective SO4 – To Conserve and manage the natural environment. I agree with this objective but the suggestion of developing greenbelt South of the borough strongly conflicts with its intentions. SO5 – to improve accessibility and deliver sustainable transport I would like to see some intention towards increasing cycle pathways around the borough in combination with existing links to cycle pathways into Manchester City centre. | Agree. Consider wording changes to address contradictions. |
| 396098/289 | Woodford Land Limited - Mr Jason Parkinson (Garner Planning Associates - Mr Christopher Garner) | SO2 Strategic Objectives The Spatial Vision reference to the need for up-market executive housing needs and the regeneration of urban sites in the north of the Borough need to be specifically referred to in the policy. | Agree. Noted. |
| 396108/395 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.25 It may be appropriate to explain how the Strategic Objectives were identified (Section 4 Para 1). 3.26 With respect to SO1 our response to Question 2 is relevant. Objective SO1 should state that efforts will be made to develop | Disagree. Agree. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--------|
| | | <p>existing areas of economic strength and deliver a successful cluster of distribution industries building upon those existing strengths. It would also be appropriate for SO1 to ensure that a sufficient and adequate supply of employment land and sites is always available.</p> <p>3.27 We consider that objective SO2 should make a clear commitment to deliver enough housing and ensure the availability of sufficient available housing land over the plan period. This would reflect Guidance contained in PPS3 and PPS12 which require a readily available supply of housing land (even in the event of changing circumstances) over the plan period, across the Borough.</p> <p>3.28 We support the remaining Objectives S03, SO4 and S05.</p> | Agree. |
| 396108/468 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Council's policy should commit to building on existing areas of economic strength in particular storage and distribution as this is a sector in which the potential exists for the creation of a cluster. Identification of an Economic Growth Corridor at South Heywood is an appropriate designation for delivering economic growth and jobs. • We support the proposals for identifying up to 58ha of Green Belt land in South Heywood for employment and mixed uses, but would support the removal of more land from the Green Belt where this will assist with defining longer term boundaries for the Green Belt for the period of the Core Strategy and beyond. • As a starting point the Core Strategy should have regard to the employment land requirements identified within the RSS as failing to do so can be held to represent planning to fail. • The Core Strategy should commit to the identification of 90ha of new employment land, or at the very least identify and remove land from the Green Belt on the basis that it is safeguarded for employment uses. • We support the provision of a Link Road to the south of Heywood to connect through to J19 of the M62. A consistency of approach to the purpose and role of the Link Road is necessary. • We have some concerns over the Council's approach to housing and the failure to identify specific sites through which future housing requirements can be delivered and the somewhat blinkered reliance on unspecified sites within regeneration areas. • We are not convinced by the Council's proposal to seek inclusion of land at Rhodes Green Middleton in to the Green Belt. This exercise appears to be "making up the numbers". No evidence or justification has been given for inclusion of this land in the Green Belt. | Noted. |
| 396130/623 | Gill Howard | I think the proposals for the south of Heywood and the other areas | Noted |

| | | | |
|------------|--|---|--|
| | | <p>between Middleton and Heywood do not meet these objectives and in some cases run contrary to them. I do not agree that developing anywhere between Middleton and Heywood will contribute to more prosperous communities or more successful and healthy communities. The development you propose could equally have no effect or negative effect. Developing the land south of Heywood (and any development of land between Middleton and Heywood) does not protect character and heritage and will likely have a detrimental effect on image. Developing the land south of Heywood (and any development of land between Middleton and Heywood) does not conserve the natural environment or effectively manage it. I also think the proposals in R2.2 and R3d run contrary to the objectives of SO4. Developing the land south of Heywood (and any development of land between Middleton and Heywood) does not improve accessibility or deliver sustainable transport. In this respect we feel the proposals for the south of Heywood create more problems than they solve. See Q38 below</p> | |
| 398409/543 | Peel Holdings (Management) Limited - Mr David Thompson | <p>Peel supports the thrust of the Strategic Objectives and in particular: SO1 - 'To deliver a more prosperous economy' SO2 - 'To create successful and healthy communities' -especially:"a) Creating attractive housing areas that provide the right amount and variety of good quality housing in order to retain existing, and attract new, residents and support prosperity and economic growth g) Seeking to increase the number of residents who like living in the borough.</p> <p>Peel Energy 3.3 Peel Energy is fully supportive of Rochdale's commitment to supporting 'appropriate renewable energy developments'. Peel Energy is however, concerned at the use of wind farms as an example of developments that can potentially frustrate delivery of the borough's stated Strategic Objectives set out in SO3 and SO4, as stated in the explanatory text that follows this policy under the heading 'Delivering our objectives and vision'. 3.4 Peel Energy asserts that it is not axiomatic that wind farm development will damage the 'quality of place' (SO3), or damage in any material way the 'natural environment and resources' (SO4). For example, Peel Energy is working with the Council, via the Scout Moor wind farm, to continue to improve and enhance public access around this important site. Peel Energy (along with other renewable energy providers) is also engaged in discussions with interested parties concerning development of renewable energy projects on sensitive environments such as peat bogs. It has been found that</p> | <p>Support noted</p> <p>Support noted.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|----------------------------|
| | | the C02 savings from a wind farm over its lifespan will more than off-set any losses of C02 storage capacity in the form of peat that may be lost during construction of the wind farm.' 3.5 Peel Energy would therefore request that this explanatory paragraph be recast to provide a more accurate portrayal of the complexities involved in delivering renewable energy developments within sensitive environments. | |
| 398423/478 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | <p>SO1 -To deliver a more prosperous economy - c) Need to refer to Kingsway as the key location that will provide the basis for a step change in the economic prospects of the borough;</p> <p>SO2 - To create successful and healthy communities - b) Health issues will be addressed in relation to spatial planning within the area targeted by the council's Sustainable Communities Programme. In General we support the strategic objectives as a reflection of the borough's strategic priorities within the Economic Strategy and Boroughwide Masterplan, We would ask that you consider whether there is sufficient reference to Rochdale Town Centre in terms of its potential as a sub-regional centre within the city region and whether this is clear in terms of the hierarchy of retailing and employment within the four township areas. We also feel that any reference to the M62 Corridor should refer to Kingsway specifically which will be the most significant development site during the life of the LDF and offers the most potential for improving economic prospects for the borough and indeed the sub-region. We acknowledge the points made around the complex interrelationship between the objectives and the spatial policies. It could be stated that improving the economic opportunities would underpin many of the other issues identified. SO3 - To improve design, image and quality of place We agree with the underlying theme and would ask that a specific mention is made to urban design and townscape considerations being included in development, design and master plan briefs for key areas of change e.g. Rochdale town centre. Page 25 -we would have expected one of the economic objectives to be the restructuring of areas dominated by declining traditional industries - the GVA Grimley report suggests job shedding in manufacturing (up to 10,000 jobs over the next 10 years) in GM. Page 26 - (S02) the objective of increasing the number of people who like living in the area seems out of place in this list. Page 26 - (503) the objective of 'creating a distinctive new identity' is probably not what is needed. Would it not be more appropriate to 'enhance</p> | <p>Agree</p> <p>Noted.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| | | and improve areas' rather than change completely? Page 28 -there is no reference to SO2 in the list? The CS 5 Spatial Objectives are supported and are relevant to RDA and its partners' work in the town centres (and in particular Sol, SO3 and S05). The long standing retail hierarchy of Rochdale is reinforced within SO1 and Table 1. | Noted. Noted. |
| 401290/490 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | Policy SO2 a - c This is in conformity with policies L2, L3 L4 and L5 of RSS. | Noted |
| Chapter 5 – Spatial Strategy | | | |
| Question 5 What are your views on the Spatial Strategy for the borough, the types of development proposed and its locations? | | | |
| 6682/112 | United Utilities - Mr David Hardman | United Utilities Water would like some reference to the issues embodied in Regional Spatial Strategy - Policy EM5 "development should be located where there is spare capacity in the existing water supply and wastewater treatment, sewer and strategic surface water mains capacity, insofar as this would be consistent with other planning objectives. Where this is not possible, development must be phased so that new infrastructure capacity can be provided without environmental harm." | Consider – perhaps the Strategy should also include need for development to be where it can be supported by infrastructure. |
| 60372/76 | British Waterways – Ms Sam Turner | British Waterways supports the aims to maximise opportunities for new development and environmental improvements along the Rochdale Canal corridor (3a). Para C states that new development will contribute towards open space provision. BW considers that similar clarification should be provided at 3a, i.e. environmental improvements will be secured as part of new development proposals, through measures such as planning conditions or developer contributions via S106 Agreements. | Noted. |
| 161663/307 | Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd - Mr David Ward | We broadly support the 5 spatial policies for guiding development within the Borough. But we suggest that care is needed in terms of releasing greenfield and greenbelt land to meet employment land needs (as referred to in Policy SP3 (1) c) and d). In our view, the focus of the Employment Strategy should be ensuring the delivery of KBP and employment within other priority regeneration areas. We are concerned that the allocation of new Greenfield land might undermine these objectives. | Noted – development will be phased |
| 161666/259 | Yorkshire Forward - Mr John Pilgrim | Thank you for seeking Yorkshire Forward's comments on the above consultation. We welcome the opportunity to participate in the development of local planning policy within Yorkshire and the Humber's neighbouring authorities as part of our statutory consultee | Noted |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | | role. In this instance, however, we do not have any observations to make on the consultation. We look forward to future opportunities for involvement in the ongoing LDF preparation process. | |
| 161683/273 | Government Office North West - Mr Dave Arstall | It is unclear what the first sentence and item 1 of SP5 would mean in practice. The structure of SP5 is also confusing. Part of it is a repetition of RSS policy DP4 and it is unclear how the remainder of the policy conforms with the recently published PPS4. | Consider amending or deleting |
| 161991/444 | Wainhomes (Development) Ltd - Mr Richard Chamberlain (Emery Planning Partnership - Mr Stephen Harris) | <p>Policy SP2</p> <p>2.9 We support the general thrust of policy SP2, which seeks to focus the majority of development (90% of employment and 75% of housing) within the south of the borough.</p> <p>2.10 Whilst we support the flexibility within the policy to allow the release of greenfield and Green Belt land outside of the urban area in the south of the borough, we consider that the policy should go further to accept that there will definitely be a need for greenfield land for development in order to meet the requirements of the RSS. Indeed, the RSS states that at least 20% of housing is required on greenfield land in the borough.</p> <p>2.11 When read as a whole the Core Strategy is clear that there is a need for greenfield and Green Belt sites for future development, and therefore this policy should be consistent with the other parts of the document.</p> <p>2.12 We support the provision of new development in the north of the borough. We do however question the need for the policy to be so prescriptive (a maximum of 25%) as if delivery in the southern part of the Borough does not come forward as expected, then that balance should be accommodated in the north. For example, the housing trajectory on page 36 of the SHLAA assumes a significant increase in the completion rate from 2014 onwards. This increase will rely on the south of the Borough and requires rates not achieved historically. Therefore some flexibility should be built into the policy for such a scenario and for the north to accommodate any shortfall through annual monitoring.</p> <p>2.13 Parts 2(a) to 2(e) of policy SP2 do not specifically include vacant greenfield sites in the urban area. This is potentially an important source of new housing to meet the RSS requirement. Therefore we consider that a new criterion which is for greenfield urban infill sites.</p> <p>Policy SP3</p> <p>2.14 We support the allocation of the land west of Broad Lane, Rochdale for housing. We address our reasons for supporting the</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Need to consider how we present the policy</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree sequential approach may be adequately covered by RSS etc and there is no need for SP5</p> <p>Noted.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>previously developed land within settlements; · second, using other suitable infill opportunities within settlements, where compatible with other RSS policies; · third, the development of other land where this is well-located in relation to housing, jobs, other services and infrastructure and which complies with the other principles in DP1-9.”</p> <p>2.21 The SHLAA has undertaken such a sequential analysis in determining that significant greenfield and Green Belt sites are required. With that need established, there is no requirement to phase the delivery of land any further as proposed in policy SP5. We consider that policy SP2 and SP3 as recommended for amendments provide a sufficient spatial distribution between north and south and what sites are appropriate and there is no need for policy SP5.</p> | |
| 162033/150 | Northwest Regional Development Agency - Mr Ian Wray | <p>We have a concern about the second part of Proposed Policy SP2, which would restrict employment development in the north of the Borough to 10% of the overall total (and housing to 25% of the overall total). This would be achieved by allowing development only where it supports regeneration priorities, is on an identified strategic site or on brownfield land. Such an approach is unlikely to support the development of the visitor and rural economies in the way that Strategic Objective SO1 intends. We suggest the policy is worded more positively, by highlighting the type of development that will be supported, rather than leaving this to the policy's final criterion. We are also unclear whether the 90% 10% split between employment development between the north and south of the Borough will be measured and monitored in terms of land, jobs or some other measure.</p> <p>We question the need for Proposed Policy SP5 given that RSS Policy DP4, which forms part of the development plan for Rochdale, already sets out a sequential approach to development.</p> | <p>Agree. Reference to such specific proportions is no longer considered appropriate</p> <p>Agree – Policy SP5 deleted</p> |
| 162038/323 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | Generally the approach set out in the Spatial Policies is supported, in particular the sequential approach in Policy SP5. | Noted |
| 162057/265 | CABE - Sarah Burgess | Thank you for consulting the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE). Unfortunately, due to limited resources, we are unable to comment on this document. However we would like to make some general comments which you should consider. A good spatial plan is essential to achieving high quality places and good design. CABE believes that getting the local development framework core strategies right is one of the most important tasks planners are undertaking. We have run workshops with over 65 local planning authorities to look at how well design is being embedded in | Noted |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>core strategy documents, which form part of the local development framework. The workshops offer local authorities independent informal advice from an expert panel and allowed us to identify the strengths and weaknesses of current approaches to spatial planning and how design, functionality and space are dealt with in core strategy documents. Three key messages for local planning authorities have emerged from our workshops. The three key messages are now embedded within a CABE publication called Planning for places: delivering good design through core strategies. A summary of the three key messages has been set out below and an e-link to the three key messages are explained in detail. Tell the story A good core strategy needs to tell the story of the place, explain how it works and highlight its qualities and distinguishing features. Telling the story helps everyone understand how the qualities of the place have shaped the strategy and its priorities for future quality. For more information about telling the story, please refer to the CABE website:</p> <p>http://www.cabe.org.uk/planning/corestrategies/tell-the-story Set the agenda Use the core strategy to say what is wanted for the area, express aspirations and be proactive and positive about the future of the place and say how this will be achieved. Set out what is expected in terms of design quality and where necessary provide links to the relevant development plan documents or supplementary planning documents. For more information about setting the agenda, please refer to the CABE website:</p> <p>http://www.cabe.org.uk/planning/core-strategies/set-the-agenda Say it clearly Make the core strategy relevant and understandable to a wide audience. Use diagrams to inform the text and communicate the strategy and show what quality of place means. For more information about saying it clearly, please refer to the CABE website:</p> <p>http://www.cabe.org.uk/planning/corestrategies/say-it-clearly It is also important that there is a clear priority for design quality and place-making objectives in the core strategy, setting out the key principles. This needs to be explicit so that it cannot be challenged when applications are being determined. Planning for places: delivering good design through core strategies is available to download as a pdf from the CABE website:</p> <p>http://www.cabe.org.uk/publications/planning-for-places You might also find the following CABE Guidance helpful: • Making design policy work: How to deliver good design through your local development framework • Protecting Design Quality in Planning •</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|------------|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | Creating Successful Masterplans – a guide for clients and Design Reviewed Masterplans • By Design: urban design in the planning system towards better practice“ (published by DETR) | |
| 162058/144 | The Theatres Trust - Ms Rose Freeman | We support the sequential approach to development within SP5. With regard to cultural facilities mentioned at c) on page 39, cultural, leisure and tourism facilities that are likely to attract large numbers of visitors should in the first instance be clustered within the strategic town centre and should have good accessibility to the public transport network. Existing important cultural facilities should be protected and enhanced where they contribute to wider regeneration. Refurbishment and reuse of existing buildings usually requires significantly less energy than building new ones and therefore supports the aims of sustainable development. This option should be seriously considered for sustainable town centres particularly where the existing building makes a positive contribution to local character or where it can form the basic building block of a new development. | Noted |
| 204017/66 | Miss Jean Barlow | I disagree with the strategy proposal (SP2) that “Most new employment (a minimum of 90%) and housing development (a minimum 75%) will be placed in the urban area in the south of the borough”. I feel that the development should be more equally split across the borough. | Disagree, but reference to specific proportions to be deleted. |
| 204017/67 | Miss Jean Barlow | SP3 Spatial Strategy in the south of the borough section(1) – Increasing jobs and prosperity – items (a) and (b) are contradictory – one states that employment development will be focused in town centres whereas the other says that employment development will be focused in “economic growth corridors”. We need more jobs in and close to town centres, not more warehousing and distribution centres alongside the motorways. | Consider need to re word / make clear the difference |
| 204017/68 | Miss Jean Barlow | SP3 Strategy in the south of the borough section(1) – Increasing jobs and prosperity – I disagree strongly with item (c) which proposes the release of green belt in the “south Heywood economic growth corridor”. | Noted |
| 204017/69 | Miss Jean Barlow | SP3 Strategy in the south of the borough section(2) – creating successful and healthy communities - I disagree with item (e) which proposes release of green belt land in south Heywood for housing. | Noted |
| 204017/72 | Miss Jean Barlow | SP3, point 4 (b) states that in the south of the borough we will “Generally protect the urban fringe countryside in the south as green belt. Its primary role will be to prevent neighbouring towns from merging....” Why should the role of the green belt in this area be to separate the towns ? I think this is very controversial, especially as | Agree. Need to re word and consider wider role of green belt in this location |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | | there are vast amounts of green belt being preserved in the north of the borough. This almost throw-away remark could give planners carte blanche to develop all but a tiny strip of green belt between Middleton and Heywood. I think this statement should be removed from the document. | |
| 204017/86 | Miss Jean Barlow | The proposal to focus employment development alongside the M62 is inconsistent with the need to reduce air pollution in the same area. The employment is likely to be more of the same type that we already have, that is, warehousing, with the associated increase in heavy goods vehicles. The spatial portrait (section 2 of this document) states that "The area straddling the borough's motorways, the A58 and the A664 have been designated as an Air Quality Management Zone, where air pollution is likely to exceed national objectives due to road traffic. " This is a statement of the current situation, not after the introduction of more heavy traffic in the future. There are many residential properties close to the M62 corridor which already suffer from air pollution and significant noise pollution. It is unreasonable to burden them with yet more pollution. | Consider - Need to explain this possible contradiction |
| 216477/223 | Mr John Lappin | SP2 2 Release restrictions on housing and employment development in north of borough by improving accessibility to areas north of Rochdale. Definitely improve public transport access to countryside north of Rochdale. SP3 D What type of open space based leisure development is planned? If you develop green land west of Langley there will be no open space for any type of leisure. N.B. From past experience in areas of leisure next to houses, there is conflict. Will the leisure activity be for all age groups not many pensioners would want to play football, horse ride or motor cross? What activity is planned? SP3 (2D) Greenfield north of Langley Lane must be included in the better protected green belt, not reserved land for future release. SP3 (4B) Priority must be given to protect all green fringe countryside, and make it greenbelt to stop town boundaries merging. Big mistake in the past when Alkrington was allowed to be enlarged to meet Oldham in the east and Manchester in the south. It is now various developments all the way to the airport, one mass of bricks and concrete. Each town has its own specific character built up over decades and must be preserved. SP3 (4D) Agree focus on brown field, maintain a strategic greenbelt and consider additions to greenbelt. | Noted. |
| 216593/126 | SEGRO Industrial Estates Ltd (Barton Willmore - Mr John | We support the spatial strategy which seeks to focus the majority of new development in the south of the Borough (Zone A) as opposed to distributing it around the whole borough. This strategy identifies | Noted |

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|---------------------------|
| | Pearce) | Heywood as one of the locations in the south of the Borough that is considered appropriate to accommodate new development, including employment. Policy SP3 goes on to state that employment development will be focused in economic growth corridors, one of which is south Heywood (Hareshill Road/J19 M62). We support this objective of seeking to increase employment development in this particular location. In addition we also support the objective of including a new link between south Heywood and junction 19 of the M62. | |
| 216610/260 | National Offender Management Service (NOMS) - Raj Samuel | Thank you for your letter of 28 October to HM Prison Service Headquarters Secretariat about your LDF core strategy. We have had the opportunity to study the documents in detail and have no comments to make. | Noted. |
| 216735/524 | Russell Homes - Mr Daniel Kershaw | <p>1.7 Of the initial 6 Spatial Options proposed, Russells have consistently argued that Spatial Option 5 is the most comprehensive of the 6 options. It will achieve the strategic objectives of economic growth, housing delivery and sustainable and integrated transportation patterns in a planned and controlled format which is in the best interests of all aspects of the community and which will not compromise the green infrastructure and environmental initiatives. It can deliver a quality and lasting environment with the principles of good design being the foundation of the option. It will enable the delivery of the Spatial Vision proposed for the borough.</p> <p>1.8 The principles of this Option take advantage of the strategic advantages that benefit Rochdale and acknowledge the spatial relationship between the environment, employment and housing in the borough.</p> <p>1.9 Employment opportunities need to be provided throughout the town, but there are sequentially more suitable locations. Problems with accessibility and the quality of the surrounding environment limit significant development within the North Rochdale and Pennine Townships. However it is essential that some development within these areas is provided in order to ensure that these do not become dormitory townships for commuters working in Rochdale and Manchester beyond. By comparison there are clear attractions and advantages to locating the majority of employment development within Southern Rochdale, Southern Heywood and North Middleton Townships as these have good infrastructure links and are genuinely attractive to the business community.</p> <p>1.10 Accessibility is clearly an important consideration in the location of employment land and buildings and to this extent the options to</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|-------|
| | | <p>increase employment growth within the M62 corridor are very important. The M62 corridor is part of the Northern European Trade Axis which links Ireland through the ports of Liverpool and Hull across into Northern Europe. The M62 corridor is a major attraction to businesses which need access to the highway infrastructure and the strategic importance of this route is critical when considering employment opportunities within Rochdale Borough. 1.11 Looking at alternatives it is quite evident that some of the proposed Options were too unplanned, lacked certainty and will not deliver the large infrastructure and regeneration led development projects that are being proposed for the economic benefit of the borough. These Options will not shape the Town and will not enable the Town to link in with the adjoining regions in terms of housing, transportation or economy. The Options adopted a reactive rather than a proactive approach and were generally weak in many areas. It would lead to ad hoc and unplanned development. 1.12 There were many aspects of other Options which were beneficial. The Options would facilitate housing led regeneration within priority areas and would enable development along key strategic corridors within the Rochdale area, however these initiatives need to be delivered in tandem with the economic growth that is vital for the long term prospects of the Borough. Further alternative Options could fail to deliver a choice of housing. Higher value homes are needed in order to retain and attract people with higher incomes and to satisfy aspirational housing need. In the long term the narrow focus of these options would be prejudicial to the wider interests of the Borough. 1.13 For all the above reasons Russells supports the chosen Spatial Vision and Spatial Strategy for the Borough. It is considered that this option can deliver the Core Objectives within a comprehensive and planned Development Framework.</p> | |
| 216814/158 | TCS Holdings Limited (Indigo Planning Limited - Ms Nicola Sewell) | <p>TCS support draft Policy SP31A which sets out the Spatial Strategy in the south of the Borough in relation to: 1. "to increase jobs and prosperity we will; a) focus retail, leisure, cultural and employment development in, and close to Rochdale, Heywood and Middleton Town Centres to maximise job creation in accessible locations (Policy EI). Rochdale will be the priority for development as a sub-regional centre."The RSS key diagram identifies Rochdale as a town for growth and development. Policy W5 relates to retail development and identifies Rochdale as a centre where comparison retailing facilities should be enhanced and encouraged.</p> | Noted |
| 361753/6 | Dr Marian Corns | <p>Millions of pounds have been poured into what used to be called 'the</p> | Noted |

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| | | slums' from 1950s onwards. What is new here - except they are now called 'regen' areas? | |
| 361753/8 | Dr Marian Corns | When am I going to see something new - not regurgitated from previous years but not yet delivered? | Noted |
| 368001/28 | Miss Erin McIlroy | The question marks on the map below (map 3 spatial strategy - key diagram) are on the small amount of open space and green belt (Bowlee to Rhodes Green) which residents can access at the moment. The plan to release these areas for development will result in no access to open green space for the people living in this area - not only this but the house prices in this area (with as already stated in this report - low house prices and low quality housing and overcrowding) will fall. As a professional I moved into this area and paid extra for access to the green open space. The price of the houses were I live would fall as there would no longer be access to the green belt. How wil this spatial strategy fulfill the objective and vision for the borough of providing better quality housing and access to open space to beenefit the health of the people living in this part of the borough? | Agree – consider deleting the proposals for north Middleton / Bowlee |
| 370419/211 | Highways Agency - Mr Ian Tull | The Agency notes the emergence of a preferred strategy has seen a focus on regeneration areas across the south of the borough, subject to less growth and development on Greenfield sites outside the urban area: There is a focus on the regeneration of previously developed sites but these should be continually appraised to assess their level of accessibility, consistent with the Strategic Objectives. Evidence base The Agency is actively involved in the Greater Manchester wide modelling of the potential transport interactions and implications of the emerging spatial plans. In the absence of any independent undertakings it is anticipated the ongoing modelling work will provide a firm basis to appraise the collective land use impacts of the 10 Greater Manchester Authorities. Until such time as these undertakings have been reported, the Agency is unable to give comments on the deliverability of the proposed spatial policy in the absence of an evidence base for the highway interactions. The Agency welcomes the firm commitment by RMBC to place sustainability at the top of the decision making agenda. The selection of accessible sites will have a direct correlation to the modal split associated with development. There are however some reservations concerning the desire to facilitate new development via a link road to J19, M62 which will need to be explored in more depth before the Agency can give final comment. The wider modelling appraisal is also still awaited and it is hoped the ultimate | Noted. Will continue to consult and liaise with HA on transport implications. |

| | | | |
|------------|--|---|--|
| | | deliverables will enable the Agency to fully appraise the cumulative transport impact of RMBCs spatial plan and the associated Core Strategy policies. The content of the Local Infrastructure Plan and the Allocations DPD are also critical to identifying if the Core Strategy is sound and deliverable. The Agency is keen to promote the DfT's 'Guidance on Transport Assessments' and the associated criteria. Furthermore, the opportunities to integrate accessibility mapping in to the Allocations DPD should be explored. | |
| 380861/261 | Local Government Yorkshire and Humber - Mr Martin Elliot | Thank you for consulting Regional Planning Body on the above. On this occasion these are not documents Regional Planning Body wishes to comment on. If you have any queries about the Regional Spatial Strategy and its relationship with Local Development Frameworks, please do not hesitate to contact me. | Noted |
| 389357/358 | MMC Developments Ltd - Mr Mark Russell (Knight Frank LLP – Sophie Taylor) | This part of the Core Strategy aims to set out broadly the type and demand of development that is required and where it will be located within the Borough. The general approach to the Spatial Strategy is supported and comments to policies which are specifically relevant to MMC's site at Rooley Moor Road are as follows: Policy SP2 states that most new employment and housing development will be placed within the urban area in the south of the Borough. This Policy also states that there will be a restriction on development, both employment (max 10%) and housing (max 25%) in the urban area in the north of the Borough. Map No. 3 at Page - Spatial Strategy Key Diagram - does however refer to MMC's site at Rooley Moor Road as a "strategic mix use site (E2 and C1)". It does not, however, refer to the site as a "strategic housing site (C1)". As stated earlier in this report, discussions with Officers of the Council have been supportive of bringing MMC's site forward for a development which is principally housing lead. Therefore, Policy SP2 should be amended to reflect this, or alternative, the Core Strategy should ensure that a policy framework is incorporated that does not prejudice the potential for this site to come forward as a housing site through a subsequent Site Specific Allocations DPD. It is agreed that employment should be focussed in the economic growth corridor in South Rochdale and in particular, at Kingsway/ Oldham Road/ Rochdale town centre. Policy SP4 deals with the Spatial Strategy in the north of the Borough where the Rooley Moor Road site is located. It is agreed that the development of key strategic sites which include Rooley Moor Road should be promoted and that this will help to create successful and healthy communities. Whilst there is perhaps a need to include services such as retail facilities and a limited amount of | Noted Reference to Rooley Moor Road to be deleted – need to consider implications and possible need to slightly reword policy to ensure regeneration schemes are supported. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>employment (see Appendices IV and V), development should be principally housing focussed.</p> <p>Policy SP5 deals with the sequential approach to development. In relation to sites within the urban area in the northern part of the Borough, sequentially preferences to develop sites that display the following characteristics are proposed: . Derelict / under-used / previously developed sites. . Close to town centres, district or priority local centres. . Close to multi-model transport interchanges. . On main road corridors. . Development on Greenfield land will not be supported The above sequential approach is supported and it is considered that the MMC site at Rooley Moor Road is derelict/ under-used and previously developed. Whilst it is not immediately adjacent to a town centre or shopping facility, it is proposed to include such provisions within the site. Development will seek to improve accessibility to public transport and the site is considered to relate well to Rooley Moor Road, which is a main road corridor.</p> | |
| 389694/299 | Clariant Ribble Limited - Mr Stephen Parkinson (Indigo Planning Limited - Mr Bill Davidson) | <p>SP2 – The Spatial Strategy for the Borough (pg 35-36) The policy overly restricts development in the north of the Borough. By introducing minimum percentage targets for employment and housing development in urban areas in the south of the Borough, proposals for sustainable and strategic development in the north could unreasonably and unnecessarily be restricted or compromised. This would conflict with the spatial vision for the north of regeneration and developing attractive housing communities with choice to meet everyone's needs. For these reasons, there should be greater flexibility in the policy to ensure appropriate development can come forward in the north part of the Borough. Because it is unclear how the targets are to be implemented in practice and because they unduly restrict flexibility, they should be deleted from all parts of policy SP2. The wording should be amended to read: 1. 'Most new employment and housing development will be placed in the...' 2. 'there will be some restrictions on development within the north of the Borough (Zone B – the Pennine fringe). Development proposals will be considered on their merits and the priorities for development will be where it: a) Supports regeneration priorities identified in policies; b) Is on identified strategic sites; or c) Involves development and/or regeneration of redundant, under utilised land in the urban area or is a run down brownfield site. There will be: d) Limited consideration to development outside the urban area if it can be demonstrated it will meet a specific need; and/or e) It will assist in providing a focus on improving access to the countryside and</p> | <p>Consider – agree that policies should not be overly restrictive but need to ensure the strategy has some meaning</p> <p>Noted.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>promoting the potential of the rural visitor economy. SP4 (pg 38-39) – Spatial Strategy in the North of the Borough Promoting Littleborough as a key service centre is supported, but the wording does not go far enough to promote housing development and the economy in Littleborough and the northern area. Housing development will increase population which will in turn support the local economy. We therefore propose a minor amendment to the policy as follows: 1b) – maximise opportunities to exploit the rural economy, particularly through supporting rural diversification to create a greater variety of employment, tourism and residential opportunities. It is not clear, at 4(d), if additional green belt land is being promoted through this policy (over and above existing). There are strategic opportunities to deliver housing choice in the medium to long term through urban extensions at Littleborough that will help cement its role as a key service centre. The promotion of land will be followed up through representations to the land allocations DPD in due course, at which time any proposed amendments to the green belt should also clearly be set out by the LPA.</p> <p>SP5 (pg 39-40) - The Sequential approach to development The proposed sequential approach in SP5 is unclear and unduly restrictive as there may be opportunities that do not necessarily comply but could be acceptable given other material considerations in their favour, such as meeting a particular need; employment opportunity or other material benefit. The policy should clarify that 2 & 3 are different approaches relating to each part of the borough and that a brownfield site in the South will not be given favour over a brownfield site in the North. Clarify by adding the words: 2 'If the site is within the urban area in the southern part of the borough (Zone A), then:' 3 'If the site is within the northern part of the borough (Zone B) then:' This clarification should also be made to SP5 (4) and (5): 4 'If the site is outside the urban area in the southern part of the borough (Zone A), then:' 5 'If the site is outside the northern part of the borough (Zone B), then:' Additional flexibility should also be built in for potential greenfield development outside the urban areas that could come forward if fully justified through clear and demonstrable need being identified. This would be achieved by the addition of the following text: 4 a) 'On other Greenfield land where a clear need has been identified.' 5 b) 'On other Greenfield land where a clear need has been identified.'</p> | <p>Disagree</p> <p>Consider deleting SP5</p> |
|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|---|
| 396047/137 | Mr Gary Loudon | <p>SP1 – Rochdale borough's role in the city region d & e.. I would like to see a strategy for increased cycle pathways from Rochdale borough in the City Centre. SP2 – The Spatial Strategy for the borough d. Ensure this applies to greenbelt to the South of the borough. SP3 – The Spatial Strategy in the South of the borough b. Hareshill Road and Heywood/Pilsworth ind estates are causing major HGV traffic concerns in the surrounding residential areas. This has already been raised at the township meetings and funds have been agreed in order to investigate the problems experienced in Birch Village and along Heywood Old Road. Please can this be considered with any further plans which may introduce increased traffic flows. c & d. I strongly disagree with the proposal of releasing greenbelt in these areas for obvious reasons. Developing these areas will destroy what little natural habitat still remains to the South of the borough. General comment. I see issues with the development of greenbelt land yet notice intention to preserve it. I understand that some development is necessary, but all alternatives must be explored before the greenbelt option. I would like to see more intention towards vacant housing development. Consideration towards reducing traffic flows in residential areas due to close motorway links. If we are to have the benefit of good motorways links, we should also invest in ensuring traffic doesn't spill into residential areas e.g. Birch Village which experiences a high concentration of HGVs at all hours of the day, Sat Nav directs them onto Heywood Old Road as oppose to Motorways. These issues need resolving in order to provide attractive living environments. SP5 – The sequential approach to development I think the sequential approach is sound.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Habitat value will be fully assessed.</p> <p>The transport implications of the proposals for South Heywood will be assessed. See Schedule A.</p> |
| 396098/290 | Woodford Land Limited - Mr Jason Parkinson (Garner Planning Associates - Mr Christopher Garner) | <p>SP2 The Spatial Strategy for the Borough It is not clear if the policy requires developments to support regeneration priorities "and" on identified strategic sites OR the reference should be "or". It is suggested the reference included should be the latter. The regeneration policies in (a) should be identified in the policy. Reference in (b) to the identified strategic sites should identify where these are referred to in the Core Strategy. The Spatial Strategy in the north of the Borough - SP4 Reference should be made in "2. To create successful and healthy communities ..." to delivering a mix of homes, including affordable and up-market executive homes to widen housing choice to ensure the identified Strategic Objectives are met.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|---------------------------|
| | | <p>SP5 -The sequential approach to development It is not clear if the numbers 1-5 are the order of priority or whether or not these are subsections and the order of priority is a) up to f) within those subsections. If the intention is that 1 to 5 is the sequential priority, then previously developed land in the northern part of the Borough should not be lower priority than previously developed land in the southern part of the Borough. Each of these areas is to have defined amounts of employment and housing land development according to SP2. Area A and B will have separate targets which are to be separately managed and monitored and therefore development in the north should not be dependent on progress in the south of the Borough. This is especially the case where the north of the Borough has the ability to meet housing needs that may not be delivered in the south.</p> | Noted. |
| 396108/396 | The Wilton Estate - (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | <p>3.29 We are supportive of Policies SPI, SP2, SP3 and SP4 which we consider offer a framework to deliver the aspirations of the RSS for the District. 3.30 We are especially supportive of proposals to release land from the Green Belt to the South of Heywood and the delivery of new highway infrastructure from Heywood Distribution Park to J19 of the M62. We also support Policy SP1's undertaking to fulfil the employment and housing land requirements of the RSS over the plan period.</p> <p>3.31 Policy SP5 raises some concerns for us. We consider this policy's application of the sequential approach to the selection of development sites to be overly complicated and could prove difficult to assess during the allocation of development sites and consideration of planning applications.</p> <p>3.32 We consider that proposed policies SP2, SP3 and SP4 already provide a good 'steer' to development across the Borough. As such we consider that Policy SP5 could be substantially simplified and that RSS Policy DP4 provides a suitable sequential approach to be reflected within this document.</p> <p>3.33 Having regard to this an alternative policy could read:"Subject to Policies SPI, SP2, SP3 and SP4 and Development should accord with the following sequential approach: • To derelict / underused / and previously developed land; • Suitable infill opportunities within settlements within priority regeneration areas; • Development of other land where this is well-located in relation to housing, jobs, other services and priority regeneration areas"</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>Agree</p> |
| 396135/355 | Joint LPA Receivers N Burd & T Greed (Savills - Mr Craig O'Brien) | We support the Spatial Strategy for the Borough, in particular Policy SP2, which advocates that the vast majority of new employment and housing development should be located in the south of the Borough | Noted |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | | (the Greater Manchester fringe). In addition, we support Policy SP3 which encourages employment development in economic growth corridors including Castleton in order to maximise opportunities (1b), and recognise the need to promote land for new housing and mixed use development in the urban area (2b) and in other appropriate locations (2c). We suggest that other commercial uses i.e. retail / leisure use should be included within the definition of employment generating uses. We also support extending the East Lancs Railway (5a) as this will support regeneration in the Borough. We agree with the principle of the sequential approach set out in Policy SP5 but object to the order set out in Part 2 which we recommend be ordered c, b, a. | |
| 397168/467 | GMPTE - Mr Richard Clowes | Policies SP3 and SP4 of the Spatial Strategy set out proposals for the south and north of the Borough respectively (pages 36-39). The last sections of both policies refer to the delivery of sustainable transport. The wording of these sections needs to be changed as the current wording "To deliver sustainable transport we will." implies that Rochdale Council can deliver transport improvements themselves when in fact they will be reliant on partnership working with other agencies to do this. This is particularly important when some of these projects (such as the Heywood - M62 link and the extension of the East Lancashire Railway) appear in no priority list at Greater Manchester or Regional level and have no business case prepared. There is a tendency to imply greater certainty for some proposals than is in fact the case. SP3 (Section 5 a 'To deliver sustainable transport') refers to "promoting improvements to the strategic road network, including a new link between south Heywood and Junction 19 of the M62". Such improvements would not help to deliver sustainable transport unless they involved bus priority measures on the strategic road network, in any case the Heywood - M62 link would not benefit bus services. It is also not clear how some of the proposals are directly relevant to the spatial strategy in the south of the borough, for example park and ride would largely serve trips from Rochdale borough into the regional centre. | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree. Spatial policies should be simplified. Further detail regarding delivery of transport proposals are set out under the relevant Core Strategy policies.</p> <p>Disagree. Improving connectivity will assist in making the borough a more desirable place to live.</p> |
| 398423/479 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | We support the principles of the preferred option whereby most of the growth will be concentrated in the south of the borough along the M62 Corridor, in areas of need, and where opportunities exist in and around the town centres of Rochdale, Heywood, Middleton and south Pennines. We would encourage some development in the northern area, particularly for high quality housing where | Support noted |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>opportunities exist. It is acknowledged that successful economic growth relies in part on the provision of suitable housing to meet the need of incoming and expanding businesses. P33.</p> <p>Reference to further land releases for employment development not being allowed if it could undermine Kingsway - could be considered if judged as being complimentary to the Kingsway strategy.</p> <p>SP3 -The Spatial Strategy in the south of the Borough This is consistent with current and proposed strategic priorities. Perhaps more emphasis can be placed in this section on the economic growth potential of Kingsway as a regionally important employment site and Heywood south.</p> <p>In view of the greenbelt issues for Heywood in particular, greater emphasis on the benefits that will result could strengthen the proposal. Re point 3. "design" again we agree with the underlying theme and would ask that a specific mention is made to urban design and townscape considerations being included in development , design and master plan briefs for key areas of change e.g. Rochdale town centre.</p> <p>We agree with the reference to Castleton (Queensway) which is a major opportunity to significantly change Castleton as a local I district centre with major growth in terms of housing and employment but less so for retailing.</p> <p>The town centres continue to be a focus for regeneration and this could be emphasised further. In particular, Rochdale as the sub-regional centre could be given more priority albeit all of the town centres are a focus for new investment and regeneration. The spatial links between Rochdale town centre and Kingsway could also be emphasised as an area of opportunity with related benefits that can benefit the regeneration of the Sustainable Communities areas of Inner Rochdale, Kirkholt and East Central Rochdale. The relationship of investment to economic benefits, linking opportunity to need could be established here.</p> <p>SP4 -The Spatial Strategy in the north of the borough We agree that Littleborough should be highlighted in conjunction with key strategic sites in that area. The promotion of Hollingworth Lake and proposals</p> | <p>Agree – amend policy E2</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> |
|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|------------|---------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>to enhance its economic potential and accessibility while protecting its environmental quality is welcome.</p> <p>SP5 -The Spatial Approach to Development Given the prioritisation set out by Strategic projects such as Town Centre East, is it reasonable to give town centre locations in (c) less priority than derelict under used land in (a). This might create difficulties in the promotion of town centres and their hinterlands for new development. Could these two categories be combined such that town centres are given at least equal priority in the sequential test.</p> <p>The Inner Rochdale area (the HMR focus area) is mainly described in them CS as Milkstone & Deeplish and Newbold. This is fine, but there are a few anomalies - Page 37 (2a) refers to Inner Rochdale and Deeplish & Milkstone.</p> <p>Page 35 -how do RMBC intend to measure, monitor and ultimately control the 90%/75% criteria of development in the south of the borough? It would helpful to clarify this.</p> <p>Page 37 (3b) better if the key gateways and corridors were named.</p> | <p>Noted. However policy SP5 is to be deleted</p> <p>Agree. Issues of consistent referencing will be addressed</p> <p>Noted. Specific proportions are too detailed for a Core Strategy</p> <p>Noted but may be an unnecessary detail</p> |
| 401290/476 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | <p>Spatial Framework Focussing development on the more urban south of the Borough, and particularly on the town of Rochdale is in line with RSS policies RDF1 and MCR5 which set the overall spatial framework for Rochdale borough. RDF1 identifies Rochdale town as one of a series of towns and cities which are 3rd in priority for growth in the region after the regional centres and inner areas. Middleton and Heywood would also be acceptable for focussing appropriate development as larger suburban centres. However Policy SP4 could make it clearer that the main focus of development will be the urban area of Rochdale itself.</p> <p>In relation to town centres, we welcome SP4 (a) which focuses development on and close to the 3 town centres, with Rochdale as priority. This fits well with RDF1 and also W5.</p> <p>Identifying Littleborough as a Key Service Centre in SP4 is in line with RDF2. However it is referred to as a local centre in E1/1L. Its role is too large scale to be a local centre as defined in RDF2 and we assume this is an error and the terminology should be amended to Key Service Centre.</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Agree – change to town centre</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Key diagram The diagram shows a series of strategic sites. In the publication version of the Core Strategy, it should be clarified whether any of these are strategic allocations in the Core strategy, in which further details plus maps are needed in the CS, or whether they are to be defined in a subsequent site allocations DPD.</p> | Agree |
| | | <p>Economic Development SP2 The location of 90% of employment land within the urban area is supported, and is in line with RSS policies DP4, RDF1 and MCR5</p> | Noted |
| | | <p>SP3 The focus of retail, leisure, cultural and employment development in the South of the Borough is supported in line with RDF1 and MCR5.</p> | Noted |
| | | <p>The focus of employment development in economic growth corridors should be in line with RSS as long as the principles of DP4 are met in developing previously developed land within settlements first, and also W3, which seeks to locate office development primarily within the town centres listed in RDF1 and in accordance with PPS6 (now PPS4). A strong justification will be required, supported by the evidence base for any departure from the DP4 / W3 approach.</p> | Noted |
| | | <p>We do understand that the evidence base does suggest that there is little market for office development in the town centres and urban areas. This will need to be brought out clearly in the Core Strategy and / or any supporting documentation, and the evidence base and policy will need to demonstrate that early release of green field land to office use will not impact negatively on possible development at more sustainable locations.</p> | Agree - need to ensure clear justification for out of centre office development |
| | | <p>Housing SP2 The split between North and South of the Borough is supported by RSS policy RDF1. In SP2 (2) we assume “poor accessibility” should read “good accessibility”. The supporting text to SP2 states that the Strategy focuses on regeneration and the use of previously developed sites, but with the flexibility to allow the release of Green Belt and green field land outside the urban area, in sustainable locations, in order to meet the development requirements and objectives of the core strategy. Given the comments in the Spatial Portrait on the outputs of the SHLAA, stronger justification is needed</p> | It should read poor accessibility – but need to better explain what the policy is saying. |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>for this approach.</p> <p>SP3 2a Langley, Inner Rochdale, Kirkholt, Deeplish, and East Middleton are all part of the Housing Market Renewal Area and so a focus on regeneration of these areas is supported by RDF1.</p> <p>SP3 2c It would be useful to clarify if these sites are PDL or a mix.</p> <p>SP3 2d The PDL target allows for some greenfield development but the PDL target is a minimum. Also we would expect the Core Strategy, in line RSS policy DP4 and the text to L4, to ensure best use is made of existing resources, including land.</p> <p>SP3 2e “Limited” should be defined e.g. local not strategic in extent, or even with an indicative area.</p> <p>SP4 b The emphasis on developing an appropriate mix of homes is supported by RSS policies L2, L4 and L5.</p> <p>The supporting text (pg 40) notes that the RSS requirements have been rolled forward to 2026. This should be in line with the advice in our recent Maintenance of RSS Housing Figures Post 2021 note .</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>They are greenfield</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Agree</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted.</p> |
| Chapter 6 – Delivering a more prosperous economy (SO1) | | | |
| E1 – Establishing thriving town and local centres | | | |
| Question 6 What are your views on our policy on establishing thriving town and local centres? | | | |
| 161663/308 | Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd - Mr David Ward | We support the emphasis placed on establishing thriving town and local centres. The text should be updated in appropriate sections to respond to the newly published PPS4. It is important that Table 1 is retained so as to demonstrate that there are a range and hierarchy of centres within the Borough. | Agree. Need to update reference to PPS4 |
| 161683/274 | Government Office North West - Mr Dave Arstall | Policy E1 partly just repeats national policy. | Agree. Have reviewed the relevant sections and amended where applicable. |
| 204017/91 | Miss Jean Barlow | I am convinced that locating new employment areas close to the town centres will help to improve the prosperity of the town centres. Conversely, locating new employment areas along the motorway corridors will not contribute at all to the prosperity of the town centres, nor of the borough as a whole. | Noted. Employment areas need to be in accessible locations whether they are in or out of centre. |
| 216477/224 | Mr John Lappin | E1 (A) Up to date “to little to late” for Middleton it has taken 10 years approx from when it was first planned, to have a “Super Store” in Middleton to attract shoppers from outside Middleton, and other | Noted. Accept it does takes time to secure development and regeneration in the town centres. Other comments don’t seek particular |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>outlets to open. Since then, Wall Mart in East Manchester, was planned and built, also nearly all the areas on the town boundary now have huge Tesco's, plus "The Fort" in Chesham Hill (B&Q, Comet etc). All Middleton has an "arena," which is a poor substitute for what we had, plus a store not yet built.</p> <p>EI (C) Housing in the town centre will bring life back to Middleton Town Centre, but safety is the main problem, bring back strong policing, man CCTV 24/7 to identify problems before they happen, and break up the teenage gangs, who are very threatening.</p> <p>EI (F) New retail must not be cheap shops, and shutters should be banned, window shopping in the evening was a way of life up to the 1960's/70's. What type of leisure, N.B. Home entertainment is a big attraction and growing. Being interested in dancing we get the impression the arena management is not interested in anything but big shows, or keep fit gym workouts. Rental rates for main halls must be capped, and made attractive fun small groups, amateur dramatics etc. They must not be priced out. I do not agree with your plan to change the pattern of Middleton residents to make Rochdale their main shopping centre. It should be for them to shop in Middleton, to help the retail outlets in Middleton. Middleton wants to attract more upmarket retail outlets, who will not come to Middleton if they see huge competition from Rochdale.</p> | <p>change to the CS.</p> <p>Housing in the town centres is supported.</p> <p>Agree. E1(c) – issues of safety and crime is covered elsewhere in the CS e.g. under design policy.</p> |
| 216814/159 | TCS Holdings Limited (Indigo Planning Limited - Ms Nicola Sewell) | <p>TCS support Policy EIB which promotes the review of "...the boundaries of the centres through an allocations DPD". We suggest it is necessary to extend the Rochdale Town Centre Boundary (RTCB), as currently defined in the adopted Rochdale UDP to accommodate retail growth and improve the market share of Rochdale which will have a positive impact on the economic function of the Borough and thereby improve the vitality and viability of Rochdale Town Centre. The RTCB should be extended to encompass the buildings and curtilage of Central Retail Park as the retail units represent a town centre use and have a strong functional and economic link with the rest of the commercial core of the Town Centre. It is of significance that Rochdale Council previously found it appropriate to include the site within Rochdale Town Centre Boundary, in the former adopted UDP (dated 1999). Central Retail Park is an existing well established retail destination and already functions as part of the commercial area of Rochdale Town Centre. The inclusion of this site within the RTCB will not dissipate the commercial area and will not extend the centres geographical function given that this area already functions as part of the town</p> | <p>Noted. Support for reviewing TC boundaries through the Allocations DPD.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>centre. The inclusion of this site within RTCB will maintain the "retail offer" and assist in sustaining and enhancing the vitality and viability of Rochdale Town Centre by clawing back trade which is currently leaking to competing centres, which is explained in detail below. The Retail Park is located adjacent to a railway line to the south, and is bound by two main roads, connecting to the town centre, which provides a logical physical boundary for the town centre. The area beyond the site to the west is predominately residential, and acts as a natural constraint against further expansion of the town centre. The Retail Park is well related to the town centre, it is located at the junction of Drake Street and Oldham Road. Drake Street continues 400m north into the town and provides direct and easy pedestrian and cycle links to the retailing core of the centre. In summary, there are strong planning benefits to include Central Retail Park with the Rochdale Town Centre Boundary.</p> | |
| 218258/108 | Kirkland Developments Ltd (Lambert Smith Hampton - Mr Richard Moffat) | <p>Kirkland Developments support the objectives set out in Policy E1 namely re-establishing Middleton as a thriving centre. Kirkland Developments are in the process of bringing forward the redevelopment of the Parkfield Industrial Estate for Town Centre uses. A planning application to allow the site to be developed for an Aldi Foodstore and non food retail unit was approved by the Council in September 2009. It is of course now wholly appropriate that the boundaries of Middleton be reviewed to incorporate the site give that it is now intended that main Town Centre uses as set out in PPS4 be developed on the Parkfield site.</p> | <p>Support noted</p> <p>Note support for reviewing TC boundaries through the Allocations DPD</p> |
| 361753/10 | Dr Marian Corns | <p>I am fed up with answering questions which have been asked many times over the years - there is nothing new here</p> | Noted |
| 389357/359 | MMC Developments Ltd - Mr Mark Russell (Knight Frank LLP – Sophie Taylor) | <p>Policy E1 deals with establishing thriving town and local centres. There was general support to the aims and objectives proposed by the Core Strategy in relation to promoting town and local centres. The approach to achieving this, set out in Policy E1, is also agreed with. It is not however clear whether this Policy does allow for development of new local centres such as that which has been discussed with Officers to be located at MMC's Rooley Moor Road site. As previously stated, a local centre type development will provide facilities which will support new housing at the site and existing residents housing and businesses in the surrounding area. The Core Strategy Policy E1 should therefore clearly reflect this recommendation. The Policy seeks to deal with supporting jobs and prosperity. The general aims and objectives of this are supported and are considered to ultimately assist in the economic regeneration</p> | <p>Support Noted.</p> <p>With regards to new local centres, existing boundaries and new centres will be reviewed through the allocations DPD in line with the principles of this policy.</p> <p>Policy E1/2, 3&4 – part 3 & 4 to clarify the criteria to be taken into account in identifying</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | | of the Borough. | new local centres through the Allocations DPD |
| 389639/94 | N H R Ltd - Empirecrest Nick Ratcliffe | Empirecrest are of the view that efforts should be made to seek to strengthen all the Borough's Town and District Centres. The policy is however flawed in that it fails to recognise the role and significance of Milnrow. Of all the Borough's centres Milnrow lies closest to the Kingsway Business Park, and it is therefore a missed opportunity to seek to invest so significantly in Kingsway without establishing a framework for securing significant investment in the nearest town centre i.e Milnrow. PPS4 envisages a "town centres first" approach to retail development, we are of the view that opportunities exist to provide new retail provision on the edge of the existing centre and this approach is to be preferred to developing new out of centre facilities. We are of the view that there is scope to increase the size of Milnrow centre and thereby enhance the range of services and facilities available to both residents and businesses. It is important to recognise that investment in public realm, public transport and traffic circulation are most effectively delivered through major private sector investment and development projects, and that the Core Strategy needs to acknowledge and embrace such investment. We accordingly believe that whilst Policy E1 should recognise the status of Milnrow it should also allow for its expansion. | Disagree. Milnrow is identified as a district centre and appropriate development is supported. Because of the scale of Kingsway and lack of direct access to Milnrow Centre it is appropriate that a separate local centre is provided on Kingsway to meet the needs of the workforce. The objector provides no evidence of the scale or the justification for expanding Milnrow. |
| 396108/397 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.34 We support the proposed policy which presents an approach that can facilitate the regeneration of the Borough's town centres | Support noted |
| 396135/377 | Joint LPA Receivers N Burd & T Greed (Savills - Mr Craig O'Brien) | We support Policy E1 in its focus on the regeneration of town centres within the Borough to improve the retail on offer and to reduce leakage to the nearby centres of Bury and Manchester. Notwithstanding, we have concerns over the retail centre hierarchy outlined in Table 1 on page 49, and the more detailed description of the various local centres in Appendix 4 of the Consultation Document. The retail hierarchy identifies Milnrow as a district centre, with a catchment population of approximately 10,110. When considering both Milnrow and Castleton in terms of population size from the 2001 Census, it is clear that there is only a small difference between the size of the two areas with Milnrow comprising a population of 11,561 compared to 9,715 in Castleton. Castleton is currently the largest of the defined local centres and should be elevated to district centre status accordingly as was previously the case with the centre. There are a variety of existing employment, leisure and retail zones in Castleton as well as an existing railway station and links to the A627(M), and J20 of the M62. There are also | Support noted. Agree. It would be appropriate to designate Castleton as a district centre given the scale of regeneration proposed in Castleton. Castleton has been elevated to a district centre in policy E1 under the hierarchy of centres. |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | | <p>proposals to improve the railway connections and station at Castleton which will strongly influence its retail prospects and role in the hierarchy of town centres in the Borough. As well as the existing opportunities, it is important to consider the identification of the Castleton growth corridor and the impact this may have on the future expansion of Castleton. The former Woolworths site comprises 7ha and is well placed to accommodate a broad range of uses including retail floorspace. Given that the Woolworths site can accommodate additional retail floorspace, we consider that the site could assist in ensuring Castleton holds the necessary retail offer to provide for its catchment area, similar to the district centre of Milnrow. On page 50 of the Consultation Document, it is stated that the current hierarchy of centres will be retained, but that a review of the boundaries of each centre will be reviewed through an Allocation DPD as part of the LDF process. For the reasons outlined above, we consider that the identification of Castleton as a local centre should be reviewed and it reinstated as a district centre, through the Core Strategy. The attached plan (Appendix 1) shows the extent of the potential district centre boundary. In addition to the above, it appears that while Castleton is not identified as a district centre within Policy E1, Castleton is referred to as a district centre on pages 66 and 68 of the Consultation Document. We consider that this inconsistency should be dealt with through the inclusion of Castleton as a district centre in Policy E1, specifically an amendment to table 1 to include Castleton as a district centre.</p> | |
| 398423/481 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | <p>"Introduction" might refer to sites that are complementary to the Kingsway strategy being allowed.</p> <p>El. I.g .(v) - it may be appropriate to reference / focus on restaurants, food and cafes rather than solely "food and drink.</p> <p>Support policies E1/I-7 as they reinforce the hierarchical approach to the Borough's town centres.</p> | <p>Intro is a reference to representations made at issues & options stage.</p> <p>Agree. Food and Drink covers restaurants, cafes etc.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> |
| 401290/482 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | <p>The E1 centres policies are generally in line with RSS policies EDF1, W3, W5 and MCR5. However, Littleborough should be referred to as a Key Service Centre, not a Local Service Centre.</p> | <p>Agree. Change intro in E1/1L to key service centre.</p> |
| E1/1R – Establishing thriving town and local centres – Rochdale | | | |
| Question 7 a) What do you think of our Rochdale Town Centre Masterplan proposals? b) Should we put them forward as policy in our final Core Strategy? | | | |
| 161683/275 | Government Office North West - Mr Dave | <p>E1/1/R Specifies the additional amount of retail floorspace to be provided in Rochdale town centre, but the policies which follow do</p> | <p>Agree. Floorspace to be set out for all the centres (this is being completed by NLP</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|--|---|--|
| | Arstall | not set out the level of growth that is being planned for in the other centres. | consultants) |
| 216814/160 | TCS Holdings Limited (Indigo Planning Limited - Ms Nicola Sewell) | <p>Question 7a TCS object to the Masterplan proposals in relation to Central Retail Park. The CSPO refers to seven main areas set out in the draft Rochdale Town Centre Masterplan; Circular Boulevard relates to the completion of the ringroad by extending Wood Street to Drake Street across Central Retail Park. TCS object to the proposed road through Central Retail Park. TCS have discussed this proposal with a number of potential retailers whom have all raised concern in relation to a road through the site as it would separate any development from the existing retail park. As a consequence, it would be difficult to attract an operator on the remaining parcel of land which would leave this part of the site isolated from the remainder of the Park and not viable for future development. Within the draft Rochdale Town Centre Masterplan Central Retail Park falls within an area referred to as the Southern Gateway Site. TCS object to various elements of the proposed masterplan approach to this area, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New high quality mixed use development three to five storey with a greater density five to seven storey to the north of Wood Street, • A link road through the site called New Wood Street; • Potential water features to mark the location of the former canal basin; • Children's playground; • Pocket Park, and • Public car park. <p>TCS would have no intention to redevelop the site in the manner proposed in the draft Masterplan. The proposal identifies a high density mixed use scheme and has paid no regard to the existing Retail Park and the valid planning permission for a retail terrace. The draft Masterplan also identifies a large proportion of the site for non-commercial uses i.e. water features, road, public car park, pocket park etc. In light of the above the proposals for the Southern Gateway site can not viably be delivered. In addition, the proposal in the draft Masterplan is directly contrary to the proposals of the Core Strategy Preferred Option Report which identifies CRP as a suitable location for retail development (food and non food). It is disappointing that as a key stakeholder the LPA and the Mouchel Group did not contact TCS to discuss the proposals for the draft Masterplan before the document was published. Separate correspondence objecting to the draft Rochdale Town Centre Masterplan will be issued to the LPA.</p> | Noted. This has been subject to ongoing discussion with TCS and the ring road has been accepted as part of the plan for that area. |
| 216814/161 | TCS Holdings Limited (Indigo Planning Limited - Ms Nicola | Question 7b In light of the representations set out in 7a) the draft Rochdale Town Centre Masterplan proposals relating to Circular Boulevard and the Southern Gateway in relation to Central Retail | See response 216814/160 |

| | | | |
|------------|--------------------------|--|---|
| | Sewell) | Park should not be included in the final Core Strategy. | |
| 217416/100 | Sandra and David Wright | There appears to be a fixation with providing space for outdoor events but our climate is not conducive to outdoor living. We are concerned about vehicular access to town centre banks, post office etc. especially for people with disabilities, elderly and families with young children. Concerned that if all the centre is pedestrianised it could become a ghost town. We like the idea of accentuating the towns history & historic buildings and hope that any new buildings will be in context. We also like the idea of the green valley and bringing more trees and greenery into the town. We feel that the town definately lacks a theatre in the centre of town, which would also bring in people of all ages. | Noted. |
| 380876/252 | Mr James Austen Stafford | My suggestion would be to open up the river Roche from the library to the back of the bus station and make it along the lines of Utrecht in the Netherlands this is a wonderful city center. And I am sure Rochdale would then become unique in Britain and would prove to become a major attraction. | See response 217416/100 |
| 380883/257 | Ms Jill Ridley | I do not understand why it is necessary to have a 'new lookTown Hall square' which 'would be the largest in England'. There is nothing wrong with the area around the Town Hall as it is and there are far more pressing concerns that need attention, without wasting money on something that can well be left as it is. There are some obvious disadvantages associated with this plan such as: • The loss of a through route through the town centre that is used by a lot of traffic • The loss of car parking space, which is obviously needed, because it is often full. (How is this issue to be addressed?) • The climate in Rochdale does not lend itself to spending large amounts of time sittingaround out of doors, so rest areas are unlikely to me used to any extent. Rochdale is not London. It is not even Manchester! A rest area has recently been created at the side of St Mary's Church and I have yet to see any of the seats here occupied. • We already have an empty space on the Butts, which is available for events, but it is little used and is something of an empty wilderness. This plan seems to come dangerously close to creating another empty space in the town centre. I would like to see this part of the development plan abandoned as it is inappropriate for Rochdale at this stage of its development. It is the kind of extra facility that a thriving town may decide to acquire. Rochdale is a struggling town and needs to expend its efforts and what money it has in tackling its pressing problems. When the people of Rochdale are asked what they want, they say they would like better shopping | Agree. See response 217416/100. There is a concern that more public space may not necessarily be better space especially if it is left unused or with occasional events or activities. Noted. Better retail is supported and the issue of empty shops has been addressed in policy |

| | | | |
|------------|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | <p>facilities. They do not ask for specialist lighting and water features, and just because the 'potential for high quality events' is created, it does not mean that they will necessarily take place. I am pleased with other aspects of the plan, particularly the 'new retail heart'. Are there any plans in place to encourage shopkeepers to occupy these new premises? The article is lacking in detail in some respects. I would like to know more about the proposed leisure facilities, what the term 'Central Leisure' is supposed to refer to, and what is meant by a 'new look Manchester Road'. You also state that 'Making your comments couldn't be easier' and that we can comment online. I tried to do this with no success whatsoever, so not that easy! There are two aspects of Rochdale town centre that are most attractive and are not mentioned: 1. Our architectural heritage 2. The excellent floral displays I hope that care will be taken to ensure that neither of these are in any way diminished as the plans go ahead.</p> | <p>E1.</p> <p>Noted</p> |
| 380916/266 | Carers Association (RMHP) Limited - E Coan | <p>It was suggested that, to start with, it would be a good idea to make as much as possible of the town centre environment - both built environment and natural environment. This led to the possibility of opening out and landscaping the River Roch upstream from the weir near Smith Street to Molesworth Street - in coming years perhaps extending and dovetailing into the residential development already underway further upstream. Encouraging the re-location of businesses which, without commercial detriment, could be sited away from the River banks was mentioned. (Possible exchanges with redundant Council premises.) For the above Association it was suggested that the building currently called "Waterside House" might be considered for development as a "Healthy Living Centre". This building is not without historical and architectural interest, it is very conveniently situated in relation to imminent public transport changes and it could be incorporated into a landscaping scheme giving prominence to the River Roch. Such a centre could provide an exercise facility for disabled residents from all parts of the Borough and it could be used to promote "active ageing" as well as affording amenities for carers. The Association is not in a position to comment on the building's condition except to say that the roof is in need of attention, however it is not over large and its open internal plan would seem to lend it to a variety of uses. (Note the use made of much larger 19C mills of similar construction at Saltaire). Clearly funding (capital & regular income) would have to be found. As far as capital is concerned this might be partly found from re-allocation within the Borough's regeneration plans which in the current</p> | See response 217416/100 |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | | financial situation may have to be re-considered anyway. Revenue might come partly from within Health Care budgets and Social Care budgets. Commercial involvement might be sought. If there is sufficient interest from local disabled people's organisations, local older people's associations and local carers' groups perhaps a feasibility study could be arranged. | |
| 396108/398 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.35 At this stage we have no particular comments upon these two questions. 3.36 However, we would make the general point that a consistent format should be applied across the document regarding the order of policies and townships /centres. | Noted |
| 397168/469 | GMPTE - Mr Richard Clowes | GMPTE has already responded separately to a consultation on the Rochdale Town Centre Masterplan proposals and I attach these comments for your information. | Noted |
| 398423/484 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | E1/IR (c) - could make reference to the new Municipal Offices We support the recognition of town centre as a priority (E I.) and a focus on Rochdale town centre in particular. As already mentioned, while we support development in all of the town centres the retail centre hierarchy clearly shows Rochdale as the main centre. It has the most potential to establish itself as a strategically important regional and sub-regional centre that could benefit the wider borough. This point could be made clearer. We support the proposed masterplan for Rochdale town centre. It is consistent with the current approach for Town Centre East. It should act as a framework within which a cohesive approach is undertaken to link the seven "big ideas". Inclusion within the LDF as a more formal Supplementary Planning Document would help establish its credentials and deliverability. However, if it is to be formalised it should not be at the expense of ensuring it is flexible and deliverable in financial and technical terms. While accepting the outline of the Town Centre Masterplan it is a concern that there is limited reference to the prospects of the town centre as a business/employment generator beyond retail and leisure. There may well be scope for promoting a professional business quarter outside the retail core. | Noted. Wording changed to include reference to municipal offices. Emphasis reference to the importance of RTC strategically. See response 217416/100 |
| E1/1M – Establishing thriving town and local centres – Middleton | | | |
| Question 8 What are your views on our policy for establishing a thriving centre in Middleton? | | | |
| 161683/276 | Government Office North West - Mr Dave Arstall | E1/1M Refers to proposals in the Middleton Town Centre Spatial Masterplan, but this is a non-LDF document and it is not clear what the proposals are. Is it intended to bring these proposals into the plan as is proposed for the Rochdale Town Centre Masterplan? | Agree. Edit the polices to reflect what the proposals are for Middleton Masterplan. |
| 216477/225 | Mr John Lappin | E1/IM (B) One way to improve the image of the area around the | The policy will reflect improved connections and |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>superstore and arena would be to fill in the subway on Long Street. It is not very "user friendly" especially for wheel chairs. Two out of the three ways through have steps, also tidy up "market place," from the old Police Station to Townley Street.</p> <p>E/IM (E) Middleton Guardens R.M.B.C do not seem to get it right after many attempts. They will not listen to locals. The old Middleton Council had it right, a beautiful gardens, with a fantastic fountain. Through out the North West the town was known for it's lovely gardens. The move of the market is however a good move and must be improved and used as a catalyst; maybe enlarge it to the space between the bus station and the Arndale.</p> <p>E1/M (F) Conservation Area Public toilets are a priority in the conservation area for visitors; you cannot rely on the "Old Boars Head", including invalid toilets. There used to be two in the days of Middleton Council. 1 in Jubilee Park, 1 next to the Old Boars Head. Wheel chair access is very poor especially in the Long Street underpass; you have a slope from Barclays Bank, then two sets of out of the underpass steps, to the conservation area. You do not mention "24 steps" made famous by the painter "Lowrie" and an attraction for artists who follow the Lowrie trail. CCTV obviously do not work properly, how can they see through masks and hoods, and do not stop the many raids on banks and buildings soc., in the town centre. They should, if used be manned 24/7, and the operator to tip off the police before the incident starts, then maybe they would be apprehended in the act. Public safety in the early evening and later is top priority, for a thriving town centre together with late shopping, other than the Arndale. The old Middleton had shops from the Old Boars to Middleton Gardens, Market Place and Townley Street. You must also ensure the property of people using the town centre in the evening is being protected. Many especially the elderly, are staying at home to protect their homes.</p> | <p>links in and around the town centre.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |
| 218258/109 | Kirkland Developments Ltd (Lambert Smith Hampton - Mr Richard Moffat) | Kirkland Developments are of the view that Policy E1/1M should explicitly acknowledge the redevelopment of the Parkfield Industrial site to provide a main Town Centre use. One of the town's key convenience retailers is to develop a new modern retail store as part of the regeneration of this area of the town. The Parkfield site lies within easy walking distance of both the Middleton Arndale and the Middleton Bus Station. The tone of Policy E1/1M should be revised to acknowledge the significance of the above key developments. | <p>Changes to the Town centre boundary will be considered through the Allocations DPD.</p> <p>(This raises the issue of support for edge of centre which does not seem to be covered by existing policy.</p> |
| 396108/399 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr | 3.35 At this stage we have no particular comments upon these two questions. 3.36 However, we would make the general point that a | Noted. |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|---|
| | Paul Leeming) | consistent format should be applied across the document regarding the order of policies and townships /centres. | |
| 398423/491 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | The combined regeneration of Middleton and Heywood also requires support to maintain their viability and distinctiveness and also in the interest of promoting sustainability. We continue to support the implementation of the Middleton Town Centre Masterplan and to build on recent success. We would agree that this momentum should be continued within an agreed framework, It would be useful to make reference to public realm and public art initiatives being undertaken in the town centre. | Support noted. |
| E1/1H – Establishing thriving town and local centres – Heywood | | | |
| Question 9 What are your views on our policy for establishing a thriving centre in Heywood? | | | |
| 204017/71 | Miss Jean Barlow | Improvements to Heywood Town Centre are badly needed, but I find little of substance here to suggest that the town centre will benefit from these proposals. There is also no mention of Heywood Market, which is a very popular and thriving market, locally managed, and which should be supported by this policy. | Disagree. It is not necessary to make specific reference to supporting the markets. |
| 381892/207 | Mrs Ann Kent | We think the town centre is sufficient for everything we need; I really don't think we need any fast food shops. | Noted |
| 381894/209 | Mr Graham Miller | We think the town centre is sufficient for what we need. We have enough takeaways fast food shops. | Noted |
| 396108/400 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.37 We support proposals to bolster Heywood town centre's retail and leisure offer and to increase the pedestrian friendliness of the town and its environment more generally. Heywood is to be a focus for investment and growth within the Core Strategy and it is important that the consumer and lifestyle services available in the town are enhanced to reflect this growth. 3.38 Proposals to remove HGV traffic movements from the Heywood Urban Area will be supported by provision of a new link Road from Heywood Distribution Park through to M62 J19. | Support noted |
| 398423/492 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | We continue to support the regeneration of Heywood through the Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood (SUN) Strategy. This could be made more prominent within the core strategy as it includes the objectives contained in 'E1/IH' and allows for a link between the town centre strategy for Heywood and links to the immediate hinterland to the town centre and wider initiatives e.g. Heywood south. | Support noted Reference to Heywood Sun is made in the RJ |
| E1/1L – Establishing thriving town and local centres – Littleborough | | | |
| Question 10 What are your views on our policy for establishing a thriving centre in Littleborough? | | | |
| 367163/35 | Mr. Russell Johnson | See page 77 of the Littleborough Town Design Statement:- "Littleborough town centre should be promoted as a principle | Noted. |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | | location for shopping, commercial uses, entertainment, leisure, cultural and community facilities in the UDP so that its viability and vitality can be protected". All the answers that are in the Littleborough Town Design Statement will just be answered with the page number of the T.D.S. | The Littleborough Town Design Statement is a supporting document and there must be policies for it to support; E1/L will be one of them. The two are complimentary. |
| 389694/300 | Clariant Ribble Limited - Mr Stephen Parkinson (Indigo Planning Limited - Mr Bill Davidson) | We support the policy of improving the centre of Littleborough through implementation of Policy E1/1L. However, in order to maintain and attract people to the town centre, the area needs a local critical mass of population to support the centre throughout the year, not just during the main tourist season. To do this, the Council should promote additional residential development at Littleborough. Policy 1L should remain with the addition of the further bullet point as follows: d) "Encourage new residential development to support and enhance local services". | Support noted. There are significant existing opportunities for new residential development in the Littleborough area. However, the spatial strategy does seek to restrict the loss of further employment sites for new housing in the north of the borough. |
| 396130/624 | Gill Howard | Littleborough will be aided to become a thriving town centre by various means including: 4. We will promote new local centres in the following locations: b) On the mixed use site at Collop Gate Farm, South Heywood; This is saying that developing other areas will help promote a thriving town centre in Littleborough? I do not accept that any development at Callop Gate Farm is going to help Littleborough. | The document does not suggest this. The objector has misread the document. |
| 398423/493 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | We agree with the approach but would draw out the relationship between the town centre and the opportunities in the area adjacent/close to it e.g. Ealees, Akzo Nobel. These are opportunities in these areas to provide development that will further support the sustainability of the town centre. | Consider changing wording to say these developments could assist the regeneration of Littleborough. |
| E1/2, 3 & 4 – Establishing thriving town and local centres – district and local centres | | | |
| Question 11 What are your views on our policy for establishing thriving district centres? | | | |
| 161663/309 | Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd - Mr David Ward | We support the identification of KBP as a location for a new local centre, but we object to the word 'central' within the Policy. This is unnecessarily prescriptive and is not consistent with the planning permission on the site. In any event, the site has been designed to be highly accessible and therefore we suggest that the word 'central' is removed (so that the text simply reads in any accessible location to meet the needs of employees and residents.....'). | Agree. Remove the word Central |
| 216477/226 | Mr John Lappin | Pre 1960 the Co-op had the right idea, all districts in Middleton had a Co-op grocer, butcher and there was usually a good green grocer. There were also Post Office's etc. (Now being closed down). The death of this was super markets, Arndales etc. How will they now work? With R.M.B.C. allowing Tesco's to open a huge store in Middleton? It will bleed all the small local shops dry, and kill them off or is this the plan. | Noted |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| 367163/36 | Mr. Russell Johnson | See page 70 of the T.D.S. | Noted. |
| 389639/105 | N H R Ltd - Empirecrest Nick Ratcliffe | Empirecrest wish to object to the proposal to create a new local centre within Kingsway Business Park, such a proposal is counter to the advice set out in PPS4, which indicates that existing centres such as Milnrow should be focus for investment. The centre of Milnrow and Kingsway will be linked via the proposed Metrolink line and accordingly investrment in Milnrow centre will provide a sustainable alternative to the creation of a new centre within Kingsway Business Park. Milnrow has the capcity though new development to serve the needs of its own residents and businesses, those new residents and business proposed for Kingsway Business Park and to address shopping leakage. The additional benefit upon focusing upon the redevelopment of Milnrow is the environment improvements which can be delivered along a key strategic corridor. | See response 389639/94 |
| 396135/378 | Joint LPA Receivers N Burd & T Greed (Savills - Mr Craig O'Brien) | Following on from question 6, it is our view that Castleton should be designated as a district centre and that Policies E1/2, 3&4 be amended to include Castleton alongside Milnrow within point 2 of the Policy. We therefore suggest that the Policy be re-worded to the following: In Milnrow and Castleton district centres we will maintain their role in meeting the daily convenience shopping needs of the local area recognising that resident's main comparison shopping needs will be met in Rochdale. | Agree. See response |
| 398423/495 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | It may be an opportune time to review the economic prospects and categorisation of Castleton. There are significant opportunities to build onto the existing centre in terms of employment, housing and retail development. This may enhance its status as a local centre. | Noted. Policy is supporting this approach. |
| E1/5 – Establishing thriving town and local centres – Primary and Secondary Shopping Areas | | | |
| Question 12 What are your views on our policy for establishing thriving primary and secondary shopping areas? | | | |
| 216477/227 | Mr John Lappin | The shopping experience also includes window shopping in the evening, shutters prevent this, also the smell from a group of takeaways is not very nice, also the usual littering of the pavements with case of food. | Noted |
| 367163/37 | Mr. Russell Johnson | Please see Page 70 of the T.D.S. | Noted |
| E1/6 & 7 – Establishing thriving town and local centres – Out of centre, Local shops and services | | | |
| Question 13 What are your views on our policy on out of centre shopping and local shops and services? | | | |
| 161683/277 | Government Office North West - Mr Dave Arstall | E1/6 says that the Council will support out-of-centre retail development at 3 locations, provided that it is of the same scale and nature to that already granted permission. This appears to conflict with PPS4, the tests in which continue to apply to renewal of extant planning permissions and redevelopment of existing facilities. In | Reference to these have been deleted |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|--|
| | | addition E1/6 does not actually appear to be necessary as any such applications would fall to be determined against national policy. | |
| 216814/162 | TCS Holdings (Indigo Planning Limited - Ms Nicola Sewell) | <p>Policy 6B states "we will support proposals for out of centre retail development, providing it is of a same scale and nature to that already granted permission in the following locations': These locations include "redevelopment of Central Retail Park, Oldham Road, Rochdale (including convenience retail, and provided it supports proposals for the completion of the ring road). TCS support Policy 6 in terms of identifying Central Retail Park as a suitable location for retail development including convenience retail, albeit object to the suggestion that the Retail Park is an out of centre location, for the reasons outlined above. TCS object to the proposals for the completion of the ring road on the site due to the reasons set out in the representations responding to Question 7. Central Retail Park is appropriate for retail development and should be allocated as such and given explicit policy recognition as part of the town centre In the Rochdale Local Development Framework. TCS consider that Rochdale Town Centre should be the principal destination for retail development followed by Middleton Town Centre and Heywood Town Centres, as set out in PPSG. However in addition to Rochdale Town Centre East Area, it is necessary for the LDF to identify areas for retail development within and adjacent to Rochdale Town Centre to improve the retail "offer" for convenience and comparison goods to enable retail growth and increase Rochdale's market share. TCS consider that in addition to extending the TCB to include Central Retail Park, there is a need for explicit policy recognition that Central Retail Park is an appropriate retail destination. It is evident from the Rochdale Borough Retail stud; (2006 and updated 2007) that Rochdale market share is low and there is a high level of retail capacity expenditure leakage to competing centres. The current level of trade leakage is unsustainable and it is in the interest of good planning that the forthcoming LDF should seek to sustain the level of trade leakage. Central Retail Park can assist in clawing back the trade leakage outside the Borough. This will have a positive impact on Rochdale Town Centre by improving the economic function of the town centre and thereby enhancing the vitality and viability of the town centre. In addition, Central Retail Park has the ability to accommodate units with modern footprints in order to attract higher order retailers and improve the qualitative offer of the town centre. It is evident in the retail market that retailers, particularly national operators seek large</p> | <p>Support noted.</p> <p>See response 161683/277</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | | well configured floorspace in prime retail locations. Further retail development at the Central Retail Park will complement the retail offer to Rochdale Town Centre and would have a positive Impact on its vitality and viability. The existing retail uses at the Central Retail Park are high transportation generators and the infrastructure is already in place to accommodate these uses. By encouraging further complimentary retail and leisure uses at the Central Retail Park will facilitate linked trips with the resultant sustainability merits. | |
| 367163/38 | Mr. Russell Johnson | See page 70 of the T.D.S. | Noted. The Littleborough Town Design Statement is a supporting document and there must be policies for it to support; E1 will be one of them. The two are complimentary. |
| 396108/401 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.39 We support this policy and its encouragement for small scale retail and services in sustainable locations such as employment areas. We consider that provision of such services in response to local needs is appropriate. | Support noted. |
| E2 – Supporting jobs and prosperity | | | |
| Question 14 What are your views on our policies for supporting jobs and prosperity? | | | |
| 161663/310 | Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd - Mr David Ward | <p>We generally support Policy E2, but we would stress the importance of recognising that employment comes in many forms and is not restricted to B1 / B2 / B8 uses only. We think the Policy should be amended to more positively allow for this (especially as this is recognised elsewhere in the Core Strategy). We also support the emphasis on the creation of the majority of jobs in the south of the Borough and, in particular, within the economic growth corridors.</p> <p>However we remain anxious that a full evidence base has yet to be established for the release of 30 hectares of greenbelt land. We therefore raise objection to this element until further clarity is provided or a more stringent approach to phasing is adopted. We particularly welcome the provisions of Policy E2 d) and e) which clearly acknowledge the credentials of high quality mixed use development.</p> | <p>Support noted. Policy does promote other employment uses. Consider changes to wording to make this clearer.</p> <p>Objection noted. Release will be phased and policy on this clarified.</p> |
| 161683/278 | Government Office North West - Mr Dave Arstall | <p>E2 2 (c) and E3 refer to allowing office and leisure developments in various locations which are not within town centres. It will be necessary to demonstrate that the sequential approach set out in PPS4 has been applied to these proposals, or to demonstrate that there is strong local justification for any departure from this.</p> <p>E2 3(a) and Appendix 2 (page 168) raise a problematic issue. The Council is seeking to retain employment site boundaries from the</p> | <p>Agree. Need to provide clarification and justification for the locations where out of centre office and leisure development will be supported.</p> <p>Noted.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|--|
| | | UDP, whilst altering the policies which will apply to these sites. As set out in section 6 of the Inspector's note of the recent frontloading visit, if the Council wishes to pursue the option of amending the policy through the core strategy there would need to be an opportunity for consultees to object to the list of sites. In deciding on the way forward you will need to consider whether this might bog down the core strategy. . | |
| 161868/538 | Mr Roger Davis | Reference was made to the under use of the Kingsway Industrial Estate. Whilst it is accepted this is not in Pennines, it was suggested the Proposed Employment Density figures should be checked to compare with those originally stated and those currently in use. There may be a discrepancy which could affect the core employment figures. | Noted. |
| 162033/151 | Northwest Regional Development Agency - Mr Ian Wray | The Strategy identifies a need to provide around 210 hectares of land for high quality employment development in use Classes B1, 82 and 88. The supporting text explains that around 175 hectares are available on existing sites, leaving around 35 hectares to be allocated to make up the shortfall. Clause 2 (b) (iii) indicates that this will largely be met by the release of 30 hectares of land from the Green Belt. We comment further on this matter in relation to Proposed Policies E3 and C1 below. Proposed Policy E2 also includes figures pertaining to the amount of land within existing Employment Zones (585.7 hectares Borough wide) which the policy seeks to protect. Because these figures include land and buildings that are in use (as well as any land available within the EZs) we suggest they are confined to the supporting text. The policy should then provide a clearer expression of: a) the amount of land to be allocated to meet identified employment requirements to 2026; and b) the Council's approach to protecting land in employment zones and the circumstances in which its release for other uses would be considered. | Agree to consider changes to clarify policy approach. Change presentation and title of table. |
| 162038/324 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | In Section 3 there is no reference to employment related to agriculture (other than to the re-use of redundant structures). Whilst farming may generally be decline in the area some farmers will want to provide new facilities, perhaps in conjunction with farm amalgamations. Accordingly it is considered that in addition to promoting tourist related development (bullet e)) there should also be overt support for necessary agriculture related development - this might include new barns where livestock needs are increased or to better meet current day standards, or the development of a new farm shop (e.g. through the conversion of an existing building). Such | Agree. Rename policy to 'Supporting and diversifying the rural economy'. Mention support for agriculture in policy. Need to mention farm shops – Noted will mention the production and marketing of local produce under E5. |

| | | | |
|------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | support is appropriate to meet the headline intention of maintaining existing levels of employment in the north of the Borough. | |
| 162058/145 | The Theatres Trust - Ms Rose Freeman | <p>We note that the bullet point for creative, cultural and media on page 61 relating to use classes for REDS has omitted sui generis. Theatres would therefore be excluded from any policy or accompanying text as their Use Class is sui generis as are nightclubs and amusement arcades, for example. We therefore request that sui generis use is included please with B1 and D2 in this bullet point. Your theatres and performance spaces are important community assets, providing jobs, skills, learning and educational opportunities, and offer vital secondary spend to tourism, retail and leisure sectors.</p> <p>The Core Strategy should aim to support the continued success of these venues and support new spaces for theatre within community centres and schools throughout the community, as well as in the town and district centres.</p> | <p>Supporting text likely to be edited to remove unnecessary detail.</p> <p>Policy C8 provides sufficient support for these uses.</p> |
| 204017/96 | Miss Jean Barlow | <p>Despite the requirements from the RSS, I question the need for additional employment land to be identified in Rochdale borough, particularly where green belt is to be earmarked for this purpose. Kingsway Business Park, recently constructed at enormous cost, with its own new motorway access link roads, is apparently almost vacant. To quote from its own publicity : "Kingsway Business Park is one of the biggest, highest quality and most strategically important new commercial property developments of its kind in the UK." The park is 420 acres in size; surely this should be almost at capacity before green belt is even considered. Furthermore, at the public meeting in Heywood in January, planning officers informed the public that our neighbouring borough Oldham is proposing to set aside no additional land, on the basis of Kingsway Business Park being adequate to satisfy future needs for Oldham as well as Rochdale. Yet RMBC's strategy proposes to deprive south Heywood of still more of its green belt.</p> | <p>Point noted. Release of land in south Heywood for employment uses is to be phased based on requirement. See response Schedule A.</p> |
| 216477/228 | Mr John Lappin | <p>Create 12000 new jobs = 12000 losses elsewhere then 1200 job losses in the south of borough when later these firms re-locate to another district outside the borough because offered better terms by another Council. What type of jobs do you expect, and what salary range? The way technology is progressing and no doubt will over the next 10/20 years accelerate, more and more machines will take over from operatives, manpower will be redundant. Robots now do operations in hospitals.</p> | <p>Point noted.</p> |
| 216593/127 | SEGRO Industrial | We support the Council's objective of identifying 210 hectares of | Support noted. |

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|--|
| | Estates Ltd (Barton Willmore - Mr John Pearce) | land for employment development as well as protecting existing Employment Zones (EZ). In addition we support the intention to focus the creation of most jobs in the south of the Borough. We support the exception of permitting office developments larger than 1,000 square metres, which do not provide face to face services close to public transport interchanges, in economic growth corridors and in other highly accessible locations. Heywood Distribution Park is located in an economic growth corridor and as such we agree that it would be suitable to accommodate major office developments. Within Policy E2 we support the Council's objective of designating Heywood Distribution Park as a Simplified Planning Zone. The recently adopted PPS4 reiterates at Policy EC2.1(j) the continuing role that SPZs can play as an effective planning tool to secure to economic development. By including the SPZ within the Core Strategy it is in accordance with PPS4 and will help contribute to economic development within the Borough. References to Draft PPS4 need to be updated within the Core Strategy as it is now adopted. | |
| 216735/530 | Russell Homes - Mr Daniel Kershaw | 2.1 Rochdale's local economy has been identified as underperforming in comparison to Greater Manchester and the rest of the North West. Unemployment is higher than the National and Greater Manchester rates with a further 3,000 people needing to enter employment in order to close the gap between the Borough and the National Employment rates. The Borough's local economy has an over concentration of manufacturing industries whose employers are typically low skilled and on low wages with an under representation of financial and business services within the Borough. 2.2 Economic forecasts show a likely decline in the manufacturing sector and as such the LDF must look to identify 21st Century employment sites to support local industry. 2.3 Kingsway is clearly significant in reducing the proportion of unemployment within the Borough as is the retention and protection of other large employment sites within the Borough, specifically Heywood Distribution Park and Stakehill Industrial Estate. 2.4 With the shortfall in employment opportunities and the population expected to rise it is necessary to allocate sufficient development opportunities to enable the growth of the economy which will facilitate an increase in jobs. 2.5 'Strategic Objective SO1 states it is the Council's intention to transform the local economy in a sustainable way to ensure residents are more prosperous and the Borough makes a greater contribution to the economic development of the city region. The | Agree need to update references to PPS4. Support noted. Further work required on the policy wording on timing and phasing of land release and development. |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>report sets out how it will achieve this by listing 9 goals which include, inter alia, increasing the number and diversity of types of businesses, the productivity of existing businesses, the number and quality of jobs, and by improving business environmental performance. Russells believe that in order to increase the quality, choice and accessibility of jobs and make the borough attractive to investment, enhanced transport infrastructure is required and the borough must make use of its advantageous proximity to the adjoining motorway network. 2.6 Russells strongly supports this strategic objectives as are set out within the document. It is vitally important for the Borough that a strong economy and access to employment underpins the foundations for growth within the Development Framework Period. 2.7 In order to achieve this sufficient employment land needs to be made available to meet the needs of businesses within and wishing to locate within the Borough. Employment opportunities should be located throughout the borough ensuring it is accessible to all. There is strategic significance associated with Kingsway Business Park, however the protection of Kingsway Business Park should not be at the expense of alternative employment opportunities that are deliverable in the short term specifically if demand exists. 2.8 The LDF core objective is to promote growth and development within the Town over a 16-year period and it is important that a Phasing Policy for the release of employment sites is included. However, it should not be dependent upon local supply reaching a set minimum level. 2.9 If development is phased there could be an over dependence upon Kingsway Business Park to accommodate the short term economic growth and provision of short and medium term employment opportunities. The reliance upon Kingsway to provide employment opportunities within the short term places a strangle hold on competitive development and creates a monopoly situation. 2.10 A combination of the downturn in market conditions and the removal of empty rates relief on constructed buildings has resulted in a significant reduction in the levels of speculative development on Kingsway. The fixed costs and overheads have resulted in a reluctance to construct smaller commercial units in isolation. A collective interest or critical mass of end users is required to pay for the start up costs and overheads (which are fixed) to be mitigated across a number of units thus enabling a sufficiently satisfactory return. In a period of economic recovery this approach to development on Kingsway could reduce the availability of short term delivery of industrial units. 2.11 It is</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>evident therefore that the Authority should not put all their eggs in one basket and there should be an alternative rather than the over dependence on Kingsway to accommodate the majority of short and medium term development. LOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT LAND AND PREMISES 2.12 It is agreed that employment development has to be in the right locations to meet the needs of business and the workforce. It is also recognised that the following issues need to be taken account of in seeking the best location and distribution of employment land to achieve sustainable development of the Borough. • Employment development should be within easy reach of the workforce and be accessible by sustainable forms of travel. It is essential that employment opportunities have good access to the strategic transport infrastructure to be attractive to businesses. • Employment needs to be accessible to neighbours with high levels of employment and economic inactivity. 2.13 The spatial relationship between employment and housing is extremely important. Jobs have to be available locally to reduce the level of commuting and congestion and create more sustainable patterns of development. It is essential therefore that Rochdale provides a wide range of new employment opportunities in sustainable locations which are attractive to the business community and does not rely on existing employment commitments and opportunities at Kingsway, Stakehill and Heywood to accommodate the majority of need and demand. 2.14 Employment opportunities need to be provided throughout the town, albeit there are clearly more advantageous locations. 2.15 Problems with accessibility and the quality of the surrounding environment limits significant development within the North Rochdale and Pennine Townships, however it is essential that some development within these areas is provided in order to ensure that these do not become dormitory townships for commuters working in Rochdale and Manchester beyond. 2.16 In summary it is considered that growth in employment opportunities is ultimately a prerequisite for a successful Borough. Rochdale is extremely well placed along North European Trade Axis and needs to take advantage of this opportunity in order to compensate for the declining manufacturing base within the Borough. Improved housing, public spaces, opportunities for leisure and the quality of the built environment are ultimately all dependent upon the annual growth within the economy and this can only be achieved by the planned and considered release of suitable employment land within the Borough. 2.17 Russells therefore supports 'Policy E2 - Supporting jobs and</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | | prosperity' and 'Policy E3 - Focusing on Economic Growth Corridors'. It is appropriate that the policy will focus on the south of the borough for the creation of the majority of jobs over the 16 year core strategy period. | |
| 367163/40 | Mr. Russell Johnson | This is answered on pages 70 & 71 of the T.D.S. | Noted. |
| 370419/215 | Highways Agency - Mr Ian Tull | The Agency has previously given comments on the named sites and the potential associated with the respective proposals. The Agency notes the nature of Kingsway Business Park and its location in relation to the wider Greater Manchester Authority will continue to require improved connections to ensure the site achieves a modal split which is non car biased. The Agency notes the Heywood site is already established and the Core Strategy is proposing additional development alongside a new relief road. The development sites are on Greenfield land and the Agency generally seeks to discourage the use of such land where: the redesignation can have an impact on the SRN and due to the wider national policy concerns. | Points noted. See response in Schedule A |
| 389357/360 | MMC Developments Ltd - Mr Mark Russell (Knight Frank LLP – Sophie Taylor) | However, Policy E2/3 - in the north (Page 59) advises that it is intended to seek to maintain existing levels of employment in the north of the Borough (where MMC's Rooley Moor Road site is located). It is proposed to retain and protect existing employment zones, sites and premises and to support their retention and redevelopment for employment use where appropriate. This is however subject to the test set out under Policy E2e. In relation to the Rooley Moor site, comments under this Policy are as follows: • As an employment site, this site has failed for a number of years - this can be evidenced. • It is considered that there is satisfactory employment land in the town to meet RSS requirements, particularly given the facilities available at Kingsway –also acknowledged by the Council. • It is considered that the site is unsuitable in land use terms for employment, given its location in a residential area and poor relationship to major roads. • Redevelopment of this site would remove an environmental problem - this is well documented within recorded discussions with Officers. (Appendix IV & V) • A housing lead development at this site will not result in a harmful impact to the operation of local businesses. | Points noted. This site is not going to be identified as a strategic site. |
| 389639/106 | N H R Ltd - Empirecrest Nick Ratcliffe | Empirecrest consider that it is inappropriate merely to seek to place a blanket protection upon existing Mixed Use Employment Zones, a more considered approach is required to regeneration, a more holistic approach is required to the retention and creation of employment. Mixed Use Employment Zones offer potential for the creation of masterplanned regeneration to the benefit not only of the | Disagree – policy indicates areas protected where appropriate. It's not a blanket protection. The policy sets out the circumstances that allow change of use. However the policy does say 'protect' which is may be causing confusion. Consider re wording of policy to make it simpler |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | | immediate area but also the wider borough as a whole. A full assessment of not only the quantity of employment site but also the quality of the existing employment sites is required, focusing upon sites existing constraints and potential for expansion. Policy E2 should not as it currently does rule out redeveloping Mixed Employment Zones for other uses to allow existing employers to invest in their businesses elsewhere within the Borough. | and clearer. |
| 396098/291 | Woodford Land Limited - Mr Jason Parkinson (Garner Planning Associates - Mr Christopher Garner) | There must be a balance between housing and employment land and therefore in criteria 2e) there must a further criteria "or the considered more suitable for housing development and its release is considered important to meet strategic housing land requirements." | Disagree. The policy does allow change of use to housing and an additional criterion is not required. |
| 396108/402 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.40 As set out earlier in response to Question 2, we consider that the Council should promote a balanced approach to diversifying the economy through encouraging innovation and growth in established employment sectors whilst attracting new high end industries to the District. 3.41 Rochdale's key economic sector lies in distribution, largely owing to its location on the strategic highway network and the availability of sites close to it. To this end the strength of this industry may facilitate the formation of a cluster in the vicinity of Heywood Distribution Park. 3.42 Draft Policy E2 sets out the Council's overarching employment policy. It is positively worded seeking to protect existing employment sites and identify a range of sites for high quality employment primarily in the B1 - B8 use classes. 3.43 Part 2 of the policy, consistent with the Strategic Policies seeks to: focus much of the development into the south of the District; maintain a rolling 5 year supply of employment land; focussing on economic growth corridors; maintain an existing supply within established employment zones and available strategic sites; along with the release of some 30 ha from the Green Belt to provide new sites; in all generating 12,000 new jobs. For the north of the District, a general policy of maintaining existing levels of employment is put forward with no new allocations proposed. 3.44 Our concerns with the Council's approach relate to the level of additional employment land proposed within the Core Strategy and the need to release land from the Green Belt to fulfil this requirement. 3.45 Material in the Background Paper at Section 5.1.6 makes reference to the employment and supply and the available evidence base; in particular a number of studies and models which provide forecasts for future sub-regional (GM) and local (Rochdale) employment land requirements. Specific reference is made to the Greater Manchester | Disagree – An additional 90 ha of employment land is not required. See response in Schedule A. Noted. Disagree. There is no need for a local review of the greenbelt boundary for the proposals in the Preferred Option. The scale of Green Belt release proposed by the objector would be unjustified and would require a strategic Green Belt review which would not be supported by RSS. See response Schedule A |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Forecasting Model (GMFM) (BP113) a trend based model that suggests a total requirement of need for 139.2ha in Rochdale for the period to 2026. A point to note from the GMFM is that within the Use Class sectors there is a general decline in the requirements for land for manufacturing purposes, but an increase for offices and distribution. Applying the RSS methodology to this figure results in a need for an additional 25 - 30 ha to be identified. 3.46 More recently the GMELPS (Greater Manchester Employment Land Position Statement) of August 2009 (BPI 13) concludes that Rochdale needs to provide a supply of around 210 - 215ha up to 2026, an additional 35-40ha (Background Paper Para 7.2.8). Reference is made in the final paragraph of the Core Strategy Background Paper section that this is a reduced figure to take into account the effects of the current economic conditions. 3.47 RSS Policy W3 indicates that between 2005 and 2021 some 90 ha of employment land needs to be delivered in Rochdale (part of the 917ha to Greater Manchester). Through draft policy E2 Rochdale Council is proposing just 30ha, a third of the required level. The Core Strategy when adopted will extend for a five year period beyond the current RSS period. Whilst the RSS is undergoing review (RS2010), that document nor the evidence base which supports it is sufficiently advanced to inform the emerging Core Strategy. 3.48 PPS12 and the emerging PPS4 make clear that development plan policy should be in conformity with Regional Policy and have the flexibility to respond to changing circumstances so the specific policy and aspirations of the development plan are delivered. For conformity to be achieved we consider that the Council should look to identify 90ha of employment land over the plan period to 2021 plus the appropriate amount for the period through to 2026. Failure to do so would imply that the Core Strategy is not in compliance with the RSS contrary to the guidance in PPS12. 3.49 Furthermore, the internal consistency of the Core Strategy would fail as the main emphasis of Spatial Policy SPI is to "deliver development which meets RSS employment land targets". 3.50 It is clear that there will be a need to release land from the Green Belt. Rochdale Council has expressed no intention to undertake a strategic review of the Green Belt as part of the preparation of the Core Strategy; we support the Council's stance on this issue. That being the case, PPG2's requirements for Green Belt boundaries to be "permanent" and live beyond the plan period are relevant. We consider that in line with PPG2 the boundaries of the Green Belt should be set with a substantial degree of permanence in</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | | mind. 3.51 In this regard the Council should undertake a localised review of the Green Belt to set the Boundary for a minimum 30 year period and to accommodate at the very least an additional 90ha of employment land. This will provide certainty and flexibility, key components of the PPS12 soundness tests. Furthermore if the defined boundaries are robust then this will reduce pressure for a future Green Belt Review. | |
| 396130/625 | Gill Howard | I do not think we should be focusing on any land south of Heywood or any sites between Middleton and Heywood. We need to preserve green spaces not erode them | Objection noted. See response Schedule A |
| 396135/380 | Joint LPA Receivers N Burd & T Greed (Savills - Mr Craig O'Brien) | We support Policy E2, particularly table 2 which recognises the importance of the Castleton corridor in providing a large proportion of the necessary employment land required throughout the Borough up to 2026. We recognise that Policies E2 and E3 are very closely related and therefore many of our comments are included in response to question 15 below. | Support noted |
| 398423/487 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | <p>E2.2.c - should include a reference to Kingsway. We support proposals for the supply of employment land and the focus on Employment Zones, strategic sites, the Green Belt proposals to release 30ha of land for development. We note the indication in E2.2.c to divert major office development (over 1000 sq m) that has to be accessible to town centres. ".... and" major offices not providing face to face services to the public close to public transport interchanges in economic growth corridors and in other highly accessible locations. We would hope that this would not prejudice the prospects for Kingsway or other none town centre office park locations e.g. Sandbrook Park.</p> <p>We also support the protection of employment sites against redevelopment for housing or "low density" employment subject to the conditions outlined. We would welcome clarification on what constitutes a "low density employment" use.</p> <p>We recognise that the borough is required to find 210ha up until 2026 and that 174ha has been identified with a further 30ha to be allocated. Rochdale's position within the sub-region may offer some opportunities to justify wider targets in relation to the needs of neighbouring authorities. We support the proposal to focus on economic growth corridors and consider that this approach should be consistent with other strategic objectives from the LSP and the Council and its partners. We note the conclusion of Castleton and refer to earlier comments regarding its status.</p> | <p>Noted, agree and consider</p> <p>Need to set out clearly where and why out of centre office development is supported- Noted.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Define or delete</p> <p>Agree – need to change policy to support change of use</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|---------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Page 57 -states 'we will protect existing employment zones' which includes mixed employment zones. Section 2e of Policy E2 (page 58) also protects MEZs from housing. In the Inner Rochdale area we proposed to build a large number of homes on the existing MEZ south of the railway station. The current UDP permits this approach as being part of a 'wider regeneration programme'. The draft CS however seems to give greater protection to the use of MEZs for employment purposes. Is it important that our housing aspirations for the area south of the railway station are supported by the CS - at present Policy E2 seems to oppose housing (see the criteria under 2e on page 58). Can this be reworded to be more in line with the existing UDP policy? See also DMI (2b) on Page 146. Page 58 (E2). We recently discussed the commercial 'markets' and how different areas with the borough may be competing with one another. I think it is important that the 'E' policies make it clear that Kingsway is a totally different (but complementary) offer to those uses anticipated in the economic growth corridors.</p> | |
| 401290/483 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | <p>E2 The proposed 210 ha employment land to 2026 reflects the recommended response to RSS W3 in Nathaniel Lichfield Greater Manchester Employment Land Position Statement. The supporting text indicates that 175 ha of land is available, and that 30 ha of additional land will be identified in the Allocations DPD in Green Belt to the South of Heywood – comments on the Green Belt release are provided above.</p> <p>E2 (c) This directs major office development to town centres which is in line with W3. However it goes on to state that offices not providing face to face services with the public will be allowed elsewhere close to public transport interchanges in economic growth corridors and in other highly accessible locations. This approach is supported by the blanket B8/B2/B1 uses given for all sites / areas in policy E3, even those outside the urban area. We understand that evidence suggests there may be a very limited market for office development within the town centres. In addition RSS policy would also support direction of development to highly accessible locations. However, the approach overall does not conform to RSS policy W3 and as such will need a strong justification supported by a robust evidence base. This is also the case as a significant amount of land with permission for B1a type use already exists outside the main town centres including Kingsway and the Heywood SPZ. The impact of allowing significant office development on greenfield and Green Belt</p> | <p>Point noted</p> <p>Agree – Policy on out of centre office development needs more precise wording and justification.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | | sites outside the existing urban area, both on office market in Rochdale town centre, and perhaps even in the Regional Centre of Manchester / Salford, needs to be considered. | |
| E3 – Focusing on economic growth corridors | | | |
| Question 15 What are your views on our policy of focusing on economic growth corridors? | | | |
| 161663/311 | Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd - Mr David Ward | We support and welcome the focus on economic growth corridors and the associated need to direct sustainable transport improvements to ensure that these corridors are more accessible to the workforce as well as commercial traffic. This should be maintained as a high priority in policy formulation and capital funding. In particular, we note and support Policy E3 (1) a) and b). We understand the reference in Policy E3(1) e) (i) to the 95 hectare and 14 hectare figures but we consider that these specific references are too prescriptive and unnecessary in this policy. Indeed, we find the cross reference to the old UDP Policy somewhat confusing. Accordingly, we object to this element of the Policy and seek the removal of the detail altogether (simply leaving the reference to KBP in this part of the Policy). As far as Policy E3 (3) g) is concerned, we refer to our comments in response to question 14. | Support noted. Agree – Delete detail. |
| 161683/279 | Government Office North West - Mr Dave Arstall | E3 identifies a number of strategic sites which are shown on the key diagram. We understand these to be locations, which will subsequently be considered for allocation with boundaries defined via an allocations DPD. Section 3 b) of the Inspector's note of the frontloading visit sets out the information which is required to support the inclusion of strategic locations and strategic sites. Given that some of the sites are small and that their identification places additional evidence requirements on the Council, we would question whether all of these are genuinely strategic and necessary for inclusion in the core strategy. E3 (g) - In addition, for the locations in the Green Belt it will be necessary to justify the need and very special circumstances for this proposed release against policy in PPG2. It will also be necessary to engage with 4NW to establish whether the proposed Green Belt release is in accordance with RSS policy RDF4 and can be regarded as a local detailed boundary change. | Agree. Non strategic sites will be deleted. Agree – 4NW have indicated that they do not consider it to be a strategic change. |
| 161991/445 | Wainhomes (Development) Ltd - Mr Richard Chamberlain (Emery Planning Partnership - Mr | Kingsway Business Park - Land east of Broad Lane 2.22 We support the allocation of the land east of Broad Lane in Policy E3 (1)(e)(i) within the Kingsway Business Park for employment purposes and associated and complementary uses including residential development. | Support noted – However the Core Strategy does not allocate Kingsway Business Park. The UDP allocation will be updated through the Allocations DPD. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|---|
| | Stephen Harris) | <p>2.23 We consider that the expansion of the business park is the most suitable and sustainable location for Rochdale to meet the regional employment land requirement, particularly in the short to medium term. The existing UDP allocation extending down to the M62 motorway to the south is located within the settlement boundary, and should come forward in advance of potential sites located within the Green Belt.</p> <p>2.24 The site is in close proximity to existing employment zones. It has good access to public transport and links with the town centre. Furthermore, direct access is available to Junction 21 of the M62 and the borough's road network.</p> <p>2.25 The site is well related to the Kirkholt and Central Rochdale housing market renewal areas. Its development would assist in the regeneration of these areas by increasing employment opportunities nearby to such residential areas. It is also well linked to other nearby residential areas, including the potential residential allocation of the land west of Broad Lane.</p> | |
| 162033/152 | Northwest Regional Development Agency - Mr Ian Wray | <p>We have no major concerns with the first part of the policy (clauses (a) to (i)) and welcome Clause 1 (e) (i) which identifies Kingsway Business Park as a strategic site within the Rochdale town centre Kingsway growth corridor. Kingsway has been identified as a strategic regional site in successive Regional Economic Strategies and has benefited from substantial NWDA investment in terms of funding and land assembly. We suggest that the policy refers to its role as a regional flagship site for inward investment and in providing opportunities for the expansion of indigenous businesses, particularly in knowledge-based and manufacturing and process industries.</p> <p>We do, however, question whether some of the sites identified elsewhere within draft Policy E3 are genuinely strategic. PPS12 advises that in general Core Strategies should not include site-specific detail which can date quickly. This is a matter on which GONW and the Planning Inspectorate might offer further advice and guidance.</p> <p>Clause 3(g) specifically refers to the release of 30 hectares of land from the Green Belt. In line with national guidance in PPG2, robust evidence will be required to demonstrate that exceptional circumstances exist to justify the release of land from the Green Belt having regard to overall employment needs and an assessment of</p> | <p>Support noted</p> <p>Agree Policy to support its role as a regional flagship site for inward investment.</p> <p>Agree – Delete reference to smaller, non strategic sites.</p> <p>Point noted – This evidence will be provided.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|---|
| | | alternative sites. | |
| 196641/639 | Castleton (EC) Residents Association - Mr William Sheerin | It is noted in the preferred options that the protected land South of Cripplegate lane will keep its current status, this protected status is important to the Castleton EC Residents Association. Any attempt to develop land South of Cripplegate lane will be strongly opposed. The land at Cowm Top which currently designated for industrial development is not attracting any business opportunities. If there is a shortfall in the LDF for Housing or Mixed Development this land should be considered for a change of designation. The Castleton EC residents association would not object to this change. We understand that if this land did achieve a change of designation there would be a need to find industrial land elsewhere in the Borough. During the last UDP the land at Kingsway was not allowed in the industrial land allocation. There is now in our opinion (because of Kingsway) adequate industrial land but none is for housing or mixed usage. It would be commonsense to reconsider the designation the land at Cowm Top to allow affordable housing and mixed usage. | |
| 204017/98 | Miss Jean Barlow | I do not agree with the proposal to focus on the "South Heywood / J19 economic growth corridor". There is already an oversupply of warehouse/distribution land in this area. The proposal to take away yet more green belt in this area is unacceptable to residents; the area has already seen a considerable loss of green belt in recent years. This area may well suit large businesses for its transport links, but I do not think that this the right way forward for the borough, for the many reasons I have given elsewhere in my responses. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A |
| 216593/128 | SEGRO Industrial Estates Ltd (Barton Willmore - Mr John Pearce) | We support the Council's policy of seeking to focus the majority of new employment development in economic growth corridors. Heywood Distribution Park is located within the South Heywood / J19 Corridor and as such is entirely suitable to continue to help achieve the Council's objectives for job creation. We support the intention to promote a new link road between Hareshill Road and junction 19 of the M62 as we believe that this will greatly improve accessibility to the Park and will assist with addressing highway concerns from local residents in respect of HGV movements. We wish to point out that the policy states that no new employment development will be supported in this corridor over and above that which is already permitted until the new link road has been delivered. The adoption of the SPZ at Heywood Distribution Park will not increase the total amount of floorspace that can be developed at | Support noted. The development allowed through the SPZ is already permitted and therefore would not be affected by the policy. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | | the Park as this is limited to the total existing and permitted floorspace. As a consequence any development coming forward under the SPZ will not be classed as new employment development and should not be linked to the new junction 19 link road. We again support the intention to designate Heywood Distribution Park as a SPZ as this will deliver significant economic benefits to the Borough in terms of job creation and inward investment. We welcome the identification in Policy E3 3(f)i) of 7.7 hectares of land at Heywood Distribution Park as having the potential for further development of those uses identified in the SPZ scheme. There is an extant outline planning permission on Heywood Distribution Park for 55,700 square metres of Class B8 development (planning permission 08/D51420) which was granted in January 2009. Implementation of this planning permission again will not be linked to the new junction 19 link road as it is an existing planning permission. | Support noted, however reference to specific sites may be deleted to comply with GONW advice. |
| 381325/74 | Yeagate Ltd (Mrs Barbara Brownridge) | The need to have a supply of attractive employment land is important if Rochdale is to be an attractive place for investment. Concentrate employment development in areas with existing development and good access to the motorway and, potentially, the rail network will increase the attractiveness of the land to developers. Although this will involve the loss of some green belt land the M62 provides a solid barrier for developments so it will not result in neighbouring towns merging into one another. There are relatively few residential properties in this area so there will be little potential conflict between the future employment development and residential amenity. This strategy is, therefore, supported | Support noted |
| 389357/362 | MMC Developments Ltd - Mr Mark Russell (Knight Frank LLP – Sophie Taylor) | Policy E3 -focussing on economic growth corridors refer to the four economic growth corridors where employment development will be focussed. These are as follows: • Rochdale Town Centre I Kingsway Corridor. • Castleton Corridor • South HaywardIJ19 Corridor. • Middleton Town Centre / Oldham Road Corridor The Rooley Moor Road site, whilst allocated in the adopted UDP for a mix use requiring employment, is not referred to under this Policy as a future employment site. | Point noted. The site is not strategic and therefore will not be referred to specifically. |
| 396034/409 | Mr Louis Henry | Finally as the economic growth corridor south of Hareshill Road makes no mention of the Equestrian Centre so it seems to me that all that green belt will be developed, possibly as a major distribution park. It will help everybody if your planners could come clean on what they envisage for the corridor when the next stage is published. | Point noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 396047/138 | Mr Gary Loudon | I'm concerned about increased traffic flows on Heywood Old Road which straddles between J19M62 and J19M60. Currently this is a | Noted –move to transport section. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| 396130/626 | Gill Howard | Like question 10 the proposals say they support local jobs and prosperity but in reality this may not be the case. So for that reason and my reasons relating to Q14 reason I do not agree. | Objection noted |
| 396135/381 | Joint LPA Receivers N Burd & T Greed (Savills - Mr Craig O'Brien) | We support Policy E3 and the suggestion that employment development should be focused within economic corridors throughout the Borough. The existing infrastructure of these locations is such that additional development can easily be accommodated. We also strongly support the notion to upgrade Castleton train station. Such an upgrade is necessary when considering the strategic importance of Castleton and the need to accommodate future growth. Notwithstanding, we consider that the mix of uses proposed within the Castleton corridor should be amended to include a larger range of employment, residential, leisure and retail uses. Specifically, the former Woolworths site could easily accommodate retail and leisure floorspace which will, in itself, generate significant employment opportunities on the site and should be treated as employment generating uses. Such retail and leisure uses should be in addition to the traditional B1, B2 and B8 employment and housing proposed in Policy E3. Whilst the Policy encourages the improvement of Castleton district centre it does not propose a mix of new development which includes additional retail floorspace. Published on 29 December 2009, PPS4 confirms the economic benefits of providing a wide range of uses. It is therefore our view that Castleton, and particularly the former Woolworths site, can accommodate the additional retail floorspace required to promote a successful district centre. Furthermore, we support the inclusion of the Trub Farm area for mixed use development and the recognition of the site's importance within the growth corridor. However, we consider that the Woolworths site is more suitable to accommodate a retail element within any future mixed use proposals given the small size of Trub Farm (1ha) compared to the former Woolworths site (7ha) in addition to the stronger linkages to both the train station and the existing local centre from the Woolworths site . Therefore, we suggest that Policy E3 be amended to confirm the suitability of the former Woolworths site to accommodate a broader mix of uses including a retail element and a significant level of residential use and that the Trub Farm site be put forward for mixed use development which does not include retail. We recommend the re-wording of point 2 of Policy E3 as follows: Former Woolworths site (7ha) – C3, A1-A5, D2, B1, B2 & B8 | Support noted. Consider changes to policy wording, bearing in mind the Growth Corridor v Regeneration Areas difference dilemma and issue of level of appropriate detail. |
| 397168/470 | GMPTE - Mr Richard | GMPTE would generally support the policy of focusing the majority | Support noted |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Clowes | <p>of employment development in town centres and key sites, within economic growth corridors that are easily accessible by public transport. Three out of the four corridors proposed (Rochdale town centre - Kingsway, Castleton corridor and Middleton town centre Oldham Road corridor) could be considered to currently have good access to public transport with access to a rail station and frequent bus services, although there are gaps in 'the network' (For example, Rochdale town centre to Kingsway). GMPTE would also support focusing the delivery of sustainable transport improvements to make the corridors more accessible and encourage sustainable travel.</p> <p>It would be useful for the clarity of this document if the later policies in TI demonstrated how the proposed transport interventions help to address specific deficiencies and accommodate future demand in these corridors.</p> <p>Unfortunately the South Heywood / J19 corridor is not currently very accessible by public transport. Given the likely nature of development it is difficult to envisage the level of investment required, to make it accessible, ever being achieved by developer contributions. Furthermore a number of the transport proposals or interventions put forward appear to be competing rather than complementary (see later comments).</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree – The proposals include improved rail and bus services. See response under Accessibility and Transport.</p> |
| 398423/488 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | E3.3.g -note Heywood area has been revised Page 65 -Section 1e) iii) refers to 2.5hs available in canal basin and Oldham Road -how was this area identified - may need refinement? Page 65 - Policy E3 promotes Oldham Road as an economic growth corridor - this is appropriate and is supported. However, as set out in 14 above, we want to ensure that this does not prejudice our ambition to build houses in the area south of the railway station. | <p>Point noted - Detail may be removed.</p> <p>Policy to be amended to make clearer support for housing.</p> |
| E4 – Encouraging the visitor economy | | | |
| Question 16 What are your views on our policy for encouraging the visitor economy? | | | |
| 60372/77 | British Waterways – Ms Sam Turner | British Waterways is pleased that particular emphasis is placed upon promoting the Rochdale Canal and Cycle Corridor. The Defra consultation document 'Waterways for Everyone' (2009) states that quality is the key to sustained growth in the visitor economy. A good visitor experience will generate more visits, increasing both the amount and security of revenue. With this in mind, it is essential that contributions from new development are invested in the network in order to enhance the visitor experience. | Point noted – May make reference under DM2 to possible contributions to canal improvements. |
| 161663/312 | Wilson Bowden | We support the objectives for encouraging the visitor economy. | Support noted |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | Developments Ltd - Mr David Ward | | |
| 162033/153 | Northwest Regional Development Agency - Mr Ian Wray | Clause 1 of the draft policy sets out a sequential approach to tourism and leisure facilities. It is intended to be read alongside the sequential approach in Proposed Policy SP5, which we have questioned the need for (see above). In any event, the criteria in Policy E4 do not constitute a sequential approach. Clause 1a merely reflects national policy as set out in PPS 6. Clause 1b relates to need and would require developers to demonstrate a need for visitor/tourism facilities even in areas that are specifically identified as tourism opportunity areas elsewhere within the policy. We see no reason for such a test. | Agree – Reword policy so that it is not a sequential test. |
| 162038/325 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | Generally the approach is supported – including in particular the intention that provision made indirectly to support tourism, e.g. new hotel accommodation, should follow a sequential approach and be absorbed in town centres first rather than less sustainable and more damaging locations. The same approach is relevant to those visitor attractions that are footloose, e.g. some recreation based leisure activities. However, some tourist attractions are location dependent – e.g. facilities directly related to those attracted to Hollingworth Lake can only be at/in the near vicinity of the Lake. Whilst there is a specific sub-policy for Hollingworth Lake it is possible that there other tourist attractions, either existing or identified in the future, that are also location dependent and where facilities such as car/cycle parking, toilets, tea room and gift shop will (subject to detailed location and design considerations) be appropriate. The current wording of part 1 of the policy does not recognise this. | Support noted Agree that many tourism facilities are location specific. Amend policy to reflect this point. |
| 162058/146 | The Theatres Trust - Ms Rose Freeman | We support a policy to encourage the visitor economy. Theatres can be a major tourist attraction, and policies to promote tourist facilities and the growth of a tourist industry can support the inclusion of theatre use. A festival or summer season may be a crucial draw and bring major economic advantage to a town or city, but this will only be possible if suitable venues are available. A policy to promote theatre use as part of a relatively small development may make a strong contribution to the character of a town and enhance the experience of visiting the town as a tourist. Cultural and visitor attractions should be supported where they are appropriate to the size, role and character of the settlement. Small-scale tourism-based schemes which help to provide local employment and support for existing rural services should be encouraged across the District. Small-scale tourism-based schemes would be acceptable where | Support noted |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | | they promote and enhance the rural or agricultural nature of their setting. | |
| 216477/229 | Mr John Lappin | Overnight accommodations B&B, about 7 years ago, with R.M.B.C. officers, it was suggested that to save Hopwood Hall from further neglect and deterioration R.M.B.C. convert it to a hotel and conference centre. Then to promote it as an attraction for visitors, who were visiting the area and North West as a base. Still no action. Only to stop further deterioration. | Point noted |
| 367163/34 | Mr. Russell Johnson | See page 74 of the Town Design Statement. It would also be beneficial for a Tourist Information Centre in Littleborough, and as we have a ready made building in the Coach House it could easily incorporated there | Point noted and supported by the policy. |
| 367163/41 | Mr. Russell Johnson | Please see page 74 of the T.D.S. | |
| 396047/139 | Mr Gary Loudon | I would like to see Birch Village put forward as a conservation area for the following reasons: - It is a rare isolated, picturesque village with great rural history and still remaining agriculture and working farms. It has many old buildings including Edgar wood design and I believe it could be turned into a real asset for the borough, especially considering it is close to the Manchester boundary. I have already suggested that the centre of Birch Village is di-sected for traffic control. I believe this small area between Whittle lane and Langley Lane could make an excellent village green which could attract local residents and visitors. Birch has great local farm shops, country walks, local history and has massive potential to provide a rural base for surrounding urban areas such as Langley etc. | Point noted and referred to the Conservation Officer. |
| 396108/411 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.57 We support proposais to enhance the strength of the Borough's visitor economy. | Support noted |
| 396135/382 | Joint LPA Receivers N Burd & T Greed (Savills - Mr Craig O'Brien) | In relation to Policy E4, we very much support the encouragement of a visitor economy within the economic growth corridors such as Castleton. In particular, we consider that Trub Farm is well placed to accommodate housing and leisure particularly due to its close proximity to the East Lancashire Railway (ELR) and the canal. In addition, we strongly support an extension of the ELR to Castleton based on the ELR 2020 Development Strategy. | Support noted |
| 397697/458 | Rossendale Borough Council - Mr James Dalgleish | Pennine Bridleway Rossendale Borough Council supports the enhancement of the Pennine Bridleway corridor as mentioned in policy E4. The Pennine Bridleway is an asset both to the local and regional tourist economy (policy E4), and provides a valuable contribution to the area's Green Infrastructure (policy R4). Properly managed Green Infrastructure can provide a wealth of benefits such | Support noted |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---------------|
| | | as the delivery of healthier, more active communities (in line with S02) and can aid the restoration and conservation of the natural environment (in line with 504). The Bridleway provides a mutually beneficial recreational facility for walkers, cyclists and horse riders between Rochdale, Rossendale and beyond. Improvements to its "recreational and tourist value" (policy E5) are fully supported by the Rossendale Borough Council. Healey Dell Local Nature Reserve (LNR) The Healey Dell LNR provides a valuable piece of Green Infrastructure on the border of the Rossendale and Rochdale boroughs, which provides recreational benefits to the populations of both Local Authorities, along with other shared tourism, landscape and biodiversity benefits. Rossendale Borough Council is supportive of policy E4's intention to "promote and enhance improved facilities and linkages into and through Healey Dell", and would ask for the opportunity to comment on any proposed developments in or future improvements to the LNR by Rochdale MBC. | |
| 398423/498 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | We welcome the proposals for the visitor economy particularly the recognition of the opportunities relating to the pennines areas and other key locations such as Castleton and Heywood. This spatial appreciation should be complemented with a more structured tourism strategy to provide a coherent framework for future investment. Support the principle of developing the visitor economy (policy E4) as proposed in the CS and emerging Town Centre Masterplan. | Support noted |
| 401290/485 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | E4 is supported by RSS Tourism policies W6 and W7 | Support noted |
| E5 – Diversifying the rural economy | | | |
| Question 17 What are your views on our policy for diversifying the rural economy? | | | |
| 60372/78 | British Waterways – Ms Sam Turner | British Waterways supports the aims of the Strategy to support development outside the urban area where it will improve the recreational and tourist value of the Rochdale Canal (E5c). In many parts of the country, particularly those outside the coastal tourist areas and the National Parks, waterways form the key tourism resource. As a leisure, recreation and tourism resource, the waterway network needs enhancement and facilities to support its leisure use. The canal network is not footloose, nor is it entirely located within established centres and supporting facilities are therefore essential. These could include marinas, mooring facilities, service facilities as well as facilities for land based visitors providing refreshments, etc. Without these facilities the ability to realise the economic and social benefits of the waterway, especially in rural areas, would be undermined. | Support noted |

| | | | |
|------------|--|---|---|
| 161868/523 | Mr Roger Davis | <p>The following relate to the stated RMBC strategy that the above area which includes Hollingworth Lake is to 1) promote the rural character and make better use of the countryside and 2) expand sustainable tourism. 1. There was no apparent forward planning in the decision to close the Oldham Rail "Loop" line and replace it with Metro Link. This statement is made by the fact that both Smithy Bridge and Littleborough Train stations are both being used by commuters who have travelled from the areas served by the previous loop. The result is cars are parked wherever possible in the vicinity of each of these stations causing congestion and will be off putting to tourists 2. Heavy Goods vehicles use the B6225 (Kiln Lane, Wildhouse Lane, Milnrow Road, Smithy Bridge, Lake Bank Road and Hollingworth Road). Also Smithy Bridge Road to the A58. These being short cuts. Is this appropriate for a designated tourist area? A weight restriction is required. 3. Car parking at Hollingworth Lake is not as good as one would wish. The main car parks are at the Visitors Centre and Hollingworth Road. Both are not tar macadam and bays not marked. The latter is not always opened and urgently requires attention to the parking area surface and marked bays. It should be noted both of these are pay as you park. 4. There is a large area shown on the maps as Pennine Rural Fringe. It is felt this area could be used for a wide range of outdoors pursuits which would fit in with tourism. 5. In Littleborough there is the "Littleborough Canalside Development Group". This group is working towards the development of a Marina on the canal. Such a project can only bring tourism and trade to the area.</p> | <p>Noted.</p> <p>Point noted – The Core Strategy makes this point.</p> |
| 162038/326 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | The approach is this policy is supported. | Support noted |
| 396047/140 | Mr Gary Loudon | Please read my previous comments regarding the alterations and development proposals to Birch Village. | Noted |
| 396108/412 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.58 While we support many of the broad principles expressed in this policy we consider that it fails to acknowledge the importance of agriculture as the main economic and land use activity in rural areas. Consequently we consider that this policy needs to be revised to provide more robust support for proposals linked to existing agricultural enterprises and their diversification as these are central to the operation of the rural economy. | Agree – Will include reference to the role of agriculture. |
| 397153/346 | United Utilities Property Solutions - Mr Andrew Leyssens | With regards to point e of Policy E5, United Utilities suggests the Core Strategy should include reference to the potential for live-work units in converted rural buildings. As a result of the continuing development of technology, there are new opportunities for live-work | Agree – perhaps need to re word policy slightly – delete the support development and connect policy to first para |

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|---|
| | | units in rural areas which can present the most sustainable form of living and working in the countryside whilst contributing to a diverse and sustainable rural economy. | |
| 398409/546 | Peel Holdings (Management) Limited - Mr David Thompson | 3.1 Peel Energy supports the reference to the potential contributions that renewable energy schemes can play in bolstering the rural economy. For example, wind farm developments generate employment and contribute to the local economy during their construction but also, if their scale is large enough, provide long term employment thereafter (i.e. through operational and maintenance services). 3.2 The Core Strategy should also acknowledge the additional economic security afforded to existing rural businesses through the income that local land owners can receive for accommodating wind turbines on their land. This income is usually supplementary to the primary use of the land, for example live stock grazing or other agricultural purposes, and thereby diversifies sources of revenue and upholds the established rural economy. | Support noted This amount of detail is not required. |
| 398423/500 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | We support the approach being taken. | Support noted |
| 401290/486 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | E5 is in line with RSS policies RDF2 and W1. However in the first line, where regard is to be had to national GB policy and local protected land policy, RSS policy for Rural areas (RDF2) will also be important. | Noted. |

Chapter 7 – Creating successful and healthy communities (SO2)

C1 – Delivering the right amount of housing in the right places

Question 18 What are your views on our policy of delivering the right amount of housing in the right places?

| | | | |
|------------|--|---|---|
| 6682/114 | United Utilities - Mr David Hardman | United Utilities Water would like some reference to the issues embodied in Regional Spatial Strategy - Policy EM5 "development should be located where there is spare capacity in the existing water supply and wastewater treatment, sewer and strategic surface water mains capacity, insofar as this would be consistent with other planning objectives. Where this is not possible, development must be phased so that new infrastructure capacity can be provided without environmental harm." | Agree – should make some reference regarding infrastructure in the RJ and link to Infrastructure Plan |
| 161663/313 | Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd - Mr David Ward | We support the overall approach towards housing provision. However, we think that it would be sensible to incorporate a general reference within Policy C1 to the opportunities offered for appropriate residential development within mixed use sites. | Agree – could make brief reference to mixed use opportunities. |
| 161683/280 | Government Office North West - Mr Dave | Similar issues apply to policy C1. Do all of these sites need to be identified as strategic locations? | Noted – Reference to the status of these sites will be clarified in revised document. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|--|
| | Arstall | <p>Is there robust evidence to show that Green Belt release is necessary to provide the plan with flexibility and ensure that housing completions meet RSS requirements? It is not entirely clear that the Council is convinced of the need to release the Green Belt areas given the words “potential release” and that on page 78 it says that the sites have been “reserved” which “could provide new housing over the plan period if required”. Greater clarity on the approach is needed.</p> <p>How has the Housing Growth Point been taken into account in C1 when considering future requirements? How does the Housing Growth Point affect the borough? AGMA has indicated that four authorities will be the initial focus of growth (Manchester, Salford, Trafford and Bolton) but that the remaining six authorities remain an integral part of the housing growth point ambitions and have been engaged in the development of the programme, and that they will join in the programme at a later stage. The core strategy needs to deal with this issue and indicate how any further growth over and above the RSS requirement will be dealt with.</p> <p>C1 also refers to proposals having to be in accordance with masterplans, but these do not have LDF status.</p> | <p>Point noted – The release of Green Belt for housing is only being considered in one location south of Heywood linked to an employment led development. See response in Schedule A. One Open Land site has been identified as locations where new housing could come forward. However, it is agreed that greater clarity is required with regard the status of these sites.</p> <p>Agree – needs to be reference to Growth Point although it has to be recognised that the focus will be on meeting the target for new homes. This can be made clear in the RJ. To achieve the aspirations of the housing Growth Point will require some flexibility in the release of Greenfield land as noted above.</p> <p>Agreed – Will just refer to taking account of relevant SPD's, masterplans etc in the RJ.</p> |
| 161991/446 | Wainhomes (Development) Ltd - Mr Richard Chamberlain (Emery Planning Partnership - Mr Stephen Harris) | <p>Housing Requirement 2.26 The Core Strategy identifies the need to provide an additional 9350 homes (gross) to meet the RSS requirement to 2026. We consider that the Core Strategy should plan for a higher number of dwellings. Plan Period 2.27 Our reasoning for the extension of the plan period to 2031 is set out in our response to Question 3. 2.28 To summarise, we consider that it is extremely unlikely that the Land Allocations DPD would be adopted prior to 2013. As this DPD will need to allocate land for a period of at least 15 years, this would result in it needing to project a housing requirement beyond the proposed plan period of the Core Strategy. We consider that this should be addressed in the Core Strategy at an early stage. Therefore, we consider that the plan period for the Core Strategy should be extended to 2031. 2.29 Therefore the housing requirement should be calculated to 2031. As an absolute minimum, this would involve extrapolating the RSS requirement, giving a net requirement of 11,200 dwellings to 2031.</p> | <p>Disagree – The only requirement is that the Core Strategy looks forward at least 15 years from adoption</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>Clearance Assumptions 2.30 We have doubts over the proposed demolition allowance of 100 dwellings per annum. 2.31 Policy G/H/1 of the Rochdale UDP (2006) identifies that a clearance rate of 140 dwellings per annum is to be assumed for housing land supply purposes. This figure will need to be reviewed having regard to changes in various clearance programmes and the economy. 2.32 The 2008 AMR states that it would be appropriate to continue using the clearance figure of 140 per annum for the next 5 years which was recommended by the Inspector considering the UDP Review. This would be until 2013. 2.33 Despite this, the Core Strategy proposes a clearance figure of only 100 dwellings per year. The 2009 SHLAA sets out that 1,155 dwellings are anticipated to be cleared in HMR areas, with an additional allowance for 20-30 dwellings per year that may be cleared in other locations. 2.34 However, further analysis of the 2009 SHLAA shows that the council is proposing more than 3,000 dwellings to be delivered within the HMR areas, with the clearance of only 1,155 dwellings which is far more than the 60% build back rate proposed by the Council and accepted by the Inspector considering the UDP Review. It is likely that much of the cleared stock will comprise high density terraced housing, to be replaced by housing of a lower density. We consider that the council's projections underestimate the amount of clearance required to deliver these additional dwellings. 2.35 To conclude, we consider that the council's clearance assumption of 100 dwellings per annum is too low and should be increased to at least 140 dwellings per annum.</p> <p>Deliverability of the supply 2.36 Table 3 identifies the total housing land supply over the proposed plan period as 11,611 dwellings. This is just sufficient to meet the identified gross RSS requirement of 9,200 dwellings. However, we have a number of concerns in respect of the deliverability of the housing land supply, and consider that additional sites will be required in order to meet the RSS requirement. Assuming all sites can be delivered 2.37 The Core Strategy assumes that all sites identified within the SHLAA will be developed in the plan period. We consider that this is extremely unlikely. 2.38 For example, the SHLAA supply comprises a very large number of brownfield sites, which typically face constraints, often not foreseen by the SHLAA prior to delivery. This may prevent delivery within the timeframe. Other sites may not come forward due</p> | <p>Disagree – The figure has taken account of planned clearance. The figure of 100 per annum still leaves a notional per annum clearance over and above the planned clearance. Agree that this will need to be monitored but having an over allowance up front could lead to the unnecessary release of greenfield sites. The additional dwellings delivered in regeneration areas relates to other sites / land being developed and is therefore not just a replacement of cleared properties. Much of the cleared stock is not high density terraced but lower density social rented properties.</p> <p>Noted – This is why we have included some areas for potential Protected Open land and Green Belt release. This is to give flexibility in terms of sites identified within the SHLAA not coming forward and also to provide some alternative location for new housing – in particular higher value housing.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>to market conditions or other site specific circumstances. 2.39 It is impossible for the council to guarantee that all sites identified within the SHLAA will come forward for development prior to 2026. We consider that further key sites need to be identified to supplement the housing land supply. Housing Trajectory 2.40 We have concerns about the deliverability of the supply set out in the housing trajectory given in the 2009 SHLAA. 2.41 Page 36 of the SHLAA sets out the Council's housing trajectory to 2026. This confirms the historic net completion rate since 2003, and the resultant increase required in the remaining years of the plan period. The trajectory in the SHLAA shows that from 2014/2015, the anticipated annual completions will be 953 dwellings, with an annual completion rate of 931 dwellings for the following four years. Such a completion rate would help address the historic under provision, yet this is a completion rate never achieved even in a strong housing market. Indeed in the 2008 AMR, which was published before the SHLAA, the highest projected annual completion rate was 550 dwellings. This shows that in the time between the 2008 AMR and the SHLAA being published, the projected annual completion rates have nearly doubled. 2.42 Given the historic under provision, the housing trajectory confirms to us that the projected figures are over optimistic and the reliance on strategic sites later in the plan period will only lead to further under provision. 2.43 As a result additional sites are required at an early stage of the plan period to address this under provision and to ensure that this does not exacerbate further into the plan period. SHLAA Assumptions</p> <p>2.44 We have a number of other concerns over the methodology used within the SHLAA which are accepted in the Core Strategy. These are as follows: 1. The council has not assessed the achievability and viability of individual sites. 2. The council may have overestimated the capacity of sites, particularly those with only outline planning permission and those without planning permission. We question the capacities set out on sites identified at appendix 1 and consider that they are too high. 3. We consider that the council has over-estimated the build out rate for developments, particularly in light of current market conditions. 4. We have concerns over the council's projected delivery rates in the broad locations identified for additional housing, particularly the inclusion of such broad areas in the 0-5 year supply. 2.45 We consider that these assumptions may have resulted in the council over-estimating its ability to deliver a</p> | <p>Disagree – The methodology used by the SHLAA follows that set out in the good practice guide. This was consulted on as part of the production of the initial SHLAA and has been used in producing the subsequent update that was also consulted on. It is impossible to do a full and detailed assessment of financial viability on every site. Work was undertaken by our Estates team on a sample of sites to assess viability. As a result of this some sites were taken out but the general conclusion was that most sites were deliverable under more 'normal' market conditions. The SHLAA takes a realistic approach in terms of site density with the only</p> |
|--|--|--|---|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>supply of housing necessary to meet the requirements of the plan period. Meeting identified housing needs</p> <p>2.46 The spatial portrait of the borough set out on page 12, which identifies that the borough has “an oversupply of older terraced housing, and a lack of larger homes to meet the needs of larger Asian families” and also “a shortage of executive or higher value homes to attract residents with higher incomes”. The Greater Manchester SHMA summarises at paragraph 7.10.1 that in the North Eastern HMA, alongside supporting housing market renewal there is a need to “achieve a significant uplift in the delivery of aspirational homes”. 2.47 The RSS states at paragraph 7.18 (c) that in Pennine Manchester there should be “support for potential economic growth and regeneration, particularly in Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder areas; including replacement and renewal of housing stock and, where appropriate, the development of a wider range of housing types (including high quality market housing). This should be achieved while ensuring that local and affordable housing needs can be met elsewhere.” (our emphasis) 2.48 We consider that the addition of such homes in the borough can only be achieved through the release of further greenfield land for housing in the short term. Such sites are typically unconstrained and offer the ability to deliver family housing providing a suitable choice and quality. We consider that suitable sites are available without the need for Green Belt release, for example the land west of Broad Lane. 2.49 Furthermore, the RSS is clear that the housing requirement should not be treated as absolute targets and may be exceeded where justified by evidence of need, demand, affordability and sustainability</p> | <p>high density schemes assumed being those with planning permission where it is inappropriate to use a different density. Where a capacity or scheme is not known a density of 40 per hectare has been assumed. This is relatively conservative and reflects recent more traditional developments that have been delivered. In order to take account of the downturn in the market the assumed build out rate was reduced from 40 to 30 per annum between the 2008 and 2009 studies. The assumptions for the number of dwellings to come forward in Broad Locations will be revisited and if necessary revised in the updated SHLAA.</p> <p>Noted (and disagree) – The evidence presented through the GM SHMA has been taken account of within the Core Strategy and there is significant emphasis on the importance of widening housing choice and providing larger and higher value housing to redress the current imbalances. However, whilst some greenfield sites have been identified on the basis that they can assist in providing higher value homes, we also take the view that brownfield sites can deliver this type of housing just as well. The Core Strategy does acknowledge that the RSS targets are not a minimum but it is still important that there is a focus on achieving this target.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>issues and fit with relevant local and sub-regional strategies. We consider that there is evidence of such a need.</p> <p>Conclusions 2.50 In light of our comments above, we consider that the council has both under-estimated its housing requirement, and has over-estimated the available housing supply over the plan period. 2.51 In addition, we consider that greenfield sites are required outside of the regeneration areas to meet the other identified housing needs of the borough. 2.52 We strongly object to the commentary on page 78 stating that “the only greenfield sites likely to be required (over and above those with existing planning permission) will be those necessary to deliver the regeneration areas and other identified major regeneration initiatives / delivery programmes.” 2.53 We consider that some greenfield release will be necessary, including areas outside of the regeneration initiatives, firstly in order to deliver an adequate supply of housing necessary to meet the housing requirement, and secondly to meet other market housing needs across the borough, specifically the need for high quality market and affordable housing outside of the regeneration areas. 2.54 We conclude that further sites should be added to the schedule of key sites at appendix 1 in order for the Core Strategy to deliver an adequate supply of housing, including the addition of greenfield sites.</p> | See comments above. |
| 162033/154 | Northwest Regional Development Agency - Mr Ian Wray | <p>We note that the supporting text refers to actual and anticipated future clearance activity within the Borough. However, because the housing figures in RSS Policy L4 are net of clearance replacement and are not expressed as ceilings, we suggest that the opening sentence of C1 is amended to read: 'We will provide sufficient land to deliver at least 450 net additional dwellings per year up to 2026 . ..' We question the need for clauses I (c) to I (f) as these appear to repeat elements of the spatial strategy.</p> | Noted – This change may read better and will acknowledge that the RSS figure is not a ceiling. It is still useful to include clauses c to f in applying specifically to housing |
| 162038/327 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | <p>In respect of the area of greatest interest to the National Trust, i.e. the north of the Borough, the approach in the Policy to new housing development is agreed.</p> | Noted – support for approach |
| 162047/451 | Bellway Homes Ltd (North West Division) - Mr Simon Artiss | <p>1. Whilst regeneration remains a priority your policy towards housing delivery must acknowledge current market conditions. A too heavy emphasis on regeneration and PDL sites risks the non-delivery of RSS minimum housing targets. The reason for this is the low residential land values which are resulting in existing use values of sites being higher and therefore the transfer of land for residential is not occurring to the extent needed. There is little indication that this</p> | Noted – Whilst this is noted, it is important given the importance of regeneration that there is still a focus on regeneration and PDL sites. It is likely that, in the short term at least, there will be some flexibility around appropriate greenfield sites. This includes the potential for reserved sites outside the urban area. In terms of s106's |

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>is improving. The other consideration is that of viability. If PDL is secured for residential development, policies must be flexible to allow viability when considering add-on development costs such as S106 contributions;</p> <p>2. Density and Commitments - higher density schemes have dropped away due to lack of bank finance and therefore policies need to be built around lower density assumptions (30-40 dph) and towards family housing, being the areas that house builders are seeking to build. Failure to do so will again risk not hitting RSS targets and the 5 year rolling supply. similarly; a realistic assessment of your existing residential commitments is required in order to assess your need for new housing land;</p> <p>3. Greenfield sites - given the above, the Core Strategy (and subsequent Allocations DPD) needs to support a proportion of greenfield sites which are considered deliverable, suitable and available and which will deliver your RSS housing targets.</p> | <p>we are undertaking an Economic Viability Assessment to ensure that the delivery of affordable housing does not impact the viability of schemes.</p> <p>Noted – as set out in the comments above, where a site capacity is not known, the SHLAA assumes a density of 40 dph.</p> <p>Noted – See comment above re: flexibility and potential for greenfield land release outside the urban area.</p> |
| 204017/46 | Miss Jean Barlow | <p>This comment concerns HT4 - increase choice of homes in South Heywood. I oppose the proposed release of Green Belt land at Collop Gate Farm for housing. Section 2 of this document, Spatial Portrait - Housing states "The Regional Spatial Strategy(7) requires us to meet a target of an additional 400 homes per year and the Core Strategy must set out how, and broadly where, these new homes will be built. The latest Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment(8) indicates that there is considerable scope to meet this requirement on previously developed sites, especially in the south, and with minimum use of greenfield sites." Therefore I can see no justification whatsoever for building on this Green Belt at Collop Gate Farm (in the south).</p> | <p>Noted – However, whilst the SHLAA includes sufficient brownfield land to meet the RSS requirement there is a need to show flexibility in terms of sites given the comments made on recent delivery of new housing – See response in Schedule A</p> |
| 216477/230 | Mr John Lappin | <p>Against land north of Langley Lane being reserved for any type of further development.</p> | <p>Noted – See comment above and Schedule A</p> |
| 216735/531 | Russell Homes - Mr Daniel Kershaw | <p>3.1 It is acknowledged that the Borough is made up of distinct housing market areas with different housing issues. The inner urban areas of Heywood, Middleton and Rochdale vary considerably from the outer suburban areas of Norden, Bamford and Alkrington and the existence of these distinct housing areas means that there is polarisation in the character and quality of residential areas within the Borough. 3.2 The inner urban areas reflect the characteristics of a weak housing market and high levels of deprivation, which include low house prices, poor quality housing, a dominance of terrace</p> | <p>Noted – This is why there is a particular focus on delivering larger and higher value housing within the Core Strategy to widen housing choice and seek to redress current imbalances.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>properties, overcrowding, neighbourhood problems such as high levels of crime, a lack of children's play and amenity spaces and proximity of bad neighbour industrial uses that are a legacy of the historic manufacturing base within the Borough. 3.3 The character of the outer suburban areas is very different with higher house prices and an improved environmental quality. 3.4 It is acknowledged that the Borough does not have enough housing of the right size, type, tenure and quality to meet the current demand for the anticipated population increase at the end of the Framework period. 3.5 Housing stock in the Borough is made up predominately of terrace properties (39%) with nearly a quarter of all houses dated before 1919 and 29% of terraced houses considered unfit for human habitation. Of all the townships within the Borough Heywood has the highest proportion of terraced properties with up to 46%. It also has a considerably reduced percentage of suburban better quality houses where there is considered to be a lack of supply.</p> <p>3.6 An overall lack of supply of all housing is considered to be evident throughout Rochdale where relatively low levels of new homes have been built in the Borough in recent years. This has restricted housing choice and limited the social and economic benefits of new development. 3.7 There is a need to provide sufficient additional homes to support the forecasted growth in new households and the economic growth and regeneration of the Borough. The delivery of New Housing 3.8 The economic conditions of the last 10 years in addition to stimulating considerable growth in the numbers of houses that have been delivered is also in part responsible for a cultural shift towards the construction of high density development sites. It is noted that Planning Policy Guidance Note 3 Housing (March 2000) and Planning Policy Statement 3 (November 2006) were also integral in increasing the density of development on sites. It is considered that market conditions which have been integral to the delivery of ever increasing housing densities on development sites has now ended and for the foreseeable future it is highly unlikely that developments will be provided at densities that have recently been experienced. The development of higher density schemes has also resulted in a shortfall of family accommodation for which there is an established need. 3.9 The consequences of this are that historic planning consents for high density townhouses and apartment schemes in excess of the 40 dwellings per hectare will need to be reassessed</p> | <p>Noted – It is considered that the Core Strategy will provide sufficient housing to meet RSS targets, local need and maximise the social and economic benefits of new housing. In delivering this the Core Strategy is not reliant on high density schemes. The SHLAA assumes a 40 dph density on those sites where a scheme is not known.</p> |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>services including employment, schools and town centres by sustainable forms of travel. 3.16 Russells are supportive of this position and would add that new housing development needs to be delivered throughout the Borough and represent the needs and demands of all aspects of society. 3.17 The regeneration of the inner urban Townships is a priority objective of the Core Strategy document. It is equally important that the location of new housing reflects the choice and needs of all households within the Borough to support the sustainable economic growth of the Borough as a whole. 3.18 Russells is supportive of greater mix and choice of homes in terms of size and tenure and the provision of high quality housing which will improve the overall image of the Borough and help deliver the growth of the economy. 3.19 It is therefore essential that new house building is required to support the existing and planned regeneration proposals, (specifically HMR neighbourhoods) but also in sustainable suburban areas to retain and attract people with higher incomes and satisfy aspirational housing need. 3.20 Development should continue to occur within Northern Rochdale and Northern Pennine areas, however the limited opportunities for expansion and the relationship with future employment opportunities dictate that these areas should not be seen as major growth areas. 3.21 It is advocated that a mix of housing be provided across the Borough but that a clear focus on the central and southern Rochdale areas, Middleton area and the Heywood area should be seen as a priority. Problems of accessibility within the Northern Rochdale and Pennine Townships and the high environmental quality of the landscape result in a limited opportunity for further expansion within these areas.</p> <p>3.22 Russells acknowledge that there is a need for affordable housing and that current approach seeks the provision of affordable housing on all sites of 15 dwellings or more and that the provision equates to 7.5% of the development value of the site. 3.23 Russells support the provision of affordable housing, but would qualify this with a note that affordable housing should not be rigidly applied where its inclusion would prejudice the development of a site which would deliver wider planning benefits. Where there are clear benefits that can be achieved from the redevelopment of a particular site but the inherent development costs are so prohibitive so as to exclude provision of affordable housing, then the policy should be sufficiently flexible to enable affordable housing contribution to be reduced or</p> | <p>Noted - We are undertaking an Economic Viability Assessment to ensure that the delivery of affordable housing does not impact in the viability of schemes.</p> |
|--|--|---|---|

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| | | removed. | |
| 367163/42 | Mr. Russell Johnson | See pages 56 & 58 of the T.D.S. | The Littleborough Town Design Statement is a supporting document and there must be policies for it to support; C1 will be one of them. The two are complimentary. |
| 370419/253 | Highways Agency - Mr Ian Tull | The Agency notes the document does acknowledge that the focus for residential units will be in regenerating inner areas, town centres and large outlying single tenure estates. The Agency welcomes the proposal to site development in local centres, consistent with RSS guidance. There should continue to be an appraisal, consistent with that outlined for economic growth, to ensure accessibility factors are considered. Town Centres are generally intrinsically linked with the availability of services but this should be appraised for each development. Policy C1 does include that new residential development will 'be in accessible locations with good access to services. The presentation of the respective regeneration areas and the associated commitments shows a desire to address sites which may suffer from low level service availability. It also shows that the deliverability of residential schemes has been explored but this should be supported by an accessibility appraisal, acknowledging local proposals. | Noted – The focus on brownfield sites within the urban area and regeneration areas should ensure that development is being focussed in areas that have good accessibility. It is acknowledged that the impact of larger schemes, and cumulative impact for certain area, will need to be taken account in terms of ensuring good accessibility is maintained. However, it is likely that more detailed issues will be considered through the allocations DPD. The only exception to this may be any larger scale development on greenfield sites which may require new infrastructure and services to ensure good accessibility e.g. South Heywood. |
| 382265/269 | Mr Mervyn Simpson | Regarding the Heywood housing sites identified within the core strategy. I have concerns for detrimental implications that may arise if planning permission is given to development schemes not considering the social and environmental issues linked to poor design. Now that the previous NHBC tree guideline recommendations have been dispensed with, does the council intend to fulfil government policy contained within British Standard 5837, previously a guideline, revised five years ago in 2005 to become Recommendations. The revisions recommend government planners to promote professional arboriculturists as early advisors into the consortium framework for draft proposals, strategies, schedules and project management. Furthermore LA's can encourage development companies to engage professional arboriculturists, via planning conditions. BS 5837 highlights; 1) The general strategy recommends seeking expert advice from the arboriculturist even if there are no trees yet. Future sites need trees. 2) The tree protection plan requires the professional arboriculturist to determine information, not the LA Tree officer working with site development. 3) LA's should advocate into the framework the professional arboriculturist rather than a general landscape architect | Noted – However these impacts would be dealt with through other relevant policies within the plan |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|---|
| | | attachment. 4) The Arboricultural Implication Assessment places the determination of site lay-out impact on tree survival into the arboriculturists hands and away from the planners and officers of regional planning departments. | |
| 389357/363 | MMC Developments Ltd - Mr Mark Russell (Knight Frank LLP – Sophie Taylor) | It is acknowledged that the aim of this part of the Core Strategy is to develop good places where people want to live and to promote community cohesion. Retaining the existing residents, attracting new residents and accommodating a wide range of age groups, family sizes, ethnic groups and income levels is also promoted. Policy C1 - delivering the right amount of housing in the right place acknowledges the requirements of the RSS and refers to making sufficient land available to delivery 450 additional dwellings per annum. The approach to focussing on delivering regeneration areas as good locations for new homes is supported. This Policy refers to housing developments in the north of the Borough as being appropriate when they are on previously developed sites which are currently committed or where housing developments would assist regeneration. It is considered that development of the Rooley Moor Road site for housing, given the complexities associated with ground condition and contamination, would be a significant factor in aiding redevelopment of the site. It is noted that Policy C1-3 does advise that the Council will seek to deliver strategic housing sites through the Allocations DPD and that they will provide a large number of dwellings and regeneration benefits. The sites which are considered to deliver these objectives have been identified through the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) - the sites either have planning permission, have previously been allocated or are newly identified sites. Appendix I of the Core Strategy Options Report refers to a schedule of sites. Rooley Moor Road is identified as having a range of between 200 and 600 units, depending on the mixture of uses at the site (SHLAA Code - SH0633). It should be emphasised here that this site should be referred to as a principally housing site as opposed to a potential mix use site with a range of units from 200 to 600. The site should be promoted as a strategic housing site, with the potential to deliver the higher end of the 200 - 600 currently referred to. The Council should, however, work with MMC to establish the exact capacity of this site which is greater than 600 units referred to. | Noted – The regeneration of brownfield sites such as TBA is supported through the Core Strategy. However, it may not be appropriate to refer to specific sites. |
| 389694/301 | Clariant Ribble Limited - Mr Stephen Parkinson (Indigo Planning) | Whilst the spatial approach to delivery of housing rightly focuses on previously developed sites in the urban areas, there should also be flexibility within the policy to allow green field development outside of | Noted – We have included some areas for potential Protected Open land and Green Belt release. This is to give flexibility in terms of |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | Limited - Mr Bill Davidson) | these areas should a clear need be identified. A new bullet 1(f) should therefore be added as follows: 1(f) Include the development of other green field sites only if a clear need has been demonstrated. The existing bullet (f) should be changed to (g). | sites identified within the SHLAA not coming forward and also to provide some alternative location for new housing – in particular higher value housing. Agree that the Core Strategy needs to clarify how it will deal with other greenfield sites in the urban area as, in the short term at least, there may be some flexibility around appropriate greenfield sites. |
| 396047/141 | Mr Gary Loudon | I would like to see vacant housing and old housing developments prioritised over new housing. I would also object to any use of greenbelt land / open space land use until all other alternatives have been fully discounted. i.e. land north of Langley Lane. | Noted – The focus of the Core Strategy is still on regeneration and brownfield sites but there does need to be some flexibility if we are to demonstrate that the housing figures can be met. It is agreed that there should be some reference to tackling vacant properties and making better use of the existing housing stock. However it should be noted that land at Langley Lane is no longer proposed. |
| 396098/292 | Woodford Land Limited - Mr Jason Parkinson (Garner Planning Associates - Mr Christopher Garner) | <p>The wording at 1d) should be simply "in the north of the borough, only be on previously developed sites to meet the sub-regional housing target of 25% as set out in SP2" rather than limit the delivery to current commitments which will of course change over time. It will be difficult to determine how housing development in the north of the Borough will assist regeneration other than redeveloping a previously developed site in its right assists regeneration.</p> <p>The key strategic sites in Appendix 1 are indicated to include all major housing sites with existing planning permission, have been previously developed or are newly identified, but the list is quite limited. It does not include all sites with current planning permissions such as SHLAA Code SH1208 Land at Greenbooth Road, Rochdale with a suggested capacity of 159 dwellings.</p> | <p>Noted – The wording suggested by the respondent would be incorrect unless it was reworded to state '25% of the boroughs housing target'. Reference to a split is no longer appropriate since changes made to the Spatial Policies.</p> <p>Noted - The purpose of Appendix 1 was to indicate some of the strategically important sites. It is inappropriate to include all the sites within the SHLAA given the sheer number. However, this Appendix will be revisited and may be moved to the Background Paper and include a better explanation of the sites included within it.</p> |
| 396108/413 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.59 We support the Council's undertaking to meet the RSS's housing requirements to 2026. Nonetheless we have concerns over the way in which housing requirements are to be met. In particular the Core Strategy's reliance on unidentified housing site's within Regeneration Areas. We have raised these concerns in detail during the SHLAA consultation process. | Disagree – The Council is committed to the delivery of regeneration within key areas of the borough. Previous work has indicated that capacity exists to deliver a significant number of new homes within these areas. It is acknowledged that the capacity of these areas needs to be monitored and amended in light of |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|---|
| | | <p>3.60 We are not convinced that widespread use of unspecified housing sites in calculating housing supply accords with guidance relating to the identification of housing sites. We consider that in the interests of certainty, deliverability and flexibility housing land must be identified especially as we now query the deliverability of some high density developments included within the Council's existing supply.</p> <p>3.61 A number of parcels of Estate land have been put forward through the SHLAA process as considered suitable for housing. We will continue to promote land in the Wilton Estate's ownership for housing, where this is considered to be the most appropriate use for the development of the land.</p> | <p>new information but it would not be appropriate to ignore the role they <u>will</u> play in meeting the boroughs housing target.</p> <p>Disagree – The housing supply has been assessed through the SHLAA using the DCLG methodology. It is not a requirement in the Core Strategy to identify all of the sites but to develop a Spatial Strategy for the delivery of new homes. The only unspecified sites are those to come forward within wider regeneration areas. Even here, a number of sites could be identified with the only omissions being those where clearance has yet to take place to create a new housing opportunity.</p> <p>Noted – These are currently on the discounted list. It is felt that the land in question is of significant landscape value (the conclusion of the Inspector in the last UDP Inquiry who dismissed the proposed Middleton West Business Park) and therefore development would not be appropriate.</p> |
| 396135/383 | Joint LPA Receivers N Burd & T Greed (Savills - Mr Craig O'Brien) | <p>We support Policy C1 and the spatial approach to delivering housing within the Borough with a focus on regeneration areas first, closely followed by key economic growth corridors. Whilst we recognise the importance of regeneration areas as a focus for new housing development we also support the notion that residential development should also be located in key economic growth corridors. Whilst Policy C1 refers to some of the key strategic housing sites within the growth corridors as part of Appendix 1 within the Consultation Document, the Policy could make further reference to other Policies such as RT10. In this way, cross-reference between Policies could help strengthen the spatial approach to delivery. Appendix 1 of the Consultation Document, suggests that the former Woolworths site has the capacity to accommodate 100 dwellings. Whilst this is dependant on the proposed mix and quantum of uses on the site we support the recognition of the former Woolworths depot as a key strategic site which could accommodate a proportion of new residential development as part of the 7ha area. We do, however, consider that the site is capable of accommodating a</p> | <p>Noted – Support for the role of new residential development in regeneration areas and Economic Growth Corridors is noted. It is acknowledged that the approach cross referencing of policies will need to be looked at in more detail.</p> <p>The reference to the number of dwellings was just a notional figure to demonstrate the potential for new housing on the Woolworths depot site as part of a mixed use development. This would not preclude a larger number of units coming forward as part of an appropriate mixed use development. The table currently in Appendix 1 may be moved or presented differently in the revised document.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|--|
| | | greater volume of residential use. | |
| 397153/345 | United Utilities Property Solutions - Mr Andrew Leyssens | Policy C1 sets out a spatial approach to the delivery of new housing. Point C1d states that in the north of the borough new residential development will 'only be on previously developed sites which are currently committed or where housing development would assist regeneration.' Whilst acknowledging a need to develop a spatial approach which has a greater focus on areas in need of regeneration, UU is concerned that this policy has the potential to prevent the re-use of previously-developed windfall sites within the urban area in the north of the borough which are suitable for residential development. For example, the former Clay Lane Water Treatment Works (SHLAA reference SH1475). This is a previously-developed site within an urban and residential area with potential for housing development. The characteristics of the site are set out in detail in a submission to the strategic housing land availability assessment dated 26 February 2009. For ease of reference, a copy of this submission is enclosed. UU suggests the spatial approach set out under point C1d is amended to include some flexibility to allow the re-use of some previously developed windfall sites where it is demonstrated that the most appropriate alternative use is residential and where there is no conflict with other policies of the plan. Such sites should also be preferred to any release of green belt or reserved land in the south of the borough. The added flexibility to policy C1 will also increase opportunities for up market executive housing in accordance with the spatial vision set out in chapter 3. | <p>Noted – The reference to regeneration is to ensure the protection of viable employment sites and other uses from simply being redeveloped for housing. Clearly if brownfield 'windfall sites' become available in the north of the borough, there productive use could also be seen as 'regeneration' to avoid derelict sites as well as contributing to the delivery of housing targets. More clarification will be included in the Reasoned Justification.</p> <p>The fact that the Clay Lane Water Treatment Works has been included in the SHLAA as a potential site shows that principle of new housing on this site is accepted. The potential of the site to provide up market housing in the borough is also noted.</p> |
| 397177/348 | Environment Agency - Mrs Sylvia Whittingham | C1/1 Delivering the right amount of housing in the right places The proposed new homes should be in locations of lowest flood risk in accordance with the sequential approach and Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment document. C1/3 Key strategic housing sites Depending on their extent, some of the key sites identified in appendix 1 may be partly within flood zones 2 or 3. Rochdale Town centre and East Central regeneration areas are also at some risk. | Point noted – This issue is addressed in the responses to Policy R6. |
| 398423/502 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | We agree with the recognition of the relationship between spatial, housing and environmental opportunities and improving health. The focus on regeneration areas is supported. C1 and C2 defines the council's sustainable communities areas and their potential for new housing provision to meet local need. The target of providing 9200 new homes in the period 2003-2026 is challenging given the land capacity issue, market conditions and funding expectations. The provision of target numbers makes a number of assumptions that are uncontrollable. The targets should be treated carefully and | Agree and support noted – The figures referred to will need to be monitored in order to take account of new information in order that the figures are realistic and deliverable. |

| | | | |
|------------|---------------------|---|--|
| | | caveats made about the future delivery of housing numbers and land that might be available. Support aspiration in Policy C1 and C2 to focus residential development in the regeneration areas including the town centre to promote mix of uses in Rochdale and Heywood town centres. | |
| 401290/494 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | <p>C1 1 The proposed annual housing figure is above that set out in RSS policy L4 but the text makes it clear that this takes into account undersupply in the period 2003 – 2009 so we consider it to be in conformity with L4. We consider the rolling forward of this higher annual figure to 2026 acceptable provided it is supported by the evidence base.</p> <p>C1 2 Most of the areas referred to are within the HMR so we would support them as locations for new housing development. However RSS policy L3 requires plans and strategies in HMR areas to manage the delivery of new build and its impacts on the existing housing stock and, where appropriate, to make best use of the existing stock. This does not appear to be picked up in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>C1 3 Reference is made to strategic sites, which are listed in the appendices and shown on the key diagram. C1 makes clear that these sites will be defined in an allocations DPD. The site references in the appendix, in SP3 and SP4, to mixed sites in E3, to Green Belt and reserved sites elsewhere in C1, and to Green Belt sites in R2, and the key diagram should all correspond and coincide, using the same site names and covering the full list of strategic sites. This is not the case at present. A simpler approach would be not to refer to specific sites in the policy at all, only to broad locations where appropriate e.g. South Heywood, and to consider the specific sites in a site locations DPD. Alternatively, as these sites are described as key strategic housing sites, with delivery of a large number of dwellings and regeneration benefits, consideration should be given as to whether any of them need to be allocated as strategic sites within the Core Strategy itself, in which case maps and descriptions will be necessary in the Core Strategy.</p> <p>C1 The supporting text (p78) refers to the fact that the SHLAA suggests that the housing requirement can be met without major greenfield release, yet three possible major greenfield sites have been reserved for housing over the plan period “if required”. We</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>Agree – See previous comment re existing stock and vacancy rates. It would be hoped that new development in older housing areas would widen housing choice and reduce the risk of housing market failure.</p> <p>Agreed – Using consistent site names is something that needs to be addressed. A Broad Location / Area of search is the approach that we are likely to adopt. Also note previous comments on Appendix 1. This will result in a change to Policy C1/3.</p> <p>Disagree – The release of Green Belt and or Open Land is being put forward to provide flexibility over the plan period.</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| | | consider that these greenfield sites (one of which is in the Green Belt) will need a strong justification in the Core Strategy, in light of the SHLAA findings, the sequential approach in DP4 and the need to concentrate development on regeneration areas. | |
| C2 – Focusing on regeneration areas | | | |
| Question 19 What are your views on our policy of focusing on regeneration areas? | | | |
| 161620/95 | Mr Steve Connell | No provision made for faith groups and religious buildings. Responsible religious learning is a vital part of a healthy community. | Noted – See response to policy C8. |
| 161991/447 | Wainhomes (Development) Ltd - Mr Richard Chamberlain (Emery Planning Partnership - Mr Stephen Harris) | 2.61 We question the deliverability of the housing numbers referred to in policy C2. We consider that the net housing delivery in the regeneration areas needs to be re-appraised. | Noted – The figures referred to will need to be monitored in order to take account of new information in order that the figures are realistic and deliverable. |
| 216477/231 | Mr John Lappin | East Middleton This area is in very urgent need of regeneration especially from Market Place, Lodge Street, Townley Street, Oldham Road. However more houses mean more children mean more children, therefore new schools, doctors etc needed, are they planned? And where? | Noted – The delivery of education and community facilities is adequately dealt with in policies C7 and C8. |
| 389357/364 | MMC Developments Ltd - Mr Mark Russell (Knight Frank LLP – Sophie Taylor) | Policy C2 - focussing on regeneration refers to a number of locations/ sites which should be promoted for housing. This Policy omits MMC's site at Rooley Moor Road. It is argued that it should be included, particularly based on the work carried out to date for planning application purposes and discussions since January 2007 with the Council, where it is accepted that the site is a regeneration site and will come forward for a principally housing lead development. | Noted – The Rooley Moor Road site is included in the Council's SHLAA. Specific reference will therefore be deleted from the Core Strategy. The purpose of this policy is to pick up on those broader regeneration areas where the provision of new housing is a key element of a wider regeneration programme. |
| 396108/414 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.62 We support the aspirations and targets for this policy however we have some concerns over the deliverability of housing bearing in mind the failure to identify specific sites within regeneration areas within the SHLAA. As explained in the response to Question 18 we consider it imperative that housing land is identified bearing in mind the need for Core Strategy to be capable of displaying available housing land for the first 15 years of the plan period. We support proposed community/amenity proposals as part of the regeneration programme. | Noted - See responses to similar points regarding deliverability above. |
| 398423/525 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | Page 80 - C2b) the 150 dwelling figure for ECR is very low. The more realistic figure is 300 dwellings with an ambition of around 350 -see also the same number on page 140 under RT2. | Noted – This figure was discussed with the RDA previously. It should be noted that it excludes sites which are in ECR but already have planning permission e.g. Dale Mill / Arkwright Mill. This figure will be revisited in finalising the |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | Page 80 C2c) iii) (Milkstone & Deeplish & Newbold) has a policy 'to improve the areas around...'. Is this objective an environmental one - i.e about image and appearance? We should be more specific about what 'improve' means. Page 80 C2c) iv) (Milkstone & Deeplish & Newbold) refers to 'high quality links'. We should be more specific about what this means i.e. new links or enhanced links? -walking, cycling, car or public transport links? | Core Strategy. Agree – These will be revisited in order to improve the clarity of the point being made. However, given the intention to keep the document short it is not intended to go into too much detail. |
| 401290/496 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | C2 This policy does not conform to RSS policy L3 in that it does not deal with the need to manage new build and its impacts on existing stock, or making best use of the existing stock. These issues are not currently covered in the Core Strategy. | Noted – See earlier comments regarding the need to refer to the existing stock, vacant properties etc. |
| C3 – Delivering the right type of housing | | | |
| Question 20 What are your views on our policy on delivering the right type of housing, including the density of development? | | | |
| 161663/314 | Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd - Mr David Ward | We support the recognition that higher quality housing is fundamental to facilitating economic growth. Those seeking to invest in the Borough need to know that there is a range and choice of available properties and the provision of higher quality housing accommodation is an important factor in attracting and retaining wealth creation. We also note and welcome the text references to densities being assessed based upon the locality of each site. This is, in our view, a practical and sensible approach. As far as the Policy itself is concerned, we note that target minimum densities are set in certain locations. This is, of course, consistent with national guidance. However, we think that it would also be sensible to include a policy reference to the appropriate assessment of the individual locality as a relevant factor in all cases. | Support noted – In response to the final point the second paragraph to the Reasoned Justification will be amended to make reference to local context and character. |
| 161683/281 | Government Office North West - Mr Dave Arstall | C3 needs to quantify through targets the mix of dwellings which the Council is seeking to secure. | Noted – The Rochdale Strategic Housing Market Assessment will provide evidence on this matter. Broad targets may be helpful but it is necessary to consider the practical implementation of such targets. |
| 161991/448 | Wainhomes (Development) Ltd - Mr Richard Chamberlain (Emery Planning Partnership - Mr Stephen Harris) | 2.62 We support Policy C3 (1) (d). We consider that there is a need outside of the regeneration areas within Rochdale for higher value housing, in particular family housing, to retain and attract residents. 2.63 This policy is supported by the spatial portrait of the borough set out on page 12, which identifies that the borough has “an oversupply of older terraced housing, and a lack of larger homes to meet the needs of larger Asian families” and also “a shortage of executive or higher value homes to attract residents with higher | Support is noted |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | | incomes". 2.64 It is also supported the findings of the SHMA, which summarises at paragraph 7.10.1 that in the North Eastern HMA, alongside supporting housing market renewal there is a need to "achieve a significant uplift in the delivery of aspirational homes". | |
| 162033/155 | Northwest Regional Development Agency - Mr Ian Wray | The Agency welcomes and supports the Council's aim to broaden the mix of housing within the Borough, including larger 3 and 4 bed family housing and higher value housing. As well as meeting housing needs, a more attractive mix of housing will help to underpin the Council's economic strategy. | Support is noted |
| 162038/328 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | Mostly the approach to the north of the Borough is agreed. However, whilst the reference to P3 is considered to be essential it is noted that this policy relates best to development within urban areas; so whilst the introduction to P3 refers generally to 'character' there is no specific reference to landscape character, in particular in the context of a rural location. It is suggested that here is the right place to make specific reference to this by adding a fourth bullet point, e.g. "d) is informed by, respects and wherever possible reinforces the identified landscape character of the site and its surroundings". | Noted. This point will be picked up under policies P1 and G6. |
| 216477/232 | Mr John Lappin | I pointed out earlier about the arrival of "The Baby Boomers" starting in 2010. Therefore would have thought R.M.B.C. had already been well on the way in providing suitable housing, to meet their needs. These must be close to all amenities, and adjacent to all main bus routes. With the increase in "one parent families" smaller 2 bedroom houses or one bedroom will be in great demand. | Agreed – A response is provided below in relation to the growing elderly population. Noted - Whilst the demographic trend to smaller households is noted, the borough already contains a large proportion of smaller homes (mainly two bed terraced properties) when compared to other districts. |
| 216735/532 | Russell Homes - Mr Daniel Kershaw | Density of New Housing 3.24 The Core Strategy states that there is generally a lack of sites available for new housing and therefore it is important to ensure that efficient use of land is available. 3.25 PPS 3 sets an indicative minimum density of 30 dwellings to the hectare with high densities encouraged on sites in and around town centres and those that are served well by public transport and local services. 3.26 It is considered that the density of the residential development should be considered on a site specific basis and a policy should be not introduced which sets a range of densities in different locations within the Borough. Russells is supportive of the principle Policy of C3 which sets a Borough wide range for density in accordance with PPS3 of a minimum of 30 dwellings to the hectare with the potential | Noted – Since the amendments to PPS3 the reference to a minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare has been deleted. The details of specific sites will be considered in more detail within the subsequent Allocations DPD. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|--|
| | | for high densities in sustainable locations and lower densities below 30 dwellings per hectare where this delivers a dwelling type and size which is in short supply. Russells have concerns that the flexibility in this policy does not extend to the south of the Borough where the minimum density will be fixed at 30 dwellings per hectare. Whilst there should be a presumption that this will be the minimum density for housing development in the south of the Borough the policy should facilitate development at a lower density where there is a shortfall of supply of a specific dwelling type and size. | |
| 217416/101 | Sandra and David Wright | We are concerned that new housing is planned where the roads are not able to deal with it eg. another 300+ houses on the Birch Hill site when Halifax Rd. is already very congested. | Noted – This site already has planning permission and the impact of additional traffic will have therefore been tested. |
| 389694/302 | Clariant Ribble Limited - Mr Stephen Parkinson (Indigo Planning Limited - Mr Bill Davidson) | General support to policy but wording of 2c) should be revised as follows: "Densities below 30 dph will be allowed if they are seeking to deliver dwellings of a type and size that are currently in short supply across the borough, or where other material factors (i.e., development constraints and landscape impacts) prevent this from being achieved. | Disagree – This is a general point that could apply to any site and would be taken account of in seeking to achieve a minimum density. The purpose of this part of the policy is to allow lower densities if they are providing a certain type of housing. |
| 390124/406 | Mr C Faulkner | <p>I have carefully read through the Preferred Options report and find that it is flawed in its approach to the long term strategic needs of housing provision. My main concerns are as follows: Rochdale Township has been dissected and emphasis placed on the southern portion of the Township. This is merely continuing the current policy of targeting residential areas of a high visible ethnic minority and housing stock which the council has a vested interest in (Council estates). The reasons given for targeting these areas are, as usual, very questionable and do not appear to rely on locally commissioned statistics that can be verified or compared. Although this approach is all well and good for those who live, or wish to live, in the above areas, it means that other areas of the town do not benefit from the same investment because they will always fall outside catchment or targeted areas.</p> <p>The second issue I wish to bring to your attention is that strategic housing provision for the elderly does not form part of the report. This is intrinsically connected to the above, misguided, strategy. As I stated at the meeting, the town has an ever increasing elderly population that is not just confined to the southern part of the borough. It is a specific issue that needs to be addressed on a borough-wide basis and is not something that can be compartmentalised. It must be central to any strategic housing policy</p> | <p>Objection noted – The reason for the focus on regeneration areas is that through interventions and assisted funding (required to try and improve these areas to be more attractive to private sector investment) there is some control on widening and diversifying the housing stock to try and avoid the need for such intervention in the future. In other areas the private sector is more likely to deliver new housing, however we are seeking to ensure the mix of housing is appropriate to meeting needs across the borough and attracting new residents.</p> <p>Agree - This issue of a growing elderly population is an important one and therefore it is intended to provide more detail on this issue in the Core Strategy. The Rochdale Strategic Housing Market assessment should provide some key evidence on this matter. As pointed out in the comment, this may also include signposting to other key relevant documents</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | | and has to be applied equitably across the whole of the town. Age is something that affects all people of all backgrounds in all areas and it is crucial that this is acknowledged and specifically catered for in the Local Development Framework. If not, then the stated strategic objectives amount to nothing more than shallow statements for a sizable percentage of the town's present and future population. For your guidance I suggest you read the following Government publication: Delivering Lifetime Homes, Lifetime Neighbourhoods - A national Strategy for Housing in an Aging Population. It is available on the www.communities.gov.uk free of charge, and clearly indicates that housing for the elderly is expected to form part of the strategic objectives of a Local Development Framework. It would not be sufficient to lump any provision of housing for the elderly under the banner of housing for the vulnerable, as that would mean putting the elderly in the same category as drug addicts, alcoholics etc. That is not acceptable. The aging population of the Borough is a very predictable occurrence and should be one of the easier areas to form a sensible and compassionate strategic objective . I am aware of other policies and strategies that RMBC have in respect of the elderly eg Rochdale Borough Strategy for Older People. However, boroughwide housing for the elderly is issue that needs to be given the importance it requires and should be specifically contained in any proposed LDF. | and strategies in order to avoid repetition within the Core Strategy. |
| 396108/416 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.63 We support the Council's policy concerning the type and density of housing. | Support is noted |
| 398423/505 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | We recognise that new housing is possible in the north. It should be acknowledged that the provision of higher value housing also assists in developing the economic prospects of the borough, meeting executive needs of relocating/expanding businesses. Page 83 C3 l b) - there appears to be demand for 5/6 bedroom houses in some areas. The reference to just 3/4 bed houses may be too narrow. Page 83 C3 le) - high densities are needed in these areas but this can sometimes compromise design. This policy should have a caveat that high densities of 50dph and above should not be at the expense of good quality design | Noted – It is acknowledged that there is a link between higher value housing and economic growth and prospects. This is a key element of the strategy and therefore the wording will need to be checked to ensure that this message is clear. It is also agreed that larger housing is not just 3/4 bed and therefore this will need addressing in the final version. The policy already stresses the importance of good design and mix of housing, irrespective of density. |
| 401290/497 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | C3 We welcome this policy on housing mix which supports RSS policies L2 and L4 | Support is noted |
| C4 – Providing affordable homes | | | |
| Question 21 What are your views on our policy on providing affordable homes? | | | |
| 161683/282 | Government Office | C4 should set out an overall plan-wide target for the amount of | Noted – The Rochdale SHMA currently being |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|--|
| | North West - Mr Dave Arstall | affordable housing to be provided. It will be necessary for the assessment of economic viability to be in place prior to publication and for key stakeholders to have been consulted on the Council's proposals. | undertaken will provide up to date information on housing need within the borough. However, setting a target based on evidence is often difficult as it is necessary to consider viability and is clearly affected by the number of total dwellings coming forward on sites above the threshold. The monitoring section does include short term targets but committing to a plan wide figure for the borough up to 2026 may not be appropriate given how need fluctuates over relatively short timescales. Work on a viability assessment is underway and will be in place prior to publication and will include consultation with key stakeholders. |
| 162038/329 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | The fifteen dwelling threshold seems quite high. It is unclear what proportion of the overall need (451 units per annum) relates to the northern area, but assuming there is some level of need here a) provision is less likely to be adversely affected by viability issues, but b) development is more likely to come forward at lower densities and on smaller sites. There may be a case for a lower threshold in the northern area? | Noted – Work being undertaken on the economic viability of affordable housing will include testing if a lower threshold is appropriate. However, given local market issues, it is currently felt that 15 dwellings is sufficiently low, even in the north of the borough. |
| 216477/233 | Mr John Lappin | Affordable housing is a priority, especially in the present economic climate, which will take years to improve. Rented accommodation will be in much demand, the start can be seen across the town, with the increase of "for let" signs instead of "for sale signs." In many streets council houses should not have been sold off, in hind sight, so we must learn from that big mistake, and maybe buy them back where possible. There will have to be a scheme in place to encourage people to be more flexible in moving to more suitable housing, e.g. 1 person living in a 3 bedroom to move to 1 bedroom to release the 3 bedroom house to a bigger family. | Noted – These issues are outside the scope of the Core Strategy as they relate to management of public sector housing. |
| 389357/367 | MMC Developments Ltd - Mr Mark Russell (Knight Frank LLP – Sophie Taylor) | Policy C4 - providing affordable homes sets out the approach for the Borough. Knight Frank, on behalf of MMC made a representation in response to the Council's Affordable Housing Development Document. Our representation in response to this Policy is therefore contained in that response. | Noted – Refers to the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Affordable Housing. However, this cannot be interpreted in respect of being a comment on the Core Strategy. |
| 396098/293 | Woodford Land Limited - Mr Jason Parkinson (Garner Planning Associates - Mr Christopher Garner) | The target provision approach of a percentage of the total sales value is supported; however the percentage target of 7.5% should apply to all developer contributions in total. So there is one "pot" from which all contributions such as affordable housing, transport, open space, health and well being, education and community | Disagree – This contribution has been calculated based on affordable housing only. This approach would not be appropriate at the local level as requirements and priorities on different sites vary, particularly in relation to |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | | facilities are drawn from to ensure competing claims for developer contributions do not result in a commercially unviable scheme. The policy should refer to the threshold of 15 or more dwellings where affordable housing is expected to be provided as referred to in Policy DM1. | highways. This would be similar to a local Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). Also the policy does state the threshold where the affordable housing policy will apply. |
| 396108/415 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.64 We have concerns about the clarity of the proposed affordable housing policy. The approach which appears to be taken is unrelated to housing types and numbers with the affordable housing requirement relating to the value of the site and not the number of units to be provided on the site. 3.65 We consider that the Council should re-write their affordable housing policy with the target to be applied to site being expressed as a percentage of the overall quantum of housing to be delivered on a site. This target should be based on evidence; derived from affordable housing need and a full assessment of viability as per paragraph 29 of PPS3. Failure to do so puts this policy at odds with PPS3 and Circular 05/05 appearing as it does unrelated to the amount of housing to be delivered but rather tied to the uplift in land values. | Disagree – The percentage relates to the total development value of the site. The fact that it is presented as a percentage means that the relative values of sites is not relevant. It represents a consistent approach and means that the contribution required can be calculated at an advanced stage and be taken account of prior to purchasing a site. The concern with adopting a proportion approach is that it provides no clarity to the developer on what the overall contribution is. |
| 398423/506 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | We support the intention to secure affordable homes. We would wish to test the model being proposed to determine if it is sufficiently flexible to maximise benefits from new development without deterring investors. Page 84 C4 -the first para on affordable homes target provision (7.5%) needs to be re-worded - it is not entirely clear what is being sought. | Noted - Work being undertaken on the economic viability of affordable housing and this should take account of these issues. Will revisit wording to ensure clarity. |
| 401290/499 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | C4 This policy sets a threshold and a target as promoted in Policy L5 in RSS. | Noted |
| C5 – Meeting the housing needs of gypsies and travellers | | | |
| Question 22 What are your views on our policy on meeting the housing needs of gypsies and travellers? | | | |
| 162038/330 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | Policy C5 will need re-consideration depending upon the partial Review of RSS given that some criteria may well be set out at that level. However, the current suggested criteria for the Core Strategy do not include wider landscape considerations – how will a specific proposal be informed by and respond to the character of the surrounding landscape? At present the policy also does not identify the potential for adverse impacts upon heritage features (both built heritage and also archaeological features). | Noted - However this is a very specific issue that may not apply to all the sites. This issue should be picked up by other more relevant policies in the Core Strategy e.g. those in the section 8 'Improving design, image and quality of place'. |
| 214012/347 | FFT Planning - Mr Steve Staines | FFT and TLRP endorse the generally approach of making provision by means of allocating sites in an allocations DPD. However we do have some concerns with Policy C5 and the proposed method of delivery through the Allocations DPD. The LDS gives no information about the timetable for the Land Allocations DPD beyond stating that | Disagree – Given the timescale for the allocations DPD it is not intended to produce a separate Gypsy and Traveller site allocation DPD. The policy is clear that these criteria would apply to allocations <u>and</u> those sites put |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | <p>it is likely that work will commence in January 2011. The need for sites is large and urgent and we cannot see how the backlog of need can be met through the land allocations DPD. This is in the context of the aims of Circular 1/2006 (para 12c) which aims for substantial provision in a 3-5 year period. In our view consideration should be given to the production of a dedicated Gypsy and Traveller site allocation DPD which could be completed in a reasonable time frame and allow provision to start in a reasonable period. The issue is pressing and Central Government has found that progress is unsatisfactory countrywide. The Communities and Local Government Department Progress Report on Gypsy and Traveller Policy (July 2009) stated that : The current position on site delivery remains unsatisfactory. It is clear that local authorities need to increase the pace at which suitable locations are identified that can be used as Gypsy and Traveller sites. Although the Government recognises the difficulties that can arise, it considers that with strong leadership at the local level, authorities can make rapid progress in addressing what is, in numerical and land-use terms, a relatively small level of need. The identification of suitable locations for authorised sites will help to reduce the number of unauthorised developments and encampments can create tensions between Gypsies and Travellers and the settled population. In our view the Council should lay out how needs will be met in a reasonable timeframe Policy C5.</p> <p>The first criterion of policy C5 does give rise to some concern. If the only sites that are acceptable in planning terms are suitable for other forms of housing then it will mean that Gypsies and Travellers will have to compete with housing developers for land. There may be problems in being able to access such land in an affordable way. Reliance on Sec 106 agreements for major developments may prove in the long term a way of accessing such land but cannot be relied upon in the short term to meet the backlog of needs because of long lead times. This issue is one that is facing many councils. Epping Forest who have a similarly constrained landscape outside of urban areas are in the process of addressing this issue. A recently issued paper by Epping Forest Council (Report to Cabinet 21.12.2009) illustrates the dilemma: 16. Officers are in no doubt that the considerable amount of concern expressed by the settled community during the consultation and in the questionnaire responses is at least partly, if not mainly, down to the proximity of</p> | <p>forward prior to such an allocation DPD being produced. Therefore this would mean that a site could come forward prior to the allocations DPD. More clarity on an allocations DPD timeframe along with the potential for appropriate sites to come forward in advance of this could be made clearer within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>Noted – This issue is recognised but fits in with the guidance that sites identified for Gypsy and Traveller provision should be of a quality that would be appropriate for all other types of residential development. Locating Gypsy and Travellers sites to rural locations away from existing properties and settlements (and therefore also essential services) would seem at odds with the national guidance. However, it is acknowledged that such an approach may be more acceptable to both the settled and travelling communities. This will need further discussion in order to consider any possible changes to criterion a).</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>some of the potential sites to properties or settlements. As far as this District is concerned, it would seem that two of the criteria for identifying potentially suitable sites are mutually incompatible – i.e. identifying sites in or near settlements, and peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community. A similar view has been expressed by some members of the travelling community in discussions with officers, but there is unfortunately no written record of this. Officers are of the opinion that, if the outcome of the DPD is to be the identification of suitable and deliverable sites, the criterion for proximity to settlements (and in turn to services) will have to be relaxed. 17. There is also the question of the efficiency of use of land. By their very nature, mobile homes and caravans are normally a fairly low density of development. Green Belt restrictions mean that the most efficient use of land should be made within or adjoining settlements to minimise the need to release more Green Belt land for development. This would indicate that rural settings are the most appropriate locations for Gypsy and Traveller sites in this District. 18. This suggests that sites in “less sustainable” locations are the only ones that may prove to be acceptable to the settled community, and this could raise reasonable and fair concerns about accessibility to services for the travelling community. 19. Officers have concluded from the experience of the Options consultation that the requirements in paragraph 65 of Circular 1/06 about first considering locations in or near existing settlements, have been satisfied. The results of the exercise indicate, however, that sites distinctly separate from settlements are the only ones which are likely to be acceptable to both the settled and travelling communities, and therefore have more chance of being deliverable than any within or in close proximity to settlements. 20. Officers believe that the results of the consultation should be used as part of the filtering process described in the report to Cabinet on 20 April to identify sites which can no longer be considered to have any potential for use for pitches, on the grounds that they are too close to existing settlements. Clearly therefore a degree of flexibility will be needed in setting criteria. It may prove very difficult to locate sites in or near to settlements. Circular 1/2006 does state that local authorities should be realistic about alternatives to the car in accessing local services. Hence in our view criterion (a) should be deleted. Retention of this criterion would in our view risk meaning that it would be impossible in planning terms to identify affordable and achievable land for sites, either RSL or private. Any policy</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | <p>should pay due regard to the need for affordable and private pitches and lay out how the differing needs will be met. The current policy does not seem to do this. We would also like to take this opportunity to draw the council's attention to part of the Site Grant Guidance (Homes and Community Agency, Jan 2009) which encourages innovative approaches in section 8: We are keen to encourage the development of innovative solutions for site accommodation provision that could help: • speed up delivery, • improve standards and value for money, and • give better outcomes. This could encompass a wide range of schemes, including: • new, improved designs that can be replicated elsewhere, • radical approaches to procurement and delivery, and • using public funding to facilitate the development of self-build and low cost owner occupied sites, providing investment was protected or recycled. Bids can only be submitted by local authorities, ALMOs or RSLs. However, these organisations are encouraged to be proactive, and work with the Gypsy and Traveller community to develop innovative schemes. Successful schemes to date have included setting up a fund for use in securing appropriate land for site provision. The sites will be made available to appropriately organised Gypsy and Traveller groups on a non-profit making basis for them to develop and manage. Funds from the sale of land will be recycled into purchasing other suitable sites. They have also included grant for the purchase of sites and provision of basic infrastructure. The families moving onto the site will be self-builders, providing their own amenities and manage their site. They will also be offered the opportunity to buy stakes in the site, the income from which will be recycled to provide further sites. Such schemes could assist in meeting demand from Gypsies and Travellers to own their own home, where the cost of achieving this aspiration is prohibitive, as well as potentially utilising the building skills of some members of the Gypsy and Traveller community, and providing better value for money than social rented provision." We would encourage the Council to work with RSLs and the local Gypsy and Traveller community to obtain the best outcome for the community. This would be a positive approach giving best value for money and would help avoid ills of the past and contribute to community cohesion. NB Given the ethnic minority status of Gypsies and Irish Travellers under Race relations legislation the words should be given capital initial letters whenever used.</p> | |
| 216477/234 | Mr John Lappin | Stop availability of illegal sites these must be identified, and action taken to seal them off. R.M.B.C. must be more vigilant in monitoring | Noted – The policy in the Core Strategy is aimed at the provision of new accommodation |

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|--|---|
| | | and tracking the movement of the travelling community to make sure they use the official sites, which must be away from main residential areas. If they buy green sites a close watch must be kept to make sure it's not converted to a camp site, as is on the increase in southern England. | on appropriate sites having regard to regional guidance. Providing for the needs of the Gypsy and travelling community should help in reducing instances of unauthorised encampments. The Council has recently published a procedure for managing unauthorised encampments. |
| C6 – Improving health and well being | | | |
| Question 23 What are your views on our policy on improving health and well being? | | | |
| 162038/331 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | In most respects the approach is supported, but: • At vii) supplement to read "...through the provision of cycle lanes, and improved pedestrian routes, focusing on links to key recreational areas and the wider countryside..." • At ix) "Safeguarding existing and creating new natural habitats which can have beneficial effects on health, including ensuring that suitable access is provided." | Support noted. Other points are generally covered in the criteria to this policy. |
| 180811/427 | Natural England - Mr Stephen Hedley | We commend this policy, and are pleased to see that our earlier comments have been taken into account. In particular, we are supportive of policy measures promoting the provision of and sustainable access to recreational facilities and open spaces (vi-ix). Sustainable design and materials We are pleased to see that our earlier comments encouraging policy measures that promote high standards of sustainable design and sustainable materials have been taken on board, through several policies in the Preferred Options (C6(ii); P3(7); and R6(f and j)). | Support noted. |
| 216477/235 | Mr John Lappin | Cycling lanes must be vigorously policed to stop cars etc. from parking in them e.g. Manchester New Road, it is impossible to cycle in the designated lane. C6D A healthy lifestyle will save spending in the healthy service, so it should start when you are young. Therefore more emphasis will have to be given to sport etc. in schools, (where are all those sports fields), but must cover more than football, netball, a lot of children hate these, but might take part in golf, tennis, fishing and climbing. C6DV Regarding takeaway junk food premise which concentrate in one area, the problem there is "the Council planning dept" that over ruled objections in the past. C6D V1 Discussed all this 20/25 years ago with baby Boomers in mind, not much to see in 2009. Regarding the play areas which started to be provided in 2009, will there be money available to keep up the maintenance? | Noted. Consider a new criterion to reflect the needs of different people in terms of providing for active recreation and sport. It is the condition rather than the amount of open space that is the key issues. The strategy looks to improve the quality of open space by securing developer contribution for improvements and maintenance. |
| 367163/57 | Mr. Russell Johnson | Please refer to page 74 of the Littleborough Town Design Statement. | The Littleborough Town Design Statement is a supporting document and there must be policies for it to support; C6 will be one of them. The |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| | | | two are complimentary. |
| 389381/88 | Pennine Acute Hospitals NHS Trust - Mr Graham Lord (Taylor Young Ltd - Mr Marc Watterson) | Whilst the Trust supports the principles of this policy in that it encourages healthier lifestyles and the consideration of health in new development as well as identifying new healthcare development, it is considered that it is important to recognise the importance of the NHS Acute Trust in the reasoned justification as well as PCT providers. Rochdale currently benefits from two hospitals, at Rochdale Infirmary and Birch Hill. The Acute Trust is an important healthcare provider in the Borough and the importance of the future development of their sites should be noted. It maybe that over the plan period parts of the hospital sites are redeveloped for further healthcare provision, or indeed other development, and a positive approach to this in the plan would be beneficial in terms of supporting longer term healthcare provision and the efficient delivery of acute healthcare services in the Borough. | Support noted. The council acknowledges that it will need to work with the Acute Trust in the considering the future of existing facilities. However, it is not necessary to include a specific policy reference to this. |
| 396108/417 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.66 We consider that it is important for the Core Strategy to provide appropriate guidance for improving health and well being, delivering education facilities and improving community, sport and leisure and cultural facilities. We have no specific comments on these policies at this time. 3.67 There are important matters to be addressed in securing the future quality of Rochdale as a place to live, work and visit as set out in the Vision. It is important that new development should have regard to local distinctiveness and design, with quality an integral part of the design process. | Support noted. Agree. |
| 398423/508 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | We support the proposals. | Support noted. |
| | RMBC additional changes | Policy should recognise the potential impact of health benefits of good building design and attractive environments and general surroundings. | Reference will be made to design in the second part of the policy. It will signpost to the actual policy on design for detail and clarification. |
| | | Whether we need to refer to other groups such as the elderly, young, disabled etc | Include reference in reasoned justification |
| | | Make reference to the benefits of having links to arts, heritage and culture. | Include reference to cultural facilities in the policy. |
| C7 – Delivering education facilities | | | |
| Question 24 What are your views on our policy on delivering education facilities? | | | |
| 367163/58 | Mr. Russell Johnson | This is answered in the T.D.S. on pages 78-79. There is now an excellent site for a High School for Littleborough at the old Akzo-Nobel site on Hollingworth Lake Road. This would serve several | The Littleborough Town Design Statement is a supporting document and there must be policies for it to support; C7 will be one of them. The |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | | purposes at once. It would help to stop the mass exit/return on the A58 during term time, also it would help to instill a sense of community in Littleborough. | two are complimentary. A new high school in Littleborough is not required within the plan period given the scale of proposed within this part of the borough. |
| 396098/294 | Woodford Land Limited - Mr Jason Parkinson (Garner Planning Associates - Mr Christopher Garner) | Residential developer funding for iii) employment skills, training, facilities and associated skills does not appear to be directly related to the development and this reference should therefore be deleted. | Noted. Housing growth will place pressure on school places so it would be sensible to negotiate planning obligation for any additional educational needs. So there is an indirect relationship to this. |
| 396108/418 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.66 We consider that it is important for the Core Strategy to provide appropriate guidance for improving health and well being, delivering education facilities and improving community, sport and leisure and cultural facilities. We have no specific comments on these policies at this time. 3.67 There are important matters to be addressed in securing the future quality of Rochdale as a place to live, work and visit as set out in the Vision. It is important that new development should have regard to local distinctiveness and design, with quality an integral part of the design process. | Support noted. Agree |
| 397168/471 | GMPT - Mr Richard Clowes | GMPT is eager to see educational facilities in sustainable locations where they are easily accessible by the community they are intended to serve. Some new or redeveloped secondary schools and colleges may require access by dedicated public transport services and where this is the case GMPT would advocate the new design layouts to incorporate safe and convenient on-site public transport infrastructure in order to improve road safety and reduce on highway congestion issues outside secondary schools and colleges. | Agree. Reference will be made to providing educational facilities in appropriate and accessible locations. |
| 398423/509 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | Should opportunities arise it may be opportune to encourage education facilities linked to Economic Growth Corridors and town centres. Pg 23 Spatial vision - leisure and shopping are not specifically mentioned in the initial paragraph and neither are the town centres as key drivers of the economy. This is important to improve the attractiveness and mix of uses in the existing town centres. | Agree. Policy C7 to include links with businesses and enterprises in order to maximise learning. Noted. Move to spatial vision |
| | RMBC additional changes | Make reference to the importance of arts, heritage and cultural facilities in improving lifelong learning. | Consider changing under criterion v) |
| C8 – Improving community, sport and leisure and cultural facilities | | | |
| Question 25 Do you agree with this approach and what other options for improving community facilities should we consider? | | | |
| 161620/97 | Mr Steve Connell | Community facilities should specify places of worship and facilities for faith groups | Noted. Reference to this is made in the reasoned justification which lists the types of |

| | | | |
|------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| | | | community facilities covered by the policy and specifically mentions places of worship. |
| 162058/147 | The Theatres Trust - Ms Rose Freeman | <p>We support Preferred Option C8 to improve community, sport and leisure, and cultural facilities and protect existing local community and cultural facilities with provision for new or improved facilities made to ensure the continuity of successful facilities. Without such a policy it could become difficult to retain an essential community asset particularly where land values become higher for an alternative use.</p> <p>This policy should also state that the loss of an existing facility will be resisted unless it can be demonstrated that the facility is no longer needed, or it can be established that the services provided by the facility can be served in an alternative location or manner that is equally accessible by the community. This policy also reflects your Cultural Strategy which states on page 16 - Nevertheless despite the enthusiasm of local people there is no sizeable venue for arts activities in Rochdale Town centre, Littleborough and Milnrow.</p> <p>As a suggestion, for clarity and greater certainty of intended outcomes and so that guidelines are clear and consistent and so that the accompanying text is more succinct, we recommend a description for the term 'community facilities' to be added to the Glossary (and in the text) as: community facilities provide for the health, welfare, social, educational, spiritual, recreational, leisure and cultural needs of the community. In this way sports, arts activities and theatre will be incorporated in any policy that mentions the improvement of community facilities. As a further suggestion you could use the following: Cultural Facilities provide for the leisure, sport and recreational needs of the community and include theatre, cinema, museums, playing fields, leisure centres, cultural heritage and tourism. Community Facilities provide for the health, welfare, social, educational and spiritual needs of the community and include hospitals, libraries, schools, churches, police, fire stations.</p> | <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Noted. Acknowledge the point but the planning system is not the most effective way of protecting private or commercial buildings from development from other uses.</p> <p>Disagree. The types of facilities covered in this category are listed in the reasoned justification of policy C8.</p> |
| 216477/236 | Mr John Lappin | Accessibility is paramount to facilities and as we have an ageing population, spare money in a family budget will be scarce, therefore cost of admission etc. must be affordable public transport must be more readily available at weekends, evening and bank holidays. | Noted. |
| 217416/102 | Sandra and David Wright | Rochdale desperately needs a new swimming baths and fitness centre., but why is it planned to be on the same site? Would it not be better positioned on the Mecca bingo site or on the other side of the | Noted. The possibility of locating leisure facilities in the location suggested has been considered but for a number of factors are has |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | | river with easy access to the bus station? | been considered most suitable on the proposed site. |
| 396108/419 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.66 We consider that it is important for the Core Strategy to provide appropriate guidance for improving health and well being, delivering education facilities and improving community, sport and leisure and cultural facilities. We have no specific comments on these policies at this time. 3.67 There are important matters to be addressed in securing the future quality of Rochdale as a place to live, work and visit as set out in the Vision. It is important that new development should have regard to local distinctiveness and design, with quality an integral part of the design process. | Support noted. Noted. |
| 398423/533 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | Support C8 to encourage major community, cultural and sport and leisure development in and around the town centres as part of a sequential approach. | Support noted. |
| Chapter 8 – Improving design, image and quality of place (SO3) | | | |
| P1 – Protecting character and heritage | | | |
| Question 26 What are your views on our policy on protecting character and heritage? | | | |
| 60372/79 | British Waterways – Ms Sam Turner | BW supports the policy to restore water bodies to their place as key and attractive features of the borough, including opening up waterways where they have been covered, and also to protect and enhance the heritage of the Rochdale Canal. The built environment of the waterways represents a unique working heritage of industrial architecture, archaeology and engineering structures and is a valuable part of our national heritage, as well as an integral part of regional cultural heritage and local distinctiveness. | Support noted |
| 161988/404 | Lancashire County Council - Ms Joanne Macholc | A general point in relation to landscape and policy P1 is whether the Core Strategy is informed by an up to date detailed landscape character assessment as required by policy EM1(A) of approved Regional Spatial Strategy. Further the Core Strategy should refer to the principle of "no net loss of resources as a minimum requirement" in relation to proposals and schemes which affect the region's landscape, natural or historic environment or woodland assets, as set out in policy EM1 of the RSS. This relates to policies such as P1 and R5 although I note that the supporting text to R5 refers to the requirement to deliver an increase in biodiversity, referred to as a "step change increase" in policy EM1 (B) of the approved RSS. | Agreed that more detailed information on landscape character will be necessary to support the implementation of this policy, and one is programmed. The interpretation of this information could be undertaken through a Supplementary Planning Document or an area-based policy in a site allocations DPD. Policy wording to be changed to refer to forthcoming landscape assessment. Amend policy R5 (now G7) to reflect 'no net loss'. |
| 162038/332 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | Overall welcomed and strongly supported. The following are suggested: • At d) whilst there is specific reference to the Cheesden Valley Area it is a little surprising that this is not specifically tied to the related moorland area associated with Knowl Moor which is a | (Note: policy should identify the key heritage landscapes rather than say 'such as'.) Policy P1 (d) refers to social rather than natural heritage, and this will be made clear. |

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | distinctive feature of the Borough. • At e) – i) in respect of the range of heritage assets there is no mention of their wider settings – these are key characteristics of such assets and quite often the attribute most under threat from unsympathetic development – it is requested that an over-arching reference to wider settings is incorporated. | Agreed. Incorporate over-arching reference to wider settings under e). Also explain this more in RJ. |
| 180811/428 | Natural England - Mr Stephen Hedley | We are pleased to see the inclusion of this very strong policy setting out protection of the Borough's landscapes and character. However, it is important to highlight the role of Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) as a tool for guiding strategic planning and development control decisions. Supporting text to this policy should refer to relevant existing and/or forthcoming LCA and the need for development proposals to have regard to the character and qualities established in the LCA. (The Preferred Options Background Paper refers to two completed LCAs at the sub-regional and local level (para.5.4.7); these, or appropriate replacement assessments, should be referred to in the Core Strategy.) We are very supportive of the policy's aim to uncover culverted waterways and restore their setting and biodiversity potential wherever possible (policy P1(c)). Landscape Character Appraisals We commend the recognition throughout the Preferred Options report of the importance and value of landscape character, quality and features (SO3(c); P1(a); and DM1(4)a) as well as the increased emphasis on enhancing the Borough's green infrastructure network (including seeking developer contributions towards this (DM2)). However, we strongly recommend that reference is made to a relevant Landscape Character Appraisal; please see our comments below (under Policy P1). | Support noted. Agreed. Landscape character assessment is forthcoming and should be referred to in the supporting text. The assessments referred to in the Background Paper were broad and will help to inform a more detailed forthcoming assessment, so it is the latter which should be referred to in the Core Strategy. |
| 216477/237 | Mr John Lappin | Views on R.M.B.C. policy for protection very poor in the past, so why should it be different in the future, when the availability of money will be tighter. E.g. Hopwood Hall, Tonge Hall, Providence Church, 24 Steps. And in the past Alkington Hall before it was bought by a developer | Noted. |
| 367163/59 | Mr. Russell Johnson | This is outlined under the heading of "Settlement and Character" On page 22 of the T.D.S. | The Littleborough Town Design Statement is a supporting document and there must be policies for it to support; P1 will be one of them. The two are complimentary. |
| 396047/142 | Mr Gary Loudon | I have previously mentioned my thoughts on Birch Village and would like to see this identified as a heritage/conservation area. I have also put forward suggestions to di-sect the village between Langley Lane and Whittle Lane (loop in and out) and to instate a village green. This potentially has multiple benefits to local community, residents and visitors. The existing old buildings (inc Edgar Wood) are | This is detail relating to a specific area, and it is not the purpose of the policy to include such detail, rather to outline broader principles and area approaches. Suggestion will be passed to Conservation |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | | jeopardised do the HGVs if no action is taken. | Officer. |
| 396108/420 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.66 We consider that it is important for the Core Strategy to provide appropriate guidance for improving health and well being, delivering education facilities and improving community, sport and leisure and cultural facilities. We have no specific comments on these policies at this time. 3.67 There are important matters to be addressed in securing the future quality of Rochdale as a place to live, work and visit as set out in the Vision. It is important that new development should have regard to local distinctiveness and design, with quality an integral part of the design process. | Noted |
| 398423/526 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | Page 96 PI f) - I am not sure what is meant by the phrase 'interpreting the borough's other heritage assets'. | Agreed that interpretation is not necessary to include in this policy, as it is a detail of implementation. Will take out. |
| 401290/507 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | P1 This has a strong approach to heritage in line with RSS policy EM1. | Support noted |
| P2 – Improving image | | | |
| Question 27 What are your views on our policy on improving the image of the borough? | | | |
| 6682/115 | United Utilities - Mr David Hardman | The Council is leading the way in NI 188, Planning and Climate Change. When one approaches Rochdale from the M62 the windfarms on the hills above the town are very apparent. Rochdale could celebrate its progressive role in climate change at this important gateway by signage, indicating the names of the wind farms and carbon emissions saved? | Noted. This is too detailed for the Core Strategy but the suggestion will be considered by the Council. |
| 161663/315 | Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd - Mr David Ward | We generally support the objectives of these policies. KBP is already making a significant contribution in this regard and the Partners' aim is to ensure that this will continue as the site develops. It is therefore important that others making investment decisions and those targeting capital funding should have regard to meeting these objectives. | Support noted |
| 162038/333 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | Necessary and supported. | Support noted |
| 180811/429 | Natural England - Mr Stephen Hedley | We welcome the measures in the policy to promote a greening of the urban environment (c) and the development of under-used land and buildings (d). However, brownfield sites can host biodiversity interests and this should be considered, and biodiversity interest conserved and where possible enhanced, in any future redevelopment proposals. | Noted, although this is more of a matter for policy R5 – Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity. |
| 216477/238 | Mr John Lappin | Agree with your views on improving image. But listen to locals suggestions e.g. R.M.B.C. insisted the roses trees would be planted in Middleton town centre, instead of floral displays. As suggested by various people rose trees have a very short flowering period and | Support noted These points do not relate to planning policy. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| | | trap litter. This was the very reason why the scrubs first planted were removed. Next year floral displays, as wanted by locals, will be planted up. Money wasted on rose trees. Regarding trees along streets, these must be replaced, if they have to be cut down. Stop the parking of cars on all grass verges and builder skips, and material such as tiles and bricks. Pay more attention to the pavements many in a very distressed state due to car parking on the, on builders skips. Very hard to push a wheel chair on them due to unevenness, cars and vans virtually fully parked on them. This can be very tricky for blind people, and forces crams, wheelchairs into the road. | |
| 367163/60 | Mr. Russell Johnson | This has been answered on Page 72 of the T.D.S. | The Littleborough Town Design Statement is a supporting document and there must be policies for it to support; P2 will be one of them. The two are complimentary. |
| 396108/421 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.66 We consider that it is important for the Core Strategy to provide appropriate guidance for improving health and well being, delivering education facilities and improving community, sport and leisure and cultural facilities. We have no specific comments on these policies at this time. 3.67 There are important matters to be addressed in securing the future quality of Rochdale as a place to live, work and visit as set out in the Vision. It is important that new development should have regard to local distinctiveness and design, with quality an integral part of the design process. | Move to appropriate question Support noted |
| 398423/527 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | Page 97 P2 - the list should include 'local improvement corridors (see spatial strategy key diagram)'. Support policies P2 Page 98 add to the list (f) something along the lines of "Supporting and promoting improvements to the public realm along main transport corridors". | Agreed. Amend policy to include reference to local improvement corridors, in bullet point relating to transport corridors Second point – covered in second part of policy |
| P3 – Improving design of new development | | | |
| Question 28 What are your views on our policy to improve the design of new development in the borough? | | | |
| 6682/116 | United Utilities - Mr David Hardman | United Utilities Water supports the words about water conservation in this section. | Support noted |
| 161663/316 | Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd - Mr David Ward | We generally support the objectives of these policies. KBP is already making a significant contribution in this regard and the Partners' aim is to ensure that this will continue as the site develops. It is therefore important that others making investment decisions and those targeting capital funding should have regard to meeting these objectives. | Support noted |
| 162038/334 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | It is appropriate to re-state the 10 design principles from the SPD here – they are key considerations and warrant being included in | Already addressed in response to P1 above |

| | | | |
|-----------|--|---|---|
| | | <p>this higher level planning policy document so that they have appropriate weight. On reflection it is considered that the wording is insufficient in respect of wider landscape character and ensuring that this is understood, respected and reinforced by new development – it is considered that this is perhaps best addressed by additional wording in Policy C3 in respect of housing development – see response to Q.20 above (however, additional wording elsewhere might also be necessary in respect of other forms of development). It would be appropriate for the list of SPDs that follow this policy in the supporting text to also include reference to the adopted Energy and New Development SPD (May 2008).</p> | <p>Reference will be made to other area – and topic-based documents which include design criteria</p> |
| 180804/55 | The Coal Authority - Miss Rachael Bust | <p>Coal Mining Legacy As you will be aware, the Rochdale area has been subjected to coal mining which will have left a legacy. Whilst most past mining is generally benign in nature potential public safety and stability problems can be triggered and uncovered by development activities. Problems can include collapses of mine entries and shallow coal mine workings, emissions of mine gases, incidents of spontaneous combustion, and the discharge of water from abandoned coal mines. These surface hazards can be found in any coal mining area where coal exists near to the surface, including existing residential areas. The new Planning Department at the Coal Authority was created in 2008 to lead the work on defining areas where these legacy issues may occur. Within the Rochdale area the main mining legacy issues which need to be identified are mine entries (shafts and adits), shallow coal workings, and surface hazards. The Coal Authority has records of over 171,000 coal mine entries across the coalfields, although there are thought to be many more unrecorded. Shallow coal which is present near the surface can give rise to stability, gas and potential spontaneous combustion problems. Even in areas where coal mining was deep, in some geological conditions cracks or fissures can appear at the surface. It is estimated that as many as 2 million properties of the 7.7 million properties across the coalfields may lie in areas with the potential to be affected by these problems. In our view, the planning processes in coalfield areas needs to take account of the coal mining legacy issues. The principal source of guidance is PPG14, which despite its age still contains the science and best practice on how to safely treat unstable ground. Within the Rochdale area there are approximately 1,100 recorded mine entries and around 9 coal mining related hazards. Mine entries may be located in built up areas, often under buildings where the owners and occupiers have no knowledge of</p> | <p>This point is a consideration in respect of construction rather than design.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------------------------|---|---------------|
| | | <p>their presence unless they have received a mining report during the property transaction. Mine entries can also be present in open space and areas of green infrastructure, potentially just under the surface of grassed areas. Mine entries and mining legacy matters should be considered by the Local Planning Authority to ensure site allocations and other policies and programmes will not lead to future public safety hazards. Although mining legacy is as a result of mineral workings it is important that new development delivered through the Local Development Framework, recognises the problems and how they can be positively addressed. Land instability and mining legacy is not a complete constraint on the new development, rather it can be argued that because mining legacy matters have been addressed the new development is safe, stable and sustainable. As The Coal Authority owns the coal and coal mine entries on behalf of the state, if a development is to intersect the ground then specific written permission of the Coal Authority may be required. The changes which The Coal Authority would like to see in relation to mining legacy issues are: Policy P3 – Improving design of new development Test of Soundness Justified Effective Consistency With National Policy-X Rochdale has a significant coal mining legacy, and it is important that this is fully considered as part of development proposals to ensure that resulting schemes are safe and stable, as required by PPG14: Development on Unstable Land. The Coal Authority therefore considers it appropriate to include the following additional text to design principle 2 of Policy P3 to widen the definition of safety to include land stability: “2. Safety and inclusion: Incorporating design measures that design out crime and ensure developments and spaces are safe to use and access. IT IS ALSO IMPORTANT THAT GROUND CONDITIONS ARE FULLY ASSESSED AND UNSTABLE LAND MITIGATED WHERE NECESSARY TO ENSURE SAFETY AND STABILITY OF NEW DEVELOPMENT, GIVEN THE BOROUGH'S MINING LEGACY.” Reason – In order to ensure that ground conditions and coal mining legacy are fully considered and, where necessary addressed, as part of development proposals, as required by PPG14.</p> | |
| 180811/430 | Natural England - Mr Stephen Hedley | <p>We commend this policy, and are particularly supportive of policy measures addressing local character (1), ease of movement for pedestrian, cyclists and public transport (4), and sustainable design and materials (7). We support the requirement for all new development to demonstrate they have satisfied the design principles in the design SPDs. Sustainable design and materials We</p> | Support noted |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|---|
| | | are pleased to see that our earlier comments encouraging policy measures that promote high standards of sustainable design and sustainable materials have been taken on board, through several policies in the Preferred Options (C6(ii); P3(7); and R6(f and j)). | |
| 216477/239 | Mr John Lappin | New developments must blend in with existing buildings, and not follow the short lived, latest craze, being pushed by the younger architects of the time. If you are looking for building etc. to last, study the Victorians, I doubt if the "new arena" in Middleton will last half as long as the baths if replaced. Obviously it was built to a very tight budget and skimmed e.g. the sound proofing the outside lights on, "24/7," even in the summer when planning listen very carefully to the people who are going to use the facility very few Middletonians would give you top marks for the town centre, we have now. | Noted |
| 367163/61 | Mr. Russell Johnson | See page 71 of the T.D.S. | See comments in respect of previous representations |
| 396108/422 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.67 There are important matters to be addressed in securing the future quality of Rochdale as a place to live, work and visit as set out in the Vision. It is important that new development should have regard to local distinctiveness and design, with quality an integral part of the design process. | Support noted |
| 398423/511 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | The emphasis and achieving high quality design of buildings and spaces is supported. It would be useful if design and development principles were to be included as a requirement within all development and design briefs and masterplans for key areas and sites. This would apply particularly in town centres, economic growth corridors and priority regeneration areas. Support policies P3. | Additional text will be included in the reasoned justification to state that design and access statements and design briefs must include demonstration how these principles have been taken into account in the design of the scheme |
| 401290/501 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | P3 Housing should be specifically required to meet Lifetime Homes Standards (RSS policy L4). | This policy relates specifically to the Oldham and Rochdale Urban Design Guides, and within the guides refers to Lifetime Homes and requires developers to demonstrate how adaptability has been considered. This promotes Lifetime Homes in line with RSS policy L4. |

Chapter 9 – Conserving and managing the natural environment and resources (SO4)

R1 – Tackling climate change

Question 29 Do you agree with the approach to tackling climate change?

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------------------------|---|--|
| 6682/117 | United Utilities - Mr David Hardman | United Utilities Water agrees to the approach to climate change including the 'greening' of the urban area. Whilst it is mentioned elsewhere in the document, you may wish to mention 'water conservation' in this section? | Agreed. This will be an important aspect of adapting to the impacts of climate change. It could be included alongside the reference to opening up waterways. |
| 161988/403 | Lancashire County | In relation to policy R1 e) standalone renewable energy | Support noted. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | Council - Ms Joanne Macholc | developments, the supporting text recognises that your council is working with South Pennine partners on a study of landscape capacity for windfarms. This will inform appropriate locations for future developments. I also note that Policy R1h) seeks to protect the borough's peatlands which act as a "carbon sink" absorbing CO2. | |
| 162038/335 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | No. The approach to reduce emissions is well addressed and supported. However, the introductory sentence only picks up on issues relating to emissions and does not acknowledge the issues around adapting to those impacts of climate change that are now unavoidable. Whilst at I) there is reference to securing climate change adaptation measures it is unclear what these might be – for example, particular emphasis should be given to wildlife networks and their role in providing connectivity so that species, flora and fauna, can readily migrate in response to a climate changing (this is more than securing tree planting, albeit that is also helpful – for example, in reducing the impact of 'heat islands' in urban areas). | Support noted. Agreed that more needs to be said in terms of adaptation measures and what these might be. The specific point in respect of biodiversity could be addressed in policy R5 (now G7). |
| 180811/431 | Natural England - Mr Stephen Hedley | We commend the inclusion of this policy, and the well considered measures it promotes. We are pleased to see the inclusion of locally relevant measures based on scientific evidence, such as the protection of the Borough's peatlands as a CO2 sink, and the opening up of waterways to help cooling. We are very supportive of the Council's efforts to produce a joint study of landscape sensitivity to wind power developments with neighbouring South Pennine local authorities (p.104). | Support noted. |
| 216477/240 | Mr John Lappin | You cannot control nature, concentrate on adaptation, instead of trying to stop it e.g. remember King Canute. Climate change is a natural phenomenon over the millenniums the earth moved between very cold and very hot and dry day, on a regular basis. R.M.B.C. should concentrate on making sure infrastructure is in place to accommodate the effects of change. | Government advise is clear that local authorities must try to mitigate climate change as well as promoting adaptation measures. The policy aims to address both, however it is recognised that the policy could be more specific in terms of promoting adaptation measures, as outlined in the response to the National Trust above. |
| 216593/129 | SEGRO Industrial Estates Ltd (Barton Willmore - Mr John Pearce) | We do not object in principle to the measures set out in Policy R1 and agree that the application of different elements of this Policy could help to address climate change and CO2 emissions. We would like to see included within the Policy a reference to those instances where the incorporation of measures to reduce CO2 emissions would make the development unviable or feasible and that where this can be demonstrated the Council will accept a lower level of reduction measures. This point is particularly important if the proposed development will help achieve other aims and objectives | Support noted. The policy has to be viewed in the wider context of the negative economic impact of climate change if it is not mitigated or adapted to. Further, a framework for requirements in the opportunity areas identified will be produced which will be supported by a thorough analysis of viability to ensure a robust but reasonable |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>of the DPD i.e. regeneration or employment creation. Ultimately, if these requirements are applied without any consideration of the economic viability of the scheme we feel that this Policy could pose a significant barrier to new development coming forward and attracting inward investment to the detriment of the Borough. We welcome the fact that there is no requirement to achieve a specific BREEAM rating in new non-residential development and would strongly oppose the introduction of this into the Policy. We do not agree that the BREEAM rating system is the correct method for measuring the environmental sustainability of new development.</p> | <p>approach. Disagree about policy wording relating to exceptions in the manner requested, as this will weaken the policy; a twin track approach is required: the planning system allows material circumstances to be taken into consideration.</p> <p>The RJ refers to Supplementary Planning Documents which will include the Energy and New Development SPD, which is already adopted and does have a BREEAM requirement, although this is likely to be gradually superseded by Building Regulations in the next few years. Any change will be picked up in future guidance. However, where opportunities arise, we may require developments to go further than the Building Regulations.</p> <p>The Planning Advisory Service indicate that local standards based on BREEAM are appropriate.</p> |
| 216735/535 | Russell Homes - Mr Daniel Kershaw | <p>4.1 Russells are supportive of the climate change initiatives and the need to combat reductions in greenhouse gases through energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy technology.</p> <p>4.2 It is acknowledged that new development can contribute towards pollution. It is also considered that new development can improve the environment and ameliorate the pollution caused or assisted by previous uses. The location design and construction of new development can determine the impact it has in relation to climate change and how well it can adapt to climate change.</p> <p>4.3 Russells supports policy R1 noting that the development should not contribute unacceptably to levels of pollution through its location, design, construction, operation, and traffic generation. In addition to this, where development clearly has potential to ameliorate pollution this consideration should lend support to the development.</p> | <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>Agreed.</p> |
| 336315/84 | Envirolink Northwest - Miss Denise Oliver | <p>We broadly support the inclusion of policy R1, however it needs to go further and set defined minimum carbon reduction and sustainable construction targets in criterion (d), and amend criterion</p> | <p>With respect to criterion (e) and the comments made, in actual fact the suggested target framework outlined almost exactly mirrors that</p> |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>(e) so it provides a more positive policy framework for stand-alone renewable energy applications. Criterion (d) currently requires development to achieve 'the highest standards of energy efficiency' and the 'lowest levels of CO2 emissions'; however unless the council has developed a methodology to determine what the highest standards are, it might be difficult to quantify the measures required to adhere to the policy and therefore lead to ambiguity when the policy is implemented. Therefore, the policy should establish minimum carbon reduction and sustainable construction targets which applicable development (for example, 5 or more residential units or 500m2 or greater non-residential units) will be required to achieve. Best practice currently recommend that local planning policy mirrors the step change in Building Regulations and require residential development to achieve the Code for Sustainable Homes level 4 by 2010, rising to level 5 in 2013 and level 6 in 2016; and non-residential development to achieve BREEAM 'Good' by 2010, rising to 'Very Good' by 2013 and 'Excellent' by 2016 as a minimum standard for all applicable development, and therefore ensure new development takes a more holistic approach to sustainability rather than just focusing on energy performance. With regards to the carbon reduction target, the Council's emerging evidence base should inform the level at which the carbon reduction target is set, however we would encourage the adoption of an ambitious target as possible. The policy should require all new developments to use appropriate renewable energy technologies to contribute towards the carbon reduction target, but the overall target should be achieved through conformity with the energy hierarchy to ensure carbon savings are achieved through energy reduction and energy efficiency measures as well as using decentralised renewable or low carbon energy technologies. This would result in the initial carbon savings being achieved through more cost effective means, and the residual renewable energy requirements would therefore be more financially viable. It would also allow the developer to take a pragmatic approach at the design stage, and achieve the prescribed carbon saving in a way which is most appropriate to the size, scale and type of development. Although the supporting text accompanying the policy makes reference to a future LDF document which would build upon the AGMA energy study recommendations, include policies covering energy requirements and provide guidance on developer contributions for energy infrastructure, this document is still in its inception stage and it could be many years until this</p> | <p>contained within the Energy and New Development SPD, an adopted document which would initially provide the implementation framework for criterion (e); it is acknowledged that this document is not referenced as it should be and this will be amended.</p> <p>It is not agreed that it will take years for the approach recommended by the GM energy study to become operational; in fact, several GM authorities have already incorporated the target framework into their draft Core Strategies and we will seek to do the same; this will include conformity with the energy hierarchy as well as allowable solutions where appropriate.</p> <p>In respect of the suggested re-wording of criterion (e), it is our view that it may be appropriate to include wording such as "which cannot be successfully mitigated"; further, it will be ensured that the wording reflects the emphasis placed by national guidance such as the forthcoming Climate Change PPS. However, the extent of qualification suggested would render the policy meaningless. In terms of weighing against other considerations, this is enshrined in national policy and there is no need to repeat it here.</p> <p>Principles of the AGMA study are already being incorporated into Core Strategies; however, there could be a two part policy, outlining measures for the short term and then when the AGMA framework is in place.</p> |
|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | | document becomes operational. Therefore in the interim, it is essential that this core strategy policy contains criteria requiring new development to be sustainably constructed, and ensure renewable and low carbon energy production is fully utilised wherever possible. Criterion (e) needs to be re-worded to ensure it takes into account the wider social, economic and environmental benefits renewable energy schemes may bring: Suggested re-wording: (e) Encouraging standalone renewable energy developments that have no significant unacceptable impact upon the local area, its character and environmental assets and adjoining uses, which cannot be mitigated or are not outweighed by the wider national and regional need for renewable energy development or the wider environmental, social and economic benefits the scheme may bring. Thank-you for the opportunity to comment on the emerging Core Strategy; we appreciate the Council's consideration of Envirolink's views and would be happy to discuss our comments further should the Council wish to do so. | |
| 367163/62 | Mr. Russell Johnson | Not entirely, if the Brownfield sites in Littleborough were used to plant trees, instead of building even more houses (We have more houses in Littleborough than the infrastructure can cope with) think how much more beneficial that would be for the environment! | National policy expects us to meet our development needs as far as possible on previously developed i.e. 'brownfield' sites. However, we will take opportunities to protect features and establish new planting. We are committed to increase tree cover wherever possible. We recognise that we would not be able to put a moratorium on brownfield development, however, this policy along with others does emphasise the need to take opportunities to plant trees in new developments and encourage the environmental regeneration of brownfield land. |
| 396108/423 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.68 We are generally supportive of the Council's policy approach to managing the natural environment and resources. However, we consider that where the Council are to seek planning obligations it is important that such contributions adhere to the tests of Circular 05105 and that the details of such a contribution are set out within a SPD. | Point noted. The Council will take account of Government circulars in this regard. It would not be appropriate to refer to such legislation in the policy. |
| 397177/349 | Environment Agency - Mrs Sylvia Whittingham | R1 e) In regards to standalone renewable energy projects it is recommended there is stronger and more unambiguous wording than 'unacceptable' to ensure such schemes do not have long term damaging impacts to the current environmental resource i.e., no detrimental impacts. | e) Agreed. (Look at UDP EM/16 and RSS EM/17). This wording will be reviewed. 'Where they are acceptable in terms of their scale and impact on the locality – |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>h) It is recommended that the borough's woodland as well as peatland resource is protected as these also provide an important carbon sink. i) The opening up of culverted watercourses not only aids urban cooling, but can also have positive flood risk reduction benefits and provide new landscape and amenity features. k) Whilst we welcome the possible additional new tree planting in a relatively lightly tree covered borough, it is recommended this is appropriately located. There may be the opportunity to expand the native broadleaved woodland coverage, provide increased biodiversity, recreation value in the borough, and make a contribution to tackling climate change by planting woodlands which absorb carbon as they grow. For advice on such sites, advice from Woodland Trust, Red Rose Forest and GMEU would be recommended. It is recommended in the qualification text, that a little guidance or reference points are provided to where development has included this innovative design. It may be worthwhile promoting a best practice examples of sustainable development, green roof systems, development strategies now being incorporated in the UK or abroad i.e., the new Rolls Royce manufacturing plant in Chichester, and the Buckshaw Village development, Chorley, Stamford Brook development, Altrincham or sustainable cities site for possible examples.</p> <p>http://www.eef.org.uk/south/whatwedo/businessimprovement/features/regional/Innovators_in_Sustainable_Manufacture.htm (http://www.nwra.gov.uk/downloads/documents/imported/rp_4xc4_NW_Best_Practice_Design_Guide_.pdf) http://www.nationaltrust.org.uk/main/w-vh/w-visits/w-findaplace/w-dunhammassey/w-dunhammassey-stamford_brook_development.htm). http://www.sustainablecities.org.uk/water/surface-water/using-gi/ As well as an increase of tree cover, which should be sited in appropriate places, there should be an aim to increase the current available greenspace / green infrastructure in its various forms. This will have a positive effect in regards to climate change, but also have wider social and environmental benefits.</p> | <p>h) Turn wording around to say "protect the borough's environmental assets which act as carbon sinks, in particular peatlands and trees and woodlands.</p> <p>i) We will ensure that proper references to the benefits of opening up culverts under policies R4 – enhancing green infrastructure and R6 – managing water resources and flood risk.</p> <p>k) Will emphasis 'appropriate type and location'. 'Allowable solution' . Refer to other documents. More could be said in the RJ in respect of 'tree planting elsewhere', e.g. the kinds of initiatives which contributions might go to; the concept of using examples will be considered.</p> <p>Will include an additional bullet point: 'Maximise the potential of existing open spaces and opportunities for new open spaces to contribute to climate change mitigation and adaptation'.</p> |
| 397697/463 | Rossendale Borough Council - Mr James Dalgleish | <p>Renewable Energy We support the document's promotion of renewable energy developments, but would wish to ensure that landscape integrity is not unreasonably compromised by such schemes (especially in the case of wind energy). Attention should be paid not only to the impact of the development in question, but to the cumulative impact of multiple installations on the landscape as a whole. In this regard, we would refer you to the advice given in Julie</p> | <p>The cumulative impact of standalone renewable energy developments is referred to in the RJ, but further reference to the study's recommendations in respect of this matter may be appropriate.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|--|---|---|
| | | Martin Associates' 'Landscape Capacity Study for Wind Energy Developments in the South Pennines' draft report (December 2009). | |
| 398409/547 | Peel Holdings (Management) Limited - Mr David Thompson | <p>3.6 Peel Energy requests that paragraph e) on standalone renewable energy developments, and the supporting text, is amended to be give increased clarity and to reflect the balance required between the positive contribution to climate change and energy security, as well as other related benefits (e.g. economic, environmental and amenity) of the development, versus the "impact upon the local area, its character and environmental assets and adjoining uses". The role of mitigation and compensation for impacts of renewable energy developments must also be taken into account as part of this balance. The supporting text can also explain that this balance is best reflected in the Core Strategy through the adoption of a criteria based policy, informed by the Regional Spatial Strategy and national planning policies.</p> <p>3.7 Peel Energy believes paragraph h) should acknowledge that the borough's peatlands are also often the same upland locations that offer the highest wind resource and therefore the best sites for generating renewable electricity from wind turbines. 3.8 It should also be known that in terms of the energy yield/carbon offset from developing wind farms on peat relative to the potential carbon sink loss, wind turbines give a significant CO2 saving over their life span ('Rural and Environment Research and Analysis Directorate of the Scottish Government, 2008).</p> <p>3.9 Peel Energy suggests that paragraph h) is also amended to incorporate the potential for offsite mitigation if it is considered that the environmental and social benefits of locating a renewable energy development on peatland outweigh any potential negative impacts. One particular example of this mitigation in Rochdale is the existing Scout Moor Habitat Enhancement Plan Fund that was established as a result of the Scout Moor Wind Farm development.</p> <p>3.10 Peel Energy believes paragraph k) should confirm that renewable and low-carbon energy developments would not be required to provide tree planting on site, or make financial contributions for tree planting elsewhere. This is due to such developments already making a significant contribution to reducing CO2 levels in the atmosphere.</p> | <p>3.6 The role of mitigation could be referred to, see the response to Envirolink Northwest above.</p> <p>3.7 / 3.8 The clear purpose of criterion h) is to make a commitment to protecting the borough's peatlands, as one of a package of measures for helping towards tackling climate change; in terms of making a balanced judgement about windfarm impacts, this is the purpose of criterion e). The suggested conflict is site –specific detail.</p> <p>3.9 the role of mitigation could be referred to , as per the response to Envirolink Northwest above.</p> <p>3.10 Disagree. There are additional benefits to tree planting aswell as CO2 reduction, as explained in the RJ and other policies. However, the Climate Change Adaptation Supplementary Document will refer to other CO2 reduction things e.g. peatland restoration in specific circumstances. Maybe confine the policy to the</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | | <p>3.11 In the accompanying explanation to policy R1 Peel Energy believes that the chosen approach of 'reduction of energy demand will be promoted first and foremost, over and above the promotion renewable energy' does not reflect the scale of the challenge that climate change and energy generation present, nor the timescales for these initiatives to have a material impact. It is not sufficient to rely on reduction in energy demand alone; secure and low-carbon sources of energy are equally vital. This is the only way that UK emission reduction targets for 2020 can be met. This is in accordance with national policy documents, such as Planning Policy Statement 22: Renewable Energy and The UK Renewable Energy Strategy.</p> <p>3.12 Peel Energy therefore believes that the strategy adopted by Rochdale must be one of equal promotion of energy efficiency and renewable energy promotion. This is reflected in policy DM1 Delivery and management of new development 5(d) 'maximise energy efficiency and utilise renewable energy technologies'.</p> <p>3.14 Peel Energy would expect that the 'landscape capacity study' referred to in the explanatory text takes full account of variables such as economic viability and the basic availability of the wind resource. Peel Energy is concerned that adopting such a narrow focus on one aspect of development will lead to an unduly restrictive framework for renewable wind energy projects. In this regard Peel Energy would refer the Council to the comments Peel Energy submitted in respect of Natural England's proposed landscape capacity study methodology (as attached).</p> | <p>urban area. Maybe an allowable solution.</p> <p>3.11 The RJ is not suggesting that it is sufficient to rely on reduction in energy demand alone, it is however reflecting the energy hierarchy in line with national guidance.</p> <p>3.12 This comment seems to conflict with the preceding comment. It is agreed that the strategy should be one of equal promotion of energy efficiency and renewable energy promotion.</p> <p>3.14 The aim of the study is not to provide an unduly restrictive framework for wind farms. Judgement of economic viability of renewable energy proposals is something that planning is not supposed to enter into.</p> |
| 398423/514 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | The requirements outlined could be built into appropriate design/development briefs as mentioned earlier. Support policies P1. | Support noted. |
| 401290/510 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | R1 We welcome this overarching climate change policy which is in line with RSS policy DP9. | Support noted. |
| R2 – Managing Green Belt | | | |
| Question 30 What are your views on our policy for managing the green belt? | | | |
| 161618/271 | Todmorden Angling Society - Mr Ray Barber | Todmorden Angling Society has a small piece of land adjacent to Ballard Close Littleborough and the same side of the stream as Ballard Close which we would like to dispose of for building (Green belt at present).The site used to be part of the mill and was occupied | Disagree. Detailed alterations to the green belt boundary should not be made in a Core Strategy, This is a matter for the Site Allocations DPD. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|---------------|
| | | by a mill lodge but is now just wasteland which some locals use as a tip. Will you please place this matter before whoever can decide to take this piece of land out of the green belt to allow it to be usefully used. Core Strategy matter. | |
| 161683/283 | Government Office North West - Mr Dave Arstall | R2 – See comments above re proposed Green Belt deletions, including the need to engage with 4NW. With regard to the additions, the Council needs to be clear on the evidenced need for these against policy in PPG2. | Agree. |
| 162033/156 | Northwest Regional Development Agency - Mr Ian Wray | Clause 2 of Policy R2 sets out the Council's preferred approach to Green Belt release. We have referred to the need to demonstrate exceptional circumstances to justify the release of land from the Green Belt in our comments on Proposed Policy E3. This will need to have regard to other open land outside the Green Belt which it is proposed to protect/reserve meet development needs beyond 2026 under Proposed Policy R3. | Noted. |
| 180811/432 | Natural England - Mr Stephen Hedley | In general, Natural England supports the protection of green belt land, as these areas can provide valuable open space on the urban fringe with associated benefits including recreation, human health and enjoyment and biodiversity conservation. However, we recognise that a stringent policy of avoiding any development on green belt land can increase pressure for development elsewhere, on land that may be more environmentally sensitive. Some green belt land can and should be enhanced to provide more greenspace benefits. Where green belt is to be reviewed we consider that there should be no net loss, and that development on any areas removed from the green belt as part of a review should itself provide greenspace, so bringing about a net gain in greenspace. We therefore commend this policy for setting out a detailed and specific description of the Council's approach to protecting existing green belt designations, and for providing a clear and reasonable justification for removal of land from the green belt. | Support noted |
| 216477/241 | Mr John Lappin | R2 1A Very important to stop towns, villages etc merging, look at the big cities to see how villages, small towns have lost their individual character. It is now virtually bricks and concrete from the airport to the M60 to the south of Middleton. If any more of the remaining green land to the north of Middleton is lost in years to come this concrete jungle will then stretch to north of Rochdale. This remaining green area must be kept for those following. R.M.B.C. have the power to protect the remaining green areas Middleton has, just as it is planning to the north of Rochdale. R22 No land must ever be released which is designated "greenbelt," it must be labelled | Noted. |

| | | | |
|------------|---------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>"sacrosanct." I realise it is now government policy that Councils' can now look at greenbelt as a possibility for development, but R.M.B.C. must stand against this, and be seen as a champion for the protection of greenbelt. R.M.B.C. should always be looking for ways to increase its "bank of greenbelt."</p> | |
| 345742/270 | Mr William Collinge | <p>ISSUE ONE The Core Strategy document contravenes the guidelines of PPG2 at 1.6 in notations 3 and 4 of government policy in the case of Burnedge village. Notation 3 states that GB land should fulfill objectives 'to retain attractive landscapes and enhance landscapes near to where people live'. Notation 4 states: 'to improve damaged and derelict land around towns'. It also contravenes the guidelines of PPG2 at A1 of Annex A which states 'that LPA's should aim to enhance the countryside, and especially those areas of land within the GB which are suffering from disuse or neglect'. These government policies are not being applied in the village of Burnedge and the proof of this shows in the derelict former housing sites which stand out as eyesores. There were some 17 plus house demolished over the years and the piles of bricks of some of them still remain on the sites although now overgrown with weeds (See attached plan - pg 5). The reason for the above situation is the LPA reluctance to allow infill development. The LPA has adopted the PPG2 policy at 2.11 which is 'washed over' policy only and has excluded the optional 'infill development' policy which is allowed by government. If infill development was allowed careful infill development only would bring visual enhancement to Burnedge village without affecting the openness of the GB. It would also create a better environment for the people living in the village by removing the present eyesores. These are the government aims of the PPG2 policies referred to above and Rochdale LPA should be adopting those policies. The proposal to carry forward the present adopted policy from the UDP 2006 at Chapter 7. G/D/2 to the new Core Strategy document contravenes government policy as stated above. For these reasons under Planning Inspectorate test four for soundness the document is not sound. ISSUE TWO The Core Strategy document contravenes the Human Rights Act 1998 Section 6 (1) and Article 14. Protocol 1. Article 1 of the European Conventions. The reason being that the Rochdale LPA has carried forward the policy it adopted at G/D/2 of the UDP 2006 to the new proposed Core Strategy document. 'The policy at G/D/2 reflects the GB policy of PPG2 at 2.11 where the government allows the LPA to include or exclude infill development in villages . The Rochdale LPA chose to exclude infill development</p> | <p>Disagree. The Core Strategy does not change the current policy approach in the current UDP which has been shown to be consistent with PPG2. It is not considered that Burnedge is a village, or a major developed site in the green belt and therefore infilling would be inappropriate. There is no evidence to suggest that environmental problems would be solved by its exclusion from the greenbelt or a policy of allowing infilling. In any event, it is not the role of the Core Strategy to redefine boundaries unless this is vital to the delivery of the strategy. Once boundaries are reviewed in a future Site Allocations Plan, this would be the appropriate time to expand on national policy or its application within Rochdale.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>in its villages. Adopting the above PPG2 policy with out allowing any infill development whatsoever means that persons wishing to carry out infill development in the villages of burnedge are being discriminated against by the Rochdale LPA. The reason for , the discrimination is the fact that the Bury LPA chose to allow/include in fill development in their nominated villages. This type of discrimination by a public authority is not allowed as set out in the Human Rights Act and the rights of an individual property owner are protected under the act. To rectify the above discrimination the Rochdale LPA would need to adopt the same policy as the Bury LPA and adopt infill development in Burnedge village. Because the Core Strategy document contravenes the Human Rights Act 1998 under test 4 of the Planning Inspectorate tests the document is not sound. ISSUE THREE This representation is made on the advice of Rochdale LPA in a letter to me dated the 22nd June 2009. Ref: RG/WC. I wish to nominate a piece of enclosed land owned by me and situated in Burnedge village to be taken out of the 'washed over' GB village and included in the Defined Urban Area of the new Core Strategy Plan. The reason for my nomination is for exactly the same reasons that the land and buildings were excluded from the GB by the LPA in the Rochdale UDP 2006 at D/3. The reasons given for excluding this land from the GB were given as: 'The area is not open and does not perform a Green Belt role ' . Consequently it should be excluded from the Green Belt and included in the Defined Urban area . My nominated piece of land would meet this criteria exactly and should therefore be excluded from the Green Belt also. It would appear that the above request comes about because of the LPAs reluctance to allow infill development in Burnedge village. Under these circumstances test four of the planning Inspectorate tests makes the document not sound. It would also appear that the above situation could contravene the Human Rights Act 1998 Section 6 (1) and Article 14. protocol 1. Article 1 of the European Conventions. Under these circumstances test four of the Planning Inspectorate tests makes the document not sound. ISSUE FOUR This representation is made on the advice and in the form of the attached 10 page Planning Appraisal carried out by CA Planning, Chartered Town Planners at my request (See attached report for full details). Important extracts from the appraisal report that: - 4.6 The Rochdale UDP at G/D/2 GB has a far more restrictive GB policy than PPG2 policy allows. 4.8 An objection regarding the site I own should have been lodged at the UDP preparation stage in order to have been</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|--|
| | | considered by an inspector. 5.6 There is no particular justification for Rochdale LPA to take an alternative approach to national planning policy. 5.22 The site I own would qualify for infill development if infill development was allowed. At paragraph 5.2 the report concludes that there is potentially an argument for future Rochdale green belt policy to allow infill development within named settlements and that Burnedge would be one such settlement. Such an approach would allow the settlement to sustain itself and not continue the previous decline. Based on the above conclusion the proposal to carry forward the present policy of the UDP at G/D/2 to the new Core Strategy document is not in the best interest of Burnedge as a declining settlement. Under planning inspectorate test four the Preferred Options document is not sound. Due to a change in policy wording for the soundness test as described in PPS12 (2008) at para 4.52, notation 2, will you please note that following amended wording which now applies to my four representations dated the 9th November 2009. The soundness test wording should now read:- "The document is not sound as it does not comply with the criteria set out in PPS12 (2008) para 4.52 notation 2." | |
| 367163/63 | Mr. Russell Johnson | See page 19 of the T.D.S. | |
| 397697/461 | Rossendale Borough Council - Mr James Dalglish | <p>Protection of Countryside and Natural Assets We support the Preferred Options Report's strategy of protecting the countryside in the north of the borough from encroachment by protecting the Green Belt there (policy R2). The green belt continues into the Rossendale Borough near Whitworth, and its protection in this area is also supported by Rossendale Borough Council's upcoming Core Strategy.</p> <p>In addition, we also fully support the protection of the borough's peatlands which act as a carbon sink. Areas in the north of the borough which border Rossendale around Rooley Moor fall into this category.</p> | <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Noted</p> |
| 398409/544 | Peel Holdings (Management) Limited - Mr David Thompson | Peel objects to: Policy R2, the Key Diagram, the Rochdale Township Delivery Diagram and Policy C1 as they do not provide an appropriate basis for the consideration of the release of suitable Green Belt sites for beneficial development. Peel notes the Council's intention for limited land release from the Green Belt in order to meet development needs to 2026 and beyond. It is also noted that an Allocations Development Plan Document is the intended vehicle for such releases and that the 'preferred area for release' is identified in the Core Strategy Preferred Options as south Heywood. | Disagree. No justification has been provided for the release of other areas of green belt. The release of land west of Norden is not a strategic proposal which is vital for the delivery of the Council's strategy. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>It is also noted that the Council acknowledges that: "There is evidence that all our development needs cannot be met within the urban area and on brownfield sites. Therefore peripheral land, including green belt needs to be considered." In order to seek to achieve the intended Core Strategy Vision and Strategic Objectives, Peel considers it important that the Council give full and further consideration to the opportunity for minor/local Green Belt boundary amendments in other key locations. Such as a key location would be Bamford. Chapter 2 of the Preferred Options - Spatial Portrait locates Bamford within the 'outer suburban areas' and notes that "Outer suburban areas experience [housing] demand outstripping supply and there is a clear shortage of affordable housing" (page 12). It is further noted that: "The borough does not have enough housing of the right size, type, tenure and quality to meet current demand or anticipated demand .. ." and that there is: " . . a shortage of executive or higher value homes to attract residents with higher incomes ... "(page 12) Peel considers that 5 hectares of land west of Norden Road, Bamford would provide an attractive site for quality family housing in a sustainable location, taking advantage of existing facilities and infrastructure in the locality. Peel considers that this site should be identified as a Key Housing Site. Peel as the landowner can confirm that the site is available and developable and that it could contribute directly both to the overall supply of housing for the Borough and to the meeting key aspects of the proposed Core Strategy Vision and Objectives - as identified above. Details of this site have previously been submitted to the Council in respect of the Core Strategy Issues and Options and Site Nomination consultations (copies attached). Requested Amendments: 1. Peel requests that section 2. of Policy R2 be amended to include the following: 'x) Land West of Norden Road, Bamford where housing development will be appropriate.' 2. Peel requests that section 4 of Policy C1 be amended to include the following: 'x) Land West of Norden Road, Bamford for residential development.' and the supporting text be amended accordingly. 3. Peel requests that the Key Diagram be amended to show Land West of Norden Road, Bamford as a proposed Key / Strategic Site. 4. Peel requests that the Rochdale Township Delivery Diagram be amended to identify the site as a 'Preferred Location for residential development in the Green Belt' and as a proposed Key / Strategic Site. 5. Peel requests that Appendix 1 be amended to include the following text: SHLM Code Site Estimated capacity SH 1447 Land to west of Norden Road, 150</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------------|---------------------|---|---|
| | | Bamford, Rochdale | |
| 401290/480 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | <p>Our initial view is that the information in the Preferred Options document and provided at the subsequent meeting with yourselves indicates that the proposed Green Belt release can be viewed as a local detailed change as set out by RSS policy RDF4. In coming to this view, we have considered the parameters set out in our Green Belt Guidance Note (May 2009) : • National guidance contained in Planning Policy Guidance note 2 (PPG2); • The fit with the policy framework in RSS; and • The available evidence base relating to the land use proposed for the area of Green Belt to be removed. In relation to these parameters, there are a number of important matters that will need to be addressed in taking forward the proposed release in the core strategy. There will need to be a strong justification for the removal of Green Belt set out in the Core Strategy and / or supporting documents, backed up by a strong evidence base. This can build on the current evidence. We understand the need for 30 ha additional employment land is raised by the recently completed Nathaniel Lichfield Greater Manchester Employment Land Position Statement, and that this location is considered to be the most sustainable and deliverable outside the existing urban area. The GMPS also notes that the south Heywood location could help to meet a strong demand for B8 sites if the B8 element of Kingsway is full developed. There will also need to be a clear justification for the proposed housing development within the Green Belt. The SHLAA indicates that sufficient land is available to meet housing provision within the urban area. We understand that the Green Belt housing is required as there is a deficit of quality up-market housing available in Rochdale, and also to support construction of the link road. However these reasons alone do not necessarily provide strong justification for Green Belt release. There needs to be evidence in terms of the market that housing provision will not be met without greenfield housing, and the development of this housing will not prejudice the housing market renewal process in the urban areas. A decision will be needed as to how the Green Belt release is dealt with in the final Core Strategy. An issue with the Preferred Options document is the way the potential Green Belt release areas are dealt with in policies E3, C1 and R2. The naming of specific sites without any reference maps is confusing, and across policies E3, C1 and R2 it is not possible to assess the total area proposed, the number and possible extent of the sites, and the use in terms of purely employment, or mixed use, or housing. One</p> | <p>Noted that green belt release may be justified and that this may be seen as a local detailed change and not a review of the green belt.</p> <p>It will be recommended that a broad location is identified and that detailed boundaries and development principles will be set out in a Site Allocations DPD.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>solution would be to leave all details of individual sites out of the Core Strategy, and to simply refer to a broad location south of Heywood in all 3 polices, with a commitment to allocating specific sites in the site allocation DPDs. Alternatively the Core Strategy could include the proposed releases as a strategic allocation with full details and a proposals map. In this case mechanisms to ensure that development here did not prejudice development at more sustainable, urban locations outside the Green Belt would be important.</p> | |
| 190952/390 | Mrs Jayne Poole | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD The traffic at peak times along Manchester Road is already extremely congested and introducing the proposed link road will only make things worse. Introducing traffic lights along with the link road will not help as sometimes the traffic backs up from the centre of Heywood into Birch and also causing a build up of traffic along Hareshill Road making it impossible to get into and out of the residents driveways. Hareshill road is a very narrow road with a narrow footpath on one side only and it is not suitable to pass two lorries side by side. The road is also well used by walkers and cyclists but if heavy goods vehicles are allowed back onto this road it will be extremely dangerous for these road users. I live along this road and to get your car off the drive you have to have the front of the car onto the road to see what traffic is coming as the footpath is so narrow. It would make more sense to improve the road links from junction 3 of the M66 to the industrial parks along Pilsworth Road and any proposed employment usage at the junction of Hareshill Road and Pilsworth Road could be accessed from the same road. When I asked what the real reason was for the link road I was told it was so that the green belt area could be opened up for employment even though there is a lot of empty space on the existing business parks. We do not need this link road we need some green belt that will allow us to breathe in some fresh air and not just diesel fumes.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 204017/48 | Miss Jean Barlow | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD I am totally opposed to the proposed release of Green Belt land, and particularly in south Heywood. This area has already lost far too much green belt land, and is becoming an industrial wasteland instead of the green and pleasant land it used to be. Enough is enough, as was witnessed by the fierce opposition expressed by many local residents at the public meeting in Heywood in November 2009. I believe this proposal to release Green Belt is not in the interests of Rochdale residents. There is already a huge amount of unused industrial and commercial land within the borough, notably Kingsway Business Park and Stakehill. Surely this</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | allocation should be taken up before Green Belt is considered. | |
| 216607/617 | Mr Rob Haughton | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD My main objections, which I have tried to keep fairly brief, are in respect of your Preferred Options Document - Oct 2009, and all relate to the release of green belt land in and around Hopwood, for the purpose of building a 'relief road' from Junction 19 - M62 to Junction 3, or part thereof, and the development of additional housing & employment use, especially surrounding the area of the Heywood Distribution Park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air Quality; All of the proposed area of major development looks to be in the RMBC Air Quality Management Area, and it is evident that the Borough is committed to reducing the levels of such pollutants, especially, in this case Nitrogen Dioxide (NO2). The latest RMBC Action Plan I have been able to obtain, states that the M62 Junction 19 requires a 25% reduction in NO2 levels and that 'goods vehicles, whether on the motorway, or on major roads, are the main source of NO2 emissions and this accounts for 82.3% of the total contribution' Clearly, if your proposal is successful this will mean a significant increase in the number of HGV traffic in this area, be it in the short, medium or even long term, which I would hope has been a major consideration in your process, but I cannot find any supporting evidence of this. This is against a background of the Borough's commitment's in a number of your various documents/reports, where there are any number of references to this important consideration, e.g, 'We will lead in ensuring our communities are protected from environmental hazards & air pollution' (RMBC Aiming High - creating a cleaner, greener environment) The lack of detail in this regard is, particularly concerning, as clearly, by bringing more employment into this immediate area, which in all likelihood will be distribution/logistics related, will simply compound this issue, way beyond what is acceptable, by your own documented and published targets & standards. • Existing Motorway Infrastructure: Clearly, the current levels of traffic on the M62/M60/M66, especially, in the rush hour periods of the day are extremely problematical, and even with the advent of the proposed 4'h lane – hard shoulder running, which will at best only provide a fairly limited benefit, as proved by the evidence from the M42 in Birmingham. Despite my extensive reviews of The Core Strategy Documents produced to date I cannot find any information in respect of anticipated projections for traffic growth and the potential impact it will have in the Borough, and more importantly, the impact it would have were your plans to be approved. I can envisage at some point in the future, if your proposal | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>is accepted, that as a result of the continued increase in HGV traffic that will inevitably result from your proposal, that both the proposed relief road will need to be widened/improved & that the Highways Agency could then at some point in the future suggest the building of an actual 4th motorway lane in an attempt to alleviate these problems, a situation that will have been exacerbated by both this development and potentially future developments that will surely follow, all of which will be devastating for the residents and indeed Council Tax Payers of Hopwood, many of whom who pay at the upper end of this levy. Clearly, this particular point is inextricably linked to the AQM problem detailed above. • Noise Pollution: Residents of Hopwood, who live close to the M62 and Junction 19, are already subjected to continual noise from this stretch of motorway, due to the continued increase in traffic on the UK roads, which over the years we have had no option but to learn to live with. It is not possible to sit outside, or indeed, have our windows open without being subject to this continual noise pollution, and again, plans to develop a relief road to the level you are suggesting will simply make this situation, and our lives, significantly worse. I would ask if this has in any way been considered, as I can find no reference to this in the Core Strategy Documentation, or has there been any measurement of the levels of noise currently being experienced, as a part of this process, to project what this could look like if your proposals are to be adopted. The proposed introduction of this relief road, which will be closer to our properties than the M62, will quite simply increase the noise levels produced by WGV's, which we will be forced to endure, not forgetting that the Logistics Industry runs it's WGVs 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, 365 days per annum, to service their clients, which would give us no respite whatsoever, and clearly goes against your principles of 'Creating a cleaner, greener environment, where people want to live, work, visit & do business - a place in which we can all take pride.' The words sound very worthy but, in my opinion, these principles seem to being largely ignored, in respect of your proposals to date</p> <p>From the recent meeting in Heywood, there was a very interesting suggestion from the floor, to properly develop a suitable relief road, fit for purpose, from Junction 3 of the M66, which looks to be a shorter more direct route, and therefore a better environmental solution, rather than Junction 19, and the compromise solution that appears to have been proposed involving as it does, a single carriageway solution, with a passing zone, and the need for traffic</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>lights at it's proposed junction with Manchester Road (A6045), which seems to be far from what is necessary to satisfy both the needs of Heywood Distribution Park, and indeed the interests of the local residents you represent. This M66 Junction 3 option is worth considering in some more detail as there is effectively no residential property that would be affected, and this could be an opportunity to develop a dual carriageway solution, using the landfill sites that are prevalent in this area, that could lead straight to the entrance of Heywood Distribution Park, without constraint</p> <p>• Environmental Issues: The area of the proposed link road is based on the area known as Collop Gate Farm, which has been for years & years & years has been used as arable farm land, and from the deeds of this land, states that 'Only to use the property hereby conveyed for the purpose of agricultural land and for no other purpose whatsoever'. As a result this area is festooned with a whole variety of wildlife, including birds, which frequent the gardens of the houses nearby, and apart from the more common varieties of British garden birds, we regularly see Thrushes, Jays, Dunocks, Chaff inches, Bullfinches, Woodpeckers, Sparrow Hawks, Redwings & even Fieldfares, which are fairly rare visitors to residential gardens. I am concerned that there doesn't appear to have been any assessment/investigation into the impact that this development will inevitably have on this vital aspect of our environment that you surely have a duty to consider/protect? I believe this is an important consideration if the Borough is fully committed to honouring its environmental credentials, as again a development on such a scale will have a massive impact of the local area, and these are losses that can never be reversed.</p> | |
| 216735/537 | Russell Homes - Mr Daniel Kershaw | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD 4.4 Russells support Policy R2 which continues to protect the principle of the Green Belt. The areas proposed to be released from the Green Belt in South Heywood are supported as this will bring social environmental and economic benefits which are consistent with the objectives of the Preferred Options Report. 4.5 Russells supports the inclusion of land to the South of Heywood for development. 4.6 It is considered that a mixed-use industrial, distribution, commercial and residential development could be supported on the site in accordance with the strategic objectives of the Core Strategy. 4.7 The release of the land will enable the provision of a link road from Hareshill Road to Junction 19 of the M62 Motorway. It would enable a second route onto the Motorway network providing relief at Junction 3 of the M66 and at Junction 18</p> | Support noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>of the M60/M62. Traffic from Heywood Distribution Park would have a link in an Easterly direction to Leeds and could therefore avoid these Junctions. 4.8 In order to facilitate the delivery of the relief road the comprehensive development of land between Manchester Road, Hareshill Road and the M62 Motorway would be required. 4.9 It is considered that development to enable the Heywood Relief Road would not compete directly or compromise the principles of development at Kingsway. The two objectives are not mutually exclusive. Kingsway is a regional development site attracting regional interests. Heywood is more localised and on a smaller scale. 4.10 Existing operators on the Heywood site support the need for the relief road. It will enhance the attractiveness of the location making it a more long-term, sustainable employment growth area. 4.11 There are many advantages from the creation of the link road and new development within this area. Haulage and distribution vehicles travelling to Heywood Distribution Park from Leeds have to add on an additional 20% of the journey time to drive beyond Junction 19 of the M62 and arrive via Simister Island, (Junction 18 of the M60) and Junction 3 of the M66. The additional 20% is both an environmental and economic cost and the creation of the link road mitigates this. 4.12 A current option for HGV's accessing the Heywood Distribution Park is to come through the Town Centre of Heywood. Traffic calming and restriction measures have been put in place on Hareshill Road, however HGV's consequently drive through the centre of Heywood which in turn creates problems of congestion, pollution and manoeuvrability within the Town Centre and along the A58 highway network. 4.13 It is a strategic objective to develop the inner Core Areas of Heywood Town which is currently suffering from neglect and decline as a consequence of unsightly manufacturing and industrial uses which are in some instances no longer needed and in many instances simply unsuitable for modern commercial and industrial requirements. The intention to redevelop these areas for a residential use is a priority, however, there is a need to retain local employment within Heywood. It is intended that the replacement employment could be provided on the Southern Heywood site. The alternative to this is that some of the local employment provision is lost. 4.14 Heywood requires good quality housing and quality employment opportunities need to be provided and a mixed use scheme could provide both high quality suburban housing and good quality employment opportunities for the town. It would also support the regeneration initiatives that are being promoted. Specifically it</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>would provide relocation opportunities for the manufacturing sector within the Town allowing for the redevelopment of the poorer quality urban manufacturing areas for residential development. 4.15 The development would enable the provision of public transport facilities into the wider Heywood distribution Park. Currently there are very limited public transport facilities, with employees within Heywood having to walk up to 1 mile to get to the edge of Heywood Distribution Park and then having to walk a further mile to their work place from the boundary to the centre of the Employment Park, however, the additional development and employment growth could sustain a more regular service. 4.16 The release of housing in the short term is also seen as important as this will facilitate the provision of the link road and tie in with the proposed employment opportunities. 4.17 Russells are supportive of greater mix and choice of homes in terms of size and tenure and the provision of high quality housing which will improve the overall image of the Borough and help deliver the growth of the economy. It is essential that new house building is required to support the existing and planned regeneration proposals within Heywood, but it is also important that new housing is provided in sustainable suburban areas to retain and attract people with higher incomes and satisfy aspirational housing need. 4.18 The site is sustainable, has good accessibility, enables the wider redevelopment objectives within Heywood Town Centre and sustains and enhances the desirability and operational performance of the existing business and opportunities within the Heywood Distribution Park. The environmental impact as a consequence of the site's release are outweighed by the clear benefits associated with improved air quality, a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and the removal of traffic in Heywood Town Centre that are gained by the link road. 4.19 Russells are therefore actively promoting the allocation of mixed use development scheme which would include residential, industrial commercial development in South Heywood. The scheme has the potential to facilitate the wider objectives of economic growth, employment provision, reversal of the recent decline in the population, enhancement of the operational facilities of the existing Heywood Industrial Estate, the removal of congestion within Heywood Town Centre, the provision of good quality residential development which is required within Heywood and the benefit to the community in terms of economic prosperity and environment sustainability. It will alleviate wider congestion problems by</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|------------|------------------|---|--|
| | | redirecting traffic around Simister Island through Junction 3 of the M66 to access Heywood Distribution Park. It will also enable the traffic calming proposals along Heap Brow (Heywood) to be implemented as it provides a necessary second relief road out of Heywood Distribution Park. It will provide a district centre which would enable localised convenience shopping to be undertaken reducing traffic movement and providing a valuable local facility. | |
| 217429/192 | Jean Grimshaw | SOUTH HEYWOOD This includes new motorways, houses, industrial units and shops, in Middleton, Hopwood and Heywood. Land around Heywood and Middleton should be protected at all costs. This green belt should remain so, and not be converted to blanket belt. There is a very large industrial site at Kingsway, with only two units on. As well as this there are lots of units for sale over Rochdale, Heywood, Middleton etc. There are also many houses/apartments for sale, why build more. Lots of Residents of Middleton and Heywood are unaware of the extent of all the proposals that are wanted by Rochdale Council. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 364647/212 | Mr Ryan Howarth | SOUTH HEYWOOD I think that the link road is a bad idea, which will increase traffic not reduce it, bringing more lorries noise and low paid jobs, losing greenbelt land and ruining the landscape around Hopwood, there will still be trucks going down Middleton Road to get to Green Lane wincanton/stobarts etc. This link road won't stop that. All that will happen is Heywood turning into a big industrial estate. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 367959/201 | Mr Keith Hardman | SOUTH HEYWOOD MOTORWAY LINK TO JUNCTION 19 FROM HEYWOOD BUSINESS AND DISTRIBUTION PARK AND DEVELOPMENT OF GREEN BELT LAND TO THE SOUTH OF HOPWOOD AND HARESHILL ROAD. Any developments would impinge on Green Belt Land to the detriment of the surrounding environment causing noise, pollution and extra traffic in our immediate area. There would be no reduction in the volume of traffic going into or through Heywood as it would still have to travel via Middleton Road, Manchester Road or Pilsworth Road. It is hard to believe that, even when we finally come out of recession, further development of Green Belt Land will be required considering that there is an empty Kingsway Business Park yet to fill and a half empty Stakehill Industrial Estate. Are Rochdale Council planning to build another "White Elephant wasting more Ratepayers money! Responsible Councils should look into the provision of alternative Transportation that does not encourage further use of non-renewable energy (fuel) and not encourage more use of roads. Councils should have a "Duty of Care" over the Environment and | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|-----------|-------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>should therefore protect Green Belt Land. Rochdale Council appear to have made it very difficult to access details of their preferred proposals, even the web site is difficult to access, especially for older persons. As information has had limited advertising and many people in Heywood have not been informed of the proposals, it is hard to believe in the integrity of the Councils plans and actions/motives. Notification of the promised second meeting at Heywood Civic Hall should be the Councils total responsibility, ensuring that every household in Heywood and especially Hopwood and Hareshill Road are fully informed of the meeting date and venue and providing sufficient time for everybody to make arrangements to attend. It is the Councils duty to listen to the RATEPAYERS and other Residents. We purchased our house on the understanding that Collop Gate Farm was and would remain "Green Belt Land". This land is bounded on Three Sides by Residential Housing and should not be developed industrially. I suggest any further road development (if required at all) to Heywood Business Park / Hareshill road should be done from Junction 3 of the M66 which would cause the least disruption to residential homes and the environment.</p> | |
| 368014/22 | Mr Robert Sherwin | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD The proposals for the protected open land north of Langley Lane Middleton and the proposed link road from Pilsworth Road to the M62 Heywood will kick start a process that will lead to yet further developments . This will effectively join the two towns in to one continuous built up area and ultimately loss of town identity and character. This natural open space is used by hundreds of local people from Heywood and Middleton for walking, jogging, cycling and enjoyment of the great outdoors without having to travel by bus or car to a formal recreation centre. The pleasant rural aspect that greets people who are visiting either town from the motorway will be lost forever. The area acts as a pleasant open rural breathing space between the two towns. I believe that this area should be reclassified for inclusion within the Green Belt and not used for development. There should also be a clear explanation of what the terms Green Belt and Protected Open Land actually mean when describing an area.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 370046/19 | Mr Simon Dennis | <p>It is not clear if the proposed additions to the Green Belt (3a&b) constitute an improvement in their protected status or not. My preference, given their location and therefore the impact on local aesthetics that any re-development of this land would have, would be for the areas to either remain protected as green belt or be</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|------------------------|--|--|
| | | granted green belt status so that they become protected and avoid any such possibility of re-development. | |
| 370270/89 | MR RICHARD ATHERTON | Future proposals to release greenbelt, like it or not, will happen - its called progress. We must be forward thinking and accept the long term housing & industry needs for the next generation. Additional land will be required to meet the boroughs expanding population. All brownfield and greenfield sites within close proximity of the town centres & transport facilities that fit the requirements should be considered first because of their minimum threat of town merging and encroachment into the countryside. | Support noted |
| 381637/251 | Ms Collette Smith | SOUTH HEYWOOD My home will overlook this proposed sight which will be a disaster for very precious green belted land, which is a haven for the community. This sight will be visually overbearing, it will be totally inappropriate and destroy a crucially important and rare part of Middleton. It will also have a devastating effect on the wildlife, the beautiful and rare bird which we see daily, the general public and families who enjoy country walks, jogging, horse riding, and bird watching. It will also have a massive impact on health issues to the local community. This will result in hazards for local people. Noise. Pollution. Greenhouse Gasses Increased Traffic. We have no choice but to breathe air around us, when air is polluted it has been proved we breathe in ozone particles and harmful gasses that can cause damage to our hearts, lungs and overall health, air pollution can cause coughing, runny eyes and breathing problems. It has been proved people with these problems have made remarkable recoveries as soon as air quality improves. people have suffered and died as a result or air pollution, breathing small amounts of air pollution over many years is considered dangerous, it can also lead to life threatening diseases such as cancer which we hear about more now than ever, the young the elderly and people with Asthma are more vulnerable, children are at greater risk as their lungs are still growing, we want our children to be able to play out and lead active independent lives in our safe precious area, we want it unaffected. What do we tell our kids, stay indoors, be less active, avoid the high traffic and industrialised area, this will literally steel our health away. I fully intend to oppose and fight this on behalf of my family, neighbours, and local wildlife. Also I would like to mention this has only be highlighted through the community. This is why have the council been reluctant to inform us properly by letter not just a glossy magazine which barely touched on this. I think this has been handled incorrectly | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 381691/167 | Mr Alan Iddon | SOUTH HEYWOOD I am not in favour of using farm land in Heywood for a link road from the M62 to Heywood Industrial park. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381703/193 | Mr Brian Ogden | SOUTH HEYWOOD My wife and I live at 284 Middleton Road and feel lucky to have green fields to the front and rear of our home. We feel that there is sufficient industrial land in Heywood, Middleton and Rochdale without any more land being taken up for this purpose, together with the considerable increase in traffic and traffic fumes this would bring to our doorstep. There are more than enough empty units on all the surrounding industrial estates which could be used for any prospective businesses without building any more which would more than likely end up empty and derelict. We would therefore like to register our objections to any proposed development on green fields within these proposals. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381705/194 | Mr Andrew Hardman | SOUTH HEYWOOD I am replying to the published Core Strategy preferred options report encompassing the proposed usage of the South Heywood / J19 corridor for such projects as a link road and manufacturing usage. I must firstly say that the whole process has been kept very quiet indeed in respect of notifying the local residents of this major proposal that not only involves everyone who is a taxpayer in the Borough, but also impacts heavily in a detrimental way on a lot of residents. The overall proposal for a link road from Junction 19 to join with Hareshill road not only goes against your initial thinking of making the HGV lorries keep on the M62 and then exit onto the M66 with easy access to Pilsworth and Hareshill industrial units but impacts heavily on the Environment of which you refer to as requiring to protect Green Belt land. The whole issue of development on this land belonging to the local Farm owner has been an unbelievable saga brought on by Rochdale council not pressing for re-instatement of the land back to its original form since 1000's of tons of unknown rubble had been dumped there. This whole core strategy goes some way in explaining why Rochdale council have taken such a lenient approach to this illegal dumping by the farm owner as it is his land that the council need to develop on!!! The whole idea of helping promote new growth in the medium sized businesses has not happened in the last 20 years and by the looks of it seems that the proposals are from yet another council quango which has been set up to justify jobs within the council. The NDC office which was set up over 3 years ago has had ample opportunity to develop attractive shopping areas within the Heywood town centre yet look what we have got for all of that investment? Please take a look around Hareshill and Pilsworth Industrial estates and you | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | will clearly see 100's of Thousands of square feet of empty industrial units that have yet to be let to businesses within these prime industrial estates, why will a short cut that will save 5 mins help fill these empty spaces!!! | |
| 381707/200 | Mr Darren Buckley | SOUTH HEYWOOD It has been brought to my attention that plans are being prepared to redevelop GREEN belt land on the out skirts of Heywood in order to improve HGV congestion in the town. I would like to strongly object to this move and believe there are a number of alternative solutions to the problem rather than take away fields and open space. The Heywood distribution park whilst bring economic benefits to the area- can also create an environmental problem. Existing links from the M66 are not sufficient and I would like to see these improved and develop the land which is currently used for land fill etc. Another option could to consider developing land at the rear of the Birch service area and connect this with Whittle lane.. This would avoid the taking away of valuable green belt land. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381708/195 | Mrs M Dean | SOUTH HEYWOOD I was at the meeting last Tuesday at the Heywood Civic Centre, and am surprised that such a scheme should be considered at all 1 .The land is green belt and has been developed enough both by industry and housing 2. The industrial site down at Pilsworth, the second largest in Europe is not used to its full capacity 3. The proposed link road from the motorway serves no purpose other than a short cut for lorries to the site, who should be using the existing motorway exit, coming off at Pilsworth on the M66 4. Traffic lights at Coronation Ave I agree are needed, but to put another set of lights at Hareshill Rd crossing Manchester Rd, will cause mayhem at rush hour. In an area that has more than its fair share of heavy goods vehicles going to the Green Lane industrial site. The road you are planning will serve no purpose and will only make things worse. 5. The cost for something that isn't necessary .the noise and disruption to residents and also the M62 motorway, will cause havoc in the area. 6. Loss of open green spaces and public footpaths where people walk are being lost or they are being diverted and when more units go up the area wouldn't be pleasant to walk around anyway. The quality of life for people living nearby should be considered. Industry and housing do not mix e.g. noise pollution and traffic. 7 All that is needed is a dual carriageway building from the Pilsworth M66 exit into a new entrance at that end the traffic is mostly in that area and is not inconveniencing residents of either Pilsworth Rd or Hareshill Manchester Rd. That stretch of road is in need of repair anyway so with this in mind it has got to, | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|---------------------|---|--|
| | | cheaper than building a new road that serves no purpose and also having to repair the old road. Overall Heywood has two large industrial developments plus other industries, three derelict mills that are rotting away and three landfills, with hardly any town centre improvements. Any further industrial developments will cause more traffic problems and will not help in the environmental well being of its residents. It appears from your plans that Rochdale and Middleton are getting or have already got new shopping centres and bus stations, whilst Heywood is being made into a giant warehouse. | |
| 381710/196 | Mr Robert Mudd | SOUTH HEYWOOD I use pilsworth road everyday to get to work travelling from heywood down to just past the M66.and it has been hammered by the consistent use of heavy goods vehicles leaving it in a very poor state of repair. I am in full support of the "Link Road" as I am sure many other motorists are. I just hope that "Rochdale Council" along with "Bury Council" have the good sense to not only fully repair "Pilsworth Road" after the "Link Road" has been built but also bring about the improvements that are drastically needed to the drainage system for preventing the flooding of this road. Apart from the stretch which resulted in many houses being flooded on the two occasions that I know about there are two other places that come to mind. The first is at the corner of the junction leading down to the M66 where a tragic young life was so unnecessarily wasted, and the second is opposite "Heywood Distribution Park" where the run off from the fields causes a great deal of flooding. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381885/197 | Ms Julie Entwistle | SOUTH HEYWOOD I've read in the Advertiser this week that residents are opposed to the relief road - well those that have a view out over green fields might object, but I suspect the majority of residents on Manchester Road, Middleton Road and Coronation Avenue are welcoming this with open arms. What residents need to realise is that they don't have a right to a view. Although the lorry gate at Hareshill Road has helped enormously with diverting HGVs via Pilsworth, we are still in Hopwood swamped with traffic, mainly cars, and often at peak times, driven by workers from Pilsworth/Heywood Distribution Park just driving through Hopwood to get to the motorway. So, I say bring it on - the sooner the better. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381887/198 | Mr Steve Darlington | SOUTH HEYWOOD I have looked at the above proposal, specifically with regard to the plans applying to Heywood and refer to the following particular extracts from the Preferred Option: From the Foreword by the Deputy Leader: "In planning the next 15 years, we will need to build on our strengths: our proximity to Manchester and the beauty of our countryside"and also from the | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|---------------|---|--|
| | | Preferred Options consultation leaflet, specifically under Heywood, plans and objectives "To protect and promote the rural character and make better use of the countryside" I note that the plans include a trunk road connection from the M62 to Heywood Distribution Park which would slice through Green Belt land and other developments to be carried out on protected land. There is no explanation anywhere as to how the laudable objectives highlighted above are to be achieved by the inclusion of such proposed developments. Perhaps the "green" objectives are just a cynical use of words with no intention of their being fulfilled. Has no consideration been given to upgrading the existing road from the M66 to Heywood Distribution Park as presumably 50% of the traffic will come from the West? You will gather from the above that I am not in favour of any plan that involves further loss of Green Belt land in Heywood too much of which has been lost in recent years. | |
| 381888/203 | Mr Mark Bell | SOUTH HEYWOOD We feel that there are more than enough brown field sites in the borough which could be used for development. Infrastructure is already in place at Kingsway - it has ideal links to the motorway which are already established at previous cost to the tax payer – why on earth take away greenbelt fields forever for industry which will disrupt and ruin many peoples wellbeing. For e.g. two shift workers live at our address, by putting industry yards from our homes, it would disrupt day time sleep with obvious consequences – this would be totally unjustified when there are plenty of other options. With regard to the proposed road from Junction 19 – Hareshill Road, across greenbelt fields, we would like point out as Hopwood residents who's back garden backs onto Manchester Road that since signs were put at exits of the motorway asking lorries to rejoin and come off at Junction 18 plus the road narrowing blocks were placed at Hareshill Road. Several years ago, there has been a noticeable difference of less vibration and noise due to less lorries on Manchester Road. By creating the road, it's an open invitation for developers to not just build housing but industrial units by the 'back door' through having the road built. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381889/204 | Mr Simon Noon | SOUTH HEYWOOD Bought house next to greenbelt for quality of life in a quiet cul-de-sac would like to keep it that way. If greenbelt built on there will be nowhere for wildlife to go and nowhere for water to drain if another built up area is added. Also this will cause more problems on already busy roads. Hareshill road was closed a few years ago to stop lorries coming this way – they do not pass houses if they come off at Pilsworth. There are un let units on Heywood | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|------------------|--|--|
| | | Distribution Park and Kingsway so there is no need to build more industrial units. The greenbelt separates Heywood and Middleton. At present only one way in and out of the estate if extended and a through road put in, burglaries will increase as they'll have a better escape route. The plans will devalue our house and hinder the enjoyment of a peaceful area where we choose to buy. | |
| 381890/205 | L Taylor | SOUTH HEYWOOD On purchasing my property – it was imperative to purchase a house in a quiet area with no through road. I feel that opening up the greenbelt land will not only change the environment for my very young children i.e. traffic, noise, pollution etc but there will be an effect on house price etc! My main concern is future “through” traffic on our estate! It is very family friendly i.e. children on bikes etc – and I feel this possible development and through road for heavy duty vehicles would jeopardise our living! Also in my opinion as to see it on a daily basis no through road is needed from J19 to Pilsworth Road as it simple isn't busy enough! I trust the Council realise if house prices decrease so will Council Tax entitlement. Also where has all the “greenbelt” land gone? And there is only 1 primary school in Hopwood with not enough spaces already! | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381892/206 | Mrs Ann Kent | SOUTH HEYWOOD We moved to this property for a reason to escape housing estates, and industrial estates close to our property, we moved from our previous location to get away from that for a better life for ourselves. We used our savings and took out a mortgage at our time of life, when we were mortgage free before. If we wanted to look at industrial estates we would of stayed where we lived before. We want fields at the back of us, countryside, greenbelt that's why what we fell in love with when we brought it. And at the end of the day that's how we want it to stay greenbelt and that's what we paid for greenbelt area. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381894/208 | Mr Graham Miller | SOUTH HEYWOOD Can I just tell you how outraged and furious I am regarding your proposed planning on the greenbelt area at the back of my property. (Industrial estates, housing, and a link road) we moved away from areas like that and put all our savings on this house for a better life, now you want to take it away from us with your suggestions doesn't bear thinking of we moved here for the countryside at the back and that how we want it to stay greenbelt. So please let it stay like it is now. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381897/210 | Mr James Porter | SOUTH HEYWOOD It is not necessary for a new motorway link from M62 at Junction 19 across Collop Gate (greenbelt land) to Harehill Road linking it to the business parks at Pilsworth. My suggestion to solve this as an alternative would be to add more | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|---------------|---|--|
| | | <p>signposting for heavy traffic along the M62 to the M66 leading to the ASDA roundabout which could be redeveloped along with the Moss Hall Road junction making it a more direct route to the business parks. This would also solve the problem of people losing their houses on Hareshill Road and the loss of greenbelt land. There would be no loss of greenbelt land which runs from Hopwood to Langley Bore to protect the lovely landscape along Middleton Road and Manchester Road towards Langley Lane and Birch. There is no need for anymore industrial parks. Kingsway Business Park for example is a business park which is under developed and has lots of empty building plots that need occupying before anymore are planned. Look at all business parks in the Rochdale Borough and make sure that all these are occupied before planning more proposed sites. Housing – look at derelict area's which can be developed. Leave our greenbelt area's alone to surround all boundaries of Heywood.</p> | |
| 382012/247 | Jillian Jones | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD I wish to raise my objection to the proposals being put forward in the Core Strategy Preferred Options. I am appalled and dismayed to see that these proposals will remove a significant amount of open green space around Middleton and Heywood, which will completely change the landscape and area. Of the site options put forward in the document 'Rochdale Borough Core Strategy Issues and Options Report - Sept 2008', I specifically wish to object to the following site options:- Option 4 - Middleton West, Heywood Old Road, Middleton Option 5 - Land North of Langley Lane (East), Middleton Option 6 - Land North of Langley Lane (West), Middleton Option 8 - Land North of Hareshill Road, Heywood Option 9 - Land South of Manchester Road, Heywood The reasons for my objections include the following:- 1. These proposals will remove a significant amount of open green space around Middleton and Heywood, which will completely change the landscape and area. 2. Replacing the green areas with industrial, retail and housing developments will have a detrimental effect on the local residents, as the open green space is good for the well being of individuals. 3. Many local residents use the green space for recreational activity and exercise. These are well established walking, running and cycling routes. Removing these areas will have an adverse effect on the health of local individuals. 4. It is highly likely that many of the current residents will look to sell up and leave the area, which is not good for the local communities. 5. Although Middleton and Heywood is divided by the M62, the open green</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|----------|--|--|
| | | <p>space helps to maintain fresh air and also encourages wild life. 6. Removal of the green areas will have a detrimental effect on the wide variety of wild life. 7. There are numerous developments around the area that are not being fully utilised. Also brown field sites can be identified. These areas should be considered for development instead, with transport being made available to enable people to travel to the jobs created. 8. If the green spaces are replaced with tile suggested developments. There is a significant risk that the buildings will remain empty and attract vandalism, which will bring down the area. 9. We should be encouraging more green areas, not less. If new areas have been identified for conversion into green belt, then this should still go ahead, but in addition to the existing green areas, not instead of them. 10. The quality of the public transport infrastructure within the area is poor, particularly in respect of the rail infrastructure. This should be invested in before the green land is considered to be taken away. 11. The quality of the retail within Heywood, Middleton and Rochdale town centres requires investment, in priority of removing our green areas. 12. Converting our green areas into industrial and retail developments does not guarantee jobs for local residents and in fact is more likely to increase the levels of traffic within the area, causing disruption and pollution for local residents. 13. Removing the green areas and replacing them with the proposals will increase the carbon footprint for the area and is not good for the environment. As a resident of Middleton for over 15 years, I am extremely disappointed that Rochdale MBC appear to have deliberately avoided making these proposals widely known. I understand that leaflets, explaining the proposals, should have been distributed to local residents some time ago, but due to the cost, these were not delivered. I find this totally unacceptable. I also cannot understand how the council can truly believe that building on the green belt areas can provide any benefits to the local community, especially when there are plenty of non green areas that would be much more suitable. The council should be ensuring that the green belt is protected for the long term future.</p> | |
| 382026/199 | Mr Lomax | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD We are writing to you in relation the proposed planning for a link road from the M62 motorway to Pilsworth Road. Unfortunately we were unable to attend the meeting last week due to work commitments but have spoke to friends who did attend. We are totally against the plans as we live at Manchester Road at the junction of Hareshill Road which is where the new road is possibly</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>going to be. We purchased our home 12 years ago. The reason we bought our home is because of its beautiful semi-rural location and a wonderful area to bring up our young family. Over the years we have spent close to £100,000 in improving our home and have finally got it to an excellent standard, so you can imagine our upset about your plans. Over time we have opposed plans for the landfill which still went ahead. This has taken away our lovely green view to a view of mounds of mud and flashing lorry lights. There are also currently plans going through for a possible food waste disposal at 3 Hareshill Road. Again this will spoil the beautiful landscape, not to mention the vermin that it will attract. We are absolutely dumfounded that this new link road could be passed. It is totally unnecessary to the area. Why not spend the money on improving on signs for the HGV's to read on the motorway. We don't see a problem with them continuing to use Junction 18 of the motorway to get to Pitsworth Road, thus not upsetting people like us in residential areas. We feel we have suffered enough over the years and it is about time that the council left this area alone. It is probably the only rural setting in the whole of Heywood and you are planning to totally ruin it. Please show some consideration to us residents who have to live here.</p> | |
| 382265/391 | Mr Mervyn Simpson | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD As one of many residents of Heywood, I know there are significant housing projects under starters orders in Heywood including: Rose Hill St/Moor St, Argyll St/Unity, Caseys/Green lane, The Bamford Squash/Bamford Rd plus many more identifiable brown field sites of demolished property on Back O' the Moss Heady Hill and George Street to name but a few. There are also possibilities of converting old mills such as The Mutual, The Crimble etc etc. into desirable properties. It is clear the stakeholders do not consider storage units occupying 5 acres but employing a dozen people a comparison of employment when there is a prolific excess already empty and producing nothing, not just here but also in Rochdale. Heywood does not consist of stacker truck drivers and shelf stackers. What you advocate is a clear neglect of inner brown field sites and produced the crisis behind the disintegration of many inner city areas during the 70's. Heywood wants Heywood to remain swathed by greenbelt, that is the essence of why it was created, if you cannot offer help then please vacate and allow people who live here and care to carry out the wishes of the people. Please understand, you must start again with your plans, or better still pass the message on to government that the stakeholders will not accept dictatorship helping developers to force proposals against our</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|---------------------|---|--|
| | | wishes onto our peripheral boundaries. | |
| 389293/376 | Mr Frederick Grundy | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD I wish to object to the proposed plans to the link road from junction 19 to Hares Hill Road and the plans to build on Collop farm Hopwood and more industry on Hares Hill Road. Living on Middleton road Hopwood just passed junction 19 towards Heywood a link road will increase the noise and air pollution more than that we are already suffering at the moment. As it is we cannot have our back windows open at night because of the traffic noise from the motorway and to bring traffic closer to our property will intensify the noise and air pollution. As for building houses at the back of our property it will bring down the prices of our houses and be over looked and spoil our view that we have paid for in the price of our property, and before you say you don't pay for views how is it that councils are thinking of charging extra rates on properties that have a nice outlook. We would never have contemplated moving into such close proximity of the M62 Motorway had there not been such a lovely view from the back of the house, as it stands now the front of the house has a road where the traffic is horrendous and the back of the house still has its beautiful views which makes living here acceptable. Building houses and a link road at the back would destroy anything that the houses have got going for them as well as the wild life that come into the back garden and the fields beyond. We feel that Heywood has enough land designated for industry, and to allocate more especially on green belt land you are over developing this area as the traffic as it is now is already at saturation point. You state it will bring in more quality jobs, firms wishing to move into the Heywood area will bring their own skilled staff with them leaving only a few low paid jobs for the people of Heywood, this will add more traffic to the local roads as people commute into Heywood to their place of work. As an engineer working in the Oldham area the firm I work for employ people from as far as Warrington Leeds and Pontefract companies only want to employ the best in their field and in today's present climate people are willing to travel, so in my view you are not creating jobs only a lot more traffic from commuters and commercial vehicles serving the proposed new industries. NB. Attached is a petition from residents of Middleton Road and Collop Drive (This includes 17 people).</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 389696/587 | D Cosgrove | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD I attended yesterdays public meeting at Heywood civic centre first of all I was taken aback by peoples feelings towards Rochdale Councils approach to matters of local concern. I wholeheartedly agree with the sentiment that you the</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|--------------|--|--|
| | | council should STOP this farce now. People of Heywood are united in our opinion that your plans have already been decided upon despite your assurances to the contrary. I will put my name to any partition/action to appose your plans for the sake of our town. | |
| 389710/552 | Linda Thorpe | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD Following attendance at a public meeting at the Civic Hall Heywood we would like register the points of objection to the future development within the town of Heywood. New link Road, from Middleton Road to Manchester Road to existing Hareshill Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will cause more traffic congestion than is already present on Manchester Road • Heavy goods vehicles will then use Hareshill Road cause excessive air and noise pollution - also excessive traffic congestion • Traffic to and through the town centre will be severely congested Existing warehouse / industrial storage • 30% of the existing storage at Heywood Distribution Park is empty • 90% of the existing storage at Broadfield Industrial Estate is empty • the newly developed industrial site at Kingsway Rochdale is 90% empty Reduction of air quality. • Two areas within the M62 / M66 corridor are presently below Government guidelines. Future proposals will increase this level. Noise Pollution • This will also increase with current proposals <p>It seems that under the current proposals thought has not been given to any other options ie</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New link road from Heywood Distribution Park through to Junction 3 of the M66 via Pilsworth Road, Moss Hall Road and left at Pilsworth Road straight to the M66. <p>This option would not only reduce traffic around the Manchester Road / Hareshill Road area it would make an easier and more viable route for drivers. Why build more Industrial space when the existing areas are not to full capacity. It appears that Rochdale Council have not given any thought to the quality of life for the people of Hopwood and Heywood as they seem eager to take all green areas away and replace these few areas with unused industrial sites. Whereas the development of a park / leisure / play area would give the young people of the district somewhere to spend some quality time. The local primary school, currently located in Magdala Street, would benefit the community if it was replace with a larger and more modern school. This could be sited on one of the areas 'earmarked' for industrial and would be far more beneficial to the residents especially if new homes are to be built within the area.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 390119/548 | Lynne Kelly | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD I am writing to voice my opposition to any redevelopment of green belt land in the vicinity of Heywood and Bowlee, Middleton. It is imperative that these areas which are effectively "green lungs" between the towns are retained for the</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>enjoyment of the community. In fact your own strategy document demonstrates that there is "broad agreement that the green belt should be protected". There are industrial buildings and land nearby the proposed redevelopment sites that are standing unused, eg. Pilsworth Industrial Estate, Heywood Industrial Estate and around the Junction at M66/Pilsworth (under Bury Council I presume) which should be filled before any new building is considered. Although I understand you are trying to comply with a government directive, that directive is fundamentally flawed. It does not take into consideration the shared boundaries, e.g. Rochdale and Bury, where the unused industrial spaces are, and potential new planning should be looked at on a wider scale to take this into consideration. I would ask you to consider all brownfield land for potential industrial build first. Regarding residential housing, again there are plenty of brownfield sites which should be filled first. Indeed there are already several newbuild estates in the planning stages in Heywood -two with Countryside Homes. There are over one million homes in the UK that are currently unoccupied due to the owner's abandonment and these should be brought back into use. To that end I would ask if Rochdale MBC has an Empty Property Officer as so many councils now do throughout the country - and if not, why not? It is the council's responsibility to look at this situation and someone designated to look at this problem throughout the Rochdale Borough would make a difference to the numbers of houses required in the future. Therefore bringing empty homes back into use and planning to build on brownfield land should be looked at first, which would then affect the area of greenbelt land which might be needed in the future, but it is not acceptable at this stage to take great areas of greenbelt for potential newbuild (private housing or affordable housing?) without having an accurate understanding of future need. Regarding the proposed Relief Road from Junction 19 of the M62. There is in fact already a motorway relief road to the Pilsworth/Heywood Industrial Estates - it's called the M66! If you had to build a road to this area then surely it should come from Birch Services area where lorries could exit directly towards the industrial estates and this would cause less disruption than a relief road from J19 which would cut a swathe through the green belt area towards Hareshill Road. In principle I have no opposition to lorries using Hareshill Road itself as I often see HGVs (usually foreign ones) stuck at the junction of Hareshill and Manchester Road unable to access their destination. They have probably followed their satnavs</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>and are always lost. I would suggest that you allow large vehicles along Hareshill Road Instead of the narrowing area at this junction as it would minimise heavy traffic which now has to travel through Heywood centre and Hopwood, or Whittle Lane. I believe this narrowing area which prevents larger vehicles travelling along Hareshill Road has contributed to the heavy traffic through Heywood centre and Hopwood. It also prevents large vehicles accessing Darnhill and north Heywood and Bury, and again sends more traffic through Heywood town centre –a problem which can be alleviated. This is not to encourage lorries through Hopwood/Birch towards the route via Hareshill as they should follow the M62/M66 link as I am sure most of them do, but as in some cases this is not the case it would make sense to facilitate access for these lorries. I would also suggest better signage to help these vehicles find their way - it is sadly lacking and part of the problem for vehicles trying to access the industrial areas. In conclusion, I object to your plans for the areas of land north of Langley Lane, Bowlee in Middleton, and south of Heywood, as I believe there are other ways of solving traffic problems, and other options for redevelopment of industrial and residential land. To destroy greenbelt land forever where it is rapidly declining is not acceptable and I know I am one of many residents who will continue to oppose your plans for our community.</p> | |
| 396034/407 | Mr Louis Henry | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD At the Public Consultation on the application by Segro for a Simplified Planning Zone, one of your officers from Strategic Planning volunteered the information that the proposed link road from junction 19 of M62 was to facilitate the access of HGVs to the Business Park rather than making them use Junction 3 M66. It seems that this is the real reason for proposing such a road, and should it come to fruition the net result will be to create a rat run of traffic at peak times from Junction 19 along the link onto Hareshill Road left at Pilsworth Road to Bury via Heap Bridge for those people working and living in Bury and right at Hareshill Road and Pilsworth Road for those people working in Heywood. The former will miss Simister roundabout and the latter will miss the tailbacks at Coronation Avenue and Manchester Road. The Highways report in support of the SPZ referred to the fact that 85% of traffic accessing the Business Park use junction 3 of M66, and as there is a Section 106 agreement as part of the grant of a planning application by Segro for the road junction at Moss Hall Road and Pilsworth Road to be upgraded, it follows that the most cost effective way to access the Business Park is via Junction 3. The proposed link road will have</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|--|
| | | <p>other implications along Manchester Road because it is connected to the M62 and will have a direct bearing on the amount of traffic that the Motonvay takes; bearing in mind the proposed management of the hard shoulder along M62 by the Highways Agency, by any criterion this a major road proposal and should be the subject of a separate Public Inquiry and not be part of the Core Strategy. Turning now to the alteration of the green belt at Heywood South, the Regional Spatial Strategy and the Regional Spatial Framework both envisage no strategic alteration to the green belt. Unless there is a direction to Local Authorities regarding green belt which I am unaware of, it follows therefore that there should be no alteration to the green belt and you should look again at what land is available particularly as the neighbouring Authority at Oldham has identified Kingsway Business Park as a location for jobs in their Plan.</p> | |
| 396047/143 | Mr Gary Loudon | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD I strongly object to release of greenbelt to the South of Heywood for reasons previously mentioned.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 396092/379 | The Casey Group (Tom Myerscough & Co - Mr Tom Myerscough) | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD My client: The Casey Group owns the land belonging to Hares Hill Farm situated south of Hares Hill Road and Pilsworth Road and more specifically the land over which the proposed link from Pilsworth Road to Junction 19 of the M62 is proposed to run in the core strategy preferred option. The Casey Group are in support of the proposals advocating the development of land south of Heywood for long term employment use and are willing to act with other interested parties in co-ordinating action to fulfil the realisation of these proposals. Land at Hares Hill Farm, is currently in the process of being developed as an Equestrian Centre but the Casey Groups architect has been instructed to look at ways to amend the current development proposals to accommodate the long term employment land release proposals. An initial examination of the practicalities of accommodating the link road between Pilsworth Road and Hares Hill Road across part of Hares Hill Farm would suggest that an easier on site location for the road would be further south but that argument could be advanced at a future date when surveying work on the proposed road line takes place. At this stage however the Casey Group wishes to confirm their support of the release of Green Belt land in the longer term at Heywood South for the provision of necessary employment land and will cooperate in the future planning stages of the proposal.</p> | Support noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 396108/424 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | <p>3.69 We are supportive of the principal intent of Policy R2 which states that the primary role of the Green Belt in the south of the Borough is to prevent the merger and coalescence of neighbouring</p> | Support for release of green belt south of Heywood noted. However the Council considers that there is only justification for |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | <p>towns. 3.70 As stated previously we are supportive of the Council's stance of the need for localised reviews of the Green Belt within the District to release land where it will meet the strategic needs, and in particular .where this will achieve more sustainable forms of development and support economic growth in accessible locations. 3.71 On the counter point we would oppose in principle the addition of land in to the Green Belt "to make up the numbers". For land to be added to the Green Belt it must be clearly demonstrated that the land fulfils the purpose of land within the Green Belt having regard to paragraphs 2.6-2.1 1 of PPG2. Non Green Belt areas of 'Open Land' are protected by policy restricting development and inclusion within the Green Belt is not needed to prevent their untimely inappropriate development. 3.72 We are supportive of the release of land to the south of Heywood for the delivery of employment, jobs and the infrastructure to deliver it. We support the release and appropriate development of such land. 3.73 We are supportive of proposals to remove Estate land from the Green Belt to the east of Hareshill Road as indicated in Figure 3.1 "Land East of Hareshill Road" map. See page 19 of the attached file. 3.74 In order to provide for the longer term employment land requirements of the District we are also supportive of the release of land from the Green Belt to the South of Pilsworth Road west of Hareshill Road. It is appropriate for this land to be removed from Green Belt status and identified as safeguarded land reserved for future employment development. 3.75 Rochdale Council will have a dilemma with regards to how much land to release from the Green Belt south of Piisworth Road and to ensure that a "permanent" boundary is identified. To this end we would suggest that the beck / stream be identified as the proposed Green Belt boundary. As safeguarded land the Council can then subsequently control the release of the land at a suitable time through the creation of a suitable phasing policy which can be guided through an appropriate trigger mechanism for release which can be managed through the Annual Monitoring Report process. Figure 3.2 "Land South of Pilsworth Road" map . See page 20 of the attached file, demonstrates the extent of the area in question which extends to 56.5ha or so. 3.77 This area of land is within two ownerships, the Estate and Casey Group. We are aware that similar representations are submitted on their behalf. 3.78 Some 18.1ha of Estate land at Rhodes Green, Middleton is one of the areas of land proposed for inclusion in the Green Belt. This area is currently defined as "safeguarded/protected open land" and</p> | <p>releasing some 35 hectares of land to meet its longer term development requirements. The identification of the exact green belt boundary is a matter for the Site Allocations DPD to deal with and further consultation will be required.</p> <p>Following advice from GONW, PINS and NWRDA, the Council no longer proposes to identify additions to the green belt in this Core Strategy.</p> |
|--|--|--|---|

| | | | |
|------------|-------------|--|--|
| | | <p>was excluded from the Green Belt as it was not deemed to fulfil a "Green Belt function" at the time the Green Belt was designated.</p> <p>3.79 We oppose the addition of land to the Green Belt where such land does not fulfil the statutory purpose of including land within the Green Belt. 3.80 To our knowledge there has been no change in terms of national guidance (PPG2), other legislation or Case Law which affects the circumstances or status of the land at Rhodes Green. There is no material provided in the draft Core Strategy to justify inclusion of this land within the Green Belt or to demonstrate why it now serves a Green Belt function. 3.81 To our mind the mechanics of the Council's proposed policy is a "numbers exercise" rather than based on a sound planning argument. Put simplistically it requires that the removal of up to 58 ha of land from the Green Belt at South Heywood requires the provision of "compensation" Green Belt at Rhodes Green. The "numbers game" is not a valid justification. We remain to be convinced that the Land at Rhodes Green is suitable for inclusion and if the Council were to maintain this argument that it may trigger a requirement for the Council to undertake a more formal Green Belt review to inform any additions to the Green Belt.</p> | |
| 396129/595 | Helen Fynan | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD • Development of green space land We strongly object to the taking and development of greenspace land regardless of its use, whether this is employment, housing or industrial warehouses. We do not think that Rochdale Council have fully explored the various brownfield sites within the borough before coming to the conclusion to take open greenspace land for development. They tried to assure us at the public meetings that this had been explored fully but we were left unconvinced. There are so many unused industrial sites on Kingsway, Stakehill and Pilsworth already that surely a more thorough and transparent investigation of these sites and their potential uses should take place before there is a move to take away any greenspace land. The Council should then publish their findings on these investigations so that residents feel that our Council has done everything in its power to ensure that brownfield sites have been considered first. We worry that the evidence from the past suggests that when developments have been objected to by residents of Rochdale MBC that their views have not been taken into consideration and the plans have gone through and do not resemble the original planning application. Evidence was given about this at the public meetings regarding the developments which have already taken place on Hareshill Road in</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>South Heywood. We do not even know at this stage what type of planning applications will be submitted for these sites - how do we comment on something we do not know and how do we ensure that the planning applications would be acceptable - given that we do not know what is proposed to be built there? • Link road being built between Pilsworth Road and Junction 19 of the M62. We strongly object to a link road being built as it will run straight through open space. How is this improving the image of the borough? At the public meetings it was discussed that there will be traffic lights and traffic management systems in place - but the feelings from residents was that it will add to the heavy congestion on the main routes through Heywood and Middleton. In particular congestion on Heywood Old Road, Pilsworth Road and Hollins Lane on the other side. On a personal note we live in Middleton, off Langley Lane and work in Crumpsall, near Cheetham Hill Road and at the University of Manchester. At the moment we cannot drive down Heywood Old Road to get to the Heaton Park roundabout (Junction 19 of the M66) due to the congestion building up at the roundabout and then the same down Middleton Road. It can take Helen an hour to get to Crumpsall which is approximately a 4 mile journey and it can take Colin over 1 hour to get to Oxford Road. Similarly if we get on the motorway at Junction 19 of the M62 the slip road is fine but then the whole motorway comes to a complete standstill whilst trying to negotiate the Simister roundabout - causing gridlock and a high number of incidents involving traffic accidents. If we cannot complete our journey to work now how long will it take if these residential and employment sites are built around South Heywood and Middleton increasing cars and HGV's to and from these sites? We do not feel that Rochdale MBC has given due consideration to developing Junction 3 of the M66 to improve links to Pilsworth Industrial Estate. It was highlighted at the public meetings that this junction was developed specifically to serve Pilsworth Industrial Estate. We would like to see this option investigated before proposals are put forward regarding a link road. • Environment We feel that the taking of unused land whether greenspace or land used for leisure purposes, will further restrict the opportunities that children have to develop in the community and give them the freedom to play, roam and exercise in a safe environment free from industrial pollutants and the dangers that any increase in road traffic brings with it. As a family, we have also noticed the return of wildlife to the area that we have never seen in the area before, Woodpeckers, Kestrels, Foxes,</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------------|-------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Hedgehogs, Geese, Squirrels to name but a few. We are confident that any industrial changes to the areas surrounding the habitats of such animals will again assure the destruction of these species from the land and deny the whole community and its visitors the opportunity to experience close up the wonders of seeing such animals in a natural environment. • Leisure Opportunities We believe the only suggestion in terms of improved leisure facilities to the community is an extension to the 'Lancashire' on Bowlee which is a private members club that the majority of residents in the area cannot afford to use. What use will this be to a community, when they can already use opportunities for 'Free Exercise' by walking, running, cycling, horse riding on the land that you propose to build on. This to our mind is your lack of understanding of the community you are supposed to work for and to listen to. • Communication from Rochdale MBC We would like to raise the issue of communication between Rochdale MBC and its residents. We feel it is very poor. The proposals we are discussing only came to light in December 2009 due to some diligent residents within the area. These plans were "communicated" via the Rochdale MBC's publication "Local Matters" which the majority of householders within the borough did not receive. At the public consultation meetings the Planning Officers assured us that this was being looked into. However, it leaves us feeling angry that such an important matter was allowed to "slip through the net" and was not afforded the due diligence it deserved when communicating with residents. We hope you will take our views into consideration when making your decision.</p> | |
| 396130/621 | Gill Howard | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD I do not agree with any of the proposals in the Core Strategy Proposals that involve the development of any of the land south of Heywood or any of the land between Middleton and Heywood (Langley Lane & Bowlee) I feel the removal of more open space for the purpose of warehouse/industrial/office, road, housing and retail: a) is not in keeping with the area; b) will not contribute to health; c) will not improve the economy; d) will not improve quality of place; e) will not encourage visitors; f) will not improve or protect the environment; and g) will not improve transport. I also think that the south of the borough is being sacrificed to meet government requirements without due consideration of how continually eroding our precious green spaces will impact in the long term. The area already has large areas of industrial park development – Pilsworth, Green Lane and Heywood – a great deal of which is empty (also Kingsway and Stakehill). Building more of the same does not mean:</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>a) they get filled; or b) if they do - that there will be new jobs; or c) if there are new jobs – that those jobs would benefit local people. Putting in a link road from junction 19 to a set of traffic lights at Hareshill Road – as was discussed at length at the Heywood meeting - is a recipe for major standing traffic congestion north and south on Heywood Old Road and east and west on Hareshill/link road. Hareshill presently has traffic barriers due to problems with a heavy loads and goods traffic so reopening the road to all traffic again is unacceptable. Not only would there be a problem of increased congestion and heavy goods traffic there is also the issue of school run traffic and child safety due to the proximity of Siddall Moor and Magdala Street schools. As was also mentioned at the Heywood meeting - a link road will provide a 'rat-run' from j19 M62 to j3 M66 and vice versa for those wishing to avoid Simister Island. I think a link road and envisaged traffic congestion would worsen air quality in an area which already has some air quality problems due to the existing motorways. We should be looking at how to avoid making the problem worse and into ways to maximise the green spaces between Middleton and Heywood not eroding them bit by bit. I think the policy for managing the green belt is wrong . You should be protecting the green belt from all development at all costs - not saying it can be used if you think it should.</p> | |
| 396142/389 | Miss Karen Dutton | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD 1. Link road from M62 to Hareshill including traffic lights on Manchester Road and Hareshill Road The congestion in this area would be horrendous. All HGVs would use this road and not. the M66 Junction 3 which was built for Heywood Industrial Estate (not Asda as the speaker stated!) The traffic is already congested when the DHSS store changes shift as cars park up on main road to collect personnel. Health and Safety of School children has not been considered as they are picked up and dropped off on Manchester Road. Road calming measures would cause huge tail hacks. The junction on M66 should be widened and used. How a councillor can say it had not been considered when it was also raised in previous meeting in Middleton tells a story! Look more at this junction rather than just giving in to businesses. Has anyone considered the problem of link road and Birch Services???? Coming from West to East it is already a blackspot for accidents for traffic coming off Birch Services onto M62 whilst traffic trying to come off for Heywood. The amount of lorries coming off would be like a convoy causing even more accidents 2. Development of Collop Gate Farm/Hareshill for Housing/Development. The amount of traffic in</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>the area would be a Health and Safety Issue. No new schools planned. There is not enough school places for local children now. There are Industrial Units available on most Industrial site in the area including Heywood, Pilsworth, Broadfield, Kingsway, Stakehill and Whittle. There is no need to build any more until these are nearly full. All the council will be doing is giving grants to companies to come into Heywood this taking employment off other areas and leaving buildings derelict. You only need to look at Heywood (large units) and Pilsworth (small units) to see no more are needed and many empty. With a big development planned at Stakehill up to A627M why is such a huge area being planned for Heywood when not directly next to a motorway? How many trucks do the Planning Office think will be in the Hareshill/Hopwood area? 3. Health and environment Air & noise pollution! Not even considered. M62/M66 already above government guidelines! Governments wants more people exercising they won't do it along queues of lorries. Hospitals - Rochdale Infirmary and Fairfield Hospital (Bury) set for closure. Which hospitals are going to serve so many people? 4. Housing. It was stated that high quality large houses were required in Heywood as sufficient terrace houses already available. Who is going to buy expensive houses when so much Industry, HGVs and pollution is near! What has happened with the development on Gort????</p> | |
| 397147/619 | Mr Mark Chadwick | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD I do not agree with any of the proposals in the Core Strategy Proposals that involve the development of any of the land south of Heywood or any of the land between Middleton and Heywood (Langley Lane & Bowlee) I feel the removal of more open space for the purpose of warehouse/industrial/office, road, housing and retail: • is not in keeping with the area; • will not contribute to health; • will not improve the economy; • will not improve quality of place; • will not encourage visitors; • will not improve or protect the environment; and • will not improve transport. I also think that the south of the borough is being sacrificed to meet government requirements without due consideration of how continually eroding our precious green spaces will impact in the long term. The area already has large areas of industrial park development - Pilsworth, Green Lane and Heywood - a great deal of which is empty (also Kingsway and Stakehill). Building more of the same does not mean: • they get filled; or • if they do -that there will be new jobs; or • if there are new jobs -that those jobs would benefit local people. Putting in a link road from junction 19 to a set of traffic lights at</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Hareshill Road - as was discussed at length at the Heywood meeting - is a recipe for major standing traffic congestion north and south on Heywood Old Road and east and west on Hareshill/link road. Hareshill presently has traffic barriers due to problems with a heavy loads and goods traffic so reopening the road to all traffic again is unacceptable. Not only would there be a problem of increased congestion and heavy goods traffic there is also the issue of school run traffic and child safety due to the proximity of Siddall Moor and Magdala Street schools. As was also mentioned at the Heywood meeting - a link road will provide a 'rat-run' from J19 M62 to j3 M66 and vice versa for those wishing to avoid Simister Island. I think a link road and envisaged traffic congestion would worsen air quality in an area which already has some air quality problems due to the existing motorways. We should be looking at how to avoid making the problem worse and into ways to maximise the green spaces between Middleton and Heywood not eroding them bit by bit.</p> | |
| 397682/388 | Mr Philip Hill | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD We object in the strongest terms with respect to the loss of green space at St Annes Academy. This would be a great loss to the area as it next to Hopwood Woods which is one of the best walking areas in the district. We object to the proposed link road between the M62 junction 19 and the end of Hareshill Road. We can understand the benefits to firms on Heywood Industrial Estate, but they moved there long before a link road was considered. We see little or no benefit to Heywood residents and a lot of disadvantages. It would also delay users of Manchester Road. I believe this is an excuse to develop Copnal Farm between Manchester Rd and M62 J19. We object in the strongest terms with respect to the loss of green space south of Heywood, between Manchester Road and the M62. This is also part of the designated green belt land that separates Middleton and Heywood. It has a semi rural feel which should be treasured. If this area was developed it would reduce the quality of life of all the people that live, work, exercise, spend leisure time or merely commute through it. We object in the strongest terms with respect to the loss of green space north of Hareshill Road. This would mean that Heywood South would be surrounded by Large Industrial Units. It would also be horrible for the residents of Hareshill Road. Rochdale Planning should ensure that the Kingsway Industrial Development Area makes very efficiently use of space so there is no need to further develop Industrial Areas either side of Hareshill Road. Loss of vital Green Belt land that has been protected from development by</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>successive governments would be a tragedy for these areas. These proposals would rob our children of yet more space that they can walk, play or cycle in. The UK was recently considered one of the worst places in Europe for children. Government, Business and parents should stop 'developing' everywhere and give our children space to be children. England has one of the highest population densities in the Western World and Greater Manchester is one of the most over populated parts of England. Developing these areas would increase building densities and increase the amount of carbon dioxide emitted in the area. Please consider our environment. There are many people who have specifically chosen to live on the borders of Heywood and Middleton because they are semi rural. Where does the planning department expect these people to move to if they become boxed in by new houses, retail and industrial units? We believe that Rochdale is full to bursting. There is heavy congestion everywhere that you go. The infrastructure struggles to cope so we see no reason to build more houses and then more industrial units to give the new residents work. Please tell central government that the people of Rochdale don't want increased housing, retail or industrial units, when it is at the expense of our Green Belt land. Please tell central government that if it have a balanced immigration policy there would be no need to keep destroying our countryside.</p> | |
| 397685/373 | Mr Nicholas Hirst | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD Proposed link road from the M62 at junction 19 is not feasible. It will cause huge disruption to the environment along with the noise, air pollution and traffic congestion. If allowed this link road will just be a short cut for the H.G.V's, hauliers and traffic to cut across to the industrial estates on Hareshill and Pilsworth roads and therefore a through road onto the M66 at junction 3. However if the planners were to leave M62 junction 19 as it is and were to extend and widen the road at junction 3 off the M66, surely it would be logical. Pilsworth Road is the original link road off the M66 motorway which you planners approved many years ago, therefore why not widen and develop and extend this existing main road. It would be more cost effective, cause less disruption to the wild life and the environment and wouldn't disrupt as many households, as you are aware it runs parallel with a landfill site tip. This would be far better option; I just hope the planners would open their eyes and think logically rather than be coerced into ideas by outside interests. Surely rather than build on greenbelt land it would be far better to develop existing inner city sites. The land and sites around Green Lane for example would be ideal to develop as flats and inner city</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|------------|--|--|
| | | housing as can be seen in Manchester City Centre and other leading cities and towns. Every avenue must be pursued to develop existing sites, even if it means the change of use of existing sites i.e. small industrial estates to housing and flats. Kingsway business park and many other already established industrial estates should be given incentives by the government in order to fill the vast amount of land and space still available on the existing sites. Please encourage these companies and industries with grants and aides in order to fill the existing sites before proceeding with possible new sites on green belt land. | |
| 397688/365 | Jean Jones | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD Firstly, the proposed link road. It appears that if this development takes place, it will the join the M66 with J19, M62. This road will cross Manchester Road at Hareshill Road, a set of traffic lights will control the traffic lights will control the traffic. If this plan is adopted it will create a 'rat-run' for traffic from the M66, M65 Rossendale Valley to the M62, plus HGV's from Heywood Distribution Park. The result of this will bring large numbers of polluting vehicles, which now travel in a semi-rural area, into an urban area, creating noise and air pollution, so adding to an area of already poor air quality. HGV's from Hey Distribution Park will be tempted to turn left at M/C Rd, if their drop-off is in the Rochdale area, and travel along to Green Lane, then on to Rochdale. All this extra traffic will add to health and safety concerns of the residents. Secondly, the proposed housing development at Collop Farm. This development for 250 houses would bring approximately 400, 500 cars. Also, planning is being south for 30 flats on M/C Road along with a Care Home. All this is within a quarter of a mile of Hareshill Road. The Coronation Avenue, M/C Road, junction is extremely dangerous, already there has been one fatality, many car accidents and many garden walls destroyed. New residential development at Gort Sand Pit, Green Lane, for 250 houses would add even more traffic to the chaotic road system in Heywood. Adding potentially, a total 800-1000 extra cars plus HGV's from Hareshill Road and all the industrial and distribution sites in Green Lane. This extra traffic would affect people who live or travel through the area each day. Thirdly, the proposed industrial development off Hareshill Road, is unnecessary, already Rochdale has two neglected area of industrial development, one at Kingsway, which already has an excellent link road to the M62, unfortunately, the planned 7000 jobs have disappeared and now there is only a depressing landscape. The other distribution park, Stakehill is now neglected and rundown and</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|--|
| | | is a disgrace. It appears that there is no end to the vandalism Rochdale is willing to inflict on its residents and taxpayers. If the greenbelt land to the south of Heywood is developed, as proposed, the small area of land on Middleton Road, between Langley Lane and Junction 19, will soon fall victim to development. If this happens Heywood will become part of Manchester, like Middleton is now and Heywood will become a suburb of the city thus losing its autonomy and its individuality. It is important that the greenbelt is preserved in this area. | |
| 398423/515 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | SOUTH HEYWOOD We support the proposed land release at Heywood (Hareshill Road) and east of Heywood Old Road which would enable appropriate employment opportunities for the local area. | Support noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 401303/631 | Carole Dixon | SOUTH HEYWOOD I am writing to lodge my serious objections to your proposals to build retail units, industrial units and housing on current greenbelt land in the Middleton/Heywood area. I own a property on the Gladewood Housing Estate (off Hazlehurst Drive), I purchased my property when it was first built almost 15 years ago, I was attracted to the area because of the surrounding greenbelt land, and the opportunities for me and my family to experience living not only close to a major city (Manchester) but close to an area of natural beauty and green open spaces. It has now come to our attention that Rochdale Council have decided to sell off a huge amount of this land, no doubt for significant capital gain. Not only is this abhorrent to most of the residents in the area, but the most disgusting fact of all is that you felt it necessary to keep this information from the residents until it was almost a foregone conclusion. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. Just imagine how you would feel if this was to happen to where you live, would you find it so acceptable then? Somehow I doubt it. I attended a meeting held in St Anne's Academy, there were approximately 250 people there, including local Councillors, and this was following only 48 hours notice the absence of anybody from the Council's Planning Department was notably apparent! I am a pragmatic person and have tried to consider, practically, whether the regeneration(!??!) of this land is necessary. Well, time and again I come to the same conclusion, NO IT IS NOT let me ask you why this council continually deems it necessary to invest our money in wasteful projects? What about Kingsway Business Park? To date there are only a couple of units on there and construction is at a standstill. How much money is tied up in that 'White Elephant?' Also, | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|---------------|---|--|
| | | <p>how many empty units are there on Heywood and Pilsworth Industrial Estates? What about other empty Industrial Units throughout the borough? Then we come to Retail Outlets. How many empty shops are there in Rochdale Town Centre, and throughout the villages within the borough? How many more local businesses would close if we had another large retail park in the area, you are totally disregarding the impact on the small shopkeeper. Then think of the road infrastructures in these areas, the traffic that would constantly be trundling around Hollin Lane/Langley Lane, etc. and the surrounding areas. You only need to look at the horrendous traffic congestion going on to Elk Retail Park to realise that whoever thought out the layout of the access roads must have been having a joke! Oh, and not to mention housing estates ... what happened to Heritage Place? Building on there was suspended due to the economic climate, now you are planning more housing, within a few hundred metres of this housing estate, what sense does that make? Then there's the impact on the schools and the increased numbers of children wanting places, and so on and so on ! I feel so strongly about this intended proposal and would ask you to seriously consider the wishes of the residents who will be severely impacted by these plans. Even if we wanted to sell up and move from this area (which I certainly would!) our house prices would be affected by these plans and I feel we are in a blighted area.</p> | |
| 401308/630 | Mr Steve Hogg | <p>SOUTH HEYWOOD We have recently studied your Core Strategy, Preferred Options Report 2009, and would like to present our objections to your proposals for the green belt protection pasture area surrounding our home in Middleton (your site options: 5, 6 & 9). Whilst the areas identified in Middleton/Hopwood area represent only a minor part of the Core Strategy document, we believe that before proceeding with ar1 plans to redevelop green belt land within its boundaries, the Rochdale MBC ought to seriously consider the amount of brown field land that it already has available and accessible without further desecration of other land, which is used, enjoyed, appreciated and cared for by a good number of its residents and communities from both within and outside the borough. It being the first 'real' open green space to the north of the sprawling city of Manchester. Perhaps Rochdale MBC has failed to consider the health and mental well being that a stretch of open/green countryside provides to the local community. Within the Hollin Lane, Langley Lane, Middleton Road, Manchester Road</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>boundaries are well-established walking, jogging and cycling routes - The creation of any development in this area would affect and interrupt access to public footpaths, bridleways and rights of way. Any building on this land would eradicate any remaining wildlife from the area and in a matter of years the townships of Middleton and Heywood would become merely an asphalt extension of Manchester, and consequently lose their semi-rural attraction not to mention their identities. Apart from the loss of the rural aspects of the area, consideration must be given to the increased volumes of private and heavy commercial traffic; we have recently experienced a sample of the damage, the noise and the inconvenience of establishing a new community with the construction of the new St Annes Academy and the replacement of a gas pipe running the length of Hollin Lane/Middleton Road. – This however, is merely a temporary issue that will come to an end within a few months a major development, whether for private dwellings or mixed for housing and industry creating employment, will ultimately carry a heavy price for those of us already living in the local community; being in such close proximity to the M62, and therefore commutable and accessible, we doubt that many of the highlighted proposed jobs or the new homes created by developing these green belt sites would be occupied by local people! Regardless of its use, the construction of any development on this site will bring its own problems Greater noise pollution than that already produced by the motorway network. Further structural damage to the roads is inevitable; an increased carbon footprint and poor air quality in the area go hand-in-hand. An exceptional increase in road traffic will bring health and safety concerns to an already busy Hollin Lane, moreover considering the close proximity to the new 1,000 capacity student academy. Of all these concerns, probably one of our greatest is that Rochdale MBC fails to utilise its existing brown field sites or those sites already procured, for example the Kingsway Business Park, not to mention the old mills from our industrial past often standing in good positions. They slowly disintegrate and look like an eyesore. Take for example the Warwick Mill in Middleton. A new town centre is planned, courtesy of Tesco and although we don't dispute its heritage to the town, it looks totally out of place looking dilapidated and in desperate need of renovation, whilst regally standing in this prime position in the town centre - all through traffic travelling to and from Manchester passing this tired old monstrosity; and there must be many more examples of these tired</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | | old buildings standing empty in prime sites across the borough? In closing, we would ask that the Rochdale MBC gives serious consideration to the thoughts and feelings of its present residents before embarking on this irreversible quest to destroy the green belt land surrounding Middleton and Heywood which has for generations provided a special and unique buffer between the borough and the surrounding towns it is after all our heritage! | |
| 381692/178 | A Tennant | RHODES GREEN I am writing about this area, Rhodes Green, about which I am concerned. Why do you wish to spoil one of the few really lovely, rural spots. You should be proud of it and try to preserve it, not spoil and build over it. Building unnecessary 'whatevers' is not a regeneration but a degeneration. You will not be releasing - what a clever euphemism – land but ruining it for evermore. Building on green-grass land would ruin the area for ever. What a legacy to leave to the next generation. Apart from which your project bodes ill when one considers the late delivery of the information leaflet and the fact that the inside of the pamphlet, showing the map of the area, is upside down. Why do you have to 'do' things when there is no need and the result is to spoil something and is detrimental to the environment. What about the old maxim that if something does not need fixing, don't. I hope someone responsible on the Council will have another look at this spot realize that 'redevelopment' would be to the disadvantage of the area and the borough and the environment; is there nobody on the Council with a sense of aesthetics and responsibility. Once spoilt it will be ruined for ever and the next generation will not forget or forgive such vandalism. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 397693/605 | Mrs Brenda Scholes (P Wilson and Company - Mr Andrew Coney) | ST ANNE'S ACADEMY Having considered the proposals set out in the Rochdale Borough Core Strategy Preferred Options Document, our above named clients have instructed me to submit their firm objection to Rochdale MBC's proposed policy on managing the Green Belt and particularly that relating to additions to the Green Belt. My Clients' objection relates to the inclusion of the land to the north of Hollins, around the St Anne's Academy in Middleton in the Green Belt. Previously the land to the north of Hollins has been reserved for long term development. By designating this area as Green Belt our clients believe that this site (which would be ideal for future development due to its strategic location, excellent links to regional and national transport infrastructure and the other local centres) would be lost for development use in the future should the need ever arise (as it would be politically and practically difficult to | In response to advice from GONW, NWRDA and PINS, it is not considered appropriate to add areas to the green belt outside a wider future review of the green belt. |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>remove it from the Green Belt once designated). Our clients believe that the land north of Hollins would be highly suitable for long term development beyond the timescale of the current LDF process for the following reasons: 1. The land is not currently designated as Green Belt and could therefore be developed without going through the politically contentious processes of extracting land from the Green Belt were it ever needed. 2. The site has the potential to be a highly sustainable development enjoying excellent links to local facilities including the following: Under 800m • Post Office, Convenience Store and general shops on Langley Lane and Hollin Lane • Queen Elizabeth High School, Hollin Lane • Langley Primary School, Thirlmere Road • Langley Library • Chemist, Convenience Store and general shops at Lakeland Court Over 800m but under 1 mile • Alderman Kay Primary School • St.Mary's RC Primary School • Middleton Primary School • Wood Street Group Doctors Surgery • Hollin Primary School • Middleton Town Centre • Supermarket (Tesco) • Middleton Library 3. The land benefits from excellent public transport links which would help ensure the sustainability of any long term development. These include local and regional bus links stopping at Hollin Road. 4. The land has excellent motorway links to key markets and would therefore be an attractive site for future business/employment development. 5. The strategic position of the Hollin Lane land at the edge of Middleton (when / arriving from the M62) makes this land ideal for use as (or as part of) a Gateway business development. A Gateway development of this type would not only prove attractive to potential businesses/employers, but would also improve the image and profile of Middleton generally as a place to work and do business. 6. Beyond its intrinsic value as open land, the land north of Hollins has no special environmental, landscape or recreational value. Therefore, Should development ever be required outside the existing developed area (beyond that potentially provided for in the LDF) this land could be utilised with the minimum potential impact on local environmental and recreational interests. In light of the points raised above, rather than designate the land north of Hollins as Green Belt, our clients believe that this area should be maintained in its current designation as reserved/protected land. On this basis, if the land is never required for development it will remain in its current green field state, but if the need arises for the land to be developed in the future (beyond the period of the current planning process), it would be available for development without having to go through the contentious process</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | | of having to remove the land from the Green Belt. Therefore my clients respectfully request that the land to the north of Hollins, around the St Anne's Academy in Middleton is removed from the Core Strategy Policy R2. | |
| R3 – Managing other protected / reserved land | | | |
| Question 31 What are your views on the three areas of currently protected open land being reserved for future development? | | | |
| 161991/449 | Wainhomes (Development) Ltd - Mr Richard Chamberlain (Emery Planning Partnership - Mr Stephen Harris) | Release of Green Belt sites 2.65 We object to Green Belt sites being released for housing, for example the land east of Heywood Old Road, in advance of non-Green Belt sites. Other sites should be considered prior to the release of Green Belt land in order to meet the development needs of the borough. This would be in accordance with national policy guidance as set out in PPG2. Land west of Broad Lane 2.66 Whilst we strongly support the identification of the site for housing, we consider that the site should be included as a key housing site within the plan. We consider that the site should be identified for housing and can contribute early period of the plan, as opposed to simply being safeguarded for potential development. 2.55 This site is also known as 'Land between Oldham Road and Broad Lane' within the Core Strategy. It is identified as being reserved / safeguarded for housing development in the plan. We consider that the site is capable and suitable for housing development, and should be included within the schedule of key housing sites identified at appendix 1. 2.56 The site lies outside of the defined urban area, as identified in current the Rochdale UDP. However it is not within the Green Belt. 2.57 The site is adjacent to residential development to the north and west, Broad Lane to the east, and the M62 to the south. It adjoins the urban area of Rochdale. The site is enclosed from the open countryside by the M62, which would create a readily identifiable and defensible settlement boundary based on permanent physical features. Its use for residential purposes would constitute "a rounding off" of the settlement boundary 2.58 The development of the site would not appear as an intrusion into the open countryside and would not interrupt any important views. 2.59 The site is in an accessible location, and is well served by public transport. It is well related to the adjacent residential area, the Kirkholt regeneration area, and the Kingsway employment area. 2.60 The site is suitable for residential development. We can also confirm that the site meets the test of deliverability, as set out in PPS3. | Disagree. Land at Broad Lane may have long term development potential and should continue to be reserved for that purpose as and when there is a clear justification. The justification for the release Green belt south of Heywood is based on delivering a wider economic growth corridor and therefore delivers a wide range of benefits. |
| 389694/303 | Clariant Ribble Limited | As it stands, development on land outside the urban area not in the | Disagree. The Core Strategy should provide |

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|---|
| | - Mr Stephen Parkinson (Indigo Planning Limited - Mr Bill Davidson) | Green Belt is not allowed unless it is identified as reserved land. This is too inflexible as there could be instances that arise where a particular need is identified for development outside of these areas. Criterion R3(d) should therefore apply to all land outside the urban area not in the Green Belt. | clarity on which areas may be required within the Core Strategy period. Not all protected land outside the urban area should be regarded as a resource for development as it may have specific open land qualities and functions. |
| 368001/614 | Miss Erin McIlroy | BOWLEE I would like to object to Bowlee Park which is currently protected open land being used for future development. Developing even 10 hectares of Bowlee Park would undermine its role as a valuable green space for a community with very little open green fields. At the moment Bowlee Park provides an area for the people of Middleton - especially Langley Estate and East Middleton to walk and exercise in - benefiting the health and well being of people who as the strategy details are less educated, working in lower skilled jobs, living in lower quality housing and having a poorer quality of health when compared with the North of the Borough where there is an abundance of green open space. Bowlee Park being within walking distance and having no charge is also something which the people can use without cost - unlike other leisure facilities which charge and require a form of transport to reach. Without Bowlee Park the people of this community would be even further deprived. I hope that the views of the people within this community will continue to be heard and valued as they have done in the past when in previous consultations Bowlee Park has been protected for the people of this community. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 368012/12 | Mr Anthony Smethurst | BOWLEE Could you be more specific as to your proposed development on the land around Bowlee. This is currently a recreational area supporting football and other sporting activities. Your proposals talk about regeneration for Langley through job opportunities and improving leisure facilities. Is it in your plans for any building ie housing etc. to be carried out? There are little enough open spaces within Middleton and to remove one which is well used would be a detrimental step. | Point noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381605/181 | Mr Dean Hill | BOWLEE I refer to the above and would request that you note my objection to any plans to develop the land outlined. Several years Rochdale Council were trying to develop the land for industrial purposes, supposedly to benefit Langley. The development of this land would not benefit local residents at all but would be detrimental to them by taking away from them the benefit of what few pleasant areas of land are left in Middleton. If employment is such an issue for local people it would be more prudent to supply a free bus service to transport people to places of work such as the giant | Noted. |

| | | | |
|------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | development at Kingsway Business Park in Rochdale. Perhaps Rochdale Council should spend more time making sure that the units at Kingsway are occupied and providing the employment promised instead of even thinking of building another "white elephant. The people of Bowlee and Rhodes have enough to contend with the closeness of the M60 motor way and the extra traffic cutting through along Heywood Old Road as well as the heavy goods vehicles travelling up and down to the land fill sites, causing the properties to "quake in their shoes". I think it is about time that Rochdale Council acted with more consideration for Middleton residents. I am sure they would not even think of doing anything like this to the open spaces in Bamford or Norden. | |
| 381612/182 | Gwen Hill | BOWLEE I refer to the above and would request that you note my objection to any plans to develop the land outlined. Several years Rochdale Council were trying to develop the land for industrial purposes, supposedly to benefit Langley. The development of this land would not benefit local residents at all but would be detrimental to them by taking away from them the benefit of what few pleasant areas of land are left in Middleton. If employment is such an issue for local people it would be more prudent to supply a free bus service to transport people to places of work such as the giant development at Kingsway Business Park in Rochdale. Perhaps Rochdale Council should spend more time making sure that the units at Kingsway are occupied and providing the employment promised instead of even thinking of building another "white elephant. The people of Bowlee and Rhodes have enough to contend with the closeness of the M60 motor way and the extra traffic cutting through along Heywood Old Road as well as the heavy goods vehicles travelling up and down to the land fill sites, causing the properties to "quake in their shoes". I think it is about time that Rochdale Council acted with more consideration for Middleton residents. I am sure they would not even think of doing anything like this to the open spaces in Bamford or Norden. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381618/183 | Christine Holt | BOWLEE I wish to state my objection to Rochdale Borough Council's proposal to develop land at Bowlee Park. The section of land in question is very well used for a whole series of recreational activities: dog walking, cycling, horse riding, flying model aeroplanes, operating remote control cars, skateboarding, roller skating or quite simply walking in a non-built up area. As there are relatively few patches of 'green' left in Middleton, I would have thought that the council would be doing all it could to conserve such | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | land rather than destroy it. Heywood Old Road is already an extremely busy road and a notorious blackspot for accidents. Adding more residential properties and businesses would inevitably add to the volume of traffic using the road, generating increased levels of pollution (and the noise levels from a constant stream of heavy goods vehicles is already at a dreadful level) and even more accidents. We also need to take into consideration the 'residents' who currently inhabit the land that will be destroyed if Rochdale's plans come to fruition. There are fewer and fewer places for our flora and fauna to thrive, and it is all too easy to ignore them because they do not have a voice to add their objections to the annihilation of their natural habitat. | |
| 381679/179 | Barbara Shenton | BOWLEE 1. We object to the plans for Bowlee on the grounds that this is a greenbelt area, a little bit of countryside still remains and this is under threat of depletion again. 2. Also Heywood old Road already carries a large amount of traffic, especially during peak periods. As well as this, if there is a problem on the M60 motorway coming from north to south, traffic is frequently diverted along Heywood Old Road, including many heavy goods vehicles, sometimes completely blocking the road. We feel we have enough traffic to contend with. Approximately 5 years ago Rochdale Council introduced plans to build a Business Park in Bowlee and the residents strongly objected. Fortunately, the council agreed that this plan was completely out of keeping with the area, good sense prevailed and this was dropped. Evidently only temporarily, as here we are again. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381679/582 | Barbara Shenton | BOWLEE I would like to object to Bowlee Park which is currently protected open land being used for development. Bowlee Park is a valued open green space used by different groups within the community for a range of different activities. It is the only open green space within walking distance of the community. Bowlee provides the community with access to green space and in doing so benefits the health and wellbeing of the community as well as the general environment of Middleton. In previous planning consultations Bowlee has been recognised as an important green space for the community which it has been protected for and this should continue. Any development on Bowlee Park would have considerable impact on Heywood Old Road, which already carries large amounts of traffic at peak periods and when traffic is diverted from the M60 due to problems on this motorway, which happens frequently. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 372258/559 | Mr Robert Aston | BOWLEE I would like to object to Bowlee Park which is currently | |

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| | | protected open land being used for development. Bowlee Park is a valued open green space used by different groups within the community for a range of different activities. It is the only open green space within walking distance of the community. Bowlee provides the community with access to green space and in doing so benefits the health and wellbeing of the community as well as the general environment of Middleton. In previous planning consultations Bowlee has been recognised as an important green space for the community which it has been protected for and this should continue. | |
| 382728/169 | Mrs Dee Leech | BOWLEE We are writing to inform you of our very strong objections for the land next to Bowlee Park being used for housing redevelopment. Not only will our house prices dramatically drop, we are very concerned for the many rabbits, foxes etc that inhabit the land, I will be deeply disturbed if these planning applications go ahead. I have terminal cancer and the only bright spark in my life at times is the view from my Conservatory which you are planning on taking away from me. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 389315/87 | Miss Carole Rydeheard | BOWLEE (c) I object to any rural land in and around Bowlee being used for development. This question was debated in detail at the last UDP review and it was conclusively proved that there was no economic requirement for this rare small area of unspoilt countryside to be decimated by clearance for yet another empty business park. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 389344/616 | Helene Lees | BOWLEE I would like to object to the proposal of any development on the Bowlee Park area. The park is used by the local people for recreation and leisure time, I feel that if the land was developed, the rural feel to the area would be lost and it would just become another 'built up' area. In this current climate, we are all being encouraged to look after ourselves and exercise, this green area is an area where a lot of the locals can come and exercise for free - please don't develop this area There are lots more areas of land that need developing and they have already had buildings on them so they are perfect for redevelopment. (e.g. -The land where the 'Car Store' was at the bottom of Heywood Old Road - currently being demolished) In previous planning consultations, Bowlee has been recognised as an important green space for the community and needs protecting. We are therefore in favour of the proposal to develop the area near Heywood Distribution Centre and feel that it would be the more obvious choice as the access to this area has already been sorted. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 389845/450 | Catherine Lomax | BOWLEE I would like to object to Bowlee Park which is currently protected open land being used for development. Bowlee Park is a valued open green space used by different groups within the | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| | | community for a range of different activities. It is the only open green space within walking distance of the community. Bowlee provides the community with access to green space and in doing so benefits the health and wellbeing of the community as well as the general environment of Middleton. In previous planning consultations Bowlee has been recognised as an important green space for the community which it has been protected for and this should continue. | |
| 389846/549 89848/550 389849/551 389854/554 389851/553 389856/602 389858/555 389860/556 389868/618 390130/557 390133/558 395975/563 394721/560 395360/562 395979/564 395980/565 395984/566 395986/567 395989/568 395990/569 395992/570 395996/571 395998/572 396000/573 396002/574 396005/575 396006/576 396007/577 396008/578 396009/579 396010/580 396018/581 396028/583 396030/584 | Mr Fred Brooks Ann Ingham Mrs T Ballan A Sinacola Mr Peter Frain Mrs D Hill Dorothy McNicoll Mr R Lowe Mr James Barker Audrey Goodall Mr Peter Garrity Jennifer Sturdy Naveed Mumtaz Leah Barnsley Joanne Staunton Mr M Bailey Tom Gregory Charlotte Marley James Robinson Adam Barber Sam MacDonald Holly Chaplin James Jackson Eleanor Scott Richard Reardon Mr & Mrs Ball Mr R Goodwin A Kennedy Mrs Kate Robinson Mr A Speight Jackie Faulkner Clare Flanigan Abi Sharp Ann Rydeheard | BOWLEE I would like to object to Bowlee Park which is currently protected open land being used for development. Bowlee Park is a valued open green space used by different groups within the community for a range of different activities. It is the only open green space within walking distance of the community. Bowlee provides the community with access to green space and in doing so benefits the health and wellbeing of the community as well as the general environment of Middleton. In previous planning consultations Bowlee has been recognised as an important green space for the community which it has been protected for and this should continue. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|---------------------|---|--|
| 396033/585 | Hannah Minns | | |
| 396952/133 | Miss Natalie Gill | <p>BOWLEE I object to any green space around Bowlee being used for development. There no economic requirement for this small area of unspoilt green space to be lost to yet more development. There are other areas of Rochdale that would be suitable for development, which would not spoil such a well used and attractive public space. My guess is that these sensible alternatives would not generate a land receipt as tempting as the Bowlee one would!? New family housing and apartments remain unsold in Heywood, so development of this area would not serve to provide housing solutions. Heywood Old Road is already blighted by a logistics park while Pilsworth Road is now home to a landfill site. This area of green space should be left alone now, before it is sold off and ruined.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 397698/586 | Mr N Shackleton | <p>BOWLEE I would like to object to Bowlee Park which is currently protected open land being used for development. Bowlee Park is a valued open green space used by different groups within the community for a range of different activities. It is the only open green space within walking distance of the community. Bowlee provides the community with access to green space and in doing so benefits the health and wellbeing of the community as well as the general environment of Middleton. In previous planning consultations Bowlee has been recognised as an important green space for the community which it has been protected for and this should continue.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 397699/596 | Mr & Mrs G Crewe | <p>BOWLEE Bowlee is a valued open green space used by many people, it has been recognised as an important space for the community and both of us understood it to be protected for this reason.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 397700/597 | Miss C Margery Peel | <p>BOWLEE I would like to object to Bowlee Park which is currently protected open land being used for development. Bowlee Park is a valued open green space used by different groups within the community for a range of different activities. It is the only open green space within walking distance of the community. Bowlee provides the community with access to green space and in doing so benefits the health and wellbeing of the community as well as the general environment of Middleton. In previous planning consultations Bowlee has been recognised as an important green space for the community which it has been protected for and this should continue. Yet again, Bowlee is disturbed by the needless development. I've lived here 43 years and we have fought at least 10 battles to keep some green places – creatures can now go from Heywood – Alkrington woods and them in the huge canal system. Last year</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|--------------------|---|--|
| | | Council's work to stop giving permission for the majority of hard-standing to lesson the risk of flooding etc. Again this exercise is a waste of money and crazy. Use Brownfield areas because these areas already have services, along with roads and shops. Do NOT destroy more green places and make Earth beneficial to all. | |
| 397701/603 | Victoria Southwell | BOWLEE I would like to object to Bowlee Park which is currently protected open land being used for development. Bowlee Park is a valued open green space used by different groups within the community for a range of different activities. It is the only open green space within walking distance of the community. Bowlee provides the community with access to green space and in doing so benefits the health and wellbeing of the community as well as the general environment of Middleton. In previous planning consultations Bowlee has been recognised as an important green space for the community which it has been protected for and this should continue. The amount of traffic and size of works vehicles is already of great concern to me. Therefore any form of development which is going to increase traffic is most unwelcome. My quality of life is already affected by this and don't feel the situation should be made even worse. I think the current facilities for leisure, i.e. football pitches and changing rooms should be improved and brought up to a good standard and that enough off road. Parking should be made available to players and their spectators. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 397702/588 | David Tonge | BOWLEE I would like to object to Bowlee Park which is currently protected open land being used for development. Bowlee Park is a valued open green space used by different groups within the community for a range of different activities. It is the only open green space within walking distance of the community. Bowlee provides the community with access to green space and in doing so benefits the health and wellbeing of the community as well as the general environment of Middleton. In previous planning consultations Bowlee has been recognised as an important green space for the community which it has been protected for and this should continue. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 397703/589 | Anna Watson | BOWLEE I would like to object to Bowlee Park which is currently protected open land being used for development. Bowlee Park is a valued open green space used by different groups within the community for a range of different activities. It is the only open green space within walking distance of the community. Bowlee provides the community with access to green space and in doing so benefits the health and wellbeing of the community as well as the general environment of Middleton. In previous planning consultations Bowlee | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|------------------|--|--|
| | | has been recognised as an important green space for the community which it has been protected for and this should continue. | |
| 397704/590 | Caroline Sharpe | BOWLEE I would like to object to Bowlee Park which is currently protected open land being used for development. Bowlee Park is a valued open green space used by different groups within the community for a range of different activities. It is the only open green space within walking distance of the community. Bowlee provides the community with access to green space and in doing so benefits the health and wellbeing of the community as well as the general environment of Middleton. In previous planning consultations Bowlee has been recognised as an important green space for the community which it has been protected for and this should continue. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 397705/591 | Mrs Mavis Watson | BOWLEE I would like to object to Bowlee Park which is currently protected open land being used for development. Bowlee Park is a valued open green space used by different groups within the community for a range of different activities. It is the only open green space within walking distance of the community. Bowlee provides the community with access to green space and in doing so benefits the health and wellbeing of the community as well as the general environment of Middleton. In previous planning consultations Bowlee has been recognised as an important green space for the community which it has been protected for and this should continue. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 397706/593 | Phil Porter | BOWLEE I would like to object to Bowlee Park which is currently protected open land being used for development. Bowlee Park is a valued open green space used by different groups within the community for a range of different activities. It is the only open green space within walking distance of the community. Bowlee provides the community with access to green space and in doing so benefits the health and wellbeing of the community as well as the general environment of Middleton. In previous planning consultations Bowlee has been recognised as an important green space for the community which it has been protected for and this should continue. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 397707/594 | Daniel Sharpe | BOWLEE I would like to object to Bowlee Park which is currently protected open land being used for development. Bowlee Park is a valued open green space used by different groups within the community for a range of different activities. It is the only open green space within walking distance of the community. Bowlee provides the community with access to green space and in doing so benefits the health and wellbeing of the community as well as the general environment of Middleton. In previous planning consultations Bowlee has been recognised as an important green space for the | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|--------------------|---|--|
| | | community which it has been protected for and this should continue. | |
| 397163/608 | Mr Steve Gill | BOWLEE I object to Bowlee Park protected open green space being used for mixed use development. Only if a recreational sporting facility was proposed, such as an all weather football or other sports facility would I accept it as a good thing. There is plenty of housing, especially in the private sector that is empty at present and this should be accessed, rather than ruining the few areas of green belt by building on them, similarly there are business units lying empty so why build more? | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 397693/592 | Mrs Brenda Scholes | BOWLEE I would like to object to Bowlee Park which is currently protected open land being used for development. Bowlee Park is a valued open green space used by different groups within the community for a range of different activities. It is the only open green space within walking distance of the community. Bowlee provides the community with access to green space and in doing so benefits the health and wellbeing of the community as well as the general environment of Middleton. In previous planning consultations Bowlee has been recognised as an important green space for the community which it has been protected for and this should continue. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 370046/20 | Mr Simon Dennis | LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE c) We would welcome the opportunity for the land to be designated as green belt to preserve the area of parkland and recreational space. | |
| 370651/65 | mrs julie woolley | LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE We strongly oppose any development around Langley Lane, Hollins and Bowlee. The strategy appears to be remove all green space and make Urban living an imposed position for all, i.e. one long corridor of housing and industry. What about health and choice re walking, children learning something of nature and farming needs? There are enough industrial units under used in other areas of the Borough particularly new development towards Milnrow on the M62. Is this going to be another white elephant? | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381637/185 | Ms Collette Smith | LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE My home will overlook this proposed sight which will be a disaster for very precious green belted land, which is a haven for the community. This sight will be visually overbearing, it will be totally inappropriate and destroy a crucially important and rare part of Middleton. It will also have a devastating effect on the wildlife, the beautiful and rare bird which we see daily, the general public and families who enjoy country walks, jogging, horse riding, and bird watching. It will also have a massive impact on health issues to the local community. This will result in hazards for local people. Noise. Pollution. Greenhouse | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Gasses Increased Traffic. We have no choice but to breathe air around us, when air is polluted it has been proved we breathe in ozone particles and harmful gasses that can cause damage to our hearts, lungs and overall health, air pollution can cause coughing, runny eyes and breathing problems. It has been proved people with these problems have made remarkable recoveries as soon as air quality improves. people have suffered and died as a result of air pollution, breathing small amounts of air pollution over many years is considered dangerous, it can also lead to life threatening diseases such as cancer which we hear about more now than ever, the young the elderly and people with Asthma are more vulnerable, children are at greater risk as their lungs are still growing, we want our children to be able to play out and lead active independent lives in our safe precious area, we want it unaffected. What do we tell our kids, stay indoors, be less active, avoid the high traffic and industrialised area, this will literally steel our health away. I fully intend to oppose and fight this on behalf of my family, neighbours, and local wildlife. Also I would like to mention this has only be highlighted through the community. This is why have the council been reluctant to inform us properly by letter not just a glossy magazine which barely touched on this. I think this has been handled incorrectly</p> | |
| 381649/187 | Mr Martin Hayes | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE PLEASE PLEASE do not let this happen. How will this aid the continued regeneration of Langley? And why would this expansion be necessary or wanted? This farmland provides livelihoods, leisure and tranquillity to the area. With so many empty and derelict houses currently across Langley, why are these not being targeted now? Why are the many open scrub grounds not being targeted? Why are the many almost derelict shopping areas not being targeted? The reason that many new residents moved to this area (including myself) was that it not only provided good links into Manchester, but also that it gave access to the countryside and provided a feeling of openness; rather than the closed in feeling of usual estates. If this land was built on, I would move out - As would many of my neighbours that I have spoken to. The new residents that were attracted to this area would largely desert it. The removal of the only open countryside available just doesn't make sense. We do not need more houses -merely the proper regeneration in all empty residences across the region. The land is essential for wildlife, livelihoods and wellbeing. The only reasons seem to be to either turn the area into warehouses and</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | industrial estates [given the prime access links] to earn the council money; or to reinforce the widely held view that since moving into Rochdale councils care, Langley is merely used as an outlet in which to move unwanted residents from other areas of Rochdale. There can be no benefit to the people of Langley and Middleton that would outweigh the removal of this countryside. Please please please do not let this happen. | |
| 381682/189 | Mr Robin Parker | LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE 1) Regeneration of housing can be accommodated within the Langley Estate. There are sufficient sites already dedicated to new build both by Lovell Developments and by Housing Market Renewal. 2) There is a major industrial development site already in the Borough, Kingsway, which is ten minutes away from Langley either by private car or dedicated transport via the M62, and we would prefer sights to be set on that option for the Langley work force. On behalf of my constituents I therefore request that the area remain as Green Corridor or, even better, be redesignated Green Belt. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381691/166 | Mr Alan Iddon | LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE Having read your new long-term plan for the borough, I have to disagree with your ideas on developing protecting open land in the green belt i.e. land to the north of Middleton, land at Bowlee and Rhodes Green. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381693/177 | Mr R Hodgson | LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE 1. I would like to state that I believe it to be wrong in principle to build on Green Belt land. I have lived in this country for over sixty years now, during which time I have witnessed the continual and insidious erosion of our Green Belt land, and I would like to ask the Council to consider the following question: How do you feel it benefits the environment to continually destroy living things in favour of tarmac and concrete? Furthermore, in these days of environmental considerations where emission targets are constantly in the news, and constantly being striven for, how do you feel you are helping to meet these locally by creating developments of this type? 2. The plans that you have supplied in relation to this development are not clear enough to make a qualitative judgment on your proposals at the present time. With a proposed development as large as this, I put it to you that you must provide much clearer plans in order that residents, like myself, can properly appraise them. I strongly object to your proceeding with these plans in the absence of complete clarity. 3. I wish to ask whether your proposed development on Bowlee Park is industrial or residential based? The type of development being proposed clearly has a bearing on both the type of traffic which may be expected to | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|----------|---|--|
| | | <p>utilize the development, and its impact upon the local environment.</p> <p>4. Will the football pitches be built upon? If they will, not only do I object in principle to a heavily used sports facility being swallowed up by development, but as I understand it, this flies in the face of a previous commitment to the use of these facilities for sport which was given in perpetuity. I believe this demands further investigation before any development is moved forward.</p> <p>5. Your plans do not make it clear how the land will be accessed following development, and I would like this explained properly. If access is to be via Heywood Old Road, then I object in the strongest possible terms that the inevitable increase in volume of traffic will seriously diminish my quality of life as a resident. I am sure that there are others in this area who feel that this proposal is currently riding roughshod over their rights, both as individuals, and as citizens of this country. I personally disagree with the premise that this development will be good for the area and demand that further research is done into both the viability, and desirability of such a development.</p> | |
| 382267/172 | Pam Vere | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE As residents on the Silver Birch Estate we have listed below our objections to the proposed re-development of Langley Lane & Bowlee Park.</p> <p>1 The area provides us with beautiful open countryside, lovely views, good walking which is enjoyed by all ages. If an industrial park is built all this will be lost to the local community. It will have a great impact on the local wildlife and the health and well being of the local people.</p> <p>2 There is 500,000 sq ft to let on the existing Heywood Industrial Estate and Kingsway Business Park is under utilised. How can you warrant building any more units?</p> <p>3 The proposal to build a link road from Langley Lane to Pilsworth Road will only add to the noise pollution, health problems and road surface problems which already exist. Moss Hall Road and Pilsworth Road from the M66 are unsuitable for 40 tonne lorries. Pilsworth Road and Whittle Lane are all in desperate need of repair due mainly to the constant flow of heavy traffic. Man power and Resources would be better spent on repairing and maintaining these roads.</p> <p>4 Middleton area has the highest percentage of lung disease. Why risk increasing this percentage rising to the local people. We need fresh air not polluted air. Has the welfare of people become less important than the building of another Industrial Park that will end as a ghost town.</p> <p>5 Traffic will increase dramatically and therefore the risk to human safety will rise. Accidents and deaths on the road will inevitably happen.</p> <p>6 Homes on Harehill Road are under threat of demolition. Why do you think it</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|--------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>is right to take peoples homes from them? 7 We have a Quarry and Landfill site nearby which are blots on the landscape. The landfill site has created a man made hill which changed the view across the fields from Whittle Lane. We have enough eyesores in the area no more please! 8 We are genuinely worried about the price of our property reducing greatly if the land on these areas is developed. We are born and bred Middleton people and we have lived in this area for 12 years because it feels like you are in the countryside. Please don't take this away from us. We have a responsibility to protect and care for the environment we live in. As council you have a responsibility to protect the people and community you represent. Please listen to the voice of the people. If our farmers are struggling then we need to support them and help them to diversify and use their land in a different way. As residents on the Silver Birch Estate we are incensed that the local community have not been adequately informed of the proposals.</p> | |
| 382269/164 | Mr Mark Power | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE I am writing to object to the proposed planning allocation relating to open land north of Langley Lane and next to Bowlee Park. My objections are as follows: the area has a lot of vacant industrial units so I don't see the need to build more at this stage, Middleton and Heywood have a number of vacant shop units again I don't see why there is any need to build new, surely it would be a better idea to regenerate what we already have rather letting it fall into a state of disrepair and become even more of an eyesore Langley for example has a number of building plots waiting for building to start, why do we need more housing?</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 382271/170 | Mrs Penny Power | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE I would like to object to any proposed planning on north of Langley lane and Bowlee Park in Middleton. I am a resident of Knight Crescent and feel it would spoil the surrounding area to give up green land to build on and certainly would not want any commercial use to build on this land.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 382274/171 | Mr & Mrs Taylor | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE I would like to object to any proposed planning on north of Langley lane and Bowlee Park in Middleton. Feel it would spoil the surrounding area to give up green land to build on and certainly would not want any commercial use to build on this land.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 389349/615 | Mrs Trisha Peacock | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE Please accept this email as our objection to the proposed plans relating to open land north of Langley Land and next to Bowlee Park. Both my husband and I strongly object to this development and do not believe that it is necessary.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------|--|--|
| 381698/216 | Mr Colin Harris | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE There is not a lot of green area's left and feel that these area's should be kept as they are! A small piece of country side that is enjoyed by many people for walks, seeing wildlife even car-boots which is a good way of re-cycling to be encouraged.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 382044/202 | K Smith | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE My objections to the proposals fall into three main areas, which in themselves are interlinked, namely :- Green issues Combating global warming Mental well being of the residents The council praises itself and residents, quite rightly, for becoming greener in their attitudes towards recycling and becoming more energy efficient. How then does this sit with covering farmland with roads and buildings? This will interfere with the rain / water cycle as there will be less open land o absorb the rainfall. The abundant wildlife in this area, including barn owls, will be greatly affected as they are forced into smaller and smaller habitats. We are supposed to be protecting wildlife, not exterminating it. This is another area where natural life cycles will be disturbed to the detriment of humankind. The council should be encouraging more farming not making it impossible for those in production to exist. As a community we should be aiming to produce more of the food we consume and thereby lessening the need for imports and thus making ourselves more self sufficient. The arterial roads in the area are already overloaded and will not take an influx in domestic and industrial traffic. There are already new and old properties for domestic dwellings, offices and industrial use nearby that are empty and need to be utilised. This area is widely used by residents of all ages, from babies in buggies to elderly citizens, for walking, jogging, exercising dogs and enjoying opportunities to bird watch and appreciate a full range of wildlife, both fauna and flora, as they watch it change through the seasons. There are too few places within walking distance of Heywood, Hopwood, Birch and Bowlee where these activities can be enjoyed. In a time of actively campaigning to overcome obesity, especially in the young, what better opportunity for exercise than to have it on the doorstep. We need, as a community, to consider what we leave as a heritage for future generations. Do we leave as mass of concrete and buildings devoid of wildlife or an area of great interest to stimulate and / or clam the minds of all who use or look at and observe this area.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 389842/612 | J Goulding | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE I wish to register my objection to Rochdale's proposal to release land at the top of Langley lane and Bowlee for development. This councils greed, clumsiness and</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | insensitivity, is systematically, eradicating all areas of beauty that have graced Middleton for centuries. It appears that you will not be happy until you have driven the honest, hard working and law abiding people of the borough from the area. Shame on you if this proposal is endorsed. | |
| 393903/561 | Matt Staniforth | LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE I would like to formally object to the proposed plans to build on the land near Langley Lane and Bowlee Park. This is an open space where nearby residents have the opportunity of walking and appreciating the open countryside, it would be a great shame to build on this land. | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 390119/637 | Lynne Kelly | LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE I am writing to voice my opposition to any redevelopment of green belt land in the vicinity of Heywood and Bowlee, Middleton. It is imperative that these areas which are effectively "green lungs" between the towns are retained for the enjoyment of the community. In fact your own strategy document demonstrates that there is "broad agreement that the green belt should be protected". There are industrial buildings and land nearby the proposed redevelopment sites that are standing unused, eg. Pilsworth Industrial Estate, Heywood Industrial Estate and around the Junction at M66/Pilsworth (under Bury Council I presume) which should be filled before any new building is considered. Although I understand you are trying to comply with a government directive, that directive is fundamentally flawed. It does not take into consideration the shared boundaries, e.g. Rochdale and Bury, where the unused industrial spaces are, and potential new planning should be looked at on a wider scale to take this into consideration. I would ask you to consider all brownfield land for potential industrial build first. Regarding residential housing, again there are plenty of brownfield sites which should filled first. Indeed there are already several newbuild estates in the planning stages in Heywood -two with Countryside Homes. There are over one million homes in the UK that are currently unoccupied due to the owner's abandonment and these should be brought back into use. To that end I would ask if Rochdale MBC has an Empty Property Officer as so many councils now do throughout the country - and if not, why not? It is the council's responsibility to look at this situation and someone designated to look at this problem throughout the Rochdale Borough would make a difference to the numbers of houses required in the future. Therefore bringing empty homes back into use and planning to build on brownfield land should be looked at first, which would then affect the area of greenbelt land which might be needed in the | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|----------------|---|--|
| | | <p>future, but it is not acceptable at this stage to take great areas of greenbelt for potential newbuild (private housing or affordable housing?) without having an accurate understanding of future need. Regarding the proposed Relief Road from Junction 19 of the MG2. There is in fact already a motorway relief road to the Pilsworth/Heywood Industrial Estates - it's called the M66! If you had to build a road to this area then surely it should come from Birch Services area where lorries could exit directly towards the industrial estates and this would cause less disruption than a relief road from J19 which would cut a swathe through the green belt area towards Hareshill Road. In principle I have no opposition to lorries using Hareshill Road itself as I often see HGVs (usually foreign ones) stuck at the junction of Hareshill and Manchester Road unable to access their destination. They have probably followed their satnavs and are always lost. I would suggest that you allow large vehicles along Hareshill Road instead of the narrowing area at this junction as it would minimise heavy traffic which now has to travel through Heywood centre and Hopwood, or Whittle Lane. I believe this narrowing area which prevents larger vehicles travelling along Hareshill Road has contributed to the heavy traffic through Heywood centre and Hopwood. It also prevents large vehicles accessing Darnhill and north Heywood and Bury, and again sends more traffic through Heywood town centre – a problem which can be alleviated. This is not to encourage lorries through Hopwood/Birch towards the route via Hareshill as they should follow the M62/M66 link as I am sure most of them do, but as in some cases this is not the case it would make sense to facilitate access for these lorries. I would also suggest better signage to help these vehicles find their way - it is sadly lacking and part of the problem for vehicles trying to access the industrial areas. In conclusion, I object to your plans for the areas of land north of Langley Lane, Bowlee in Middleton, and south of Heywood, as I believe there are other ways of solving traffic problems, and other options for redevelopment of industrial and residential land. To destroy greenbelt land forever where it is rapidly declining is not acceptable and I know I am one of many residents who will continue to oppose your plans for our community.</p> | |
| 396034/408 | Mr Louis Henry | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE With regard to Middleton North, in previous Plans both Bowlee and land to the north of Langley Lane have been identified by planners as ripe for development, this notwithstanding the last Public Inquiry which refused the Plan for Bowlee. Since Bowlee was refused one wonders why it is included</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|--|
| | | again as the same arguments against it are likely to be used at any Inquiry. | |
| 396108/425 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.83 We support the safeguarding of land to meet future development needs. We would also support the identification of further 'reserved land' to the South of Heywood to meet future employment land needs to 2026 and beyond should the Council maintain that the 30ha proposed for release from the Green Belt is sufficient to meet immediate requirements. 3.84 It is appropriate for the land at Rhodes Green Middleton (currently listed under Policy R2.3a) be listed under the provisions of Policy R3d as Protected Open Land; i.e its current status is maintained. | Support noted. |
| 396130/622 | Gill Howard | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE I do not agree with any of the proposals in the Core Strategy Proposals that involve the development of any of the land south of Heywood or any of the land between Middleton and Heywood (Langley Lane & Bowlee) I feel the removal of more open space for the purpose of warehouse/industrial/office, road, housing and retail: a) is not in keeping with the area; b) will not contribute to health; c) will not improve the economy; d) will not improve quality of place; e) will not encourage visitors; f) will not improve or protect the environment; and g) will not improve transport. I also think that the south of the borough is being sacrificed to meet government requirements without due consideration of how continually eroding our precious green spaces will impact in the long term. The area already has large areas of industrial park development – Pilsworth, Green Lane and Heywood – a great deal of which is empty (also Kingsway and Stakehill). Building more of the same does not mean: a) they get filled; or b) if they do - that there will be new jobs; or c) if there are new jobs – that those jobs would benefit local people. Putting in a link road from junction 19 to a set of traffic lights at Hareshill Road – as was discussed at length at the Heywood meeting - is a recipe for major standing traffic congestion north and south on Heywood Old Road and east and west on Hareshill/link road. Hareshill presently has traffic barriers due to problems with a heavy loads and goods traffic so reopening the road to all traffic again is unacceptable. Not only would there be a problem of increased congestion and heavy goods traffic there is also the issue of school run traffic and child safety due to the proximity of Siddall Moor and Magdala Street schools. As was also mentioned at the Heywood meeting - a link road will provide a 'rat-run' from j19 M62 to j3 M66 and vice versa for those wishing to avoid Simister Island. I think a link road and</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>envisaged traffic congestion would worsen air quality in an area which already has some air quality problems due to the existing motorways. We should be looking at how to avoid making the problem worse and into ways to maximise the green spaces between Middleton and Heywood not eroding them bit by bit. Q31 a) I don't think any land should be released from green belt for development. b) I do think more locations should be included in the green belt c) I don't think any areas of protected open land should be developed whether reserved for development or not d) I don't think green belt policy should be included in core strategy because of conflict of interest.</p> | |
| 397147/620 | Mr Mark Chadwick | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE I do not agree with any of the proposals in the Core Strategy Proposals that involve the development of any of the land south of Heywood or any of the land between Middleton and Heywood (Langley Lane & Bowlee) I feel the removal of more open space for the purpose of warehouse/industrial/office, road, housing and retail: • is not in keeping with the area; • will not contribute to health; • will not improve the economy; • will not improve quality of place; • will not encourage visitors; • will not improve or protect the environment; and • will not improve transport. I also think that the south of the borough is being sacrificed to meet government requirements without due consideration of how continually eroding our precious green spaces will impact in the long term. The area already has large areas of industrial park development - Pilsworth, Green Lane and Heywood - a great deal of which is empty (also Kingsway and Stakehill). Building more of the same does not mean: • they get filled; or • if they do -that there will be new jobs; or • if there are new jobs -that those jobs would benefit local people. Putting in a link road from junction 19 to a set of traffic lights at Hareshill Road - as was discussed at length at the Heywood meeting - is a recipe for major standing traffic congestion north and south on Heywood Old Road and east and west on Hareshill/link road. Hareshill presently has traffic barriers due to problems with a heavy loads and goods traffic so reopening the road to all traffic again is unacceptable. Not only would there be a problem of increased congestion and heavy goods traffic there is also the issue of school run traffic and child safety due to the proximity of Siddall Moor and Magdala Street schools. As was also mentioned at the Heywood meeting - a link road will provide a 'rat-run' from J19 M62 to j3 M66 and vice versa for those wishing to avoid Simister Island. I think a link road and envisaged traffic</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|------------------|---|--|
| | | congestion would worsen air quality in an area which already has some air quality problems due to the existing motorways. We should be looking at how to avoid making the problem worse and into ways to maximise the green spaces between Middleton and Heywood not eroding them bit by bit. | |
| 397173/606 | Michelle Hurst | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE We are residents of Silver Birch Estate, and wish to register our opposition to the proposed development of Bowlee / Langley Lane, for the following key reasons: 1. Bowlee is the only local green space available to us in this urban area, and it is regularly used by the local community for recreation /events. 2. Since the opening of the M60, the traffic flow has been significantly heavier and faster between the M60 (junction 19) and M62 (junction 19) i.e. along Heywood Old road and up Langley Lane. The additional traffic will only increase along the proposed area if this development goes ahead, and this is unreasonable for local residents, many of whom are young families, and unsustainable for the current fabric and layout of the roads. 3. The area is already saturated with commercial developments (Pilsworth/Slattocks/Heywood Ind.Park/Birch Ind. Estate, Middleton Junction/Rhodes) many with empty units -we do not believe there is a demand for more new units!</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 397690/600 | Mr S McDonough | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE I am hereby putting forward, on behalf of myself, my partner and our three children, a formal objection to the Council's proposals for forthcoming developments relating to the open land north of Langley Lane and next to Bowlee Park. We are all disgusted in the underhand way the Council has sought to "force" these developments through, without hardly any information filtering through to the local neighbouring communities! We have attended meetings in the recent past outlining the various proposals and options which were being discussed; but at the heart of all these meetings and get-togethers, the main thing which stuck in people's throats was the outright ignorance and barefaced cheek the council has shown, during these proposals being put forward! I feel it my right as a law abiding, Council Tax payer to object in the strongest way possible, not only to these proposals, but more importantly to the shabby, "cloak and dagger" manner in which the parties responsible have behaved.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 398434/366 | Mr Terry Beddows | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE I noticed an article that stated Rochdale Council had plans to develop land that is currently a protected area. The area I refer to is farmland to the North of Langley Lane and to the South of Bowlee, in Middleton. I would like</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|--------------|--|--|
| | | to place on record my strong objection to these plans and would ask that this decision be reconsidered. I would be grateful if you could assure me that my objection has been noted and will be brought to the attention of the appropriate persons. | |
| 401303/635 | Carole Dixon | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE I am writing to lodge my serious objections to your proposals to build retail units, industrial units and housing on current greenbelt land in the Middleton/Heywood area. I own a property on the Gladewood Housing Estate (off Hazlehurst Drive), I purchased my property when it was first built almost 15 years ago, I was attracted to the area because of the surrounding greenbelt land, and the opportunities for me and my family to experience living not only close to a major city (Manchester) but close to an area of natural beauty and green open spaces. It has now come to our attention that Rochdale Council have decided to sell off a huge amount of this land, no doubt for significant capital gain. Not only is this abhorrent to most of the residents in the area, but the most disgusting fact of all is that you felt it necessary to keep this information from the residents until it was almost a foregone conclusion. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. Just imagine how you would feel if this was to happen to where you live, would you find it so acceptable then? Somehow I doubt it. I attended a meeting held in St Anne's Academy, there were approximately 250 people there, including local Councillors, and this was following only 48 hours notice the absence of anybody from the Council's Planning Department was notably apparent! I am a pragmatic person and have tried to consider, practically, whether the regeneration(!??!) of this land is necessary. Well, time and again I come to the same conclusion, NO IT IS NOT let me ask you why this council continually deems it necessary to invest our money in wasteful projects? What about Kingsway Business Park? To date there are only a couple of units on there and construction is at a standstill. How much money is tied up in that 'White Elephant?' Also, how many empty units are there on Heywood and Pilsworth Industrial Estates? What about other empty Industrial Units throughout the borough? Then we come to Retail Outlets. How many empty shops are there in Rochdale Town Centre, and throughout the villages within the borough? How many more local businesses would close if we had another large retail park in the area, you are totally disregarding the impact on the small shopkeeper. Then think of the road infrastructures in these areas, the traffic that would constantly be trundling around Hollin</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|---------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Lane/Langley Lane, etc. and the surrounding areas. You only need to look at the horrendous traffic congestion going on to Elk Retail Park to realise that whoever thought out the layout of the access roads must have been having a joke! Oh, and not to mention housing estates ... what happened to Heritage Place? Building on there was suspended due to the economic climate, now you are planning more housing, within a few hundred metres of this housing estate, what sense does that make? Then there's the impact on the schools and the increased numbers of children wanting places, and so on and so on ! I feel so strongly about this intended proposal and would ask you to seriously consider the wishes of the residents who will be severely impacted by these plans. Even if we wanted to sell up and move from this area (which I certainly would!) our house prices would be affected by these plans and I feel we are in a blighted area.</p> | |
| 401308/636 | Mr Steve Hogg | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE We have recently studied your Core Strategy, Preferred Options Report 2009, and would like to present our objections to your proposals for the green belt protection pasture area surrounding our home in Middleton (your site options: 5, 6 & 9). Whilst the areas identified in Middleton/Hopwood area represent only a minor part of the Core Strategy document, we believe that before proceeding with ar1 plans to redevelop green belt land within its boundaries, the Rochdale MBC ought to seriously consider the amount of brown field land that it already has available and accessible without further desecration of other land, which is used, enjoyed, appreciated and cared for by a good number of its residents and communities from both within and outside the borough. It being the first 'real' open green space to the north of the sprawling city of Manchester. Perhaps Rochdale MBC has failed to consider the health and mental well being that a stretch of open/green countryside provides to the local community. Within the Hollin Lane, Langley Lane, Middleton Road, Manchester Road boundaries are well-established walking, jogging and cycling routes - The creation of any development in this area would affect and interrupt access to public footpaths, bridleways and rights of way. Any building on this land would eradicate any remaining wildlife from the area and in a matter of years the townships of Middleton and Heywood would become merely an asphalt extension of Manchester, and consequently lose their semi-rural attraction not to mention their identities. Apart from the loss of the rural aspects of the area, consideration must be given to the increased volumes of</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>private and heavy commercial traffic; we have recently experienced a sample of the damage, the noise and the inconvenience of establishing a new community with the construction of the new St Annes Academy and the replacement of a gas pipe running the length of Hollin Lane/Middleton Road. – This however, is merely a temporary issue that will come to an end within a few months a major development, whether for private dwellings or mixed for housing and industry creating employment, will ultimately carry a heavy price for those of us already living in the local community; being in such close proximity to the M62, and therefore commutable and accessible, we doubt that many of the highlighted proposed jobs or the new homes created by developing these green belt sites would be occupied by local people! Regardless of its use, the construction of any development on this site will bring its own problems Greater noise pollution than that already produced by the motorway network. Further structural damage to the roads is inevitable; an increased carbon footprint and poor air quality in the area go hand-in-hand. An exceptional increase in road traffic will bring health and safety concerns to an already busy Hollin Lane, moreover considering the close proximity to the new 1,000 capacity student academy. Of all these concerns, probably one of our greatest is that Rochdale MBC fails to utilise its existing brown field sites or those sites already procured, for example the Kingsway Business Park, not to mention the old mills from our industrial past often standing in good positions. They slowly disintegrate and look like an eyesore. Take for example the Warwick Mill in Middleton. A new town centre is planned, courtesy of Tesco and although we don't dispute its heritage to the town, it looks totally out of place looking dilapidated and in desperate need of renovation, whilst regally standing in this prime position in the town centre - all through traffic travelling to and from Manchester passing this tired old monstrosity; and there must be many more examples of these tired old buildings standing empty in prime sites across the borough? In closing, we would ask that the Rochdale MBC gives serious consideration to the thoughts and feelings of its present residents before embarking on this irreversible quest to destroy the green belt land surrounding Middleton and Heywood which has for generations provided a special and unique buffer between the borough and the surrounding towns it is after all our heritage!</p> | |
| 217439/601 | Mr H Davenport | <p>LANGLEY LANE The government has requested more land to be made available for building houses, and for industry, and land north</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>of Langley Lane has been mentioned for this purpose, but should not be considered further for the following reasons:- 1. The gap between Heywood and Middleton was already considered to be the minimum sustainable by local planners in the area, and by the inspector in the last. 2. There are plenty of empty houses, many of which have not been occupied for several years, which can accommodate a raising population for many years to come. 3. Existing industrial estates and buildings these on seem to be greatly under used and could accommodate a much greater manufactory labour force. 4. Langley Lane itself has become North Manchester rat run with its attendant dust and other pollutions. Public transport facilities should be encouraged throughout the country should be encouraged to reduce congestion. 5. Land in the Birch, Pilsworth, Hare Hill areas is succumbing at an alarming rate to rubbish dumping. More buildings of any kind can only increase this problem. 6. Middleton has already constructed more than its fair share of farm land to building of various kinds approximately 40 farms lost to building of various kinds approximately 40 farms lost to building since 1946. Any further building should be restricted to areas within the existing built up boundary.</p> | |
| 217442/599 | Miss Marjorie Davenport | <p>LANGLEY LANE This letter is to tell you why I think the land north of Langley Lane , Middleton should not be released for either Industry or Housing. In the past there has been so much 'open' countryside taken for building homes and industry that there is so little remaining for residents to enjoy. 1. There are plenty of empty houses, and spaces for new homes, in the estates for any increase in population. 2. There is plenty of room I the existing buildings, and room in the empty spaces in the Industrial Estates for any new buildings which may be required without encroaching on further land. Let us stop any plans the government may have for any buildings on this land, and preserve it for future generations.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 217460/165 | Mr Stuart Meade | <p>LANGLEY LANE I Strongly object to any release of open land on Langley Lane / Hollin Lane / Heywood Old Road, for any type of development. This area is used extensively by walkers, joggers, families, parents, grandparents and dog walkers. It is used for exercise and pleasure and I have yet to see any of the above walking / jogging along Windermere Road or through Hollins Estate. It is regarded as a safe area in which to walk and is onen used by singles and couples of both sexes. The Core Strategy Report shows a poor air quality corridor either side of the motorway and yet you propose to pollute this last area of farm land. (Go directly south of</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>Langley Lane and the next piece of farm land is in Cheshire, past Manchester Airport). Jobs are not created by building in green belt areas. All that happens is that firms relocate from existing Industrial units to new build with all the benefits of grants, preferred rates, ect. Whilst the Government may require more industrial land, surely Brown field sites, which for years have provided land for housing, should now be used.</p> | |
| 217474/188 | Mr Raymond Richardson | <p>LANGLEY LANE I wish to object most strongly against the councils proposal to release the farm land north of Langley Lane to be used for housing or industrial development. In 1994 when the council wanted to develop this land the government inspectors' report said that the piece of land between Heywood and Middleton was already small in size and that any reduction would reduce the important buffer zone between the two towns which is important for them to keep their identity. Throughout the Rochdale borough on the big Industrial sites there are a lot of "To Let" signs with some of these units being empty for a long time also some of the land on these sites has not been developed. When you look around the borough there are hundreds of private houses for sale and sites where housing developments have stopped because the building firms have run out of money owing to the economic climate. What is going to happen to these unfinished developments? When you look around the borough you will see plenty of derelict sites (brown sites) which should be used for re-development before using white or green sites. The proposed north of Langley Lane development would cause huge problems with the increase of already heavy traffic in this area which would result in an increase in road accidents with children from nearby St Anne's Academy. The land north of Langley Lane is used by many families and people to escape the built up area in which they live to take part in recreational activities, for example, jogging, walking and cycling which is important for their physical and mental wellbeing. I feel yet again that the residents who live in the area of this proposed development are being put through a lot of unnecessary worry and stress when, it was stated in the last inspectors report that in his view Langley Lane would make a firmer and clearer boundary line between Heywood and Middleton and if he was asked to define the Green belt in this vicinity he would recommend that this White belt site be included into the Green belt so that Langley Lane would firmly define the edge of Middleton and the beginning of a Green belt boundary between Heywood and Middleton. I feel like most of the residents in this area that yet again</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|----------------|--|--|
| | | we have been let down by Rochdale Council. | |
| 345617/184 | Mr peter shore | <p>LANGLEY LANE I understand that there is a proposal to develop this land for Industrial/Retail/Residential purposes. My objections are based on the following: Industrial. Stakehill Industrial Estate - An existing Industrial Park with an existing infrastructure offering direct motorway access with many units lying empty. Kingsway Business Park - A new Business Park that has absorbed a huge amount of money in development costs and is yet to attract any significant occupiers. Retail Rochdale Town Centre - There are proposals for extensive re-development of the retail offer. Middleton Town Centre - Tesco are currently re-developing the old swimming pool/leisure centre site. Residential There are many derelict and vacant brownfield sites available in both Heywood and Middleton Boroughs. Comment Industrial Common sense dictates that if there is no demand for existing developments with excellent access to the motorway infrastructure, how can the Local Authority justify investment into another venture. We (the tax payers) currently fund an organisation called Rochdale Development Agency. I also understand that we provide funding to an organisation called MIDAS (Manchester Investment Development Agency Services). Just what are these organisations doing to attract investment? Before you respond to this question please be aware that I possess in depth knowledge of the activities and strategies of both these organisations and I strongly believe they do not offer value for money. I believe there is a need to review and overhaul the way that the Borough is attempting to attract Inward Investment as clearly, the current strategy is ineffective. On face value, the proposal to develop another industrial complex when we can't fill existing space would suggest that the Authority has too many people with not enough to do. Retail There are proposals to redevelop the retail offer in Rochdale Town Centre. Why are you now planning to introduce a competitive scheme? Surely it makes sense to consolidate the retail offer so that it can compete with the likes of the Trafford Centre and Manchester City Centre. The Trafford Centre is a 20 minute drive from the Borough and, with the introduction of the Metrolink, access Manchester becomes far more convenient! With the development of the new Tesco store in Middleton Town Centre there is a need to grasp the opportunity to review the retail offer within the town and offer a complimentary retail scheme. Otherwise the town is at risk of further retail degeneration as Tesco drives other retailers away Residential As a resident of Middleton I am aware of the many</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|-----------|-------------------|---|--|
| | | brown field/derelict sites in the area. From an eco-friendly point of view, would it not be better to regenerate these dormant sites rather than develop green space that breathes life into our over polluted atmosphere? | |
| 364075/1 | MR DAVID MORRIS | <p>LANGLEY LANE The area to the north of Langley Lane is open space that is beneficial to local residents living mainly to the south of Langley Lane and other nearby residential areas. It is also an area abundant with wildlife including Sparrowhawks and Herons and wild deer. The area acts as a green lung buffering against the pollution caused by the M62 motorway. The fields themselves are used for farming and the stabling of a large number of horses which adds to the semi rural aspect of the areas of Birch and Langley Lane. The area is also a significant historical site with links to LANGLEY HALL which dates back to 1050AD, and was the birthplace of Cardinal Thomas Langley in 1363 who became the Prince Bishop of Durham and instrumental in the crowning of King Henry IV of England. Most of rural Britain is under threat and we should preserve the smaller pockets of open countryside for the benefit and well-being of local residents. We need the fresh air and the green fields and not a sprawling conurbation that destroys the image and character of our countryside.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 364186/2 | Ms Fran Harper | <p>LANGLEY LANE The proposals contradict themselves as they state changes are needed to promote the borough as a beautiful, green area for tourists to want to visit and then say they propose to develop the small amount of green land to the north of Langley Lane!! Will the planners be happy when there are no green spaces left in this area?? I know the excuse is to provide employment, housing etc., but there are various areas around other parts of Middleton that are crying out for redevelopment and/or money spending on them. Is it just that the council are keener to offer these attractive spaces to developers because there is more money to be had from the sale of green areas? Perhaps if enough of us show we care we can stop this madness!!</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 368014/13 | Mr Robert Sherwin | <p>LANGLEY LANE The proposals for the protected open land north of Langley Lane Middleton and the proposed link road from Pilsworth Road to the M62 Heywood will kick start a process that will lead to yet further developments . This will effectively join the two towns in to one continuous built up area and ultimately loss of town identity and character. This natural open space is used by hundreds of local people from Heywood and Middleton for walking, jogging, cycling and enjoyment of the great outdoors without having to travel by bus</p> | |

| | | | |
|------------|----------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>or car to a formal recreation centre. The pleasant rural aspect that greets people who are visiting either town from the motorway will be lost forever. The area acts as a pleasant open rural breathing space between the two towns. I believe that this area should be reclassified for inclusion within the Green Belt and not used for development. There should also be a clear explanation of what the terms Green Belt and Protected Open Land actually mean when describing an area.</p> | |
| 381583/219 | Mr Dave Saye | <p>LANGLEY LANE I take much interest regarding the proposed development of the beautiful green areas, north of Langley Lane. I have read that these land areas are protected, so how can they be developed? Why is there no consideration or thought for the wildlife naturally created by the Great Spirit. What harm has the wildlife done to lose their dependency on this land for their survival for unnatural inconsiderate greed of mankind. Mans attitude towards the nature around him is of special importance, because as we should respect our created world. This also should respect the animals, birds, insects, plant life. So any proposed interference with these naturally created life forms, dependent on areas that could fulfil man's greed, could have serious consequences, interfering with natural creation.</p> | |
| 381590/180 | Mrs Amanda McCartney | <p>LANGLEY LANE I live at 36 Braithwaite Road. My husband and I bought the house from Lovell's 2 years ago when we started our family. The property was so attractive to us because of the lovely views, Lovell's were also charging a higher price for our house because of the lovely views. We now have 2 young daughters and love the house we live in, it's very quiet and as stated before the views are lovely which everyone who visit's my house comments on. I also have a dog that we walk regular around the Langley Lane area; also I walk regularly around Langley Lane, through to Heywood for exercise. I was very upset to hear that the land facing my house maybe sold and used for industrial units. Not only will this create lots of pollution and noise, it will be an eyesore to look out of my windows at home. I am aware that there are lots of units in the area that are empty as of lack of business's requiring them, there is Stakehill, there are units on Hares Hill Road empty etc. I would hope you would add my letter to the lots you have already received and would hope the council will re-consider what they are trying to turn lovely green land into.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381628/191 | Kathryn Cahill | <p>LANGLEY LANE As a long time resident of Langley living on Langley Lane opposite this belt I feel I have to write to you to oppose</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|----------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>this move. It is a beautiful area which I visually enjoy daily and to destroy this to build an industrial area especially in the current economic climate where half of these units remain empty seems scandalous. I say this as someone who works in Trafford Park but definitely would not want to live within its boundaries. Definitely not a place for children, joggers or dog walkers, all of who use and enjoy this green belt. The constant noise and congestion of traffic would be appalling compared to what we have to suffer now. Please leave these belts as originally intended as a small haven of countryside separating townships.</p> | |
| 381642/186 | Mrs Valerie Kempster | <p>LANGLEY LANE We certainly don't want any buildings on the green open land from Langley lane or hollin Lane. And we certainly don't want traffic and pollution coming to our Area. Why spoil the unique views we have little left of. Many parents with children, dog walkers and the elderly enjoy walking in safety enjoying the views and the wildlife. As for the wildlife, Foxes, Squirrels etc, will be gone forever. Why take their life away from them. Life is hard enough for them without putting buildings on every bit of green land. What would life be if we have to live in a concrete jungle and have no bit of countryside to enjoy. As for the elderly, the views at the back of Langley Lane isn't far for them to from Silver Birch Estate to enjoy their walks and the unique views. I say again, Silver Birch Estate do not want any sort of buildings on the green open land from Langley or Hollin Lane and I know they will make it clear in the near future which I most certainly know they will.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381656/218 | Mrs Sheila Wood | <p>LANGLEY LANE I object most strongly to the proposed swallowing up of yet more open land for the following reasons: 1) There are already four new housing estates in the immediate area, one built on Langley Lane and three others on Hollin Lane. Surely that is enough without taking more Greenland for yet estate or Business Park, now I believe the business park at Stakehill has half the units empty. 2) We are surrounded by business parks - Pilsworth, Slattocks, Heywood and Bowlee, do we really need another one with its attendant heavy goods traffic. We already have quite enough of that with the M62 interchange on Hollin Lane. 3) The constant chipping away of green land strikes a parallel with 1930's Ribbon Development, which resulted in towns becoming physically merged and gradually losing identity. Wouldn't a better solution to the problem be to utilise areas of Brown Land. Which have been left unused, and property boarded up, such as houses on Langley Estate thus leaving Greenland undisturbed for the benefit of the</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|-----------|---|--|
| | | population at large? | |
| 381674/168 | A Connell | <p>LANGLEY LANE We wish to object most strongly against the Council's proposal to release the farmland north of Langley Lane from its present status as 'Protected Land', to land which will be made available for development. (Viz: To provide land for development of either Housing, Industrial, or a mixture of the two), on the following grounds:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional Industrial development in this area, and probably also for the whole of the Borough, is not needed or necessary. 2. Additional Housing Development in this area certainly cannot be justified. 3. Any erosion of the 'green space' between Middleton & Heywood would further reduce the natural and important 'buffer zone' dividing these two independent townships. 4. Any development within the limits of this proposal would be the start of progression towards an eventual 'conurbation type linkage' of Middleton and Heywood with the loss of their individual identification. 5. Any development encroachment on this farmland would see the loss of an important stretch of Countryside currently enjoyed not only by the local residents but also the loss of natural habitats for the wildlife in this 'green space'. 6. The proposal certainly would not 'protect the amenity of the locality' which is the common phraseology that planners push when turning down planning proposals that they consider blight on area. 7. The industrial developments that Rochdale Planning Department have approved over the last decade indicate that they over estimated demand. The high number of 'To Let' signs relative to industrial premises on sites such as Pilswoith, Stakehill & Kingsway alone is verification of this. Not only this, but development on the two largest of these sites is far from complete. 8. On nearby Langley Estate, continued housing development has been put on hold due to the downturn in the housing market demand. A good deal of land is available on this estate to cover any future demand and the proliferation of 'For Sale' signs in and about the whole of Rochdale is further evidence that more housing cannot be justified. 9. The undoubted problems that the increased traffic flows would have on the local environment cannot be tolerated. The traffic volume in this immediate area is already at its limit. 10. Langley Lane physically cannot support the volumes of extra traffic that development would undoubtedly generate. 11. An increase in private and/or HGV's on Hollin Lane & Langley Lane would only add to the already congested problems the catchment area suffers. But more worrying, is the higher likelihood of road accidents that might well be caused. The nearby St Annes Academy is being increased in | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>size and Road Safety must be considered in such proposals. 12. We also support the Heywood residents who are objecting to the proposed new road linking Harehill Road to the roundabout on the M62 Motorway (junction 19). Apart from further denudation of the green land on the Heywood side of the Motorway, this suggested link road would add to the traffic congestion in the vicinity of the roundabout as well as the immediate catchment area. In 1995, we had a Public inquiry about the very same issue and at that time, the Planners themselves conceded that if it had not been for the 'Structure Plan Housing requirements', the site in question then and now would probably have become part of the Statutory Green Belt. Following the inquiry, the Inspector's Report said that the open land between Middleton & Heywood fulfilled several of the purposes for which land is included in Green Belts. In particular he referred to it helping to keep the two towns separate, and that in his view, Langley Lane would make a much clearer and firmer boundary than the present line, much of which follows an insignificant stream. The Inspector also said that it was his view that in practice the land performs the same Green Belt role as the neighbouring land to the north. He further added that if he had been asked to define the Green Belt in this vicinity starting from a clean sheet, he would have to recommend the inclusion of the site in the Green Belt because he felt that Langley Lane firmly defines the edge of Middleton and marks the beginning of the narrow and vulnerable band of open land separating Middleton & Heywood. Does the findings of a Government Inspector mean nothing to the RMBC? Planners will no doubt use their granting of planning permission on this site to attract 'speculative' developers build Industrial Units and/or a new Housing Estate. We hope the Inspector insists on seeing plans of just how much land has already been used within the Borough over the past Ten to Fifteen years for 'speculative Industrial development'. The amount I know is quite substantial and, considering that vast footage of properties that are still 'To Let', it begs the question of why we need more 'vacant' Units to replace the green spaces. An argument Planners often use to try to hoodwink our Councillors is that such a development will provide work for local residents. We all know that this is just a shallow ploy. Only the 'Factory' type development has even the remotest chance of employing local people and the development they propose is NOT in this category. Planning Officer (Mr Paul Simpson) has suggested that if we have the audacity to object to development in our particular area, we must suggest an</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------------|--------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>alternative site for this. We are not in the business of doing the Planning Departments work for them; we pay them to look after our interests not to work against the local environmental needs. We can only presume from this request that there has not been any survey carried out with the developers to find out if they have any firm clientele for such needs. Our answer to this inappropriate suggestion is firmly that development of this nature is NOT needed on the site in question or probably elsewhere for that matter, within the Rochdale Metropolitan Borough. For the reasons given above, unless the Council have a hidden agenda that we are not aware of, (Government Grant conditions or whatever), we cannot understand why the Planners have not queried the requirements issued by the Government Planners in connection with the Core Strategy Proposals. The Government Planners surely have not taken into account the local conditions prevailing in Rochdale, unless, as we say, there is some hidden agenda? If, and we hope we are wrong with this line of thought, it is related to our Council seeking Government Grant Aid Monies, what is this monetary allocation designed to be used for? We have a surplus of industrial Units and Housing is not a problem so, just where do the Council plan to use such funding?</p> | |
| 381687/213 | Mr Bernard Collins | <p>LANGLEY LANE It has been brought to my notice that you Council and Committee are once again attempting to interfere to try and release our beautiful and coveted Protected Land area of Langley Lane and Hollin Lane and intend to follow once again to desecrate all of this area by once again useless and entirely needless building and industrial development. I and all of my colleagues have, house owners, neighbours experienced this skulduggery some years going back a while. Then and now presumably, some other avaricious large company like the previous Mobaine can see a large lucrative return financially trying to prove a needless fictitious demand. This area where we live is a source of outstanding natural beauty. The land and panorama with its extensive views and scenic gardens are a joy to behold and to attempt yet again to gain control will be fought for finely by the indigenous residents and house owners as it was in you furious attempt. I like every thing else in this country of potential value, it becomes the target for unscrupulous financial attention by local Council and greedy politicians, who are only interested in feathering there own nest.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381689/217 | Mr T Colson | <p>LANGLEY LANE We wish to object most strongly against the Council's proposal to release the farmland north of Langley Lane</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>from its present status as 'Protected Land', to land which will be made available for development. (Viz: To provide land for development of either Housing, Industrial, or a mixture of the two), on the following grounds:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional Industrial development in this area, and probably also for the whole of the Borough, is not needed or necessary. 2. Additional Housing Development in this area certainly cannot be justified. 3. Any erosion of the 'green space' between Middleton & Heywood would further reduce the natural and important 'buffer zone' dividing these two independent townships. 4. Any development within the limits of this proposal would be the start of progression towards an eventual 'conurbation type linkage' of Middleton and Heywood with the loss of their individual identification. 5. Any development encroachment on this farmland would see the loss of an important stretch of Countryside currently enjoyed not only by the local residents but also the loss of natural habitats for the wildlife in this 'green space'. 6. The proposal certainly would not 'protect the amenity of the locality' which is the common phraseology that planners push when turning down planning proposals that they consider blight on area. 7. The industrial developments that Rochdale Planning Department have approved over the last decade indicate that they over estimated demand. The high number of 'To Let' signs relative to industrial premises on sites such as Pilsworth, Stakehill & Kingsway alone is verification of this. Not only this, but development on the two largest of these sites is far from complete. 8. On nearby Langley Estate, continued housing development has been put on hold due to the downturn in the housing market demand. A good deal of land is available on this estate to cover any future demand and the proliferation of 'For Sale' signs in and about the whole of Rochdale is further evidence that more housing cannot be justified. 9. The undoubted problems that the increased traffic flows would have on the local environment cannot be tolerated. The traffic volume in this immediate area is already at its limit. 10. Langley Lane physically cannot support the volumes of extra traffic that development would undoubtedly generate. 11. An increase in private and/or HGV's on Hollin Lane & Langley Lane would only add to the already congested problems the catchment area suffers. But more worrying, is the higher likelihood of road accidents that might well be caused. The nearby St Anne's Academy is being increased in size and Road Safety must be considered in such proposals. 12. We also support the Heywood residents who are objecting to the proposed new road linking Hareshill Road to the roundabout on the | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>M62 Motorway (junction 19). Apart from further denudation of the green land on the Heywood side of the Motorway, this suggested ink road would add to the traffic congestion in the vicinity of the roundabout as well as the immediate catchment area. In 1995, we had a Public Inquiry about the very same issue and at that time, the Planners themselves conceded that if it had not been for the 'Structure Plan Housing requirements', the site in question then and now would probably have become part of the Statutory Green Belt. Following the Inquiry, the Inspector's Report said that the open land between Middleton & Heywood fulfilled several of the purposes for which land is included in Green Belts. In particular he referred to it helping to keep the two towns separate, and that in his view, Langley Lane would make a much clearer and firmer boundary than the present line, much of which follows an insignificant stream. The Inspector also said that it was his view that in practice the land performs the same Green Belt role as the neighbouring land to the north. He further added that if he had been asked to define the Green Belt in this vicinity starting from a clean sheet, he would have to recommend the inclusion of the site in the Green Belt because he felt that Langley Lane firmly defines the edge of Middleton and marks the beginning of the narrow and vulnerable band of open land separating Middleton & Heywood. Does the findings of a Government Inspector mean nothing to the RMBC? Planners will no doubt use their granting of planning permission on this site to attract 'speculative' developers build Industrial Units and/or a new Housing Estate. We hope the Inspector insists on seeing plans of just how much land has already been used within the Borough over the past Ten to Fifteen years for 'speculative Industrial development'. The amount I know is quite substantial and, considering that vast footage of properties that are still 'To Let', it begs the question of why we need more 'vacant' Units to replace the green spaces. An argument Planners often use to try to hoodwink our Councillors is that such a development will provide work for local residents. We all know that this is just a shallow ploy. Only the 'Factory' type development has even the remotest chance of employing local people and the development they propose is NOT in this category. Planning Officer (Mr Paul Simpson) has suggested that if we have the audacity to object to development in our particular area, we must suggest an alternative site for this. We are not in the business of doing the Planning Departments work for them; we pay them to look after our interests not to work against the local environmental needs. We can</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|------------|------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>only presume from this request that there has not been any survey carried out with the developers to find out if they have any firm clientele for such needs. Our needed on the site in question or probably elsewhere for that matter, within the Rochdale Metropolitan Borough. For the reasons given above, unless the Council have a hidden agenda that we are not aware of, (Government Grant conditions or whatever), we cannot understand why the Planners have not queried the requirements issued by the Government Planners in connection with the Core Strategy Proposals. The Government Planners surely have not taken into account the local conditions prevailing in Rochdale, unless, as we say, there is some hidden agenda? If, and we hope we are wrong with this line of thought, it is related to our Council seeking Government Grant Aid Monies, what is this monetary allocation designed to be used for? We have a surplus of industrial Units and Housing is not a problem so, just where do the Council plan to use such funding?</p> | |
| 381697/214 | M Leach | <p>LANGLEY LANE I am writing about the planning of buildings, industrial-housing. While I know there is a need for families to have a roof over their head, and also industrial units bring employment for people. So I would like to see just some of the green land used and not all, as families with children like to walk there. There are lots of empty houses I pass every day and nobody does anything about them.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 381702/174 | Mr Graham Taylor | <p>LANGLEY LANE As a former resident of Hopwood and where a very close friend of mine lives at 4, Hollins Drive, I would suggest to develop any form of housing/industrial development on the farming/rural land behind and aside Middleton Road would be a grave mistake. There has already been more than enough housing development between the Langley Estate and what was the original boundary of Hopwood over the years, leaving precious little green belt for people to enjoy and remember Middleton/Hopwood as it has been for many years as a recognised, separated green belt between the two. As a young boy in the 1950's I can always remember the pleasure I used to obtain walking or cycling down Middleton Road to Hopwood as I completed the triangle between Hopwood Avenue, Manchester Road, Langley Lane and then finally back down Middleton Road back to Hopwood. Sadly, there is now little open countryside between Langley, Middleton and Hopwood, Heywood remaining; for the sake of future generations and indeed those living in the area today, please do not further develop what remaining rural area remains simply in the name of what amounts to essentially</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------|---|--|
| | | monetary 'greed' from the councils and landowner concerned all in the name of supposed 'development'. | |
| 381709/175 | Brenda Stringer | LANGLEY LANE We think the green belt on the left hand side going to Heywood should stay as it is not to be built on leave us some green space! ! | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 382012/173 | Jillian Jones | <p>LANGLEY LANE I wish to raise my objection to the proposals being put forward in the Core Strategy Preferred Options. I am appalled and dismayed to see that these proposals will remove a significant amount of open green space around Middleton and Heywood, which will completely change the landscape and area. Of the site options put forward in the document 'Rochdale Borough Core Strategy Issues and Options Report - Sept 2008', I specifically wish to object to the following site options:- Option 4 - Middleton West, Heywood Old Road, Middleton Option 5 - Land North of Langley Lane (East), Middleton Option 6 - Land North of Langley Lane (West), Middleton Option 8 - Land North of Hareshill Road, Heywood Option 9 - Land South of Manchester Road, Heywood The reasons for my objections include the following:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These proposals will remove a significant amount of open green space around Middleton and Heywood, which will completely change the landscape and area. 2. Replacing the green areas with industrial, retail and housing developments will have a detrimental effect on the local residents, as the open green space is good for the well being of individuals. 3. Many local residents use the green space for recreational activity and exercise. These are well established walking, running and cycling routes. Removing these areas will have an adverse effect on the health of local individuals. 4. It is highly likely that many of the current residents will look to sell up and leave the area, which is not good for the local communities. 5. Although Middleton and Heywood is divided by the M62, the open green space helps to maintain fresh air and also encourages wild life. 6. Removal of the green areas will have a detrimental effect on the wide variety of wild life. 7. There are numerous developments around the area that are not being fully utilised. Also brown field sites can be identified. These areas should be considered for development instead, with transport being made available to enable people to travel to the jobs created. 8. If the green spaces are replaced with the suggested developments. There is a significant risk that the buildings will remain empty and attract vandalism, which will bring down the area. 9. We should be encouraging more green areas, not less. If new areas have been identified for conversion into green belt, then this should still go | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|------------------|--|--|
| | | <p>ahead, but in addition to the existing green areas, not instead of them. 10. The quality of the public transport infrastructure within the area is poor, particularly in respect of the rail infrastructure. This should be invested in before the green land is considered to be taken away. 11. The quality of the retail within Heywood, Middleton and Rochdale town centres requires investment, in priority of removing our green areas. 12. Converting our green areas into industrial and retail developments does not guarantee jobs for local residents and in fact is more likely to increase the levels of traffic within the area, causing disruption and pollution for local residents. 13. Removing the green areas and replacing them with the proposals will increase the carbon footprint for the area and is not good for the environment. As a resident of Middleton for over 15 years, I am extremely disappointed that Rochdale MBC appear to have deliberately avoided making these proposals widely known. I understand that leaflets, explaining the proposals, should have been distributed to local residents some time ago, but due to the cost, these were not delivered. I find this totally unacceptable. I also cannot understand how the council can truly believe that building on the green belt areas can provide any benefits to the local community, especially when there are plenty of non green areas that would be much more suitable. The council should be ensuring that the green belt is protected for the long term future.</p> | |
| 382102/176 | Linzi Woolfall | <p>LANGLEY LANE I am writing to object to any building on the farmland at either side to Hollin Lane and Langley Lane Middleton. This land is a green "buffer" between Middleton and Heywood and makes living in this part of Middleton more acceptable. People need to see open farmland and green areas for their wellbeing, to build on every available green space is not an option for our future. The residents do not need work on their doorstep, they will have to travel to work like the vast majority of the country. I also am not convinced that enough work for local people would be provided. There are already several areas in Rochdale that have been developed like this, for example stakehill and the horrible eyesore at Kingsway. The other major problem with development on Hollin Lane is the increase in traffic. Hollin Lane is already very busy. I would like to see both sides to Hollin Lane and Langley Lane designated as protected Green Belt for the future.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 389839/613 | Mr Darren Jervis | <p>LANGLEY LANE I wish to object most strongly against the Council's proposal to release the farmland north of Langley Lane from its present status as 'Protected Land', to land which will be made</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>available for development, either Housing, Industrial or a mixture of the two. I object to this proposal on the following grounds:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Additional Housing development in this area cannot be justified. There are already a vast number of properties of all sizes standing empty and displaying 'For Sale' and 'To Let' signs throughout the borough. 2. Additional Industrial development in this area and for the whole of the borough is not needed or necessary. The industrial developments that have already been approved over the last decade indicate an over estimated demand. The number of 'To Let' signs on industrial units on the Pilsworth, Stakehill and Kingsway sites confirms this. 3. A proposed development in this area would create an increase volume of traffic. The traffic volume in this immediate area is already at its limit. Langley Lane cannot physically support any extra volume of traffic that development would undoubtedly generate. 4. Not only would extra traffic being cars/vans/HGV's on Hollin Lane and Langley Lane add to the already congested problems this area suffers but there would be added concern for the health and safety of residents and members of the public to be considered. There would be a higher likelihood of road accidents and as the nearby St. Annes Academy School is increasing in size thus there being more pupils/students; road safety should be a great concern. Also on a health issue an increase in traffic would amount to more carbon emissions which will go against the Government's target in reducing CO2s. 5. Any erosion of the 'green space' between Middleton and Heywood would further reduce the natural and important 'buffer zone' dividing these two independent townships and form one continuous built up area. This would mean these two areas will lose their individual identification. Also any development encroachment on this farmland would see the loss of an important stretch of Countryside currently enjoyed not only by the local residents but also the loss of natural habitats for the wildlife in this green space. <p>What I would like the Council to use these planned proposals for the Local Development Framework would not to bring in new development into the area but to sort out existing empty properties housing/industrial/retail before even considering building any more that are going to be left unoccupied. To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land rather than removing green spaces that are declining to build on.</p> <p>At the public meeting on the 14th January, 2010 there was a lot of public feeling regarding this situation of empty industrial units on the abovementioned industrial sites and I was not satisfied in the</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | <p>response given. We were given replies that were a contradiction. You stated that employment needs to be brought into the borough and that new industrial units are needed to do this. When asked why these empty units can not be filled with businesses that can bring this employment. The reply to this was that the council has no control on what these units can be used for. So if the Council sell this preferred land for industrial to a developer won't the same situation apply! The Council will have no control on what this developer uses these units for, more then likely storage and more empty units. I do not understand how this can be a beneficial asset to the borough, I see this as a blip on the landscape. We have recently moved to the area and as mentioned above there were plenty of different houses to choose from. We narrowed our selection down to two options. The first was a three bedroom house which had been modernised in a built-up area and the second option was a house which needed a lot of work but looked out onto open space and has an attractive view. We chose the second option purely for its location. Therefore building more houses on an open space will not necessary attract more people to the area but have the adverse effect of driving the already established local residents away form the area! I would also like to use this opportunity to enquire if this protected land could be recommended for the inclusion in the Green Belt as it will act as a buffer zone between Heywood and Middleton and also help to secure nature conservation.</p> | |
| 390115/610 | Marie Stamp | <p>LANGLEY LANE I would like to register my total opposition to Rochdale Council's proposal to use land north of Hollin Lane for possible development.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 390117/609 | Jackie Booth | <p>LANGLEY LANE I would like to register my total opposition to Rochdale Council's proposal to use land north of Hollin Lane for possible development.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 398440/368 | Mr Steve Winder | <p>LANGLEY LANE I feel I must object strongly to the proposed future plans to build on what little greenspace there is left in Middleton/Heywood, namely the proposed building on greenbelt land on Langley Lane! This land is the only green space now left in our area's where we feel we can breath! Everyone I have spoken to is of the same opinion & not just local residents! Indeed I have many friends outside the Rochdale Manchester areas that are really concerned about these proposals. I feel enough is enough! Who wants to live within the middle of an ever increasing building site? or indeed a bigger conurbation than we already have? I wish for you to</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | | note my objection strongly against these proposals. | |
| 398445/369 | Veronica Malkin | <p>LANGLEY LANE We would like to put in an objection against the proposed development around the area north of Langley Lane. We live on the Silverbirch Estate off Langley Lane and feel that this is detrimental to all who live in the area. Our house was purchased when the estate was first built and indeed we were told that there were only 3 phases of development. As time progressed, a further estate on the Knight Crescent area was built. Having moved from Langley we had moved here so we could look out of our windows and overlook the fields of Bowlee and the farms opposite. The subsequent buildings of houses to the rear of ours means we can no longer see Bowlee and now this proposed development puts us in fear that you are about to take away the remaining green space. There is little green land left around here, please do not take it away from us. We have Industrial estates already at Pilsworth and Heywood, Stakehill too is close by. Do we really need more? Do you not think that there is enough traffic and HGVs on our local roads? You would be adding to that even more. Can Pilsworth and Langley Lane really take more traffic of this calibre? There is also St Annes School to think about. What of the impact on our children? It is quite a built up residential area now which it wasn't 20 years ago, the new estate at Hollins having also been built. We don't want to live in an Industrial area which is what you seem to be trying to do. We are sure there is an alternative to that which you are proposing, leave our fields and green space alone.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 397175/607 | Liz Norris | <p>LANGLEY LANE Having been to one of the local meetings & reviewed the plans on your website, I would now like to place my objections to the proposals & in particular to the proposal for the Land North of Langley Lane (West), During rush hour the traffic gets heavy along Langley Lane as it turns from Hollin Lane to get on to Heywood Old Road/Manchester Road. This problem gets worse when traffic can not easily turn right at the bottom of Langley Lane, on to Manchester Road, due to the volumes of traffic coming down Heywood Old Road going into Hopwood/Heywood. Many children walk on Langley Lane to get to & from their local secondary schools or to their nearest bus stops (St Ann's, Siddal Moor & Cardinal Langley). The Farm Shop & Newsagents on Langley Lane are of great local convenience to the estates off Langley Lane & the development would rid us of this.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 397682/386 | Mr Philip Hill | <p>LANGLEY LANE AND BOWLEE We object in the strongest terms with respect to the loss of green space between Bowlee and</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|---------------|---|--|
| | | <p>Langley. This would completely change the nature of the village and the surrounding are. Being on a high position it would reduce the quality of the views for miles around. It would also cause congestion in both Rhodes Green and Bowlee. We object in the strongest terms with respect to the loss of green space at Top of Hebers. This land to the north of the top of Langley Lane has for many years represented the end of Middleton and provided a gap before you bump into Heywood. The people of this area would greatly miss the rural feel to this area if it was developed.</p> | |
| 397686/598 | S Horan | <p>LANGLEY LANE I object to this proposal due to the fact that when I bought my property this was green belt area. To build on this land would destroy an area which gives a lot of pleasure to people of the area and from far away. In my opinion it is not practical to build on this land due to its position e.g. the fact that it is facing a busy school and in a short time a college, also many students use Hollin Lane and Langley Lane to get to Hopwood Hal College. The volume of traffic would increase dramatically, as many people would tell you that at times it is hard to get in and out of your own house. People of Hollin Lane and Langley Lane have bought their houses for the position and views. The plans seem to include industrial as well as retail for this area and this would completely destroy this area. There are too many industrial estates in this area, which are half empty and could accommodate your needs. May I also add that these industrial estates do not back onto houses or next to schools. Why is there any need for more houses when lots of properties are empty on Langley and areas being pulled down, plus there are lots of private houses that are up for sale and cannot be sold. I hope that Rochdale council come to their senses as regards how people feel on this issue. This was green belt so top bending the rules and leave this area alone.</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| 397687/361 | Mr James Hall | <p>LANGLEY LANE I had to laugh with your points for this proposed site, included the regeneration of Langley! Since when has Langley ever been a high priority for Rochdale Council? Just weigh up the facts, apart from a few private houses at the top of Langley Lane, Hollins Drive and Hollins Lane, the biggest impact will be on the people who live in the Council houses on Langley. And even then too odd insult to injury, you propose submitting, land north of the school, back into green belt status, who will this benefit? Only the private householder up near J19 roundabout. There is 3 million sq ft, of vacant property in the near vicinity, all with in 5 minutes of the motorway network, no matter what lame excuses you present in not</p> | Objection noted. See response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|---|
| | | <p>using this vacant space, the point is, it is there. And in a period of carbon foot printing and ecological issues, your Council is quite prepared too decimate a place that is home for rabbits, foxes, badgers, goats, birds (all types), bats, hares, frogs, toads, newts and all this in the name of profit, shame on you ROCHDALE COUNCIL! And if you think that the people of Langley will not fight this proposed I suggest you think again!</p> | |
| 397693/604 | <p>Mrs Brenda Scholes (P Wilson and Company - Mr Andrew Coney)</p> | <p>LANGLEY LANE Having considered the proposals set out in the Rochdale Borough Core Strategy Preferred Options Document, our above named clients have instructed me to submit their strong support for the protection of the 14Ha North of Langley Lane to meet future housing, employment or mixed use development needs as set out in Policy R3-Managing Other Protected/Reserved Land. The Council's evidence suggests that within the lifetime of the LDF, some protected land will need to be available/released to accommodate development that cannot be satisfactorily accommodated within the existing developed area of Middleton. Our Clients believe that the 14ha of land North of Langley Lane is highly suitable for this purpose. The reasons for our Client's support of the protection/reservation of the Land North of Langley Lane for future long term development are summarised below. Green Belt The Land North of Langley Lane has been protected land excluded from the Green Belt for many years. Therefore, this land could be used to meet long term development need without any impact on the integrity of the existing Green Belt or any question that such a development would be contrary to the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. Sustainability With regard to eventually developing the 14Ha North of Langley Lane as a residential or mixed use development, our clients believe that the site possesses strong sustainable development credentials in terms of its access to employment, local services and public transportation. The sustainability of the site is underpinned by the facilities that are available within walking distance of the site and the public transport links available in the vicinity, these are summarised below: Local Facilities The site off Langley Lane benefits from the following facilities within walking distance. Under 800m a) Post Office, Convenience Store and general shops on Langley Lane and Hollin Lane b) Queen Elizabeth High School, Hollin Lane c) Langley Primary School, Thirlmere Road d) Langley Library e) Chemist, Convenience Store and general shops at Lakeland Court Over 800m but under 1 mile a) Alderman Kay Primary School b) St.Mary's RC</p> | <p>Support noted. See response in Schedule A.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>Primary School c) Middleton Primary School d) Wood Street Group Doctors Surgery e) Hollin Primary School f) Middleton Town Centre g) Supermarket (Tesco) h) Middleton Library Any future development of the Langley Lane site for residential development (in full or as part of a mixed use scheme) would benefit from access to the above infrastructure and would offer a greater pool of potential users for these local services (in turn making these services more successful/sustainable for the benefit of new and existing residents).</p> <p>Public Transport The area around the land at Langley Lane is served by a number of frequent local bus services linking the site with local infrastructure, other service centres within the borough and beyond. These local bus services include: 1 The Nos. 64, 163 and X69 linking Hollin Lane to Bury, Middleton and Manchester. 2. The Nos. 113, 123, 124,125,130, 150,163, 296 frequently linking Windermere Road with local services and also providing access links to the wider area e.g. Manchester. Sustainability Conclusion Given the excellent existing local facilities and public transport links available, our clients believe that the site is highly sustainable for future development which is either wholly or partly residential; and would not result in a final development overly reliant on private transportation. Suitability for Employment Use With regard to eventually accommodating an employment or mixed use development on the 14Ha North of Langley Lane, the site in question has a number of features which would make it eminently suitable for a development involving employment. These can be summarised as: 1. The 14Ha North of Langley Lane sits at the entrance to Middleton from the M62. As such, a "business gateway" type development could assist in providing Middleton with a modern and dynamic business image attracting new investment and employers. 2. The location of the land on the edge of the town with good access to the M62 means that there would be minimal disruption (e.g. traffic) caused to the existing urban area by an employment/business development. 3. The site has main road frontage which is attractive to commercial/business users. 4. The land has good access to the M62 providing excellent access to markets in Manchester, Merseyside, West Yorkshire and beyond. Convenient access to these markets would naturally be attractive to business and those looking to invest in the area. 5. The excellent sustainable transport links outlined above would provide workers with excellent sustainable means of accessing their place of work without needing to rely excessively on private car transport.</p> | |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | | Environmental Value Whilst the 14Ha in question is open land and therefore has some intrinsic value, our clients do not believe that the area has any special environmental, recreational or landscape value. Therefore, use of this land would minimise the negative effect on the local environment caused by any development outside the existing developed area which the Council's evidence suggests is necessary within the life of the LDF or beyond. Previous Designation As is acknowledged in the core strategy the land north of Langley Lane has in the past been protected for future development. If as is stated, land still needs to be set aside for possible future development, our clients believe that this land should be drawn from that land previously set aside for such a purpose. In light of the above, our clients strongly support Rochdale MBC's position on protected/reserved land and urge them to adopt Core Strategy Policy R3 in its current form. | |
| 398423/516 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | BROAD LANE AND BOWLEE We support the proposed land release in respect of sites outlined in d (i) and (iii) | Support noted. See response in Schedule A. |
| R4 – Enhancing green infrastructure | | | |
| Question 32 a) What are your views on our policy for enhancing green infrastructure? b) Should standards for recreational open space provision be reviewed? c) Should standards be applied for other types of greenspaces e.g. natural areas? | | | |
| 60372/80 | British Waterways – Ms Sam Turner | British Waterways is supportive of the policy for enhancing green infrastructure but feel that greater emphasis should be given to the role that waterways can play in contributing to GI. The Defra document 'Waterways for Everyone' (2009) sets out the cluster of benefits offered by the waterways; •creating nature and wildlife corridors that link towns with the countryside; •supporting health and well-being through outdoor recreation opportunities and the creation of attractive and stimulating landscapes; •providing green transport corridors for walking and cycling; •creating accessible community spaces, supporting community cohesion and volunteering; and •supporting sustainable rural communities, where services for local people, such as shops, pubs and post offices that might otherwise have been closed are kept open by custom from tourists and recreational visitors | Noted Many of these points are picked up in broad terms within the policy as written they will be picked up in greater detail in the GI Strategy. 4b to be changed to refer the other principal river valleys and the Rochdale Canal. |
| 162038/336 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | Welcomed and supported. | Point of support noted. |
| 180804/56 | The Coal Authority - Miss Rachael Bust | Policy R4 – Enhancing green infrastructure Test of Soundness Justified Effective Consistency With National Policy-X Past coal mining activity in Rochdale has left a legacy, which could result in potential public safety and stability problems in areas of public open | Noted; but feel that this is too detailed for the core strategy. Issues such this will be addressed in the |

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| | | <p>space. Some mine entries will be within areas of greenspace, which can present a safety risk. It is important that the Local Planning Authority and developers are aware of the potential risks and location of mine shafts in areas that attract large numbers of people. The presence of mine entries is not a constraint on development, and addressing them in a positive way as part of any improvements to greenspace areas can remove future public safety hazards arising from past mining activity. The Coal Authority operates a year-round 24-hour emergency call-out facility (01623 646333) for surface hazards for any changes detected in the ground appearance. The Coal Authority therefore recommends inclusion of an additional criterion for green infrastructure proposals within Policy R4 as follows: “(l) Ensure that any mining legacy issues, such as mine entries (shafts and adits) are identified within areas of public open space and, where necessary, treated as part of any planned improvements to maintain public safety.” Reason – In order to ensure that ground conditions and coal mining legacy are fully considered and, where necessary addressed, as part of open space proposals, as required by PPG14. The Coal Authority welcomes the opportunity to make these comments, we are of course willing to discuss the comments made above in further detail if desired and would be happy to negotiate alternative suitable wording to address any of its concerns.</p> | <p>detailed site scoping and design as a part of any development proposals.</p> |
| 180811/433 | Natural England - Mr Stephen Hedley | <p>We are pleased to see the inclusion of this comprehensive policy on the protection and enhancement of green infrastructure. We commend the policy for addressing detailed and locally relevant issues, such as identifying key assets central to climate change mitigation; identifying the Roch River Valley as a priority for enhancement; and establishing a provision standard for recreational space. We are also pleased to see the reference to local BAP priority habitats in the policy’s supporting text. We do however, have two recommendations to strengthen this policy: • We recommend the inclusion of a provision standard for accessible natural greenspace, in line with Natural England’s ANGSt . This could be included as an addition to the policy text on ‘access to and within the countryside and the natural environment’ (Policy R4(j)). The incorporation of the ANGSt within the Core Strategy could also help to support the objectives of the Borough’s forthcoming Green Infrastructure strategy. • It would be helpful to reference the background work/evidence which led to the establishment of the recreational space provision standard (2.1ha per 1,000 population),</p> | <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted, although this reference may be moved to the explanatory text of Policy R5.</p> <p>The Council will consider establishing appropriate local standards having regard to the ANGSt guidance.</p> <p>The 2.1ha standard derives from a local interpretation of the NPFA standards established by the current Unitary Development Plan and will be explained in the Core Strategy background paper.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|---|
| | | to improve the transparency of this decision. | |
| 216477/243 | Mr John Lappin | R41 Ten years ago the "Middleton Environment Group" spent two summers cleaning up, opening up, putting down a new path in the Myrtle Brook area, down stream from the Myrtle Lodges. R.M.B.C. then left it to degenerate again what a waste of time and money, and a big disappointment to M.E.G. Why should we believe it will be different in the future with your promise of protection and enhancement, when you could not deliver in the past? R44 Suitable alternative recreational green space will already be, being used. so we cannot afford to lose any green space currently being put to some sort of recreational use, by the public. | Point noted GI township plan / strategy will begin the process of securing funding for enhancements through developer contributions, detailed management and maintenance as appropriate. |
| 367163/64 | Mr. Russell Johnson | It would help if existing sites were upgraded and maintained, for instance the need for a proper footpath from the Vistors centre car park entrance to the Rakewood turn off at Hollingworth lake should be a priority before new projects are undertaken. We are well served with footpaths throughout our area, but many are in need of maintainance, and sign-posting. | Noted Specific site issue, maintenance and upgrade of existing paths more appropriate within township plan or GI Plan. |
| 370046/21 | Mr Simon Dennis | I agree with and would welcome priorities 2, 4c, f & g | Support noted |
| 381275/263 | Rochdale Field Naturalists Society - Mr Patrick Culkin | We are pleased to see a clear commitment in the objectives to preserving and promoting wildlife in the borough, and to achieving a balance with tourism and leisure. Obviously the effectiveness of how this can be achieved lies in the detail of the full strategy, which as I have said we have not been able to review in time for your December 8 deadline. However over the next few months we will review the existing draft of the full strategy, and will therefore be properly prepared to review the next draft, which you say you expect to publish in the spring of next year. We will then respond to the proposals within that draft. | Support noted |
| 396108/452 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.85 We support proposed policy R4. | Support noted |
| 397177/350 | Environment Agency - Mrs Sylvia Whittingham | We recognise the importance of GI and support the development of GI networks. These can help to deliver a range of Environment Agency objectives including the Water Framework Directive, as well as wider community benefits. Identifying land as GI where there is a high level of flood risk (i.e. functional floodplain) will provide opportunities to mitigate against flooding and provision of additional compensatory flood storage. This may reduce flood risk at a strategic level and enable development to take place elsewhere. | Support noted |
| 397688/371 | Jean Jones | Much of the strategy is to be applauded e.g. the development of the Roch Valley, but this is of no advantage to the people of Hopwood | Support noted. Re: deficiency of open space in Hopwood. GI |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|--|
| | | who are already short of primary school places, areas of open space e.g. football pitches etc and most of all an overall infrastructure that will improve the lives of residents and the travelling public. | planning will identify enabling development and external funds and increase accessible open space in Hopwood through development proposals and Heywood GI plan. |
| 398423/528 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | Page 109 R4 - no reference to Rochdale Canal as an important asset and connection. | Agreed. Include reference to canal as detailed. |
| 401290/512 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | R4 and R5 We welcome these policies which will help implement RSS policies EM1 and EM3. | Support noted |
| R5 – Increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity? | | | |
| Question 33 What are your views on our policy for increasing the value of biodiversity and geodiversity in the borough? | | | |
| 161988/405 | Lancashire County Council - Ms Joanne Macholc | Further the Core Strategy should refer to the principle of "no net loss of resources as a minimum requirement" in relation to proposals and schemes which affect the region's landscape, natural or historic environment or woodland assets, as set out in policy EM1 of the RSS. This relates to policies such as P1 and R5 although I note that the supporting text to R5 refers to the requirement to deliver an increase in biodiversity, referred to as a "step change increase" in policy EM1 (B) of the approved RSS. | Agree; principle of no net loss to be included. |
| 162038/337 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | The policy proposed is not considered to meet the aims that are stated, or indeed the overall CS Objectives. The first sentence is important and agreed. However, the next paragraph is considered to be inconsistent with the overall approach, especially in respect of habitats. Arguably, if biodiversity is indeed to be increased, then habitats in addition to those that are known to include protected species are also of importance and warrant safeguarding. At b) there is a case for an absolute approach requiring no loss of habitat at all; with the fallback of, in exceptional cases, permitting minor losses where greater than equivalent (both in terms of overall area and species richness) replacement provision can be secured. | Change wording of policy to be more explicit; policy sets out a series of approaches for protected species / habitats, designated sites and the expectations for development proposals. Return to original policy wording for designated and non- designated sites. |
| 180811/434 | Natural England - Mr Stephen Hedley | We commend the recognition in the policy's supporting text of the value and importance of protecting non-statutorily designated sites of importance to biodiversity (p.112, 113). We are also pleased to see geodiversity has now been included in the policy and supporting text. It would be useful for this policy to note that existing features of biodiversity or geological interest may be found on brownfield land, in addition to greenfield land (5(ii)). We commend the inclusion in the policy's supporting text that 'In all cases, proposals will be required to contribute to the biodiversity interest of the development site' | Support noted and agree. Changes to be included in RJ |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|---|
| | | (p.113). | |
| 216477/244 | Mr John Lappin | See above re: Myrtle Brook area, re: view on your policy for increasing Biodiversity. | Support noted |
| 396108/455 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.86 We support proposed approach to protecting and enhancing Bio and Geo-diversity. | Support noted |
| 397177/351 | Environment Agency - Mrs Sylvia Whittingham | <p>b) Some alternative habitat provision may be totally impracticable, such as the creation of new peatland habitats or ancient woodland, which have been established over a extensive period of time and to which no habitat mitigation plan can ever hope to recreate, however well intentioned. Therefore from a policy perspective it is always beneficial to protect such highly complex ecological systems from inappropriate development than to mitigate for any impacts, when there is little likelihood of being able to recreate these habitats and the species that relied on this. Therefore there needs to be effective protection of these designated sites and the ecological networks that link them. In regards to future riparian development there may also be opportunity to improve the ecological quality of these key riverine and wildlife corridors by integrating with flood risk reduction proposals i.e., creating or enlarging flood storage, opening up and expanding cannalised or culverted watercourses. This restoration of heavily modified watercourses also has the ability to meet new objectives for relevant waterbodies in the River Basin Management Plan. It is also recommended, where practicable that biodiversity opportunities are integrated in new development proposals particularly when it can be integrated with wider benefits such as reducing flood risk, e.g. by creating new retention ponds and/or flood storage, removing culverts, de-canalising rivers that have had a legacy of poor or inappropriate development. PPS9 sets out the key principles that will help to ensure the impacts of potential development on biodiversity features are fully considered as part of the planning process. It also encourages the provision of new nature conservation features beyond the requirements for mitigation or compensation. Paragraphs 1(ii) and 5(ii) state that policies should aim to restore or add to biodiversity interests. Paragraph 14 states that the opportunities for building-in biodiversity features should be maximised. Such improvements can provide valuable enhancement to the living and working environment of the Borough. There are opportunities within many development proposals to create, manage and enhance wildlife habitat and the natural landscape. Any planning applications that capitalise on these opportunities should</p> | <p>Agree. RJ changes to wording to reflect this. Paragraph 21.11 UDP</p> <p>Noted; detailed approaches not suitable for this document, but are included in the Biodiversity and Development SPD</p> <p>Covered in R6 (now G8) and GI</p> <p>Noted. Agreed policy covers these points which are further elaborated in the Biodiversity and Development SPD</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | | be encouraged. The creation and enhancement of habitats adjacent to existing wildlife sites where the new habitat can complement and provide a buffer for existing habitat, should be promoted. Habitat creation and enhancement towards the achievement of targets within the Greater Manchester Biodiversity Action Plans or new River Basin Management Plan should also be encouraged through the planning process. | |
| 401290/513 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | R4 and R5 We welcome these policies which will help implement RSS policies EM1 and EM3. | Noted |
| R6 – Managing water resources and flood risk | | | |
| Question 34 Do you agree with the approach to water management and flood risk outlined above? | | | |
| 6682/118 | United Utilities - Mr David Hardman | United Utilities Water agrees with the approach to water management and flood risk, particularly in regard to the words on water conservation, pollution prevention, SUDS and Surface Water Management Plans. United Utilities is very happy to provide information and discuss flood prevention. | Support noted. |
| 162038/338 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | Yes. | Support noted. |
| 180811/435 | Natural England - Mr Stephen Hedley | We are supportive of this policy. We commend in particular the recognition in the policy's supporting text of the need to protect key conservation interests (such as natural meandering, waterside habitats and rate of water flow) in designing flood defences and related engineering works (p.115). Sustainable design and materials We are pleased to see that our earlier comments encouraging policy measures that promote high standards of sustainable design and sustainable materials have been taken on board, through several policies in the Preferred Options (C6(ii); P3(7); and R6(f and j)). | Support noted. |
| 397177/352 | Environment Agency - Mrs Sylvia Whittingham | f) It is recommended in regards to SUDs, that the above ground options such as swales and ponds etc. are given equal consideration as the current orthodox oversized piped drainage and underground retention tank options, as these have little wider landscape or ecological benefits as opposed to the former. i) We seek a stronger stance in regards to culverting, and only approving culverting if there is no reasonably practicable alternative or if the detrimental effects of culverting would be so minor that they would not justify a more costly alternative. We would also recommend that any riparian development with existing culverts seek to open up and restore these, where feasible. Our general emphasis is to move away from reliance on artificial flood defences and towards encouraging the enhancement, restoration or re-creation of natural features, where feasible, and manage flood risk in a more | f) Agreed that the RJ should require equal if not greater consideration to these measures rather than to underground options. i) Agreed. The policy or RJ should be expanded to reflect this comment. Derogation of existing water resources – agreed that this should be avoided and it is likely that a revision of point k) would be the most appropriate way to include this. |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | | <p>sustainable way. We have as part of our flood risk management role now looking for initiatives such as, managed realignment of flood defences, restoration of naturally functional flood plains and inter-tidal salt marsh and mudflats, removal of culverts, and the creation of substantial new washlands to accommodate flooding in low lying areas, which as a consequence have far greater biodiversity and recreational potential than traditional artificial flood defences. The new River Basin Management Plan for the North West has been submitted to ministers for sign off. Once approved these will be published on the 22 December 2009 and will identify objectives for specific waterbodies in the borough http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/planning/33106.aspx. As a component of managing water resources it is important to ensure that the derogation of the quantity of groundwater does not occur as the result of new development. For example a new or extended quarry development may lead to unacceptable de-watering that adversely affects groundwater resources, and also potentially the features that it supports. We would suggest that this should be included within the document, and would suggest the following: - Ensuring that new development does not lead to the derogation of existing water resources quantity such as watercourses and groundwater. This could be included as part of a reworded point 'K' or added as an additional point. From a flood risk viewpoint, the principles outlined in measures a) to l) are welcomed. Paragraph 3 on page 115 "New development must not adversely river catchment areas and functional flood plains and flood storage areas or increase the risk of flooding elsewhere, and this must be taken into account" does not read well. The later Allocations DPD document should identify all proposed developments and the level of flood risk associated with them. The DPD will need to show compliance with the policies of the Core Strategy.</p> | <p>Agreed that paragraph 3 on page 115 does not read well and this will be reviewed.</p> |
| 397697/453 | Rossendale Borough Council - Mr James Dalgleish | <p>Flood Risk Management Rossendale Borough Council supports your promotion of sustainable urban drainage systems in policy R6, and would welcome the opportunity to work with yourselves on any cross-border flood risk issues that may arise, especially in the River Spodden catchment area.</p> | <p>Support noted.</p> |
| 398423/517 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | <p>We support this approach. Development briefs and masterplans for key sites and areas could be used to inform and guide development in respect of flood risk and required mitigation.</p> | <p>Support noted.</p> |
| R7 – Reducing the impact of pollution | | | |
| Question 35 Do you agree with the approach to pollution control? | | | |

| | | | |
|--|---|---|---|
| 162038/339 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | Mostly. The proposals put forward are supported; however, it is considered that at b) there should be specific reference to soils – this is both in terms of ensuring that soils, especially those in productive use, are i) not polluted, and ii) managed so that they are safeguarded, e.g. not lost through washout. | Protection of soil is a difficult area to manage through planning |
| 180811/440 | Natural England - Mr Stephen Hedley | Air quality It is clear that air pollution from transportation is a particular challenge for the Borough, and we support the inclusion of Preferred Options policies to focus efforts on improving air quality in AQMAs (policies R7(a, b, d); and T2(C)iii). | Support noted. |
| 204017/85 | Miss Jean Barlow | I would like to see more definitive proposals to reduce air pollution in the areas designated as Air Quality Management Zones. In particular I am concerned about the M62 corridor, where controversially this document proposes to increase traffic pollution by introducing new employment areas in green belt alongside the M62. | Agreed. The policy will focus on air quality management areas and other areas where pollution levels are unacceptable |
| 216477/245 | Mr John Lappin | 20 years ago, M.E.G. campaigned and highlighted noise, air and water pollution in the town, virtually ignored by Council. Middleton being in a dip, surrounded by motorways, and bisected by major roads, is a target for vehicle emission pollution, also we have two large firms, one in the town centre, and one on the hill in Middleton East both manufacturing with chemicals, which could contribute to air pollution. Two major rivers converge in the town centre, and are prone to pollution, from internal sources, and from outside the town boundary in the east. Pollution control must be a top priority and prosecution orders taken out when needed. | The policy will focus on air quality management areas and other areas where pollution levels are unacceptable. Precisely where these areas will be will be based on evidence provided by Environmental Health |
| 397177/353 | Environment Agency - Mrs Sylvia Whittingham | In regards to reducing the impact of pollution, it would be worth including a water quality indicator as well as air quality aspect to environmental indicators for pollution. We are adopting as part Water Framework Directive and River Basin Management Planning, a new monitoring strategy for environmental data, please refer to the following link for further information http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/planning/33260.aspx & http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/research/planning/33262.aspx . It would be good for the core strategy to align with the overall RBMP objectives in improving the ecological status of all waterbodies in the borough by 2027. | Agreed that there should be a water quality indicator. Will investigate this further. |
| R8 – Managing mineral resources | | | |
| Question 36 Do you agree with our policy on managing mineral resources? | | | |
| 161697/17 | Greater Manchester Geological Unit - Ms | Policy should refer to the need, in principle, to provide for the maintenance of landbanks, i.e. appropriate levels of permitted | Agreed. Will revise introduction to reflect these comments and to make full reference to the |

| | | | |
|------------|--|--|---|
| | Alethea Faulkner | reserves, for non-energy minerals (MPS para.15; RSS Policy EM7) Could clarify the first sentence of R8 to read “We will ensure the sustainable management of mineral resources and make an appropriate contribution towards helping Greater Manchester meet its contribution to the regional apportionment for land-won aggregate”. Agreement has been reached across the ten Greater Manchester Authorities to produce a Joint Minerals Development Plan Document. The Minerals Plan will provide a sound, sub-regional, planning policy framework that provides a clear guide to minerals operators and the public about: • The locations where mineral extraction may take place, • The safeguarding of sensitive environmental features and of mineral resources with potential for future extraction, and • All aspects of environmental and resource protection including the sustainable transportation of minerals. | Minerals Plan. |
| 162038/340 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | Yes. | Support noted. |
| 180804/53 | The Coal Authority - Miss Rachael Bust | Test of Soundness Justified Effective Consistency With National Policy-X Objection – Whilst The Coal Authority supports the Council's commitment to defining Minerals Safeguarding Areas and/or areas of search and sites for minerals extraction, including energy minerals, we consider that Policy R8 is lacking a reference to prior extraction of mineral resources in situations where non-mineral development must take place within MSAs, in line with the requirements of MPS1. We would therefore recommend the following additional text: “...define minerals safeguarding areas and/or areas of search and sites for minerals extraction, including energy minerals, and identify and safeguard sites for storage, processing and transfer. Within the defined safeguarding areas, if it is necessary for non-mineral development to take place consideration of prior extraction of those minerals resources will be required.” Reason – In order to address the requirements of MPS1 regarding safeguarding of mineral resources and prior extraction of those resources, where necessary. | As referred to in part A of the policy, the Council will be working on a GM minerals plan, which will identify areas of search including detailed policies relating to their extraction. It is not appropriate to include more detail in policy R8 of this Core Strategy. |
| 180804/54 | The Coal Authority - Miss Rachael Bust | Test of Soundness Justified Effective Consistency With National Policy-X We also consider that, as surface coal resources are prevalent across most of the borough, there should be reference to coal and energy minerals within the supporting text accompanying Policy R8 as follows: “In the borough, there are significant areas underlain by sand, sandstone and gritstone. THERE ARE ALSO COAL RESOURCES PREVALENT AT SHALLOW DEPTH. Whilst current levels of extraction are low...” Reason – In order to | This will be reviewed in the light of the Minerals Plan and the approach taken in that document. Agreed that presence of coal should be reflected in the RJ. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| | | acknowledge within the Core Strategy the presence of nationally important surface coal resources within Rochdale. | |
| 180811/436 | Natural England - Mr Stephen Hedley | We would welcome an amendment to this policy to highlight the opportunity to restore mineral extraction sites to the benefit of the natural environment including bio- and geological diversity. (For example, an addition could be made to the last sentence in the policy R8(d) pertaining to 'effective restoration and aftercare'.) | This is implicit in criterion d. An explanation of environmental benefits will be included in the reasoned justification. |
| 396108/456 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.87 We support the Council's proposed policy for managing resources. | Support noted. |
| 397177/354 | Environment Agency - Mrs Sylvia Whittingham | In respect to the mineral resource in the borough, it is hoped that his not only deals with the extraction process and how this balances the differing environmental, social and economic impacts, but also promoting sensitive restoration. The sensitive restoration of quarry sites can offer significant nature conservation possibilities after extraction, but frequently these opportunities are lost or not pursued. The 'after minerals' website (http://www.afterminerals.com/index.aspx) provides a useful information source in guiding sensitive restoration and aftercare, to ensure such opportunities are not lost in the borough. | Noted. Opportunities for improving nature conservation value will be included in the reasoned justification. |
| R9 – Managing waste | | | |
| Question 37 What are your views on our policy for managing waste? | | | |
| 161697/16 | Greater Manchester Geological Unit - Ms Alethea Faulkner | The preferred policy direction for waste is reasonable and seems to reflect national and regional guidance and the approach being taken in Greater Manchester on the preparation of the Greater Manchester Waste DPD. Consultation at Issues and Options stage on the Joint Waste DPD indicated that waste minimisation was an important issue. However, as the need to minimise waste production should be linked to all development in Rochdale and not limited to waste specific developments, it is recommended that such a policy is included within the Core Strategy. | Noted. |
| 162038/341 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | Supported. | Support noted |
| 396108/457 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.88 We support the Council's proposed approach to managing mineral waste. | Support noted |

Chapter 10 – Improving accessibility and delivering sustainable transport (SO5)

| T1 – Delivering sustainable transport | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| Question 38 What are your views on our proposals in the delivering sustainable transport policy? | | | |
| 161663/317 | Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd - Mr David Ward | We welcome the specific references in Policy T1 to securing strategic transport improvements. This clearly requires multi-agency working. The priority being given to securing a metro link stop on KBP is also welcomed. We also note and support the other references in the Policy to improved walking / cycling / public transport access to KBP. | Support noted – No action required. |
| 161868/521 | Mr Roger Davis | The following point does not effect Pennines but, having attended an exhibition of the route the Metro line will take to the stopping point near to Rochdale station I am deeply concerned that yet again, refer point 1 of the attached, there is no apparent consideration to car parking. I raised this point with the persons at the exhibition who could not answer as they were members of the construction team. The map I saw showed the stop opposite the Fire Station. This area is currently exceptionally busy due to the Nye Bevan complex. There is very little parking available and surely this particular matter would come under the core strategy planning. | Agree with your views. T1b(i) commits the Council to work with GMPTE to improve Park & Ride at Rochdale Station to address this. Proposals to temporarily address parking issues in the short term and also permanent solutions to park and ride demand from Rochdale Station. Short term actions to address these issues are not dependent on the Core Strategy. |
| 162033/157 | Northwest Regional Development Agency - Mr Ian Wray | Policy T1 presents a long list of transport schemes and measures to be delivered in conjunction with other relevant agencies. In the current financial climate, delivery of all these projects is likely to be a considerable challenge; the supporting text acknowledges that funding for this package of proposals through LTP capital finance, Regional Funding Allocations and the GM Transport Fund is dependent on them demonstrating a satisfactory business case and having a high enough priority. Schemes that do not pass these tests would be reliant on developer contributions through planning obligations and section 106 agreements. We suggest that these caveats should be made more explicit within the policy itself rather than the supporting text. We are aware that the proposal to provide all purpose passenger services via the East Lancashire Railway is only at the feasibility study stage. We suggest that the policy is amended to provide a clearer distinction between firm commitments and proposals that are currently being investigated. It would be helpful if the supporting text were to say more about the delivery of Metrolink between Rochdale and Manchester City Centre (from 2012 onwards) and the potential benefits that this will bring. The supporting text indicates that regeneration funding for eligible proposals may be sought from other agencies including the NWDA. Clearly, any such proposals beyond existing commitments would be subject to the Agency's usual appraisal process. | Do not agree that these caveats should part of the policy. They remain in the supporting text, noted in the policy and referred to in the delivery section. Scheme priorities, delivery and implementation will be set out in the core strategy delivery section and in more detail in the infrastructure plan. It is a challenge but the intention to implement the schemes in policy T1 within the plan period remains. There will also be cross reference in Policy T1 to the delivery section. In 2012, Phase 3a of Metrolink between Rochdale to Manchester City Centre will be complete and open.. The economic benefits of the Metrolink are referred to in Policy E3. Noted and already aware that the proposals seeking NWDA finance will be subject to the Agency's appraisal process. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| 180811/437 | Natural England - Mr Stephen Hedley | <p>We highly commend the strong focus in this policy on enhancing the public transport network, including a commitment to significant rail network enhancements, quality bus corridors, and measures for cyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>The policy could be strengthened by providing more detail with regard to pedestrian and cycle links (b(vii)), such as stating specific locations or particular measures that will be prioritised.</p> | <p>Support noted. No action required.</p> <p>This document provides a framework to continue development of strategic cycling and walking networks. The detail will be developed and included in supporting transport and LDF documents.</p> |
| 204017/45 | Miss Jean Barlow | <p>My comment concerns c(i) Proposed Heywood Southern Relief Road to M62 junction 19. It is totally unclear why this proposed road, on green belt land, is required, and what problems it will overcome. Section 2 of this document, entitled Spatial Portrait of the Borough, itself states that "Rochdale Borough, particularly the southern part, has excellent access to motorways". So why do we need this additional motorway access road in the south ? Many residents feel that it is big business and landowners who are driving this requirement, rather than the interests of the residents of Rochdale Borough.</p> | <p>Objection noted.</p> <p>See Response in Schedule A.</p> |
| 216477/246 | Mr John Lappin | <p>The view on your policy is very commendable and top priority must be given to ensuring that public transport is vastly improved, especially at weekends, evenings and bank holidays. Not just on major routes, but on minor routes which are usually served by smaller bus companies, who are prone to cancelling at short notice. You appear to have overlooked the delivery of freight by rail and canal. Pre 1950 all cities and large towns had a freight yard, where goods were delivered to, and then distributed around the area, by 'electric powered vehicles.' RMBC. must now start planning for when the oil runs out, or becomes very expensive, or rationed, and alternative ways of travel and transportation will be needed, "not wait until it happens."</p> | <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Improving evening / weekend public transport services is a priority in Rochdale MBC's Transport Strategy and the Council will lobby the PTE on this issue.</p> <p>Canal and rail freight potential has been considered, but it was concluded that canal freight is too slow to be attractive to business. Railfreight opportunities are limited but will include a commitment in Policy T1 to positively consider sustainable freight transport proposals as opportunities come forward. The approach in support of encouraging freight transport will be included in the supporting text.</p> <p>Will also refer to consolidation or freight distribution centres.</p> |
| 216593/130 | SEGRO Industrial Estates Ltd (Barton Willmore - Mr John Pearce) | <p>We support the proposal within Policy T1c(i) for the Heywood southern relief road to junction 19 of the M62. This road has the potential to increase the attractiveness of Heywood Distribution Park as a location for business whilst reducing the impact of associated HGV movements on existing residential areas in Heywood.</p> | <p>Support noted. No action required.</p> |
| 216735/540 | Russell Homes - Mr | <p>5.1 Development should be located where it is accessible by choice</p> | <p>Support noted. No action required.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | Daniel Kershaw | <p>of transport modes. The accessibility to jobs, education, shopping, leisure and other essential facilities are influenced by determining factors, specifically where development is located and the quality and choice of transport links available to serve that development. Accessibility should be tackled at the strategic, Borough wide and local levels.</p> <p>5.2 Russells supports the strategic objective SO5 whereby the Borough needs to draw on and contribute to the prosperity of the city region and the Northern Way Initiative through improved transport links. The consideration is given to the location of employment opportunities and the accessibility of these employment areas to households across the Borough is also supported. At the local level good access to community facilities, local centres and transport interchanges are important to improve quality of life, meet sustainability objectives and are essential for the economic growth of the Borough.</p> <p>5.3 Russells supports Policy TI - Delivering Sustainable Transport</p> <p>5.4 Russells supports the industrial link from Hareshill Road to Junction 19 of the M62. It would enable a second route onto the Motorway network providing relief at Junction 3 of the M66 and at Junction 18 of the M60/M62. Traffic from Heywood Distribution Park would have a link in an easterly direction to Leeds and could therefore avoid these Junctions.</p> | |
| 216814/163 | TCS Holdings Limited (Indigo Planning Limited - Ms Nicola Sewell) | TCS object to Policy T1C3 which relates to Rochdale Town Centre relief road (Smith Street to Drake Street) in terms of the part of the road running through Central Retail Park for the reasons set out in Question 7. TCS have discussed this proposal with a number of potential retailers whom have all raised concern in relation to a road through the site, as it would separate any development from the existing retail park. As a consequence it would be difficult to attract an operator on the remaining, parcel of land which would leave this part of the site isolated and not viable for future development. | Objection noted but the principle of a route from Wood Street to Drake Street remains in Policy T1 and is being promoted by the Council. If objection successful, and land is not available an alternative proposal that does not impact on Central Retail Park will be considered. This link is key to getting traffic out of the town centre and improving access by sustainable modes. |
| 217416/99 | Sandra and David Wright | Our concerns relate specifically to the Townhead junction which has created more holdups since it was altered to traffic lights. At the very least it would now benefit from an improved slip road off St. Marys Gate to Whitworth Rd. to prevent traffic queuing needlessly. If the plans for pedestrianising the town centre go ahead will this mean additional buses & other traffic using this already busy junction to access car parks (planned for access from John St. on the last development plans) and the bus station? Also the A58, Halifax Rd., continues to be very congested at all times of the day and grinds to | Point noted and referred to Impact Partnership for consideration. |

| | | | |
|------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
| | | a halt whenever there are problems on the motorway and motorists look for alternative routes. | |
| 370419/255 | Highways Agency - Mr Ian Tull | <p>The Agency notes transport policies are predominantly focused on public transport improvements although road building projects have been identified, notably the J19 Southern Relief Road which is of particular interest to the Agency. The Agency previously provided RMBC with an accessibility mapping exercise which provides a visual illustration of the borough and access to seven key DfT indicators. Policy T1 makes particular reference to the opportunities to focus development in locations which are well served by "Quality and Choice" of transport links. The policy should definitively state that sites should be underpinned by an overarching statement and commitment to deliver sustainable sites.</p> <p>The Agency acknowledges that Policy T1 actively seeks to encourage a modal shift away from single occupancy car journeys. The performance of this policy should regularly be appraised to evaluate if the proposed measures are delivering the desired returns.</p> <p>The identification of funding mechanisms and the long term aspiration for major sustainable transport improvement is also welcomed. The forthcoming allocations and infrastructure documents will need to ensure that the proposals are justified alongside the phasing of the identified sustainable transport schemes. Heywood Relief Road South Heywood has been identified as an existing major employment location and there are proposals to expand the mix of employment services available alongside the proposed new road link. The new link road would accommodate bus services to Heywood Distribution Park but there is also a potential to increase traffic movements by facilitating new corridor development and by providing an alternative route for traffic travelling between the M66 and the M62. The Agency has previously provided comment on the Heywood Relief Road proposals following the Stakeholder Workshop in June 2009 and these comments supplement those previously provided. The minimum assessment of a new link road would require not only an assessment of the potential movements associated with the existing and proposed development in Heywood but also the strategic implications for the M66/M62/M60 traffic will need to be identified. The potential for strategic traffic to reroute should be clearly assessed given the changes in through traffic and also the merge/diverge arrangements at the respective junctions. The interaction with any Agency schemes should also be explored,</p> | <p>Points noted. All development locations and alternatives have been assessed with regard to their sustainability, especially accessibility through the Sustainability Assessment and site selection process.</p> <p>Agree that the policy impact on modal shift will form part of the monitoring report.</p> <p>Modal shift is monitored through GMLTP (LTP12 – Non-car use to the regional centre in the morning peak, and non-car use to 9 other key centres in the morning peak)</p> <p>Agree that proposals and access arrangements should be evaluated together to deliver the desired returns.</p> <p>Agree and included points made with regard to Heywood Southern Relief Road and they have been included in the study brief to assess the proposal's transport impact.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|--------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>most notably the proposed hard shoulder running along the M62 between J18 and J20. A more comprehensive discussion of the routing of the proposed relief road should be outlined as the Agency will need to fully appraised of the implications on a micro and macro level. Perhaps more fundamentally, the requirement for new road infrastructure should be appraised. Whilst the borough has taken account of the need to capitalise and invest in public transport infrastructure the identification of a significant relief road scheme could be considered contrary to this approach. RMBC should take account of the DfT's new approach to transport provision, and as set out in DaSTS – Delivering a Sustainable Transport Solution, where a comprehensive evidence base will be required that considers the perceived transport challenges and all available options to address these challenges. The DaSTS approach moves away from large scale highway infrastructure capacity improvements as a first priority. Instead, when promoting areas for development, local authorities and developers should initially consider the most sustainable locations, improved public transport, cycling and walking access, together with demand management techniques to address the residual demand. In the hierarchical approach to transport solutions/provision, major infrastructure interventions are seen as the lowest priority. Whilst the relief road may provide a bus corridor and alleviate problems associated with HGVs in the settlement of Heywood it is clear that the infrastructure works would also be a catalyst to deliver further development (circa 2000 jobs). The opportunities associated with the local rail infrastructure have been identified but the relief road must be comprehensively appraised and justified following a review of all options through the DaSTS approach. The DaSTS approach is also particularly relevant to Policy T2(e).</p> | |
| 381278/258 | Network Rail - Ms Diane Clarke | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rochdale re-signalling works to facilitate the transfer of the Oldham Loop line to Metrolink will be carried out in 2012. This may unlock capacity in the future in conjunction with timetable alterations. • We will continue to work with regional stakeholders and their aspirations for the East Lancs Railway through normal industry processes. • There are a number of RUS's and Route Plans which may be of interest to the Rochdale area all of which can be found on the Network Rail website, these include: • Route 20 Route Plan -This is part of Network Rails Business Plan and outlines the companies plans for the area and is updated on an annual basis. • North West RUS - Outlines the industries strategy for the Railway in the North | <p>Points noted.</p> <p>Rochdale MBC is a stakeholder partner in influencing these strategies and studies. No action required.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | | West area to 2017. • Freight RUS - Outlines the industries national strategy for Freight traffic to 2017. • There are also a number of ongoing studies, the Manchester Hub study which is due to be published in 2010 and the newly started Northern RUS. | |
| 389357/370 | MMC Developments Ltd - Mr Mark Russell (Knight Frank LLP – Sophie Taylor) | Policy T1 deals with delivering sustainable transport. In relation to MMC's site at Rooley Moor Road the proposals to improve access to public transport network and interchange/ hub facilities is supported. In particular, improved linkages to Rochdale town centre public transport interchange, the railway station and park and ride facilities should be promoted. Improved linkages to Kingsway Business Park should also be promoted. Also enhancement to pedestrian/ cycle links to key transport hubs is supported. | Support noted. No action required. |
| 396108/459 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.89 We support the priorities and proposals of Policy T1 which we consider provides a framework to achieve sustainable growth. | Support noted. No action required. |
| 396130/627 | Gill Howard | I do not agree a relief road from J19 M62 to Hareshill Road will improve accessibility and deliver sustainable transport (saying it will does not make it so) The proposal also says Provide access to development focus areas and town centres including.... i) Heywood Southern Relief Road to M62 Junction 19 (allowing bus services to Heywood Distribution Park) and supporting traffic management;. This is misleading. The relief road won't allow a bus service to get to Pilsworth Ind Est - only opening up Hareshill Road to all traffic will allow a bus service to reach the Industrial estate. But opening up Hareshill to all traffic is unacceptable when Hareshill has traffic barriers due to problems with a heavy loads and goods traffic. I do not think a relief road will support traffic management , I think this will have the opposite effect. Putting in a link road from junction 19 to a set of traffic lights at Hareshill Road – as was discussed at length at the Heywood meeting - is a recipe for major standing traffic congestion north and south on Heywood Old Road and east and west on Hareshill. Not only would there be a problem of increased congestion and heavy goods traffic to local residents we also need to consider the additional of school run traffic and how this would impact on child safety due to the close proximity of Siddall Moor and Magdala Street schools . Furthermore as was also mentioned at the Heywood meeting - a link road will provide a 'rat-run' from junction 19 of the M62 to junction 3 of the M66 (and vice versa) for those wishing to avoid Simister Island. Then there is the issue of air quality how the link road, and traffic congestion would worsen an area which already has some problems with air quality due to the | Objection noted. See Response in Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|--|---|
| | | motorways. We should therefore be thinking about how to avoid making the problem worse. | |
| 396135/384 | Joint LPA Receivers N Burd & T Greed (Savills - Mr Craig O'Brien) | In relation to Policy T1, we strongly support the need to deliver sustainable transport both within the Borough and to the wider area. In particular we consider it is very important to strengthen the sustainable transport links between Heywood / Castleton and Manchester via the ELR. As already stated, we support the new link on the ELR, in addition to a new station at Broadfield, as this will be a key driver in the future growth of the Castleton growth corridor in terms of increasing the travel capacity for workers (in connection with Policy E3) and visitors (in connection with Policy E4). | Support Noted. No action required. |
| 397168/472 | GMPTE - Mr Richard Clowes | <p>General Comments. It is important for all future developments to be located in areas of high public transport accessibility and GMPTE welcomes the fact that the document contains a number of positive references to sustainable transport, including bus, rail and proposed Metrolink services. Where new development is to be located in areas with poor public transport accessibility, policies should be put in place to ensure that adequate public transport is provided (this principle is set out in section 4 of GMPTE's 'Land Use Planning and Public Transport' guidance document www.gmp-te.com/landuse).</p> <p>A number of public transport interventions are proposed in the Core Strategy Preferred Option Report but it is not always clear how they will be funded and delivered by 2026. Given that funding for transport is likely to be limited in the foreseeable future, delivery may well depend on the extent to which the developers themselves can provide funding. In any case the infrastructure Plan will need to show that the phasing of sites reflects the timescales within which any essential infrastructure can be delivered and explicitly identify how it will be funded. It would be useful for GMPTE to be consulted on an early draft of the Infrastructure Plan. Unless bus services required to serve developments can be provided commercially, it may not be possible to provide them as there are no guarantees that GMPTE will be able to support them financially. In some cases there may be potential to use developer contributions to establish a fund to 'kick-start' commercial bus services, but this would need to be assessed on a case by case basis. GMPTE's budget for subsidised bus services is a limited resource and is already heavily committed. However as part of the wider development of Greater Manchester's Bus Strategy GMPTE is, on behalf of the GMITA, developing a 'Target Bus Network' for delivery in partnership with bus operators,</p> | <p>The mechanism outlining how proposals will be delivered and funded will be presented in the Allocations DPD. Private sector and development related funding will be key in delivering these proposals. Site Phasing will also be covered.</p> <p>Issues regarding bus service funding are noted but many developments will already be served by the existing PT network (Central & South Rochdale East Middleton etc). The Core Strategy has attempted to locate development in sustainable locations, where public transport services already exist and/or have potential for improvement (ie new development could improve the viability of some services).</p> <p>The Borough Transport Strategy clearly links with the Core Strategy and this only needs to be mentioned once. The transport strategy is not an evidence base but is a statement of borough transport priorities and aspirations. Evidence will be collected in the future schemes are developed.</p> <p>Aware of the GM Bus Strategy "Target Bus Network" work that is taking place and that it is taking account of development areas identified in LDFs and potential new destinations.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>which sets out how to provide better connectivity including links with other public transport modes. GMPTE has however no immediate source of funding to finance the identified improvements, but is working with the bus operators to explore ways of implementing the network.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Preferred Option Report has been prepared alongside a draft Transport Strategy for the Borough. GMPTE have commented on this document separately and I attach a copy of these comments for your information. Given that the Transport Strategy should represent a key evidence base, supporting the proposed transport interventions required to deliver the Core Strategy, it is surprising that it is only referred to a few times throughout the whole Core Strategy Preferred Option Report.</p> <p>There is also recently completed Greater Manchester- wide transport modelling undertaken by GMTU to identify the cumulative effect of proposed development in the conurbation. The Core Strategy will need to take account of any issues raised by this transport modelling and incorporate this into the evidence base.</p> <p>Detailed Comments The justification for the potential interventions in T1 is not always made clear and some interventions seem to be competing rather than complementary. In particular, the aspiration of a station at Broadfield does not sit well with the improvements to highway access to Heywood Distribution Park from the M62 (see comments below on Policy T1c(i))</p> <p>Similarly, the desire for improved heavy rail services on the Calder Valley line conflicts with that to extend Metrolink services to Littleborough. The result appears to be a 'wish list' rather than a justified package of interventions.</p> <p>The objectives or aspirations for the ELR are unclear, particularly in terms of how they may impact on the national rail network or whether they are compatible with the objectives for the Calder Valley line.</p> <p>It is not clear how some of the interventions in T1 relate to the land use strategy set out in the rest of the Core Strategy Preferred Options Report, to address specific deficiencies and accommodate</p> | <p>The GM wide transport modelling requires substantial refinement to take account of reduced development allocation proposed in the Preferred Options report and the Draft Submission. Addressing the issue raised by the model, and requires a co-ordinated approach involving Local Authorities and Sub-Regional bodies. Assessing regional development allocations was not properly carried out at regional and sub-regional levels prior to abolition of RSS therefore the cost and responsibility has fallen to LA's to develop solutions to address the impacts sub-regional bodies have failed to address. This is not reasonable without commensurate resources and funding.</p> <p>Do not agree that there is contradiction in the proposals presented in T1. The aspiration to improve access by road, bus, rail cycling and on foot to development in South Heywood follows the multi-modal approach to mitigate traffic impacts of new development encouraged through NATA and by Central Government. The various proposals will also address a number of transport and regeneration issues. Comment made suggests outdated and lack of flexibility in addressing access issues.</p> <p>Same views with regard to access between Rochdale and Littleborough but will modify the feasibility study description to address the capacity of the transport network between the two centres.</p> <p>ELR proposals link Heywood to the public rail network and provide the town with wider travel choices to Manchester, Bury etc while</p> |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | |
|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>future demand or to deliver the Core Strategy overall.</p> <p>Each of the proposals should be linked to a highlighted existing issue or the specific growth corridor where improvements are required. The later section on infrastructure (page 150) seems to minimise the importance of most of the interventions in policy T1 by stating that the potential release of land outside the urban area of Heywood is the only site requiring infrastructure to be in place prior to development. Some interventions (particularly highway and rail schemes) are clearly defined but far less detail is given for some other proposed schemes.</p> <p>Whilst reference is made to walking and cycling, it is not properly articulated what roles these should have in the wider network whilst the references to bus priority are limited.</p> <p>Policy T1 Part (a) Section (i) (ii) and Part (b) section (v) Greater emphasis should be placed on the reference made to "Route Utilisation Strategies" (RUS), which are part of a compulsory regulatory process that informs government policy (the Manchester Hub study recommendations will become part of the Northern RUS).</p> <p>Proposals for the ELR do not have the same status, since the mechanism for delivery is unclear. Section (ii) identifies the need for improved sustainable travel links between Heywood / Castleton and Manchester. Whilst this is valid, there are means of improving public transport connections other than by using the East Lancashire Railway to run passenger services.</p> <p>Part (b) Section (ii) highlights the need for improvements at Rochdale Railway station but it is surprising that improvements at other stations in the district are not identified, particularly in view of the high priority given to people with impaired mobility in policy T2. Section (iii) proposes additional park and ride provision and all stations have been identified as needing park and ride facilities. However is not likely that all stations will be suitable for park and ride due to physical constraints (lack of space) and the location of park</p> | <p>protecting ELR's Core Business. Network Rail in their proposed signalling improvements programmed for 2012 at Castleton Junction are aware of this through this consultation process. The proposals will also help to increase passenger capacity on the Calder Valley Line services to and from Mills Hill as well as measures taken to increase capacity on the whole of the Calder Valley Line.</p> <p>Include text detailing how T1 (a), (b), (c) and (d) help deliver the overall approaches of the Core Strategy in Reasoned Justification and Background Paper.</p> <p>Revised the introduction of the policy and reasoned justification to clarify the role of transport in meeting the overall strategy.</p> <p>The role of walking and cycling is mentioned in T1b (vii) and T1c (ii), T1c (vii) and T1d(i) identifying our priority areas.</p> <p>Refer to bus priority in T1a(iii) and included in all proposals in T1b. Further detail is presented in the Borough Transport Strategy. Will also include proposals in GMLTP3.</p> <p>T1a (i) refers to Rail Route Utilisation Strategy and will include proposals emerging from Manchester Hub Study and improvements to Park & Ride and access at the Borough's other stations in T1b(iii).</p> <p>ELWRAS – East Lancashire and West Rochdale Assessment Study currently taking place is assessing the business case for rail services on ELR. This will report later this year with proposals going forward for consideration for the GM fund. Will also be seeking external funding with partners.</p> |
|--|--|---|---|

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| | <p>and ride sites needs to be carefully considered to avoid: • Increasing the number of car trips and miles travelled through abstraction from other modes • Increasing car miles travelled due to rail heading which will also reduce passenger rail revenues.</p> <p>Section (v) advocates improvements to Heywood station although these are not specified. In the event that passenger services were to be operated on the East Lancashire Railway, providing a station at Broadfield is unlikely to generate significant demand for several reasons including: • The potential station location (adjacent to Pilsworth Road) is some distance from the distribution parks south of Heywood • The rail service would only be suitable for a limited number of trip origins (including Rawtenstall and Ramsbottom).</p> <p>Edge-of-town developments with good road access tend to have a dispersed trip pattern with the majority of journeys made by car. It should also be noted that the provisions of section (c) (i) are likely to increase car dependency. • The frequency and operating periods of a rail service would probably not be attractive to employees in this type of employment site due to unsocial hours and variable shift patterns It is therefore suggested that wider options could usefully be considered for improving public transport links to Heywood Industrial Park including enhancements to local bus services.</p> <p>Section (vi) "Provision of a Heywood Bus Interchange" the relevant agency which Rochdale Council would work with in this instance would be GMPTE however we are not aware of any firm proposals or commitment to deliver a Bus Interchange in Heywood.</p> <p>Part (c) Section (i). Whilst the relief road will potentially improve bus service access to Heywood Distribution Park, it will also make it easier to travel by car and the potential to operate a commercially viable and attractive bus service is highly debateable. It is also not clear how this fits with the aspiration for a station at Broadfield (see comment above).</p> <p>Section (vi). It is not clear how the aim to reduce congestion will be achieved and whether this is linked to improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes (mentioned separately in section (vii)) or the designation of routes for commercial vehicles (mentioned separately in section (viii)).</p> | <p>Park and Ride provision can feasibly be delivered at all the Borough's stations through development opportunities as well as transport proposals. The reasons presented are consequences of this but does not affect the need for additional provision.</p> <p>Improvements to Heywood station will be delivered by ELR and development opportunities in neighbouring locations. Specific proposals will depend on these.</p> <p>The proposed location of Broadfield Station is where there was previously a station, adjacent to Heywood Industrial Estates. The station will also serve as a commuter station for Heywood, Norden and Bamford areas with high car ownership and commuter trips. The service will be attractive to commuters to / from Heywood to Bury and Manchester as well as those mentioned above.</p> <p>Heywood Southern Relief Road is to improve vehicle access but will be part of a package of complementary measures to improve public transport access and improve safety and traffic management.</p> <p>Point on Heywood Bus Interchange noted and will work with PTE on its development.</p> <p>The proposals to access Heywood Distribution Park are a package to enhance overall access by all modes. Reference made to potential additional jobs and new homes to justify PT passenger potential.</p> <p>The Core Strategy will not go into detail on individual packages of measures to tackle congestion. Proposal T1c(vi) indicates where in the borough tackling congestion will be a priority. This is clarified through revised text in</p> |
|--|---|---|

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>In addition, what opportunities are there to provide bus priority measures?</p> <p>Part (d) This section lists a number of points but does not make any reference to: • Road space reallocation (i.e. for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport) • Ensuring that long distance movements are concentrated on the principal routes as defined in the road hierarchy Section (ii) The application of intelligent transport systems could be expanded to include public transport applications (e.g. RTPI) to improve the quality and coverage of public transport information systems. In addition, the introduction of smart card ticketing and integrated ticketing is not mentioned.</p> | <p>T1c(vi). Detail provided in supporting documents when options are worked up.</p> <p>Prioritising pedestrian and cycling improvements will provide alternative travel choices for short trips currently made by less car. Included in introduction of Policy T1 explicit statement regarding the sustainable balance and complementary nature of the transport proposals. Also added text to T1c(i)</p> <p>Included policy on bus priority measures, which the Council supports in T1d. Detailed proposals to be identified and developed.</p> <p>Amended text in Policy T1d(i) to acknowledge to make best use of the existing highway network rather than just maintain.</p> |
| 397697/454 | Rossendale Borough Council - Mr James Dalgleish | <p>East Lancashire Railway (ELR) and Metrolink Rossendale Borough Council supports the Core Strategy's ambition to extend the ELR as both a commuter link and a tourist attraction. The use of the railway by commuters to Greater Manchester from the Rossendale area would ease pressure on the already congested A56 / M66 at peak times, and would contribute to reducing private car usage in line with your policies R1 (Tackling Climate Change), R7 (Reducing the Impact of Pollution) and T1 (Delivering Sustainable Transport). The promotion of more sustainable transport links is also concordant with the vision and aims of Rossendale Borough Council's upcoming Core Strategy. The ELR attracts visitors to East Lancashire and supports economic and regeneration opportunities as part of an overall tourism strategy. The promotion of visitor attractions and improved visitor facilities at ELR stations as mentioned in policy E4 would provide benefits for areas located all along the ELR route. Rossendale Borough Council would welcome further discussions with yourselves regarding the future aspirations expressed towards increased accessibility by expanding the Rochdale Metrolink to Whitworth in Rossendale (as mentioned in the supporting text beneath policy T2). We would also wish to see aspirations for through bus services from Rossendale to Kingsway Industrial Estate and other key locations being incorporated into the plan.</p> | <p>Support noted and will work with Rossendale MBC as proposals to extend Metrolink and cross town bus routes progress. No action required.</p> <p>Core Strategy supports proposals to improve bus and light rail access between Rochdale Town Centre and Kingsway Business Park. These are being progressed.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| 398423/534 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | Support policy T1 in respect of new and improved facilities (Transport Interchange / metrolink). Amend the description of the new Rochdale town centre relief road to clarify the location as 'Drake Street (Maclure Road junction) to Wood Street (oldham Road junction)'. Add Pioneers Route and Smith Street improvements to section c) to enhance potential for funding prioritisation. | Changed "Smith Street" to "John Street". Pioneers Route is included in the Town Centre section of the Core Strategy and included in the delivery of that project. |
| 401290/503 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | T1 We welcome many of the proposals listed which could potentially help deliver a more sustainable transport system. However there is no indication of how likely the proposals are to come forward, particularly in light of the likely reductions in public funding. We would suggest that there could be an overarching policy which sets out the guiding principles for transport, and that individual proposals are set out separately. Deliverability and timescales could be indicated in the Core Strategy or in background papers, with contingency plans where necessary. | Agreed. Amended policy to clarify how the transport schemes support delivery of the Core Strategy. The delivery plan will indicate priorities, timings and mechanisms for delivery. |
| T2 – Improving accessibility | | | |
| Question 39 Do you agree with our policy for improving accessibility? | | | |
| 162038/342 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | Yes. | Support noted. No action required. |
| 180811/441 | Natural England - Mr Stephen Hedley | Air quality It is clear that air pollution from transportation is a particular challenge for the Borough, and we support the inclusion of Preferred Options policies to focus efforts on improving air quality in AQMAs (policies R7(a, b, d); and T2(C)iii). | Support noted. No action required. |
| 216477/248 | Mr John Lappin | Definitely a line from Middleton to Bowker Vale must be top priority. Mills Hills station is too far out of the town centre, for those without transport. Stakehill Estate is adjacent to both rail and canal, a perfect example for looking at alternatives to road delivery. | Support noted, but also seeking to improve links to Mills Hill Station. Stakehill already has a 10 minute or more frequent bus service. No action required. |
| 370419/256 | Highways Agency - Mr Ian Tull | With regard to Policy T2 (Improving Accessibility) the identified requirement for Transport Assessments and Travel Plans should take account of the 'Guidance on Transport Assessments' (DfT, 2007) which has clear criteria, Appendix B, which has been identified through a comprehensive appraisal process. There are clear variations in the criteria presented by the DfT and the proposed standards outlined in Policy T2. The DfT guidelines also contain more prescriptive thresholds for respective land uses alongside the more generic overarching criteria. The Agency does not object to the criteria where it is more stringent than National Guidance but would have reservations if the final policy was to adopt more relaxed criterion. It is therefore suggested that the policy references the DfT guidance and requires which ever criteria is more rigorous. | Checked the differences between Preferred options thresholds and those in DfT guidance. Have made some amendments. Insistent that need for transport statements and Assessments based on trips generated as well as development size and type. The latter offers developers too many loopholes latitude to evade their responsibilities to local communities in providing measures to ensure the impact of their development on local communities and operation of the local transport network are mitigated. Issues regarding Heywood and Middleton public |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>Alternatively, the policy criteria should be refined, especially where developments are located in close proximity to the Agency's network or in locations which could have a material impact on the SRN junctions/through flow. The Agency is keen to see the DfT guidelines applied consistently given that the implications of developments on local roads can also have implications for the movement of traffic on the Agency's slips roads and mainline flow which can impact on safety and reliability of journey travel time.</p> <p>The Agency acknowledges that the borough has 'excellent access to Motorways' but also identifies that 'public transport improvements are vital in Heywood and Middleton'. Importantly, the current deficiencies in rail services are stated alongside the opportunities presented by the expansion of the Metrolink service.</p> <p>The Agency also welcomes the potential of park and ride facilities at stations on the Caldervale rail line. The fundamental decision on where to site development will be critical in delivering sustainable development whilst investment in the existing public transport infrastructure will enable new development but also provide an opportunity to influence the modal choice of existing travel patterns. The opportunities associated with the East Lancashire Railway are well document and have been discussed in previous LDF appraisal documents and those of neighbouring authorities.</p> <p>The Agency does welcome the application of the RSS Accessibility Assessment which should be adopted alongside the emerging regional parking standards. RMBC have previously consulted on their Travel Planning & New Development SPD and the Agency has given comment supporting the content of the document. The Agency awaits the content of the Local Infrastructure Plan which should illustrate the linkages between the spatial plan and the associated public transport commitments.</p> | transport services are noted as are the remaining points made. |
| 389357/372 | MMC Developments Ltd - Mr Mark Russell (Knight Frank LLP – Sophie Taylor) | Policy T2 - improving accessibility generally seeks to promote sustainable travel and is supported in general terms. The general requirement to prepare Transport Assessments and Travel Plans is considered to be a reasonable requirement for developments of the scale referred to and for sites such as that at Rooley Moor Road | Support noted. No action required. |
| 396108/460 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.90 Yes, we support those proposals set out in Policy TI, in particular those relating to the provision of the Heywood Southern Relief Road and associated measures (T1c(i)). Our understanding of the current proposals are for the provision of the Link Road between the A6045 Manchester Road and J19 of the M62 as generally indicated in Figure 3.3 on page 22 of the attached file. | Support noted. No action required. |

| | | | |
|------------|---------------------------|---|---|
| 397168/473 | GMPTE - Mr Richard Clowes | <p>The title of this policy ('Improving Accessibility') is misleading as Policy T1 also covers accessibility improvements. Policy T2 is specifically concerned with ensuring that new development is sustainable and makes adequate transport provision. Part (a) The accessibility hierarchy comprises a mix of modes, population groups (e.g. people with impaired mobility) and trip purpose (e.g. shopping, visitors / tourists), but there is no reference to access to employment, health or education facilities. Therefore, it is not apparent what value or use the hierarchy would have. Parts (b) and (c) It would be more logical to place section (c), which covers the types of development needing a TA, before section (b) which sets out more detailed criteria for the application of Transport Assessments and Travel Plans.</p> <p>The requirement for a full and detailed Transport Assessment for some of the proposed development in section (b) seems a little onerous and it may be more useful to request a Transport Statement for some development proposals that are likely to generate less significant transport impacts. (For further guidance see Department for Transport – Guidance on Transport Assessment, March 2007).</p> <p>One outcome of a Transport Assessment would be to inform the specific objectives of a travel plan therefore in section (c) i) it would be more appropriate to set the same threshold requirements for a Transport Assessment and a Travel Plan.</p> <p>Part (d) There are concerns relating to the application of North West RSS Area Accessibility Assessment criteria to determine the accessibility of developments in urban areas. In applying the accessibility standards, there is a need to take care that there is no adverse impact on adjacent areas. GMPTE would be happy to comment on any Supplementary Planning Document concerned with accessibility standards for different land uses.</p> <p>Part (e) The introductory sentence could be taken as referring only to cases where highway capacity is insufficient. It could be improved by saying that transport improvements will be needed "where additional traffic movements cannot be accommodated without mitigation of adverse impacts".</p> <p>Page 126 Enhancing the sustainable travel offer will: In bullet point 7 it is not clear why the reference to "orbital bus services" need to be</p> | <p>Amended the policy title, but disagree with points relating to Accessibility Hierarchy. Have changed the order of T2b and T2c. Checked thresholds and made some amendments in line with DfT Guidance thresholds. Some are too weak. Prefer to base them on trip generation as based on development type and size enables developers to evade their responsibilities to mitigate the impacts of their development on the local transport network to the local community's satisfaction.</p> <p>Aware of concerns regarding the RSS Accessibility Criteria and even though RSS has been abolished Rochdale MBC have set out accessibility criteria that development proposals should strive to meet where appropriate. These will be based on thresholds rather than a points score</p> <p>Do not agree no clearer than current wording. From public consultation, communities want stronger wording than that proposed.</p> |
|------------|---------------------------|---|---|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--|
| | | qualified by "in centres without heavy rail or Metrolink services". This would appear contradictory since what these centres require are strong bus links to the regional centre to compensate for the lack of fixed track alternatives. Orbital bus links are a separate issue. Page 127 The basis for listing the Council's long-term aspirations for further major sustainable transport improvements is not clear, in terms of how they relate to the spatial strategy or to existing problems. There is little prospect of funding being available or the proposals being delivered during the period covered by the Core Strategy up to 2026 and their mere presence, listed in this document will not guarantee priority when resources for transport become available. | Agree and have amended. Support and amended with a justification but the commitment is to assess their feasibility. We cannot demonstrate their deliverability at present but they will help to meet Rochdale MBC's long term strategy and transport aspirations. |
| 398423/518 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | We agree with the general principles around improving access coupled with the need to mitigate environmental impact. Also the need to agree strategic proposals that are needed to sustain and stimulate economic benefits across the borough. There is a clear link between transport corridors and opportunities for investment. | Support noted. No action required, |
| 401290/504 | 4NW - Ms Sam Turner | T2 We welcome reference to accessibility, which is in line with RSS policies DP5 and DP6. However it would be useful to recognise the broader aspects of accessibility, for example the need to provide people with the skills to access jobs. | Agree this is important but referred to in the economy policies. |
| Chapter 11 – Delivering the Core Strategy in our townships | | | |
| Delivery of the Core Strategy in Heywood | | | |
| Question 40 What are your views on our approach to the core strategy in Heywood? | | | |
| 204017/47 | Miss Jean Barlow | This comment concerns HT2 (regenerate Heywood town centre) and HT4 (increase jobs in Heywood). I believe the focus in this document about increasing jobs in the Hareshill Road and Collop Gate areas is completely wrong. We need jobs in and near the town centre in order to bring more prosperity to the town. Types of businesses likely to occupy greenfield sites adjacent to the motorway are warehousing and/or offices. I fail to see how either of these could create new jobs and prosperity in the area. There is already an oversupply of warehousing provision, both in the immediate area and across the borough. Warehousing jobs are low quality and low paid, and few in number compared to the square footage of land used. They will not contribute to making the borough more prosperous or thriving. Typically, office developments close to motorway access do not provide new jobs, nor any prosperity for the local area. I know from personal experience that what happens is that jobs are transferred from another location, and no new jobs are | Noted – The Heywood township section also emphasises the importance of importance of regeneration in and around the town centre and this will help to bring more prosperity to the town. SEE SCHEDULE A |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | | available for the local people. Instead the existing jobholders will be travelling further to this location, creating more traffic problems and environmental pollution. They will not visit the town centre at all, nor use local businesses or facilities, but just hop straight back onto the motorway at 5pm to go home. To make the town centres thriving, we need more jobs in the town centres where the workforce can pop out at lunchtime or after work to use local facilities (and spend their money). A prime site in Heywood would be the recently-vacated site of Mossfield School, right in the town centre and adjacent to shops, cafes, car parking, banks, sports centre etc. Also ideal would be the site of Boots warehouse. The logic of releasing yet more Green Belt in this area completely defeats me. | |
| 204017/50 | Miss Jean Barlow | HT1 - regarding improvements to the Roch Valley. Whilst I cannot disagree that the Roch Valley area should be conserved, I think there is limited potential for making it a more prominent feature. By its very nature it is hidden away and inaccessible to most people. I feel that only a small number of people will seek to spend their leisure time in such an area, but compare this to the thousands of residents who daily enjoy a view of open fields, if only for a few minutes on their way to work, and yet you are proposing to get rid of yet more green belt. I feel that money spent on improving Roch Valley could be much better spent elsewhere. | Noted. |
| 204017/70 | Miss Jean Barlow | HT4 The fourth bullet point proposes a "mixed use development (housing and employment) around Collop Gate Farm with a new local centre". At the public meeting in Heywood in November 2009 the "new local centre" was queried by residents. The answer was vague, and it was unclear where the requirement had come from. Apparently the local centre is to include some new shops. New shops here would have a detrimental effect on the prosperity of Heywood town centre, which as the report states needs to be improved. | Noted – It is considered that a new local centre may be required to serve new development south of Heywood. The size, location and potential uses within such a centre would only be agreed as part of the more detailed site allocation policy. Any provision would be appropriate to the scale of develop it is expected to serve and will be assessed having regard to impact on existing centres, including Heywood town centre |
| 216593/131 | SEGRO Industrial Estates Ltd (Barton Willmore - Mr John Pearce) | We support the objective of seeking to increase jobs in south Heywood and welcome the intention to designate Heywood Distribution Park as a SPZ coupled with a new link road to junction 19 of the M62. | Support is noted |
| 216735/541 | Russell Homes - Mr Daniel Kershaw | 6.1 Russells support the LPA's Spatial Vision for the Borough. The vision seeks to achieve the strategic objectives of economic growth, housing delivery and sustainable and integrated transportation patterns in a planned and controlled format which is in the best interests of all aspects of the community and which will not | Support is noted |

| | | | |
|-----------|------------------|--|----------------|
| | | compromise the green infrastructure and environmental initiatives. It can deliver a quality and lasting environment with the principles of good design being the foundation of the vision. | |
| 373238/51 | Mr Hartle Hartle | <p>1. What is the specific evidence on which the proposal for a link road from junction 19 to Hareshill Road has been put forward for consideration within the Core Strategy. I see no evidence that such a link would improve existing traffic flow in Heywood.</p> <p>2. Given that we have the M66 Pilsworth connection approx one kilometre from Heywood Industrial park, why a second connection from Junction 19 over 2 kilometres away across Greenbelt land in a high value residential area. Any further development of the Pilsworth /road area can be adequately served by the existing M66 Pilsworth link.</p> <p>3. The majority of HGV on Middleton Road appears to be from the Green lane industrial estate, why has this factor been ignored and why are there no proposals to address Green Lane traffic .</p> <p>4. Why is there not an action to investigate into the issue of HGV and commuter traffic entering, leaving or passing through Heywood from all routes within the Core Strategy.</p> <p>5. Why do we not have a proposal to further develop the M66 Pilsworth connection</p> <p>6. In the proposals for industrial development of South Heywood, why are we considering industrial development between Heywood industrial park and junction 19 which is green belt and adjoining high value residential land and not the huge area of land adjoining either side of the M66 in the Heywood area and M66 Pilsworth/ Heywood Distribution Park area, a great deal of which is now completing landfill. Hopwood is a predominately high value sort after residential area surrounded by green fields, which if necessary, should be considered for housing, not industrial development.</p> <p>7. What evidence to we have that guides us on industrial development needs in the Hopwood and Heywood area, given that we already have considerable unwanted existing industrial facilities in Heywood Distribution park, in the general Heywood/Rochdale area and as an example of new development, vast empty spaces on</p> | SEE SCHEDULE A |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>the new Kingsway industrial park within the borough.</p> <p>8. Despite massive opposition from the local community, the Hareshill Road land fill and the Knoll Hill Wind Farm went ahead. In this instance, on what basis do we have any influence over the final decision making process as the Core Strategy progresses, since the local community has no representation, voting powers or power of veto over the Core Strategy at this early stage or later stages in its development.</p> <p>9. You are putting to the local community the Core strategy for Heywood with we assume the objective of listening to the community and making changes accordingly. The local community has to have the power to change the terms of reference of this Core Strategy otherwise the consultation process is meaningless. You ask for comments in all sections of your document and do not indicate a facility to ask/answer questions and facilitate change. If you are to just listen to comments from the local community, possibly make minor changes that do not affect the present Core Strategy terms of reference and do not make significant changes where required, then from the point of view of the local community the consultation process has no purpose and constitutes a breach of human rights. It is not sufficient to have such a significant document asking only for comments. We need access to evidence, a formal question/ answer / action/amendment process, not just an unresponsive comments box where comments will be viewed with discretionary action.</p> | |
| 396108/462 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | <p>3.91 A set of policies and proposals are set out in the Core Strategy document (at pages 129 to 133) including a Heywood Township Delivery Diagram at Map 4 (Page 131). 3.92 A separate vision has been drafted for Heywood which we consider to be suitably brief. In line with our earlier comments, we would consider that an appropriate reference should be made in the Borough wide Vision to provide consistency and linkage across the document.</p> <p>3.93 We are broadly supportive of the proposals for the regeneration of Heywood and the Town Centre in particular (HT1 and HT2). Similarly we support proposals to enhance the East Lancashire Railway as a tourist attraction and commuter line (HT3).</p> <p>3.94 We welcome the economic development proposals for the township set out in proposed Policy HT4 along with the general</p> | <p>Noted – The Strategic Vision is likely to be amended which will include reference to the Townships in order to provide a link between the Visions.</p> <p>Support is noted.</p> <p>Support is noted.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>phasing of development.</p> <p>In terms of the proposed Link Road, we note that within Policy HT4 the Council consider the need to provide a Link Road between M62 J19 and M66 J3, to service new development and reduce heavy traffic in Heywood Town Centre. This proposal differs slightly to the text elsewhere in the document which merely sees the provision of a Link Road between the A6045 Manchester Road to J19 of the M62 and modest improvement to the roadway at Hareshill Road and Pilsworth Road between the junction with Moss Hall Road and the intersection with the A6045 Manchester Road. in the general area as illustrated in Figure 3.4 on page 23 of the attached file. 3.95 Should the more substantial road scheme be pursued we are mindful (in the first instance) that M66 J3 at Pilsworth Road is within the administrative boundary of Bury District.</p> | <p>Noted – Details regarding any proposed road will be clarified within the revised document.</p> |
| 396130/628 | Gill Howard | <p>I do not agree with any of HT4. I do not agree with developing Callop Gate Farm for housing residential and retail for all the reasons mentioned in relation to this previously. I do not agree with designating Heywood Distribution Park as an SPZ. This seems to be a way to get planning through without the public being able to object. Report says Develop existing employment sites within the urban area off Hareshill Road before releasing additional land (Policies E2, E3) I do not agree with developing existing sites off Hareshill road nor do I agree to releasing additional land.</p> | SEE SCHEDULE A |
| 396135/385 | Joint LPA Receivers N Burd & T Greed (Savills - Mr Craig O'Brien) | <p>We support Policy HT3 and consider it is vital to explore the potential for a new station at Broadfield as well as providing a new rail link to join up with the main Calder Valley line, and thus providing key accessibility to the Castleton growth corridor.</p> | Support is noted |
| 397168/474 | GMPTE - Mr Richard Clowes | <p>HT3 - Enhance East Lancs Railway as a tourist attraction and commuter line The aspirations for the East Lancs Railway appear to be contradictory. There is support for its development as a tourist attraction but there is also a desire to introduce commuter services which assumes that the two uses are compatible. Running commuter services to Castleton is impractical since Manchester bound passengers would have an indirect journey involving a change of trains. Similar comments apply to the reference in RT10 (page 142) to extending the East Lancs Railway to Castleton.</p> | Noted. |
| 397685/375 | Mr Nicholas Hirst | <p>At the public meeting with the planners there was no mention of Heywood town centre. This is essential to the overall plan for the future. I would like to see new investment and plans for the like of cinemas, theatres, concert hall, parks, sports facilities, restaurants,</p> | <p>Agree – Policies addressing Heywood town centre and the regeneration of the wider central area of Heywood are included elsewhere within the Core Strategy</p> |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | shops and communal open areas. I feel this is essential to obtain investment and funding for the Heywood area. Tram and train links also need to be looked at along with other forms of public transport i.e. buses and bike lanes. | Agree – This is why improvements to the East Lancs Railway and other forms of public transport are set out in the Core Strategy |
| 398423/519 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | This section outlines how the core strategy proposals are translated into each township. We would refer back to earlier comments. | Noted |
| Delivery of the Core Strategy in Middleton | | | |
| Question 41 What are your views on our approach to the core strategy in Middleton? | | | |
| 216477/249 | Mr John Lappin | <p>Up to the 1960's Middleton was a vibrant town with a large variety of shops, places of entertainment, factories and a town centre gardens much admired by all, and envied by other towns. Then came the planners and developers, result disaster for Middleton. R.M.B.C. have had the chance over the last 20/30 years to put this right with various plans and UDP's, so why will this one work. To make it work listen to the locals even if it is against your master plan and will spoil, in your opinion, the nice picture planned.</p> <p>Middleton must be kept separate from Heywood and Rochdale, any release of green land will be the thin edge of the wedge, and the green light from developers to merge us all together.</p> <p>Middleton has a very long and interesting history and must be identified as the main nucleus to advertise the town, but entrance to the historic buildings still standing must be made readily available to visitors. Do you realise the No.1 attraction is virtually closed all the time. The only time it is open is Friday morning whilst being cleaned and Sunday "St Leonard's Church." Re: the park and cemetery could I suggest Jubilee Park is renamed "Jubilee Gardens," as the word park denotes a play area to many younger people. In the cemetery "Sam Bamford's" monument must be renovated, also his actual grave is in urgent need of attention. They are not one and the same.</p> <p>Town Centre The jury is out on the supermarket only time will tell on this, historically the Arndale was in the opinion of many, the start of the decline of Middleton, it moved the shopping area to the edge of town, from the middle of the town.</p> <p>The Warwick Mill is the most imposing building in the town, what a municipal building it would have made, if only R.M.B.C. had taken a chance 20 years ago. Regarding residential development, I fear it is</p> | <p>Point noted</p> <p>SEE SCHEDULE A</p> <p>Point noted – This is the purpose of the heritage area promoted within this section</p> <p>Point noted</p> <p>Point noted</p> |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|---|
| | | <p>to late, see the huge apartments, and complexes, now available in North Manchester, so it's only use can be storage or offices.</p> <p>The actual town centre area i.e. from the Old Boars Head to the Arndale must be urgently looked at again. If underpass filled in (what a mistake that was) and Long Street, Old Hall Street and gardens made the main shopping again with emphasis on gardens not what R.M.B.C. keep inflicting on Middleton. The Market Place, Townley Street, Spring Vale, Grimshaw Lane and Oldham Road area must be given top priority over all other areas for re-development.</p> | Point noted |
| 216523/11 | Mr Robert Taylor | <p>MT1 - Do not build on any more green land around Middleton. There is precious little of it remaining. Protect all remaining green land by including it in Green Belt status. MT2 - Langley is already a blot on Middletons landscape - Improve its character by all means but do not build any more houses there. MT3 & 4 - I agree with the policy aims. MT5 - East Middleton does need revitalising - utilise brownfield sites only for housing.</p> | SEE SCHEDULE A |
| 218258/110 | Kirkland Developments Ltd (Lambert Smith Hampton - Mr Richard Moffat) | <p>Policy MT4 needs not only to recognise the need to integrate the new large Tesco store with the remainder of the Town Centre, but also ensure that, the redevelopment and regeneration of the Parkfield Industrial Estate site is integrated within the Town Centre. The site relates well to the existing Middleton Arndale and Middleton Bus Station. The inclusion of the Parkfield site within the Town Centre is wholly consistent with the objectives set out in Policy P2.</p> | Noted. |
| 381270/262 | Mr Nick Clarkson | <p>With regards to the Middleton section of the document (being resident there) I find the general tone puts forward many optimistic views of how to redevelop the borough, don't all proposals, yet at the same time many ideas seem to conflict with what is laid out in the document itself. Straight away in the foreword by Irene Davidson she quotes that we should "preserve the beauty of our countryside" yet part of the core proposals is to extend the urban sprawl/overspill across the fields on Langley Lane. Plus there is the rather glib "Improve the canal corridor with attractive canal side developments - now granted the state of the canal from Sandbrook Park through to the Gordon Riggs garden centre is a disgrace and could do with immediate investment but areas like Slattocks are a delight and the people who use these areas appreciate their value as they provide much needed areas of recreation be it walking, fishing, or just generally winding down after a working day earning money to pay for the council tax. These "attractive canal side developments" I assume would simply be more buildings to satisfy developers and</p> | Points noted – For issues relating to loss of open land see Schedule A. |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>either end up being ugly office blocks like the banal grey box that is the Zen Internet building, or canal side living spaces which completely ruin the rural aspect of such areas. Any development should be with the interests of the community rather than big business. It's bad enough having a huge Tesco being built in the centre, as if anyone really needed it with so many hypermarkets in the immediate vicinity strangling small local businesses, I no longer shop in Middleton or Rochdale centres as there is nothing there to attract us shop wise all the local shops are gone with the exception of a butcher and Broadbents, the rest is £ shops or charity shops and that is not a town centre in my book, even the "prestigious (joke)" Arndale centre is full of junk shops or empty properties and has had it's day. The blood money price of the arena paved the way for Tesco, and yet the main pedestrian area of the centre looks like it still has craters left from dropped WWII bombs as it has now for years and years, so much for regeneration. And there's the rub, more often than not developments are rarely in the interests of the local community, the bulk of their staff needs are usually met from outside the community. It's all well and good having an Arena, and it is good, it's a decent enough place and gives somewhere for children, youths, everyone to go and burn off some energy. But so much of Rochdale borough has been concreted over and built on that there are precious few immediate areas where children/people can just leave their houses and play/relax just a short walk away - resulting in a general malaise in the community and must contribute to the crime rate through boredom. It's all very well having a sports centre but it seems pay to play is the order of the day!!! Hopwood Hall - left to ruin, yet could be refurbished and opened as a local historical/nature/community centre ... anything other than left to rot. There's potential throughout the whole Rochdale Borough but more often than not it is brushed aside for the quick buck and quick fix, and to massage the over inflated ego's of planners. So I suspect as usual people will take second place against the wishes of a council intent on boosting revenues to fund more "development" of open space and fill the council coiffeurs. The document does have an upbeat forward looking vision, and I truly think that aspects of it are bang on, but at the same time I'd hate to see the good ideas compromised by bad planning and a disregard for what people want, because in my past dealings with the council I honestly think they do run roughshod over peoples views as they think that they know what's best for the borough. Look at the decline in the quality of life</p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | |
|---|---|--|--|
| | | here and I'd challenge said thinking, no matter what statistics the council come up with you know it's true. As my wife said, when she was a little girl she used to drive through Middleton and think it was a lovely place, but now, well ... she doesn't think quite the same anymore. | |
| 396044/122 | Miss Theresa Long | Ref. MT1: I wish to object to the open land next to Bowlee park being released for "employment uses". Equally I am against releasing land along Langley Lane for long-term development. These are some of Middleton's only green areas and should be valued as such, in an increasingly built up area. Building on these rare areas of countryside in an otherwise heavily developed town will just make Middleton township merge into north Manchester and surrounding towns. The quality of life for many Middleton residents would without doubt be diminished. I am also concerned about the vehicle access to these sites. Currently, Heywood Old Road and Langley Lane are used as link roads between Manchester, Heywood and the M60 and M62. These are extremely busy roads, particularly at peak times and any further development can only increase this problem. It must be remembered that these are residential areas and the potential volume for traffic if further development were to take place is likely to be unacceptable for residents. With these comments in mind, considering the Rhodes Green area for Green Belt inclusion would be an extremely positive step. Ref. MT2: I agree that Langley should be regenerated, and I believe that money can be well spent on bringing current properties and housing areas to an acceptable standard. However, for reasons stated above, I would be very concerned regarding the construction of a further 600 homes in Langley. Ref. MT3, 4 & 5: I agree with the regeneration of Middleton town centre, development of brownfield sites and preserving heritage areas. These can only make Middleton a more desirable location for prospective business and residential use. | SEE SCHEDULE A – In relation to the additional 600 homes, this is part of the ongoing regeneration of the estate and includes the improvement of centre at Wood Street and making better use of open spaces. |
| 396108/465 | The Wilton Estate (Carter Jonas LLP - Mr Paul Leeming) | 3.96 Consistent with our comments upon Policy R2 we consider that there is no justification to consider the inclusion of land at Rhodes Green for inclusion in the Green Belt. Consequently we object to provision five of Policy MTI. Our view is that this land should be retained as open land and safeguarded for the longer term development requirements of the Township. | SEE SCHEDULE A |
| 396130/629 | Gill Howard | I do not agree with developing land round Bowlee and north of Langley Lane. There is little enough green space left as it is. | SEE SCHEDULE A |
| Delivery of the Core Strategy in Pennines | | | |
| Question 42 What are your views on our approach to implementing the core strategy in Pennines? | | | |

| | | | |
|------------|--|---|--|
| 6682/119 | United Utilities - Mr David Hardman | PT2 - South Pennine gateway - UU support the principle of making best use of the potential of its reservoirs, however the opportunities which they present need to be balanced against operational needs. The Core Strategy should refer to these operational needs as the first priority. | Noted. |
| 60372/81 | British Waterways – Ms Sam Turner | BW is supportive of the aims to improve access to and within the canal corridor and the regeneration of key sites along the canal. BW welcomes the emphasis on ensuring that regeneration contributes to the biodiversity value of the Rochdale Canal as a Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and does not damage its special interest. BW supports the provision of environmental improvements such as woodland planting and reclaiming derelict, underused and neglected land to enhance the landscape and biodiversity quality of the river valley and canal corridor. However it is considered that it should be made clearer that developer contributions from sites adjacent to the canal will be sought with a view to delivering such improvements. | Support noted Point noted – All new development adjacent to the canal will be expected to take account of its location in terms of its design and contribution to the quality of the corridor. Open space contributions may also provide the opportunity to enhance the canal corridor. However, all of these will be dealt with on a site by site basis as opposed to a general requirement for financial contributions. |
| 162038/343 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | The Vision is appropriate and supported. No objections to the Policies as developed to date – PT1 in particular is agreed. | Support noted |
| 380888/264 | Mrs R Gower | 1. The roads up have deteriorated to a very bad state. 2. When council cut the grass they leave such a mess behind. 3. There are no bins to put any rubbish in. I walk into Littleborough every week and the only bins I see are by the fishing lodge and the next one is on Victoria Street in Littleborough. No wonder rubbish is scattered all down the road. 4. The dry stone walls have been knocked down in places in the time I have lived here, what a shame they cannot be re-built up as this is a main way in to Rochdale as well. Why not put young offenders on this task and teach them a good trade to keep all areas with these walls in good order. 5. The autumn/winter is coming, the leaves are falling and on the Same Todmorden road the drains are already getting full of leaves, and the kerbs are disappearing under them. When they get wet it will be like last year dangerous and slippery under foot. | Points noted, however these are issues outside the remit of the Core Strategy. |
| 389639/107 | N H R Ltd - Empirecrest Nick Ratcliffe | Empirecrest support the improvement of the Milnrow / Newhay gateway. | Support noted |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|---|
| | | In our view however other policies in the document, which seek to allow a new centre at Kingways Business Park and to place a blanket restriction upon the redevelopment of Mixed Use Employment areas are inconsistent with the objectives set out in Policy PT5. In our view enhancing the quality of the main road corridors and wider public realm must involve redevelopment and regeneration. The expansion of the role and function of Milnrow centre should in accordance with PPS4 be a priority over and above the development of a new centre at Kingsway Business Park | Any new centre within Kingsway Business Park would be of a scale in keeping with just serving the needs of the business park itself. Any provision would be assessed against the impact on existing centres. There is no 'blanket' restriction on the redevelopment of mixed employment sites although the importance of retaining well functioning employment sites is emphasised. Regeneration and improvement of key corridors and gateways is a focus of the Core Strategy. |
| 389694/304 | Clariant Ribble Limited - Mr Stephen Parkinson (Indigo Planning Limited - Mr Bill Davidson) | Littleborough is recognised as the key service centre for the Pennines area throughout the Core Strategy, servicing a catchment population similar in scale to Heywood (Table 1, page 49). However, the plan should provide additional focus to the town through expansion of residential development that will help underpin its function and meet needs in terms of both affordable and up market housing. | Points noted – There are a number of sites currently with planning permission or allocated in the existing UDP that can provide additional housing – both affordable and upmarket. The general approach on restraint in the north of the borough is aimed at protecting the high quality landscapes and retaining good quality employment sites. Some opportunities will still exist to deliver housing on appropriate sites. |
| Delivery of the Core Strategy in Rochdale | | | |
| Question 43 What are your views on our approach to the delivery of the core strategy in Rochdale? | | | |
| 161663/318 | Wilson Bowden Developments Ltd - Mr David Ward | We welcome and support the identified objectives of Policy RT8. | Support is noted |
| 196641/638 | Castleton (EC) Residents Association - Mr William Sheerin | RT 10 Delivering new homes and jobs in Castleton Development of Trub area with mixed use development enhancing the canal corridor and East Lanc's Railway to provide tourism opportunities is acceptable to the Castleton EC Residents Association providing the east side of the canal which is protected under the current UDP keeps its status - It is considered that a Marina would not impinge on this protection (Policies E3 C1 T1) Redevelopment of the Woolworths site for mixed usage is acceptable to the Castleton EC Residents Association (Policies E3 C1) East Lanc's railway extension into Castleton (with new station) is acceptable to the Castleton EC Residents Association (Policies E4 T1) Any new development will support the regeneration of the Castleton local centre is acceptable to the Castleton EC Residents Association (Policy E1) | Support for the redevelopment of the existing Trub and Woolworths sites is noted. Objection to development on land west of the canal is noted Support is noted. Support is noted. Support is noted. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--|
| | | <p>Redevelopment of the Royle works site to provide new employment opportunities is acceptable to the Castleton EC Residents Association (Policies E2 E3)</p> <p>Replacement of current superstore at Sudden will be acceptable to the Castleton EC Residents Association providing car parking and main road access provision are improved and no additional impact will be noted by the residents on Royle Barn Road (Policy E3).</p> <p>Proposals for redevelopment along Queensway /Canal corridor to assist regeneration of the area and create new jobs will be acceptable to the Castleton EC Residents Association providing these developments are on current Brownfield sites.</p> | <p>Points noted</p> <p>Points noted</p> |
| 396135/387 | Joint LPA Receivers N Burd & T Greed (Savills - Mr Craig O'Brien) | <p>In terms of the approach to delivering new homes and jobs in Castleton we fully support Policy RT10. The delivery of new homes alongside employment growth within the Castleton growth corridor is vital to ensure a sustainable spatial pattern of growth. As already pointed out in the response to question 6, it is felt that Castleton should be promoted as a district centre and not a local centre and that this should be made clear and consistent throughout the Core Strategy, or through an Allocations DPD. We therefore recommend that Policy RT10 be amended to outline the importance of the regeneration of Castleton district centre rather than the local centre. Furthermore, the former Woolworths site is capable of accommodating a broad mix of uses, including retail and a significant residential element, therefore it is advised that whilst Policy E3 be amended to promote a broader mix of development this is also clarified within Policy RT10.</p> | Support for general approach and mixed use regeneration of the Woolworths site is noted. |
| 398423/520 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | <p>In general the preferred option supports regeneration in the SCP areas, with emphasis on the regeneration of ECR and Inner Rochdale throughout the document. We think the level of detail for the relevant ECR and IR policies is appropriate. The two areas are also specifically identified as 'regeneration areas' on the spatial strategy diagram, which is then supported by area specific policies. The aim being to align the CS preferred options with the key objectives of HMR and the Borough Renaissance Masterplan is welcome. I would add the following comments in relation to the details contained in the consultation document:</p> <p>The terms "Inner Rochdale" is used to describe the neighbourhoods located immediately adjoining the town centre. Would it be better to use the term "Inner Areas of Rochdale" throughout the document, to avoid confusion with the 'Inner Rochdale' area. Page 154 (CI) table should refer to Rochdale Development Agency in full rather than</p> | <p>Support is noted</p> <p>Agreed – Changes will be made to avoid confusion and provide greater clarity</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|--|---|
| | | RDA (not to be confused with 'Regional'). Support approach in DM1 re delivery and management sequential approach. | |
| 398423/529 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat Rattigan | <p>Page 138 - Rochdale diagram - the area of RT6 on the map should be extended slightly to include land to the south of the canal (i.e. Woodbine Street area).</p> <p>Page 138 - Rochdale diagram -the map shows a clear boundary between the 'regeneration area' of Milkstone & Deeplish and the 'employment zone' along Oldham Road. In reality we expect there will be mixed uses at the interface i.e. along the along Oldham Road corridor.</p> <p>Page 139 -the Rochdale vision refers to an 'exciting' gateway. The main thing is to have a high quality, well designed gateway (see reference in Borough masterplan). I don't think 'exciting' is the best description.</p> <p>Page 141 - RT6 - the new homes also need to be of a high quality, not just larger.</p> <p>Policy RT3 "Revitalise Rochdale Town Centre" supports the aspirations embodied in the development brief issued for TCE albeit residential development is not specifically stated.</p> | <p>Point noted - The area does actually include the land to the south of the canal. This may not be clear on the plan on p.138 due to the scale and the presentation of the canal corridor.</p> <p>Point noted – It is clear from the text that there will be a mixture of uses in this area. The diagram is not meant to be read in a way that specifically parcels up land for specific uses. It is intended to be read at a higher spatial level.</p> <p>Point noted – Will consider rewording</p> <p>Point noted – Will refer to the quality of new homes</p> <p>Points noted</p> |
| Chapter 12 – Managing delivery and monitoring progress | | | |
| DM1 – Delivery and management of new development | | | |
| Question 44 What are your views on our approach to the delivery and management of development? | | | |
| 6682/120 | United Utilities - Mr David Hardman | United Utilities Water would like some reference to the issues embodied in Regional Spatial Strategy - Policy EM5 "development should be located where there is spare capacity in the existing water supply and wastewater treatment, sewer and strategic surface water mains capacity, insofar as this would be consistent with other planning objectives. Where this is not possible, development must be phased so that new infrastructure capacity can be provided without environmental harm." | Noted. |
| 161620/104 | Mr Steve Connell | Add to section 3 d ' providing opportunities for building places of worship' or similar | Noted. |
| 161683/284 | Government Office North West - Mr Dave Arstall | Policy DM1 appears largely to repeat other elements of the plan and national policy – is it necessary? | Noted. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|--------|
| 180811/438 | Natural England - Mr Stephen Hedley | Landscape Character Appraisals We commend the recognition throughout the Preferred Options report of the importance and value of landscape character, quality and features (SO3(c); P1(a); and DM1(4)a) as well as the increased emphasis on enhancing the Borough's green infrastructure network (including seeking developer contributions towards this (DM2)). However, we strongly recommend that reference is made to a relevant Landscape Character Appraisal; please see our comments below (under Policy P1). | Noted. |
| 368001/29 | Miss Erin McIlroy | The delivery and management of development is short sighted and biased. In that the south of the borough is expected to give up the small amount of green belt and open space it has for development whilst access to green belt and open spaces will be enriched in the North of the borough. | Noted. |
| 396098/295 | Woodford Land Limited - Mr Jason Parkinson (Garner Planning Associates - Mr Christopher Garner) | 12.1 The Creating successful and healthy communities section must refer to the Spatial Objective of providing up market executive housing. | Noted. |
| DM2 – Delivering planning contributions and infrastructure | | | |
| Question 45 What are your views on our approach to delivering planning contributions and infrastructure? | | | |
| 60372/82 | British Waterways – Ms Sam Turner | BW welcome the inclusion of a dedicated policy relating to planning contributions, but feel that specific reference should be made under point 3 to the Rochdale Canal being one of the areas where developer contributions will be spent, where applicable. BW receives no specific central grant funding to invest in and maintain towpaths. It is therefore crucial to improve the pedestrian and cycle networks along the canal corridor by encouraging financial contributions from developers in order to improve towpath surfacing and access improvements and to contribute to the maintenance and cleanliness of the towpath and waterway. Such contributions are essential in order to fully unlock the potential of our waterways as attractive, sustainable and accessible transport routes for walking, jogging and cycling. | Noted. |
| 161683/285 | Government Office North West - Mr Dave Arstall | We note that the Council is working on an infrastructure plan. Key elements of this will need to be drawn out and included within the core strategy. Section 5 of the Inspector's note of the frontloading visit gives guidance on the level of detail required in relation to infrastructure and delivery. The Notwithstanding the information in Table 4, the plan is currently lacking in detail on the questions of what, where, when and how. Table 4 should make reference to the AMR. | Noted. |

| | | | |
|------------|---|---|--------|
| 162038/344 | The National Trust - Mr Alan Hubbard | Under 3 there should be explicit recognition of the potential need for contributions to address heritage matters in a similar manner to that proposed in respect of Green Infrastructure. | Noted. |
| 180811/439 | Natural England - Mr Stephen Hedley | Landscape Character Appraisals We commend the recognition throughout the Preferred Options report of the importance and value of landscape character, quality and features (SO3(c); P1(a); and DM1(4)a) as well as the increased emphasis on enhancing the Borough's green infrastructure network (including seeking developer contributions towards this (DM2)). However, we strongly recommend that reference is made to a relevant Landscape Character Appraisal; please see our comments below (under Policy P1). | Noted. |
| 216735/542 | Russell Homes - Mr Daniel Kershaw | 6.2 Russells support the position that contributions to physical and social infrastructure should be delivered by Planning Obligations. 6.3 The impact of development should be assessed on site specific basis. Specific mitigation that is required as a consequence of a development scheme should be borne by the development scheme taking into consideration all other requirements. | Noted. |
| 368001/30 | Miss Erin McIlroy | Your approach to delivering planning contributions and infrastructure is not in line with the objectives or spatial vision for the borough. For example DM2 - Delivering Planning contributions and infrastructure 2) residential development For new residential development, unless on site / other provision is made, we will seek contributions for: Open space provision and maintenance (policy R4 and SPD); Obviously this does not apply to developments in the South of the Borough were the small amount of open space will not be provided or maintained for the people who live there. | Noted. |
| 396098/296 | Woodford Land Limited - Mr Jason Parkinson (Garner Planning Associates - Mr Christopher Garner) | 13.1 In order to avoid an adverse impact on the commercial viability of residential schemes there is should be one "pot" from which all contributions such as affordable housing, transport, open space, health and well being, education and community facilities are drawn from to ensure competing claims for developer contributions do not result in a commercially viable scheme. The pot should be the 7.5% of the gross development value of the dwellings referred to in C4. 13.2 The list in 2 and 3 is extensive and there needs to be a recognition in the policy that developer contributions are subject to commercial viability and may be set aside to ensure viability to enable a development to proceed. | Noted. |
| 397168/475 | GMPTE - Mr Richard Clowes | For new residential development Rochdale MBC may wish to consider contributions towards residential travel plan measures. | Noted. |
| 398423/536 | Rochdale Development Agency - Mr Pat | Policy DM2 - Planning contributions - use of local labour - support but need to be clear about the legality of approach? | Noted. |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--|--------|
| | Rattigan | | |
| Introduction of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) | | | |
| Question 46 What do you think about us introducing CIL? Would this be preferable to S106 obligations in some cases? | | | |
| 6682/121 | United Utilities - Mr David Hardman | United Utilities Water believes that CIL is for infrastructure which has no other funding stream. Our Water and Wastewater assets are funded through our charges to our customers and approved by our regulator. Therefore, we do not believe that a shortage of the capacity of our assets will be funded by CIL. | Noted. |
| 216477/250 | Mr John Lappin | Do not agree with R.M.B.C.'s plan to increase the residents of Heywood and Middleton using Rochdale Town Centre for shopping. Will this mean the town centre of Heywood and Middleton will be starved of investment, and the Council's main efforts will be centred on Rochdale? Because that is wrong, every town centre in the borough should be on an equal platform, then it will up to the shoppers where they will go to shop. | Noted. |
| 216735/545 | Russell Homes - Mr Daniel Kershaw | 6.4 Russells do not support the introduction of CIL. CIL is an inflexible tool that could lead to delays in the commencement of development and will, in instances, prevent entirely appropriate and desirable development from being delivered due to the onerous financial obligations that are placed on a site in accordance with the set tariffs. 6.5 Where specific projects give rise to the requirement for off-site infrastructure works to be secured (by payment of the CIL tariff) prior to commencement of development, the developer will have no control over the timescales for the delivery of the infrastructure works. Delays will lead to increased preliminary and finance costs and will impact upon the feasibility of development. The potential for delays that are outside the developers control will lead to the possible withdrawal of potential funding sources. 6.6 In instances where development is taking place in regeneration areas and the viability of a proposed scheme is marginal, CIL will place an added financial burden on the scheme that could prejudice the delivery of the scheme. 6.7 CIL will need to be applied to Heritage Schemes that often carry added costs. This could have an impact on the retention of historic and listed buildings. | Noted. |
| 368001/31 | Miss Erin McIlroy | You set out that the government requires development which is sustainable using a broader range of possible contributions and immediately point out how you have an exception to this - that being the release of land in the area South of Heywood. This is unacceptable as when consulted most residents are in opposition to this and other possibilities have not been researched or identified in this document. If a broad range of contributions are to be put forward | Noted. |

| | | | |
|--|-------------------|--|--|
| | | were are they? This is a major issue for the residents of this area yet no other options have been put forward. An infrastructure plan should be completed and the local community consulted before submitting the core strategy. There is no indication here that there would be any consultation with members of the community here. You have asked residents to such as myself to put forward views on each of the points raised here but have not adequately explained what is meant by a CIL or what this would mean for a resident such as myself. Why have you asked for my view, when obviously you have no interest in informing me enough to have a useful view on this? | |
| Appendix 3 Accessibility standards / targets (see policy T2) | | | |
| Question 47 What are your views on the accessibility standards in the table above? Can you suggest any standards where we've left them 'to be decided'? | | | |
| 368001/32 | Miss Erin McIlroy | Accessibility standard are unacceptable in many places. All residents of the borough should have some access to quality green space. As we currently do in Middleton however after the planned development on the green space in Middleton (Bowlee Park to Rhodes Green) the residents in the south of the borough would have no green space within walking distance. There are too many standards left to be decided and this must be reviewed again by those putting forwards the preferred strategy. | Points noted. Issues relating to Bowlee Park to Rhodes Green allocation responded to in schedule A. Further review of Accessibility standards to be conducted. |

4. TOWNSHIP MEETINGS NOTES

Introduction

Set out below are the notes from the public meetings held during consultation on the Preferred Options Report. There were two rounds of meetings held. The first round was in November 2009 and the second round in January 2010 following the decision to extend the consultation period.

The layout of the meeting notes below do vary and reflects the nature of the meeting. Some of the public meetings were based around a question and answer session because of the numbers of people and the fact it was mainly focussed on a couple of key proposals. Other meetings were based more around an informal round table discussion with members of the public wishing to discuss particular issues.

All of the comments noted and questions raised have been considered in developing the pre-submission version of the Core Strategy.

NOVEMBER 2009 MEETINGS

HEYWOOD TOWNSHIP

Note of Heywood Township LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Public Meeting

Heywood Civic Centre – 3 November 2009

Attendance

Council officers – Peter Rowlinson, Paul Simpson, Chris Hall, Wayne Poole, Francis Comyn, Richard Chapman
Members of the public – 105

Peter Rowlinson (Head of Planning Services) gave a presentation on the Preferred Options and answered questions from the public as part of an open question and answer session. The following comments were made:

- Council not doing their job of protecting Green Belt;
- Opposition to any further development in the Green Belt;
- No need for new land. Empty properties in Stakehill, Heywood Distribution Park, and there are only 3 units on Kingsway;
- Issue of document not being in the libraries and Council information points;
Officer response - We will give people extra time to comment
- Objecting that document says “we will” do or not do things;
- We don’t care about other Townships or other parts of the borough;
- Why can’t you deliver voting cards to residents of Hopwood?
- People don’t get to hear about consultation, Local Matters is not reaching; all households;
- Jean Jones delivered 250 letters about Public Consultation event;
- There’s a problem with the delivery of Local Matters;
- New road will not help congestion in the Town Centre;

- What is wrong with the roads that currently serve Heywood Distribution Park? There is a motorway serving the area so why do we need another road?
- Hareshill Road is not wide enough at present;
- We already have tip in Green Belt, Yearsley's has been developed, windfarm has been developed, that's enough development in the countryside;
- Peel Holdings and Casey's are behind the proposals for a new road;
- Land owners, Whittaker's, wanting to develop all of their land;
- The Inspector will not be interested as they do not live in Heywood;
- Other people cannot build anything but ok for big developers and landowners;
- Local people will not take the low skilled jobs on the Distribution Park, many have better jobs elsewhere;
- Not supportive of office development, should use the empty buildings in Heywood Town Centre;
- Do not want a supermarket;
- Need to provide evidence on the number and size of HGV's that will be taken out of the town;
- Another road linking to J19 will add to already lengthy peak time delays;
- How will the link road alleviate problems around Manchester Road and Green Lane and help other domestic traffic?
- Issue of existing peak time congestion traffic through Heywood to get to Bamford Norden etc. Mostly car drivers. How will the road help that?
- Provide a new motorway interchange from Birch Hill Services would be a better alternative;
- There has been a traffic survey, it's held within engineers section;
- Council needs to provide hard evidence to back up their proposals;
- Just moving the traffic problems around;
- There is still a need for traffic to be able to access business in the town centre, this won't help;
- There are a lot of units still to be filled before any new land would be needed;
- Signs are only in English in terms of access to Heywood Distribution Park, therefore foreign drivers do not realise there is limited access;
- Would there have to be demolition of properties to provide new road?
- Where is the detailed design? People want to know where exactly where the road is going;
- Putting more trucks on roads will just add to congestion on M62, M60 and M66, it will create more noise from motorway and other roads;
- Wording is different in the different documents;
- There are a lot of empty shops. We don't need anymore;
- People who will occupy new homes will not be bothered about Heywood;
- There are opportunities on old school sites for office development;
- Need to extend the period by which comments can be submitted;
- Needs to be publicised better;
- Will comments be published?

Officer response - Yes, a document will be produced as at the Issues and Options stage detailing all the comments and our response.

- Inspector will have the final say, but we don't support that as he will know nothing about the local area as he does not live here;
- Not a consultation but more like a dictation;
- Are there opportunities for freight on ELR;
- Would there be a need for CPO?

Officer response - Not at this stage

- Issue of need to demolish any houses was raised again.

Officer response - This will not be necessary. Short section of new route, most will be upgrading of existing route within the existing highway boundary where possible.

- Residents do not want any more shopping or a local centre in Hopwood;
- Map is not clear enough. Need detailed maps with detailed plans;
- Hareshill Road is not wide enough;
- Want another public meeting for Heywood;
- Need more microphones at next meeting so people can be heard;
- Want a guarantee there will be a second meeting;

Officer response - Another meeting will be arranged

- Half of existing industrial land is empty;
- There is an issue of open space – talk about access but proposing to build on some;
- Objection to proposal for a local centre in south Heywood.

MIDDLETON TOWNSHIP

Note of Middleton Township LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Public Meeting

Middleton Arena – 9 November 2009

Attendance

Council officers – Paul Simpson, Chris Hall, Wayne Poole, Emily Barker
Members of the public – 15

Paul Simpson (Strategic Planning Manager) gave a presentation on the Preferred Options and answered questions from the public as part of an open question and answer session. This was then followed by discussion in groups. The following comments were made:

Consultation and process

- The events have not been publicised enough and this has affected the number of people attending.
- Issue of people receiving Local Matters – Publicity needs to be improved in the future.
- Questions were raised regarding the role of the Inspector in determining the final Core Strategy.
- Need to encourage people to look at local press and get more involved.

Transport issues

- No need to try and bring Metrolink to Middleton. The huge cost in trying to do this would be better spent on improving bus service and facilities.
- There is a need for better public transport and access to the countryside.
- Bus services into Manchester are quite good but sometimes not good to other areas e.g. new jobs at Kingsway Business Park. These need improving.

Land at Bowlee

- In relation to possible leisure development at Bowlee, it was considered that there are already enough leisure facilities in Middleton (new Arena) and so why do we need more?

Land at Langley Lane

- Langley Lane was in the Green Belt but was taken out
- It's well used by the local community for recreation (dog walking etc)
- People have bought houses on Langley Lane thinking that the land was in the Green Belt. Now it could have an industrial estate built on it.
- Will people get compensation if land is built on?

General points

- Most people were concerned about the loss of greenfield land outside the urban area in Middleton.
- There was some support for development on greenfield land from a land user, but support was mainly due to uncertainty about the future use of land which has affected the individual in recent years.
- Same discussions keep being repeated, both with the UDP and through the core strategy process, so the community are becoming apathetic
- Belief that the RSS employment land requirement is excessive.
- Greenfield is easier, cheaper and quicker for developers to develop than brownfield land and will be developed in preference to the more difficult brownfield sites.

Housing

- Gort has been set aside for high quality housing, but how much of this do we need in Heywood?
- Collop Gate is being chipped away by development and there will soon be nothing left.
- Quote from the background paper that 39% of the borough is terraced housing and 29% of this is uninhabitable, the focus should be on sorting that out
- New houses have been built in Heywood which have never been inhabited.

Town centre

- Need to regenerate Middleton Town Centre and other areas, and update their image. Currently appear old fashioned.
- Traffic development has resulted in Middleton becoming a ghost town, bypassed by traffic and not visible.

- Rochdale town centre is very poor, but Bury is booming and expanding. Why?
- Need to redevelop the town centre to retain people and jobs in Middleton and prevent them commuting to elsewhere.

ROCHDALE AND PENNINES TOWNSHIP

Note of Rochdale & Pennines Townships LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Public Meeting

Touchstones, Rochdale – 4 November 2009

Attendance

Council officers – Paul Simpson, Chris Hall, Wayne Poole, Emily Barker

Members of the public - 7

Paul Simpson (Strategic Planning Manager) gave a presentation on the Preferred Options and answered questions from the public as part of an open question and answer session. The following comments were made:

Housing

- Query about the different approach to housing development across the borough.

Officer response - North of the borough will be an area of housing restraint, development to be concentrated on existing brownfield / regeneration sites. Housing growth to be concentrated in the south of the borough, due to the better capacity and infrastructure.

- Feeling that some of the properties especially on council housing estates such as Kirkholt have been neglected and there has been a loss of community.

Officer response - These are the current regeneration priorities and are listed as such in the preferred options report. The HMR package for Kirkholt already includes neighbouring areas such as Balderstone and the peripheral countryside.

General

- Need something in the strategy to develop the community spirit and bring Rochdale together as a borough.

Officer response - Trying to do this through the overarching themes, and then look in detail at smaller areas such as the townships to give people an idea of proposals which might affect them. This builds into and feeds from the bigger borough picture. Activities will be supported by SPD's where appropriate. It is the core strategy which sets the direction and SPD's tie into and feed from this.

Town centre

- Concern about the number of consultations taking place which may be confusing for residents and be contributing to apathy / poor attendance at the meetings etc.
- Concern that the town centre masterplan proposes a large events space in the town centre which is inappropriate given the climate and the lack of car access to the town centre. Not all people can or will access the centre via public transport.
- People need some access to the town centre in cars, especially for the elderly or disabled.
- If more of the town centre becomes pedestrianised the routes around the town centre will be more congested especially the A58/ Whitworth Road junction where improvements or alterations will be required.
- This was compared to Heywood where a bottleneck has been created in the one way system around Morrisons.
- People are discouraged from coming into Rochdale; need to attract people in now and then build on this through town centre improvements.
- Need better access to the town centre by car.

Officer response - The town centre Masterplan proposes to complete the ring road system and will try to keep unwanted traffic out of the centre to create a better quality environment. However, there will be routes in and linked to car parking spaces etc. The redevelopment of the bus station and demolition of the existing bus station will result in a new 2000 space car park being created on the site of the old bus station.

- What is the influence of the city region on town centre planning?
- Officer response - Our proposals have to fit into this as part of the Regional Spatial Strategy. Manchester is the regional centre, and the town centres of Greater Manchester are the next priority as sub regional centres.*
- The town centre masterplan needs a car parking and transport strategy.
 - We have a lot to be proud of the town centre and we need to promote its heritage and history, this includes the Town hall, Co-op museum and a very good local history facility. We can use these assets as promotion and a basis for future development.
 - Support for the town centre Masterplan ideas greening the river bank and making the River Roch more of a feature.

Health centre

- Concern over the lack of parking at the new health centre near to the station and the proposed health centre in Wardle.

Consultation

- Concern that consultation does not really make a difference or change decisions. This applies not just to the council, but also to other public sector organisations such as the NHS.

- Policies can be conflicting.

Officer response - The final core strategy document has statutory status and will form the basis for planning and bidding decisions with private and public agencies.

Community

- Rochdale has a divided community; collective thinking is needed to address this problem.
- Major disparity in the number attending the Heywood meeting and tonight's meeting. Local concerns clearly drive peoples agendas.

Rochdale Leisure Centre

- It will be on the same site as the current leisure centre. Some debate over whether this or the Mecca Bingo site as allocated in the UDP is the better site. One issue is the barrier of the major road crossing and poor quality environment at John St and beyond to the leisure centre. Although there is some support for moving to the Mecca Bingo site, economic considerations mean it will stay on the same site.

Character

- Need to retain the character and history of our individual towns and neighbourhoods. Do not want a cloned town centre which could be anywhere.

Officer response - Preferred options stresses the need retain and protect areas of distinct character and quality and enhance areas of lesser quality. Some areas have become devoid of character; in these areas it may be important to "create" additional character.

Local shopping facilities

- Need to retain local shopping facilities and small shops.

Officer response - Part of the policies for successful healthy, communities cover the need for local shops.

- The problem is that small shops close and hot food takeaways begin to dominate an area.

Officer response - There are limited planning options in relation to this, and its difficult for planning to dictate what type of shops are present and where.

Gateways and corridors

- The approaches to Rochdale are "through dereliction". The Council was complimented on the improvements to the corridor at Broadfield Park but other areas including Oldham Road need improving.
- The views in the Pennines need to be enhanced, or more created where possible.

Officer response - This idea is supported by the identification of gateways and corridors with potential for improvement to create a more attractive environment.

Funding

- There was some discussion around how the Core Strategy will be funded. Much of this will have to come from the private sector, and it's dependent on developments coming forward.

Officer response - For infrastructure, developers will be expected to contribute to any improvements or enhancements which are required. This may include public transport improvements.

Officer response - All the proposals within the strategy should be deliverable, but this is within a 15 year timeline. Final decision rests with the planning inspector who will have to look through the evidence and make decisions based on deliverability, representations, evidence of need etc.

Note

Another consultation meeting was held for Pennines / Rochdale townships in Rochdale Town Hall on 10 November 2009 however only 2 members of the public attended and therefore a formal meeting was not held.

JANUARY 2010 MEETINGS

HEYWOOD TOWNSHIP

Note of Heywood Township LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Public Meeting

Heywood Civic Hall – 21 January 2010

Attendance

Council officers – Peter Rowlinson, Paul Simpson, Chris Hall, Francis Comyn, Wayne Poole, Paul Lewis, Ruth Gilbert

Members of the public – 151

Peter Rowlinson (Head of Planning and Regulation) and Paul Simpson (Strategic Planning Manager) gave a presentation on the Preferred Options and answered questions from the public.

Note: Where similar points were made, they have generally been grouped under the same heading in order to provide a clearer note of the issues raised. However, where an individual put forward a number of related points, these have not been split up in order to try to reflect their point of view. Where there was a response by an officer at the meeting, this is in italics after the relevant point. It does not necessarily reflect the Council's final response to the issue raised, but it is included to provide a reflection of what was said at the meeting.

Most of the discussion was on the link road and development proposals in south Heywood.

Consultation process / procedural matters

- We only have 8 days to comment, people need longer, it's not a thin document and there is more in the plan than the presentations cover, there were no comment forms put in Phoenix Centre or in libraries.
- People have not had an acknowledgement to their letter/email. Not had a postcard acknowledgement.
- Not many people have seen the Core Strategy. Not enough about it in the Heywood Advertiser.

Officer Response – consultation started at the beginning of Nov 2009, the consultation period was extended to the end of Jan 2010, and we think that offers people sufficient time to comment. People will be getting an acknowledgement of their representations.

- Is a note being taken of the comments being made tonight?

Officer Response – Yes, the public and Councillors will be able to see a record of this evening.

- Why are inspectors from London making decisions about Heywood?

Officer Response – That's the way the planning system works, and we have to work within the system.

- How often are LA's proposals overturned?

Officer response – mentioned Middleton West Business Park in the last UDP as a proposal that was rejected by an Inspector.

Need for the J19 / Hareshill Road link road / negative impacts of the road

- There was a traffic census on Manchester Road/Coronation Road. Gort sand pit will increase residential traffic. 30% of units on Pilsworth Road are empty. More employment will lead to more traffic.
- Hareshill Road residents complained there have been problems of traffic (HGV's) getting off M62 in the past. Proposals will create more problems. Hareshill Road is very narrow at some points. People will use this as a 'rat run'. M66 junction with Pilsworth Road was put there to serve the business parks. Will houses need to be demolished?

Officer response - Road would be a slip road off the existing slip road to a roundabout and will not require taking out additional properties.

- Proposals will move more traffic into Heywood.
- One person queried the clarity of the document which does not make reference to a relief road.
- Proposals for traffic lights on end of Hareshill Road will create problems. There's already a problem with traffic congestion.

Officer response – this has been looked at, but agree needs further discussion with engineers.

- Hareshill Road houses do not have any foundations. The road was upgraded by the air Ministry and later by Yearsleys. Naive to think you can do this without a new road.
- Air quality is already poor. This is going to make it worse.

Officer response - there is a small strip of poor air quality along motorways. We will do more work on the potential impact on air quality.

Alternatives to the link road

- Why isn't a link road from M66 being considered instead?

Officer response - We are already looking at it but there are issues with Junction M62 and M66 which is already extremely busy and this might result in objections from the Highways Agency, but M62 J19 is lightly trafficked.

- M66 J3 – one of the proposals by owners of Distribution Park was to improve Pilsworth Road. It's more obvious to do this.

Officer response - not aware that this is being put forward by SEGRO.

- Junction 3 off M66 was mentioned last time but does not seem to be the same incentive to explore this option.

Officer response - not certain that this was mentioned last time. Will go away and have a look at this.

- J3 of M66 was put in as infrastructure to serve business parks at a high cost

Officer response - that junction was mainly improved to serve Park 66.

- Issue of traffic from Tetrosyl site was raised.
- Is junction 3 M66 not being looked at because it crosses into Bury council area?

Need for additional employment land

- Why do we have to follow RSS targets for development?

Officer response – If we did not look at and take account of guidance the Core Strategy would be found unsound.

- Businesses move from one site to another; how many jobs are there for Heywood people?
- Plenty of vacant units / land on Kingsway Business Park.
- A lot of employment units vacant across the borough, including Heywood.
- There is contradictory information regarding how much of the land will be employment.

Officer response – clarified the position with regard to development split. Plans will be reviewed and updated on a regular basis. The arguments on the need for the land will be put to the planning inspector.

- Waste of time having a public enquiry – what has changed from last time?

Officer response – The main change is the need to meet the RSS requirement.

- Need industry not distribution.
- How many people employed in Heywood Distribution Park? There are not many from Heywood.

Loss of Green Belt / farmland / existing properties

- Farmland is being ruined.
- Issues were discussed previously in the late 1980s as a part of the UDP. Fought to have this land kept in the green belt.
- Interested in how much GB land will be lost. We were misinformed about the last UDP and proposals for current development, which has not been as promised. Therefore why should we trust the LA this time?

Officer response – proposals are to take around 6% of Green Belt. Also looking at only building on the widest point of Green Belt, the Green Belt will not be made any narrower at its narrowest point.

- Issue of development of site on Langley Lane, Middleton was mentioned
Officer response – Langley Lane would only come forward if needed as substitute for South Heywood, if we need more employment land and if we need more land after 2026.

- Problems of impact on the environment and increased flood risk.
- Will there be a CPO on the housing on Hareshill Road? Quality of the environment will be poor given the HGV's that will go along there and noise, fumes and vibration. Concerns over the width and condition of the road.

Officer response – there will be further work with engineers on the design of the road.

- Once land has been taken out of the Green Belt it could be developed differently from what currently is being suggested.

Officer response – release and development will be in accordance with the proposals put forward in the plan.

- Issue of impact on views from adjoining residential properties.
Example given of problems with existing development on Hareshill Road.

Officer response – Peel did do work to look at impact on neighbouring houses and put in a landscaped bund. Employment uses will not be built next to housing.

Complaints about the environment of south Heywood

- South Heywood is becoming an eyesore. How many of the people who put forward these ideas live in Heywood? Not enough being done for younger people. Residents could not afford to fight Equestrian Centre any further.
- Need to spend money on the centre of Heywood, full of fast food shops and pound shops. Nothing for young people.

- Identified air and noise pollution and traffic congestion as problems. So what is the reason for picking this area? Certainly it's not about meeting residents needs

Officer response - South Heywood offers the opportunity for a better 'product' for employment and housing which is more likely to be attractive to the market. The Council is focusing on brownfield land but acknowledges the need for flexibility to attract development.

- Development will limit outdoor leisure opportunities.

Equestrian Centre / tipping issues

- Complaint about the land fill operation at the equestrian centre and the noise, disturbance and environmental problems its causing local residents
- The area of the Equestrian Centre shown on the plan was questioned. The Equestrian Centre is 2m higher than original land. Can we build on tipped land?
- Vibration from traffic on Hareshill Road and issue of the road breaking up. It will need a new road. You don't even know where the boundaries of equestrian centre are. Five year plan from tipping to start of equestrian centre, it's an unacceptable level of nuisance.

Officer response – The Council did refuse the landfill application, it was won on appeal.

- Councillor Lambert re-iterated his willingness to meet residents to discuss the problems.
- Are Casey's aware of the Council's proposals?

Officer response – Casey's have been made aware of proposals in this area.

- This will mean they just tip quicker and not properly landscape it. They are not following the requirements of the permission at present.

Officer response – Will get report from enforcement officers.

- Once land has been tipped, will it then be built upon?

Officer response – Only if the land is taken out of the Green Belt will it be built on.

- Council knew that Equestrian Centre would never have horses on because of its proximity to employment sites.
- Query about the enforcement officers visits to tipped area. Needs closer control as there are problems, recently a problem of a lot of mud on the road.

Officer response – A complaint came via Councillor Carol Wardle, it was investigated and found that the wheel washing facility was broken.

- It was suggested that this shows a need more wheel washers.
- Councillor Wardle stated she was opposed to the landfill proposal (i.e. equestrian centre). The recent traffic surveys are the last phase of surveys being carried out to investigate the potential for traffic calming.

The lorry gate has been effective. The motorway link road needs further work. The south Heywood proposals first came out in 2008 in the Issues and Options report. The planning department should have made this consultation more accessible, but accept that there has been a problem with Local Matters.

Role of Councillors

- The meeting shouldn't be hijacked by members.
- A resident thought Councillors should serve the residents not the government.

Impact on Heywood / other priorities / general points

- Don't need anymore retail in south Heywood.
- Are we intending to turn Heywood into sink area of Rochdale?
- One person questioned whether the proposals were to benefit Manchester City Centre rather than Heywood.
- Heywood is socially and economically deprived. People aren't around who can afford large, expensive houses. Terraced houses not being purchased, and some new development largely unoccupied. Government wants to 'carbon offset' with tree planting but how can there be proper 'carbon offset' for development if green land is built on and no trees can be planted?
- Plans have been developed by landowners, particularly the owner of Collop Gate Farm and Peel Holdings (Hareshill Road). J3 off M66 is best way to serve employment units. Understand that SEGRO want to do this. Relocate empty units to new site and demolish to redevelop for housing. Kingsway Business Park is a white elephant. There are enough tin sheds in Heywood. Money should be spent on Heywood Town Centre.
- Who is on the group that's discussing development of south Heywood? Previous owner of Collop Gate Farm said he did not want a road to be built on his land. Landowners have more control than the Council.

Officer response - we have offered to meet with local residents to discuss the issues. It would be useful if there was a local residents group to meet with.

- No development proposed in Pennines, including housing. Why is this?

Officer response - in Pennines area there are less opportunities due to access, topography etc. But development still proposed at sites such as Birch Hill. Therefore there is a focus on where opportunities are greater, including the M62 corridor in the south of the borough.

- Issue of building quality housing and creating a better quality of life; however the proposals run counter to this. Will lead to drop in value of existing quality houses and existing residents will leave. No details on the proposals and therefore it is difficult for people to comment on them.

Officer response - there are no specific plans at this stage. A Core Strategy is not supposed to have detailed proposals for sites. The Council is not intending to put employment next to housing.

- Comment from resident that there will be employment next to her house on Hareshill Road and HGV problem. Need to get more freight off roads and onto rail.

Officer response – the possibility of rail freight was looked at but did not stack up in terms of cost and not what business wanted, they want the flexibility of roads.

- No reference made on the need for additional infrastructure e.g. schools, hospitals etc. The proposed closure of A & E at Fairfield Hospital was mentioned.
- Should be ensuring that we can meet the service needs of existing residents. Need additional services.

Officer response – proposals are based more around employment land than new housing, therefore the impact on the infrastructure would be less.

- Comment made regarding use of the phrase 'we will' in the 'Core Strategy.' Focus on higher value housing, but who wants to live next to a link road. Mentioned issue of people who live on Whittle Lane.

Officer response –at present this is preferred option and will have to be agreed by members and tested by an Inspector.

- Many examples of brownfield sites which should be built on first to improve the area.

Officer response – This is what we are trying to do and work is being done to deliver these including Boots, Back o' th' Moss, Britannia Metals etc – looking at minimum 80% of new dwellings on previously developed land.

- Are we looking just to develop new housing on Boots to replace that being lost through demolishing Angel Meadow?
- Young people haven't been mentioned before. There are not enough school places and job training opportunities even with current housing development. Not enough land for allotments. Do something for Heywood not at it.
- Issue of selling of part of Bowlee Park.

Officer response – Councillors keen to retain Bowlee Park for recreation.

- What's happening with proposals for widening the M62?

Officer response – issue of hard shoulder running and reconfiguration of junctions would not result in 'physical' widening of the motorway corridor.

- Have to meet government targets but also should meet needs of residents including 'open land' for recreation, walking and open views of the countryside. Issue of need for new schools.

Officer response – This issue is covered in relation to infrastructure. The main issue in terms of need relates to employment land.

- If you don't build more houses you don't need more employment. These proposals will just reduce quality of life, particularly for young people. Need to protect these areas.

Officer response – the issue of household growth needs to be addressed.

- Investment in Heywood and Middleton town centres would create jobs without taking green field land. Need to improve transport links to Kingsway etc so that local people can take the jobs there. Should be looking at brownfield and not greenfield land.

MIDDLETON TOWNSHIP

Note of Middleton Township LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Public Meeting

Middleton Arena - Thursday 14th January 2010

Attendance

Council officers – Peter Rowlinson, Paul Simpson, Emily Barker, Andrew Eadie, Ruth Gilbert, Richard Chapman, Sohida Banu
Members of the public – 95

Peter Rowlinson (Head of Planning and Regulation) and Paul Simpson (Strategic Planning Manager) gave a presentation on the Preferred Options and answered questions from the residents present. About 70% of residents had come to discuss proposals for the Langley Lane area, about 20% had come to discuss proposals affecting Bowlee and other residents were Rhodes Green, Hollin Lane and South Heywood.

The following points were raised by meeting attendees. There is a brief officer response in italics.

Poor communication from the Council

Many in the audience agreed with a complaint about the poor communication and a claim that many people were not aware of the proposals.

Officers apologised for the incomplete distribution of 'Local Matters' which provided information about the Preferred Options, how to comment and the public meetings. The problem has been referred to the Council's Media team who will take up this matter with company responsible for distributing the paper.

Middleton West Site UDP Decision

Was the decision, made a few years ago by the Rochdale Borough UDP Planning Inspector, not to include the Middleton West site in the document binding?

No. The Council decided to delete a proposal in the submission UDP for a large 36ha site (Middleton West Business Park) in response to the Plan Inspector's recommendation. The Option now being considered is for a

smaller site in response to changed circumstances. The Inspector's report on the Core Strategy will however be binding on the Council as the plan-making system has changed

Clarification on Middleton Development Proposal

Prior to this event a meeting of objectors to the Langley Lane site met before Christmas at St Anne's Academy. They required clarification on exactly what development was proposed for the Langley Lane, Hollin (North of St Anne's Academy, Bowlee and Rhodes Green.

Is there a "ranked" order of sites for development which will be presented to the Inspector?

There was concern that even if the Inspector selects the Heywood site as the preferred employment land sites, the remaining sites in Middleton will remain as possible allocations, in case further employment land etc is needed.

Question asked about what would happen if the Inspector does not support allocation of the Heywood, instead they may select Middleton.

The preference was for development in south Heywood. Langley Lane would only be pursued if the Langley Lane option falls. All sites have to be considered on their individual merits and an Inspector will need to be satisfied that all options had been considered.

South Heywood

When will the Council know whether the South Heywood site will be allocated?

There will be a public enquiry in February 2011 with a decision by May / June of that year. The government inspector will want to look at the other options.

Presentation Circulation

Can a copy of the presentation be circulated to everybody ?

Vacant Commercial Development

There is around 3 million sq ft of vacant industrial and commercial space vacant. Why does the council not promote this? Why does it allocate any more land?

The Council is continuing the "build it and they will come" policy in developing Slattocks (Stakehill Industrial Estate) and Kingsway. Why not consult with employers?

Why not knock down Slattocks (Stakehill Industrial Estate)? Many of the premises are vacant and the site could be re-developed for modern business needs?

How much development in sq ft does the 175 ha available at present equate to?

Officers used the analogy between vacant employment land in the borough and housing choice. If people are in the market for a 4 bedroom house, they will not be interested in a terraced house no matter how many are available. This is the same with employment land so we need to have a supply of new land available, In addition to the existing vacant plots or buildings. The council has achieved 96-97% of housing on brownfield land. The figure is slightly less for employment; around 60-70%. This trend will continue. It is proposed to add only 30 ha to the existing supply. This is below the figures recommended by Government office. Other key areas for employment land are Kingsway, Mills Hill, South Heywood, Canal basin. Only one of these is a greenbelt site.

Approx 8/10 million sqft

New sites are coming forward, including 600 000sqft at Kingsway. There is still plenty of demand, with one company moving from bury to Heywood due a lack of suitable sites in Bury.

Langley Lane - Greenbelt

Why isn't Langley Lane being proposed for inclusion in the Green Belt like Rhodes Green and Hollin Lane? At the last public inquiry, the Inspector said it was Green Belt 'to all intents and purposes'.

Latest advice from the Planning Inspectorate is that significant changes (exclusions or additions) to the Green Belt would constitute a 'review' of the Green Belt. Such a review would need to be carried out at a sub regional level and in accordance with Regional Policy. Regional policy says that the Green Belt should not be reviewed until at least 2011. There are however, some areas of green belt that have less development potential and could perform a green belt purpose and Rhodes Green and Hollin Lane could fall into this category. These sites could be considered for inclusion in future years.

Greenbelt

1995 UDP Inspector recommended that Rhodes Green and Hollin lane were included in the Greenbelt. Why has this not been taken forward?

The Inspector did not recommend this.

Situation if Heywood site is rejected

If the Inspector rejects the Heywood site, will the Middleton sites then go forward without further consultation?

The Inspector may make the decision himself. Otherwise we will go to a further round of consultation. Where a large number of objections are received, the Inspector will ensure that the issues raised are scrutinised in considerable detail and residents will be allowed to express their views at an Examination in Public. The Inspector will look at all sites and other options considered.

Vacant Commercial Development (2)

Why not look at developing the 50 or so industrial sites that are vacant? We don't need more land / sites.

How will an Inspector consider new Sites?

Is there an assumption that the inspector will look at only brown field sites?

The Council expects ¾ of all new development to be on existing sites. However, the council has limited influence in terms of ensuring these sites are used. The Council cannot give rate incentives for relocation or new development as we do not get business rates; these go directly to the government.

Call for Sites Process and Publicity

How many people have been asked and have put forward sites for development and where was this request made? As a landowner I may have wished to do so but have not received any correspondence requesting this? Were all landowners contacted or just selected landowners; it seems that most of the land in question is owned by either the Council or Peel Holdings. The landowner did not believe that a robust calling procedure was in place. Many people objected to the consultation process, or the lack of it.

The Council advertised a 'call for sites' using adverts / press notices and letters distributed at the Issues and Options consultation stage. Landowners at Langley Lane for example have responded to this. This is the same level of contact we have had with the landowners across the borough.

We have assumed that landowners who had submitted sites for consideration as part of the last UDP will still want those sites considered. Some have been eliminated following investigations. Some were outlined in Issues and Options. We will still consider other options put to us.

The call for sites is not a statutory requirement and our consultation and publicity in general exceeds what we are statutorily required to do. It is not critical for the Core Strategy as only Strategic sites should be shown. However, the supply of potential sites helps the Council to demonstrate that it can meet its needs. If other sites are suggested we will consider them. Sites that help to meet our requirements will be included in a site allocations document which will subject to further consultation.

Community Conflict

There was a concern that the process was setting communities and townships against each other.

This is not the intention. The big opportunities for development and growth are where they are (in Middleton and Heywood). The Council must, in consultation with all communities decide on what it considers is preferable otherwise an Inspector will decide for us.

Progress from Issues and Options to Preferred Options

In the Issues and Options Consultation there were a series of options presented to us, why has the obvious Option 5 been chosen, as it suits the proposed allocations ? Do Councillors vote on this process? There is concern that there is no connection between Issues and Options report and the Preferred Options report. The Issues and Options document did not mention targets?

The Issues and Options referred to land requirements and these were set out, alongside information on the current supply in the Background Paper published with it. There were 6 options in the Issues and Options, and there were possible allocations for industrial land in these. The preferred option is a combination of several of these, and actually scales back from option 5.

At each stage of preparation, including when it is adopted, the Core Strategy has to be approved by elected members as a basis for consultation. An independent public inquiry will be held and the Inspectors binding report is expected around May/June 2011.

Air Quality

It seems that it is proposed to worsen pollution by new development.

There is no proposal for development in the areas where air quality is likely to exceed government limits. The Core Strategy is a package of policies, including transport, environmental and other.

Industrial Land Allocation

What calculations were used to establish how much industrial land was needed?

The allocation in Preferred Options is over and above the allocations in the UDP; much of this land is still vacant. How can the public be confident that the correct allocation has been made this time?

The only criteria that is used is location i.e.: next or near to the motorway. Other factors need to be considered including loss of amenity and air quality.

Greater Manchester is required by the Regional Spatial Strategy to address a shortfall of up to 900ha of land which equates to 90 hectares per district. The Council is proposing 30-35 ha.. Rochdale Council employed their own consultants, as did the authorities across Greater Manchester. This resulted in the figure we are using now which is based on the projected need for new build, re-use and redevelopment of existing sites and buildings. The model used to produce these figures is directed by Government.

We do not have a priority order for sites.

PENNINE TOWNSHIP

Note of Pennine Township LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Public Meeting

Coach House, Littleborough - 11th January 2010

Attendance

Council officers - Francis Comyn, Wayne Poole, Sohida Banu, Paul Lewis
Members of the public – 4

Francis Comyn gave a presentation on the Preferred Options and this was followed by a group discussion.

The following points were raised by meeting attendees:

Train line

The closure of the Oldham train loop has created a number of problems with fewer train services to Rochdale and from Manchester. Because of the Oldham loop closure; there have been increasingly congested carriages and an increase in the number of cars parked at the stations mainly at Smithybridge and Littleborough which is causing problems. It has been suggested that the Akzo site could help alleviate the problem of car parking by providing the extra spaces to accommodate more cars. In addition, park and ride has also been put forward to support the extra car parking at the Akzo site.

Akzo Nobel

Although housing has been approved on the site, it would be more suitable for a Joint Service Centre. The site is big enough to accommodate this type of service and car parking.

Kingsway

What is happening on the site?

It has been advertised as the main employment attraction for Rochdale but there are still issues with attracting employers to come to the site. The number of employees based on floorspace has reduced significantly and the Council /RDA are not entirely truthful.

Countryside and the rural environment

There are many opportunities to integrate with the rural environment and the countryside but these opportunities have not been explored. The canal can be linked to extra curriculum activities with the schools and communities. It is also an excellent tourist attraction point.

Cycle centre and supporting accommodation

There is currently an issue with Stubley Mill cycle route. Again there could be a better link with schools and communities to improve cycle routes as part of the tourist attraction.

Other issues

- Promote opportunities such as rock climbing as part Pennines offer;
- Keep area around Hollingworth Lake as countryside;
- There is an issue with the marina and water supply in the Canal (there has been a meeting with Paul Rowen);
- There have been a few issues with the public consultation on Rochdale town centre scheme;

- The design of housing especially bungalows has changed over the years where a number of extensions have been approved but they have had an adverse impact on the visual amenity and has changed the appearance of the surrounding area.

Note

A consultation meeting was held in Milnrow on 12 January 2010 however only one member of the public attended and therefore the meeting was not held.

ROCHDALE TOWNSHIP

Note of Rochdale Township LDF Core Strategy Preferred Options Public Meeting

Reception Room, Rochdale Town Hall - 11th January 2010

Attendance

Council officers – Peter Rowlinson, Paul Simpson, Chris Hall, Francis Comyn, Wayne Poole, Paul Lewis, Ruth Gilbert
Members of the public – 19

Paul Simpson (Strategic Planning Manager) gave a presentation on the Preferred Options. He and Chris Hall (Land Use Strategies Co-ordinator) then answered questions from the public.

The following points were raised by meeting attendees. There is a brief officer response in italics.

General

Concern was expressed that the Preferred Options Document was too general and that it was difficult to pick out specific proposals and boundaries. When will boundaries and further detail be provided?

Officer Response: The preferred Options are intended to show the broad spatial strategy and identify the scale and broad location of new development. Only strategic sites can be shown. Development sites must be shown in a Site Allocations Document which will be published later and in line with the Core Strategy. Work will start on this later this year. This will be subject to the same consultation process as the Core Strategy and so residents will be able to comment on the sites.

Spotland and Falinge

What exactly is planned for the area? Little detail is provided. Jobs and industry should be encouraged and promoted.

Officer response: Agree but the detail will come later and not in the Core Strategy. The CS establishes this as a regeneration priority area and in the

short term physical regeneration will be limited as major public funding is not available. However, selective redevelopment will be pursued in the short term alongside environmental improvements and better links to the town centre. Accessibility to employment opportunities will be improved if the Council can meet its employment land requirement.

Castleton

The path along the Canal running from Castleton to Sandbrook Park should be improved and maintained to help regenerate the area.

Officer response: Agreed but this is too detailed for the Core Strategy. The Economic Growth Corridor approach will however support a package of improvements, including improvements to the canalside environment.

TBA Site

There are many small sites across the borough that present a lot of infilling opportunities so that TBA should not need to be considered.

TBA is a controversial site that should not be redeveloped for housing, but should be made into an “urban park”. The Council should use the opportunity the Core Strategy provides to identify the TBA site as one not to be used for housing and identify other sites that will meet the demand.

The Preferred Options document lists TBA as one of 12 key deliverable sites for housing in the borough on P165 of the Preferred Options document. TBA is not a deliverable site. The Council should use the Core Strategy to reject the TBA site as a potential housing site. It also should not be included in the Allocations DPD.

One of the objectives of the Core Strategy is to Create Successful and Healthy Communities but developing on the TBA will not help to achieve this as the site has distinct contamination issues.

The Council will back the developers that get Government funding to develop the site. Developing the TBA site is the Council's preferred option.

Valid points that have been raised at this meeting should not be dismissed.

If at this meeting it is proposed and voted upon to remove the TBA site from the list of potential housing sites would it make any difference? Can there be an assurance that the TBA site will be removed from the Core Strategy document? Can there be an assurance that the TBA site will not be considered as a site for potential housing development?

If the TBA site is to be removed from the list of potential housing sites then how will the borough meet the Government's demand for housing supply?

It is important at a public meeting that opinions are heard and that it is shown publicly to the attendees that the TBA site is to be taken out of the Core Strategy and Preferred Options document.

Officer Response: The potential of small sites has been taken into account. Housing development at TBA could potentially make a significant contribution towards the Borough's housing requirement.

There is no funding to secure the site as an urban park. Landscaping could introduce a risk if contamination is not addressed and this would be very expensive.

Our assessment, taking into account work on a Brownfield Land Study, suggests that housing could be deliverable and is the only feasible way to fund the contamination remediation process. However there is clearly uncertainty over the capacity of the site.

The Planning Inspectorate has told us that the Core Strategy is not the document to allocate individual sites for housing. It is not a strategic site, and therefore the site cannot be identified in a Core Strategy where only broad locations are indicated. The site was referred to in order to demonstrate that it could potentially contribute towards meeting our land requirement within the urban area and on brownfield sites. As such it is proposed to recommend to councillors that reference to this and other sites be taken out of the Preferred Options report and that the site notation be taken off the key diagram. Information on sites that make up the housing supply will be in supporting documents and these will be kept under review up to 'examination in public'.

If the Council decided to allocate the site in a future 'Land Allocations' Development Plan Document, anyone would be able to object or comment. The consultation/decision-making process will be the same as with the Core Strategy.

Balancing the provision of housing and employment land

There is a demand for housing from Central Government. Is there any strategic review into the balance required between the houses built and jobs that are available? There needs to be a balance between the two as there is no point in building houses where there are no jobs or providing jobs distant from residential areas.

Officer response: Agreed. The supply of one can affect the other but requirements set by Regional Guidance take account of economic forecasting models. Locally, we must identify locations taking account of need, opportunity and accessibility.

Lack of Detail

It is difficult to know what the public are being consulted on when the plan is aspirational and not detailed. The public cannot be consulted on "airy-fairy" plans. Why is there a consultation if there is nothing concrete to be consulted upon?

Officer response: The Core Strategy is not meant to be site specific with detailed policies and implementation plans; however, it is meant to give a

clear indication of broad locations, scale of development and identify areas for regeneration, conservation etc. The Government Inspector advised the Council that there is too much detail on some matters in the Core Strategy at present. This detail should be provided in the Site Allocations DPD and Area Planning Frameworks and ultimately development schemes will require planning permission and public consultation will be carried out on all of these.

Quality jobs and Skills

There are too many distribution jobs which are low density and low paid and more manufacturing jobs should be provided instead.

Officer Response: Agreed there is a need to increase the range of jobs in the Borough. However, government policy does not allow the Council to be overly prescriptive in the types of employment allowed on particular sites. There needs to be a range of quality sites to attract all sectors.

Green Belt

What criteria does the Council use to decide when Green Belt land should be released?

Officer response: Allocation of Green Belt for development is the last resort. If land is not available in the urban area or on protected open land not in the green belt, the Council will assess the value of green belt land in terms of the extent to which it fulfils the functions and objectives of green belt, balanced with the need for development and the suitability of the site for development.

Affordable Housing

Most of the sites identified for housing will be for affordable housing. Where will the more desirable housing be located?

Officer response: The intention is to widen the range of housing in most areas including regeneration areas. The borough has a shortage of high value housing and the Core Strategy will support such provision.

Focus for Regeneration

The north/south dividing line that has been drawn through the borough in the Core Strategy dissects Rochdale. This means that once more the focus for regeneration and development will be in the large housing estates and areas where there is a concentration of ethnic minorities.

Officer response: The priority will be in areas in need of regeneration and which are accessible. This approach does not rule out development on sites in need of regeneration and investment in other areas.

Housing for the Elderly

There is nothing in the strategy that deals with the elderly population. There is a reference to, and policy, relating to Gypsies and Travellers. So why is there not one for the elderly population? Where will homes suitable for the elderly be located? This issue is one of the biggest social and economic

challenges we face as a greater proportion of the population live longer. There is a need to address issues in the national strategy for Housing the Elderly.

Officer response: Agreed that this is an important aspect of housing supply. Gypsies and Travellers are singled out in response to requirements in RSS and therefore have to be referred to. The CS gives support for the identification of sites where housing for the elderly should be provided. It is difficult to recommend specific focus areas for elderly housing; more critical is the accessibility of any elderly housing to shops and community facilities and to non-car transport. Design policy stresses the value of building adaptable homes. The issue, however, will be considered further.

Integrating Development and Wildlife

There is a need to integrate opportunities for wildlife in new developments, not just in corridors and open space, but to directly interact in all urban developments.

Officer Response: Agreed. The Core Strategy seeks to enhance biodiversity particularly in areas and communities that do not frequently come into contact with wildlife or the countryside. We already have Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which gives guidance and advice to developers in how to use open space and techniques to attract wildlife and a wider range of species into their proposals. All development proposals, including those in areas identified in the Core Strategy and sites identified in a Site Allocations Document will need to protect features of ecological value and consider the creation of new habitats where opportunities exist.

Peter Rowlinson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI
Service Director
Planning and Regulation Services
Telegraph House, Baillie Street
Rochdale OL16 1JH

ldf.consultation@rochdale.gov.uk
www.rochdale.gov.uk/yourviews

This document can be made available in large print or in Braille on request.
Anyone who requires the translation of this document to Bengali or Urdu should request this.
Tel: **01706 924210**

اگر آپ کو یہ معلومات بڑی لکھائی یا بریل میں یا ٹیپ پر یا اردو یا بنگلہ میں درکار ہو تو براہ مہربانی نیلی فون نمبر: 01706 924210 پر رابطہ کریں۔

আপনি যদি এই তথ্যসমূহ বড় ছাপার অক্ষরে, ব্রেইল, টেইপে অথবা উর্দু এবং বাংলায় পাইতে চান
তাহা হইলে দয়া করিয়া 01706 924210 নম্বরে ফোন করুন।



ROCHDALE
METROPOLITAN BOROUGH
COUNCIL