

BOLTON METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

BOLTON UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON OBJECTIONS

Inspector: Peter F Davies BSc(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

Date of Inquiry: From 27 November 2001 to 19 December 2002

BOLTON UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

INSPECTOR'S REPORT ON THE PUBLIC INQUIRY INTO OBJECTIONS

Table of Contents

Chapter 1:	INTRODUCTION	pages 1.1 to 1.3
Chapter 2:	PART 1 POLICIES	page 2.1
Chapter 3:	COUNTRYSIDE AND THE RURAL ECONOMY	pages 3.1 to 3.11
Chapter 4:	GREEN BELT	pages 4.1 to 4.14
Chapter 5:	NATURE CONSERVATION	pages 5.1 to 5.17
Chapter 6:	ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT	pages 6.1 to 6.12
Chapter 7:	DESIGN AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT	pages 7.1 to 7.16
Chapter 8:	OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION	pages 8.1 to 8.16
Chapter 9:	ACCESSIBILITY	pages 9.1 to 9.22
Chapter 10:	HOUSING	pages 10.1 to 10.22
Chapter 11:	COMMUNITY PROVISION	pages 11.1 to 11.3
Chapter 12:	EMPLOYMENT AND THE ECONOMY	pages 12.1 to 12.15
Chapter 13:	RETAIL AND LEISURE	pages 13.1 to 13.15
Chapter 14:	TOWN CENTRES	pages 14.1 to 14.8
Chapter 15:	MINERALS	pages 15.1 to 15.9
Chapter 16:	WASTE	pages 16.1 to 16.6
Chapter 17:	MONITORING AND REVIEW	pages 17.1 to 17.2
Appendix 1:	OBJECTIONS AND SUPPORTING REPRESENTATIONS	
Appendix 2:	INQUIRY DOCUMENTS	
Appendix 3:	APPEARANCES	
Appendix 4:	INQUIRY PROGRAMME	
Appendix 5:	NOTE OF THE PRE-INQUIRY MEETING	

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
586	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
2225	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No
2393	Peel Investments (North) Ltd	No
2438	SWAN (Save Westhoughton Act Now)	No
1789	SWAN	No
1851	The Countryside Agency	No
1852	The Countryside Agency	No

Summary of Objections

- Consideration should be given to emerging Regional Planning Guidance (RPG) as the UDP progresses through its stages of review. **(Objection 586)**
- Objective 11 at Second Deposit should be deleted. MPG3, paragraph 4, states that it is not for the planning system to set limits on, or targets for, any particular source or level of energy supply. **(Objection 2225)**
- It is unclear whether the revised list of objectives at Second Deposit is in priority order. The need for good quality housing and employment creation should have more emphasis than sustainability issues that are given undue emphasis. **(Objection 2393)**
- Object to the change to Objective 4 at First Deposit. While Objective 9, at Second Deposit, is similar - the First Deposit objective should be reinstated. **(Objection 2438)**
- Some Council partnerships have been unsatisfactory. While First Deposit objectives are generally supported, there should be greater emphasis on the need to protect open space and greenfield sites. This should be within a context of sustainable development, providing for - not least - wide opportunities for employment and housing for all. Environmental assessments would minimize the use of greenfield sites. **(Objection 1789)**
- The strategy in Chapter 1 should state the national and regional aims of sustainability to set the strategic context for the Plan. **(Objection 1851)**
- The plan objectives should be more comprehensive and include, for example: reference to countryside/rural issues; the need for design briefs for key development sites; as well as local distinctiveness. **(Objection 1852)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 1.1 Paragraphs 1.4 and 1.5 to PPG 12 require development plans to have regard to any RPG. While the Second Deposit version (paragraph 01.05) records the position at its time of publication, it should be updated as the plan moves to adoption - not least to reflect the final RPG. **(Objection 586)**
- 1.2 Second Deposit Objective 11 does not set specific limits, or targets, for any source of energy supply. Its intention reflects, generally, national planning guidance on

sustainable development - including those to make prudent use of natural resources (PPG 12 at paragraph 4.1) and to conserve minerals as far as possible [MPG3 (revised) at paragraph 6]. Together, that would be likely to reduce the use of, and reliance upon, non-renewable fuels. **(Objection 2225)**

- 1.3 The success, or otherwise, of Council partnerships are a matter for it. First Deposit objectives were rewritten at Second Deposit stage and provide an appropriate context for the protection of open space and greenfield sites, as well as opportunities for housing and employment. The need, or otherwise, for environmental assessments is prescribed primarily by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999 No 293) rather than legislation on the preparation of development plans. Any development proposal would be required to submit an assessment if prescribed by the regulations. There is, therefore, no need to refer to this in the UDP. **(Objection 1789)**
- 1.4 The Second Deposit version of the plan, at paragraph 01.14, contains 4 themes of sustainable development. These reflect those sought by the objector and are a general restatement of national guidance in “A Better Quality of Life, A Strategy for Sustainable Development in the UK”. **(Objection 1851)**
- 1.5 The Second Deposit version has extended the list of plan objectives. They, generally, have Borough-wide application - including the countryside. Objectives 14, 15 and 19 seek to ensure community access to services, while 2, 4 and 5 would include the quality of development. Chapter 7 of the plan addresses design matters, including local distinctiveness. New workplaces would be embodied in Objective 20. Within the context of Objectives 14 and 15, the plan seeks to ensure access to good quality housing. Community involvement procedures are a matter for the Council, within the statutory context. The use of building control powers to achieve sustainable construction practice relates to other than planning legislation. **(Objection 1852)**
- 1.6 The Second Deposit version establishes 23 objectives, fairly reflecting the overall approach of PPG 12. They include sustainable development objectives, as recommended by paragraph 3.8 of the guidance, and consistent with the themes of the plan at paragraph 01.14, that include economic growth and employment. Objectives 14 and 15 reasonably address housing. The plan does not indicate that the objectives are set out in priority order. As they provide a framework for the plan as a whole, there is no need for it to do so. This is not, however, explicit. For the avoidance of doubt, therefore, the plan should make this clear. **(Objection 2393)**
- 1.7 Objective 9 reflects the general thrust of the UDP. It is worded positively. It acceptably reflects national planning guidance, provides a general context for monitoring, and would include within it open space and greenfield sites. **(Objection 2438)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.8 Modify the plan in response to Objection 586: amend paragraph 01.05 to reflect the final stage of RPG. Other relevant chapters of the plan should also, where appropriate, be the subject of updating.
- 1.9 Modify the plan in response to Objection 2393: amend paragraph 01.16 to indicate that the objectives are not set out in priority order.
- 1.10 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1789, 1851, 1852, 2225 and 2438.

OMISSIONS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1891	North West Tourist Board	No
1904	CED Promotion Partnership	No

Summary of Objections

- The strategy makes no reference to tourism. A specific tourism objective should form part of the UDP's overall strategy - reflecting, not least, the economic importance and potential of tourism. **(Objection 1891)**
- The plan has not sufficiently involved local communities. There should be a wider range of sustainability indicators - including whether economic growth is compatible with it. The plan should give more detail on how sustainable development will be achieved and measured. **(Objection 1904)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 1.11 Chapter 1 introduces the UDP and sets out its strategy, including that which the Council considers to be its sustainable approach. Objective 20, at Second Deposit, would promote the creation of employment opportunities. That would reasonably include tourism, as well as other forms of economic activity. Objective 23 seeks the development of new, sustainable tourism opportunities. The tourism interest has not been prejudiced. **(Objection 1891)**
- 1.12 I have taken into account all the matters raised by the objector. National planning guidance in PPG 12 (paragraph 2.10) indicates that local people and other interested bodies, including community groups, should have the opportunity to express their views on the preparation of a development plan. The form of the consultation is generally for the local authority to determine (paragraphs 2.10 to 2.13). The Council has published a Statement of Public Participation (CD B9). Specific failings, if any, on consultation are a matter between the objector and the Council. At Second Deposit, the sustainable themes of the plan were changed to reflect national objectives (paragraph 01.14). These include economic growth and employment. CD B11 is a sustainability appraisal of the plan and the objector has not significantly disputed the Council's view that policies perform well. Reasonably, however, the objector stresses measurement and achievement of sustainable development. In Chapter 17 (17.03), the Council states its overall approach to monitoring, but further information should be given there on the means of measuring the plan's "sustainable" approach. **(Objection 1904)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 1.13 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1904: amplify paragraph 17.03 to provide more detail on how the Council intends to measure the achievement of the stated sustainable approach of the plan.
- 1.14 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1891

CHAPTER 2 - PART 1 POLICIES

OMISSIONS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1892	North West Tourist Board	No
1121	English Nature	No

Summary of Objections

- A Part 1 policy on tourism is required to prevent other tourism policies in Part 2 of the plan operating in a strategic vacuum. **(Objection 1892)**
- There is no over-arching sustainable development Part 1 policy that would underpin all other policies. **(Objection 1121)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 2.1 National planning guidance in PPG 21 indicates that tourism makes a major contribution to the prosperity of many towns (paragraphs 1.1 and 3.4). Paragraph 3.8 of PPG 12, together with the box following paragraph 3.10, generally indicate the policies to be included in Part 1 of a UDP where they are appropriate to the area. The latter includes tourism at bullet point 8. While tourism is a significant component of the Borough economy, a sufficiently positive approach to it is established at Policy E8, other policies of the plan, as well as its Second Deposit objectives (20, 23). An acceptable policy context for tourism is established. **(Objection 1892)**
- 2.2 Paragraph 3.8 to PPG 12 advises that Part 1 policies should be within a context of sustainable development objectives. The Second Deposit themes of the plan at paragraph 01.14 acceptably reflect national planning guidance on sustainability in paragraph 4.1 to PPG 12. I see no need to recommend a modification to the UDP to meet this objection. **(Objection 1121)**

RECOMMENDATION

- 2.3 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1892 and 1121.

CHAPTER 3 - COUNTRYSIDE AND THE RURAL ECONOMY

POLICY R1

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1585	Charles Topham & Sons Limited	No
1696	Mr D Southworth	No
1905	CED Promotion Partnership	No
1969	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No

Summary of Objections

- While the principle of the policy is supported, it should more closely reflect national planning guidance - particularly in PPG7 (revised). **(Objection 1585)**
- The Council is too eager to encourage and permit development requiring a more cautious approach - including the sequential test. **(Objection 1696)**
- There should be support for local food production, particularly in urban areas and by the community sector. **(Objection 1905)**
- The wording of the policy should be changed to reflect guidance in PPG1 and MPG3. The policy should not expect benefits from development and references to harmful or damaging effects should be deleted and replaced with unacceptable impacts upon. **(Objection 1969)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.1 I deal, first, with 1969 as this raises concern over the wording of a policy that restates the Part 1 policy at paragraph 02.01. My views also include an advisory element for the Council. The policy is worded as an aim rather than a statement of planning policy that should indicate the type of development that would be permitted. Here, for example, it includes the word “encourage”. The second sentence of the policy effectively repeats the first in a negative fashion. It is not necessary. Similarly, the objector’s suggested wording is not satisfactory - not least the inclusion of the word “unacceptable” - this being a matter for the decision-maker to establish in the light of an assessment of any proposal. This would take into account the development plan, national planning guidance and all material considerations. I have assessed the references by the objector to national planning guidance, noting that to paragraph 36 of PPG1(Revised) is within a general context of planning obligations and conditions. The modification I recommend below would establish clarity. Here, however, I am not certain of the intention of the word “amenity” - somewhat unclear. If it relates to the character and appearance of the countryside, the policy should say so. Otherwise the word should be clarified. Overall, it follows, therefore, that the same considerations apply to the Part 1 policy at paragraph 02.01. **(Objection 1969)**
- 3.2 The policy establishes the plan’s strategic approach to the countryside. In my opinion, its broad intent is consistent with the thrust of national planning guidance - including PPG7 (revised). **(Objection 1585)**

- 3.3 Developers and others with an interest in land/buildings have a right to submit development proposals. All are required to be fairly assessed against the development plan and all material considerations. This strategic policy, subject to my recommendation below, would indicate the type of development that would be permitted. Other policies of the plan address the sequential test. **(Objection 1696)**
- 3.4 In the countryside, agriculture is an important economic activity. The plan would not preclude local food production there. I have considered allotments as part of my assessment of the objections to Policy CP1 and have recommended the inclusion of a reference to them (paragraph 11.6 of my Report). They make a contribution to local food production. To add an urban requirement to a countryside policy would be inappropriate. **(Objection 1905)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.5 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1969: delete paragraphs 03.01 and 02.01 and substitute:
- “03.01(02.01) R1. The Council will permit development proposals that do not adversely affect the amenity, economy and the natural and historic environment of the countryside.”
- The Council should also consider reviewing the word “amenity” in the policy and its replacement by “character and appearance”, reflecting paragraph 3.1 above.
- 3.6 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1585, 1696 and 1905.

POLICY R2: PROTECTED OPEN LAND

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
81	Accland Bracewell Management Pension Fund	No
267	Mr F Purtill	No
533	National Grid Company Plc	No
543	The Hulton Estate	No
555	Mrs M Holden	No
556	Mrs D Boddy	No
563	Mr M Birchall	No
570	Ms K Birchall	No
1098	Bolton WIDE	No
1154	Mr and Mrs A W Knight	No
1184	Messrs W Cartwright & F Lee	No
1209	The House Builders Federation	No
1303	Mr M Cooper	No
1535	Westbury Homes Ltd/ Wain Estates Ltd	No
1549	Persimmon Homes Ltd	No
1556	Beazer Strategic Land	No

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1596	Peel Investments (North) Limited	No
1600	Peel Investments (North) Limited	No
1623	The Emerson Group	No
1748	Arrowcroft North West Limited	No
1788	SWAN	No
1854	The Countryside Agency	No
1900	Wimpey Homes	No
1970	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No
1992	Mr D Lord	No
2016	Mr A Partington	No
2079	Messrs W Cartwright & F Lee	No

Summary of Objections

- Land at Bowlands Hey should not be designated as Other Protected Open Land (OPOL), on the Proposals Map. It should be allocated for housing. Development is already taking place there and it would be sensible to continue it. Bowlands Hey should form either a strategic allocation or a phased release in the latter part of the plan. **(Objections 81, 267, 555, 556, 563 and 570)**
- The plan covers developments that may be acceptable in OPOL, the Green Belt and Green Corridors. Under these policies, any development required to meet operational requirements would not be acceptable development. Either a policy should be included in the plan to allow utilities to carry out essential developments or, the existing policies amended to allow essential utility development to take place. **(Objection 533)**
- Land at Lee Hall, Westhoughton should not be shown on the Proposals Map as OPOL. **(Objection 543)**
- Land at Chequerbent, close to a junction of the M61, would offer a sustainable location for an inward investment or a high quality business park. It should not be subject to Policy R2 but identified as a site for development under Policy E2, insufficient regard being given to the range of demand for employment sites. **(Objection 1098)**
- While the designation of Bowlands Hey as OPOL is supported, a small area of land to the north of the disused railway line should be excluded. **(Objection 1154)**
- The objections relate to various land at Ditcher's Farm, Westhoughton. It should not be designated under the policy, including land at Beech House and off Dixon Street. Ditcher's Farm is suitable for housing and should be either an allocation under H2 or identified as a preferred area of search to meet an identified shortfall in housing supply in the latter period of the plan. **(Objections 1184, 1535, 1900 and 2079)**
- Category (iv) appears to contradict category (iii), the former confusing Green Belt policy and open land policy. It should relate to development required for agricultural, forestry or other uses appropriate to a rural area. **(Objections 1209 and 1623)**
- Land to the rear of Plodder Lane, adjacent to the hospital, should be included within the adjacent area of OPOL. **(Objection 1303)**
- The Lee Hall site would provide a mixed-use urban extension that would meet the housing and employment needs of the Borough. **(Objection 1549)**

- Land at Knowles Farm, Horwich should be removed from the OPOL designation and allocated for housing development. **(Objection 1556)**
- Sites at Meads Grove and to the west of Slack Fold Lane should form a reserve of safeguarded land for future housing development under Policy R2, following any review of the Green Belt. **(Objections 1596, 1600)**
- Land at Lever Park Avenue should be allocated for housing. **(Objection 1748)**
- Limited infilling allowed by criterion (i) could result in large-scale housing development, contrary to the policy. The scale of infilling should be specified. On criterion (iii), recreational development - that would, for example, require a location outside the urban area - may not be appropriate near the urban area. The policy should reflect this. **(Objection 1788)**
- Area-based policies such as R2 should include criteria - for example on design matters - that would vary across the plan area. The policy should be linked to R5. **(Objection 1854)**
- In the interests of clarity, the first line of the policy should be changed. The word “permanent” should be inserted between “permit” and “development”. At category (i), the word “unacceptably” should be inserted before “adversely”. **(Objection 1970)**
- A further criterion should be added to the policy indicating that development should be accessible by a range of transport modes to areas of employment growth. **(Objection 1992)**
- The R2 designation would prejudice a joint development proposal. The policy is too restrictive and fails to recognise the location of mineral resources in the area. The investigation and potential future extraction of minerals is restricted by the designation. The boundary of the designation should be amended to exclude the landholding at Gibb Farm. **(Objection 2016)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.7 To begin, there is little convincing evidence before me that the principle of OPOL is unacceptable. I agree, and note that there is a similar designation included in the adopted plan. The Second Deposit version of the plan informs me that OPOL is that part of the countryside that is not Green Belt (paragraph 03.02). Having spent some time on my site visits assessing OPOL, I am in no doubt that the areas so defined should fairly be described as countryside. Generally, they - and the Green Belt - define the urban area(s) of the Borough, albeit the plan does not include a clear definition of it. It should. In Chapter 4, I have concluded that there is no justified basis for a review of Green Belt boundaries. Policy R2, at paragraph 03.07, states that some of the OPOL could be appropriate for development in the future, but not during the plan period up to 2011 - and not without a further review of the UDP. Taking into account my Green Belt conclusions in Chapter 4, it follows that any requirement for additional land outside the urban area(s) during the period of the plan would need to address OPOL.
- 3.8 That takes me to the status of OPOL. In my view, the Bolton approach reflects the general intention of paragraph 2.12 and Annex B to PPG2 (Revised) - that to protect Green Belt boundaries within a longer time-scale than a development plan. I can confirm it - not least as the policy would broadly support the urban concentration approach of the plan, this generally consistent with national planning guidance.
- 3.9 On then to the objections. Statutory undertakers have permitted development rights. These are set out in Part 17 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995. They are intended to reflect the operational requirements of statutory undertakers. There is no basis for me to depart from them.
-

Any development proposal that did not benefit from permitted development rights would need to be considered in the light of the development plan, national planning guidance and all material considerations. **(Objection 533)**

- 3.10 These objections seek removal of OPOL designation and allocation for housing/employment. While I support the principle of OPOL in this chapter of the plan, it must be subject to qualification as - in Chapter 10 - I conclude that additional land should be made available for housing. At Chapter 12, I deal with the merits of an employment allocation at Lee Hall/Chequerbent. **(Objections 81, 267, 543, 555, 556, 563, 570, 1098, 1184, 1535, 1549, 1556, 1748, 1900, and 2079)**
- 3.11 The area of land that the objector seeks to be removed from the designated area of R2 is in open countryside and separated from Old Fold Farm and Baldwin's Farm by the line of a disused railway, the cutting of which has been infilled. To allocate the site for housing would result in isolated and sporadic development in the countryside, in conflict with the approach of Policy R2. National planning guidance in PPG7 (revised) indicates that the countryside should be safeguarded for its own sake (paragraph 2.14) and that building in the open countryside away from existing settlements should be strictly controlled. The objection would conflict with these national policy intentions. The objectors have submitted no convincing evidence to the contrary. **(Objection 1154)**
- 3.12 The site is adjacent to an area of OPOL to the west and a large hospital complex to the north and east. Visually, it is related to the latter - rather than the countryside to the west. The objector has not disputed the Council's evidence that a proposal for a new hospital building on the site has recently been granted planning permission. Taking all the above matters into account, I do not consider that the designation of the site as OPOL would be justified. **(Objection 1303)**
- 3.13 The submitted objections indicate these as being to Policy O2. It is clear, however, that they relate to Policy R2 as recorded by the Council. My recommendation proceeds on that basis. The sites are part of the approved Green Belt defined in the adopted plan and carried forward into the UDP. In Chapter 4, I have concluded that there is no justified basis for a review of the Green Belt boundaries of the plan. It would not be appropriate to allocate the sites as OPOL. **(Objections 1596 and 1600)**
- 3.14 "Limited infilling" [criterion (i)] is not defined in the plan. Acceptable. Each case would need to be considered in the light of its specific circumstances. Here, the intent of the criterion relates to that within an established housing or industrial area. This reflects a sound planning principle, establishing sufficient control to protect the areas of land defined under the policy. I share the view of the objector that planning proposals may arise within R2 land, through criterion (iii), that may be inconsistent with a location adjacent to an established urban area. The UDP would, however, need to be read as a whole - other policies needing to be taken into account - as well as national planning guidance, particularly in PPG7 (revised). Acceptable planning control would be available to the decision-maker. **(Objection 1788)**
- 3.15 There are clearly linkages between policies of the plan. It would need to be read as a whole in the assessment of development proposals. To include specific area-based policies on matters such as design would result in an overly-complicated and detailed plan in general conflict with paragraph 3.1 to PPG 12. Sufficient control would be established, including N5. **(Objection 1854)**
- 3.16 A development plan should indicate the type of development that would be permitted. There is no need for it to refer to permanent development. When a development proposal would be likely to have an adverse effect, it is for the decision-maker to

establish whether that would be unacceptable - taking into account the development plan, national planning guidance and all material considerations. **(Objection 1970)**

- 3.17 The objector has submitted little evidence in support of his case. While PPG13 indicates that the government wishes to promote more sustainable patterns of development and reduce the need to travel, especially by car, sufficient control is established by other policies of the plan - particularly at Chapter 9. **(Objection 1992)**
- 3.18 1209's concern over the sufficiency of development land has been dealt with in chapters 10 and 12. It and 1623 express concern over the wording of the policy. I have some sympathy - not least as it appears to confuse Green Belt and countryside policy. Category (iii) appears to introduce a Green Belt test of openness to areas of countryside not so defined. It also refers to acceptable development in the Green Belt when the correct test is appropriateness - as does criterion (iv). The Council's evidence creates further difficulties. Here, it suggests that a golf-driving range would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Such a use fairly involves outdoor sport and recreation. The test in Revised PPG2 relates to the buildings associated with it and whether they would be essential for that purpose. That would be for the decision-maker to establish. It is reasonable for the Council to seek to safeguard the character and appearance of that part of the Borough's countryside that is not Green Belt. In my opinion, the policy should say that, albeit category (iii) appears to introduce an onerous test of enhancement. Without departing substantially from the Council's general intentions, that are acceptable, paragraph 03.06 does need clarification, not least to assist the development control process. Here, the principle of categories (i), (ii) and (iii) are reasonable, subject to modification. The intent of category (iv) is, in view, also reasonable - subject to modification of the word "acceptable. **(Objections 1209 and 1623)**
- 3.19 I have carefully considered all the evidence before me at the Inquiry. As indicated at paragraph 3.8 above, the intent of the policy is acceptable - reflecting national planning guidance that seeks to safeguard the countryside. On an extended site visit, I was satisfied that the objection site, and other land related to this objection, has been appropriately designated. Against that, the objector did argue persuasively at the Inquiry in a number of respects. Here, for example, I agree with his view that Areas of Search for minerals should be included within the UDP (paragraph 15.28 of my Report). There, mineral extraction - as part of a scheme with adjoining landowners - would be likely to reduce the flow of aggregates into Greater Manchester, consistent with the need to reduce travel. A potential rail facility would offer a further benefit, although its practicality requires further analysis. The development "package" before me has, however, uncertainty relating to its waste element, the mineral extraction that the objector tells me would create a void for waste, as well as the details of a rail connection. My balance of judgement is that there is insufficient detail before me to support the objection. Nonetheless, the plan, including my recommendations, would not preclude - in principle - a proposal that has been justified in accordance with it. **(Objection 2016)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.20 Modify the plan in response to Objections 1209 and 1623: delete paragraph 03.06 R2. (i) to (iv) and substitute:
- "03.06 R2. The Council will permit development proposals within the defined areas of Other Protected Open Land, shown on the Proposals Map, provided that they fall within one or more of the following categories:

- (i) the development represents limited infilling within an established housing or industrial area, is in scale with it and would not adversely affect its character or surroundings;
 - (ii) it forms part of, and is required for, the maintenance of an existing source of employment;
 - (iii) the development requires a location outside the urban area, but is inappropriate within the Green Belt, and providing it maintains the character and appearance of the countryside; or
 - (iv) the development would be appropriate within the Green Belt.
- 3.21 The reasoned justification at 03.07 and 03.08 should be amplified to reflect paragraph 3.18 above, as well as the recommended modification at paragraph 3.20 above.
- 3.22 Modify the plan in response to paragraph 3.7 above. The reasoned justification to the policy should define the urban area. It should be shown on the Proposals Map.
- 3.23 No change to the plan in response to Objections 533, 1154, 1303, 1596, 1600, 1788, 1854, 1970, 1992 and 2016.
- 3.24 No change to this chapter of the plan in response to Objections 81, 267, 543, 555, 556, 563, 570, 1098, 1184, 1535, 1549, 1556, 1748, 1900, and 2079. The Council will need to take into account, however, paragraph 3.10 above of my Report and its links to Chapters 10 and 12.

POLICY R3: FARM DIVERSIFICATION

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
587	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1855	The Countryside Agency	No
1893	North West Tourist Board	No
2240	Government Office for the North West	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy should be clarified to eliminate unnecessary phrases and indicate how applications would be determined. **(Objections 587 and 2240)**
- The policy incorrectly relates rural diversification to the re-use of farm buildings, rather than all forms of rural diversification, and is not integrated with other policies. Rural diversification and development can be achieved by other than farm diversification. This would benefit local communities and the rural economy. **(Objection 1855)**
- Tourism is not identified as a potential activity that would be acceptable as part of farm diversification proposals. It is an important and successful contributor to the rural economy. **(Objection 1893)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.25 I can deal with all these objections together. The policy does need clarification, partly reflecting Objections 587 and 2240. To begin, this chapter of the plan seeks - through Policy R1 - to safeguard the countryside and promote the rural economy. That broadly reflects the overall approach of national planning guidance. Here, the Ministerial Statement (March 2001) added the diversification of farm businesses to the requirement on Councils to encourage rural enterprise [paragraph 2.8 of PPG7 (revised)]. That reflects Policy R3. The Statement also replaced paragraph 3.4 with paragraphs 3A and 3B. Generally, the latter paragraphs indicate that - while it is preferable for farm diversification schemes to re-use existing buildings - new buildings may also be acceptable subject to the tests there. In my view, therefore, national guidance supports 2 elements - rural enterprise and farm diversification, both including the potential for new buildings. The policy should reflect that. While tourism would be a rural activity that may contribute to diversification, it would be one of a number. I see no justification to make specific reference to it in the policy. In summary, the policy should address diversification in the countryside, with further guidance on the re-use of farm buildings - both subject to the need to maintain the character and appearance of the countryside. Although the criteria in the policy for the re-use of farm buildings are not entirely consistent with paragraph 3.14 of PPG7 (revised) that deals with rural buildings, they reflect sound planning principles. The recast policy should be reflected in the reasoned justification. Here, I have carefully considered the Council's Proposed Change No PC01. For the reasons set out above, it does little to assist. **(Objections 587, 1855, 1893 and 2240)**

RECOMMENDATION

3.26 Modify the plan in response to my overall consideration of Objections 587, 1855, 1893 and 2240:

(a) delete paragraph 03.09 and its heading and substitute:

“Diversification in the Countryside

03.09 R3. The Council will permit development proposals that result in the diversification of the countryside provided that they do not adversely affect its character and appearance.

Here, the Council will permit proposals for the re-use of farm buildings provided that:

- (i) the building is of permanent and substantial construction that is capable of conversion without major reconstruction;
 - (ii) the form, bulk and general design of the proposal is in keeping with its surroundings; and
 - (iii) the proposed use would not include requirements for open storage, areas for vehicle parking or other associated development that would adversely affect the character and appearance of the area.
- (b) the reasoned justification at paragraphs 03.10 to 03.12 should be amended to reflect both the reworded policy and paragraph 3.25 above.

POLICY R4: AGRICULTURAL LAND

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1971	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No

Summary of Objection

- The wording of the policy at First Deposit should be changed to reflect MPG7 paragraph 13. The word “irreversible” should be inserted before “loss”. **(Objection 1971)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

- 3.27. While MPG7 (1996) does include a reference to “irreversible” at paragraph 13, it relates to the ability to achieve high standards of reclamation. PPG7 (revised) at paragraphs 2.17 and 2.18 - as amended by Ministerial statement in March 2001 - generally restates the need to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land. This intent is generally reflected in Policy R4. At Second Deposit, the Council has added paragraph 03.15 to the reasoned justification consistent with current national guidance. **(Objection 1971)**
- 3.28. An advisory matter for the Council, not the subject of specific objection. The Second Deposit policy refers to “exceptional circumstances”. This, in a development plan policy, indicates uncertainty. The Council is advised to consider modifying the policy as set out below.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 3.29 Reflecting paragraph 3.28 above, the Council is advised to consider amending the first 3 lines of paragraph 03.13 as follows:
- “03.13 R4. The Council will permit development proposals that would result in the loss of Grade 3A, or better, agricultural land, provided that:.....”
- 3.30 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1971.

POLICY R5: LANDSCAPE CHARACTER

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
64	English Heritage	No
1714	Mr D Southworth	No
1856	The Countryside Agency	No
1972	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd.	No

Summary of Objections

- It is unclear how the policy relates to Policy N5 on landscape features that contribute to landscape character. The policies should be combined. **(Objection 64)**

- The policy should indicate that there would be a sequential approach to development in order to safeguard greenfield sites. **(Objection 1714)**
- The reasoned justification refers to other policies in the plan that need to be taken into account. As R3 refers only to farm buildings and enterprises, the policy is too restrictive and may be damaging to the local economy in preventing other developments that may not harm landscape character. **(Objection 1856)**
- The wording of the policy should be changed to reflect PPG1. This, generally, should deal with unacceptable consequences for the environment or community, as well as an intent to encourage development that makes a positive contribution. **(Objection 1972)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 3.31 To begin on an advisory basis, I have some difficulty with this policy - partly reflecting the objections. My extensive site visits in the Borough generally confirmed the presence of the 7 Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) set out in the policy. They are not, however, shown on the Proposals Map. A development plan should give guidance to the development control process. While the principle of LCAs is not the subject of substantive objection, insufficient detail is given on their extent and definition. This, the Council appears to intend to address through Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). As indicated in paragraph 3.16 to PPG 12, SPG may be taken into account as a material consideration in planning applications. While an advisory recommendation for the deletion of the policy from the plan is an option, my balance of judgement - on this policy - is to advise the Council to approve the relevant SPG, following public consultation, before adoption of the plan. In this case, it would reflect the general advice in paragraphs 3.15 to 3.18 of PPG 12 and would enable the boundaries of the LCAs to be defined. All this should be reflected in the reasoned justification to the policy.
- 3.32 Next, the wording of the policy (paragraph 03.16) is unnecessarily complicated. The first sentence is positive. The second is negative - generally repeating the intent of the first. It is not necessary. The Council is advised to consider modifying the policy, in one sentence, that would indicate the type of development that would be permitted.
- 3.33 While the objector does not object to the precise wording of the policy, I accept its view that LCAs would include landscape features listed in Policy N5. It appears to me, however, that the 2 policies have specific objectives. R5 establishes the Council's approach to development within LCAs and is appropriately located within a chapter on the countryside. Policy N5 deals with another matter, specific landscape features that have a flora and fauna importance. While the 2 have linkages, the need for clarity in the plan justifies their separation. Where necessary, development proposals would be assessed against both: firstly, the test of landscape character and, secondly, the test of landscape features. To combine them would result, in my opinion, in a complex and over-detailed policy. This would conflict with paragraph 3.1 to PPG 12. The aspirations of the objector are not prejudiced by the plan. **(Objection 64)**
- 3.34 The policy addresses varying landscape character within the Borough. In the assessment of development proposals, the plan would need to be considered as a whole. There, sufficient control would be established. **(Objection 1714)**
- 3.35 The Council has indicated 7 LCAs. Policy R5 seeks, generally, to protect their character. Within it, as the reasoned justification to the policy indicates at paragraph 03.18, specific proposals would also need to be assessed against other policies of the plan - this including R3. As the policy relates to landscape character, and the plan needs

to be read as a whole, the addition of qualifications would over-complicate the policy in conflict with paragraph 3.1 to PPG 12. **(Objection 1856)**

- 3.36 Fairly, the policy sets out to establish the type of development that would be permitted, consistent with “Development Plans: A good practice guide”. PPG1(Revised) indicates that good design on development can improve the quality of the existing environment (paragraph 15). Similarly, it is reasonable to seek or reinforce local distinctiveness where this is supported by clear plan policies (paragraph 18). R5, overall, acceptably reflects these policy intentions. The objector’s suggested wording would not assist clarity. It is for the decision-maker to establish whether a proposal would be unacceptable in the light of the development plan, national planning guidance and all material considerations. The use of the word “encourage” would imply an aim rather than a statement of planning policy. One further advisory matter - consistent with Chapter 7, Policy D1 at paragraph 7.1. The use of the word “positive” contributes little to the policy - any proposal that contributes to the character of the landscape would clearly have a positive effect. The word is not necessary. **(Objection 1972)**

RECOMMENDATION

- 3.37 No change to the plan in response to Objections 64, 1714, 1856 and 1972. The Council is advised to consider, however, modifying the plan to reflect paragraphs 3.31, 3.32 and 3.36 above.

CHAPTER 4 - GREEN BELT

POLICY G1

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
7	L Gallagher	No
257	The Hulton Estate	No
260	The Hulton Estate	No
262	The Hulton Estate	No
264	Mr and Mrs Ashworth	No
564	Mrs M Riley	No
567	Mr J Kay and Mrs N Platt	No
1102	Mr H Gregory	No
1104	Mr H Gregory	No
1106	Mr H Gregory	No
1176	L Halliwell	No
1301	Westhoughton Town Council	No
1348	Westhoughton/Hulton Park Liberal Democrats	No
1552	Alfred McAlpine Developments Ltd	No
1581	Charles Topham & Sons Limited	No
1590	Peel Investments (North) Limited	No
1593	Peel Investments (North) Limited	No
1597	Peel Investments (North) Limited	No
1601	Peel Investments (North) Limited	No
1791	SWAN	No
1857	The Countryside Agency	No

Summary of Objections

- Bowlands Hey, Lee Hall and Ditcher's Farm should be protected under Green Belt policy. **(Objections 7, 1301, 1348 and 1791)**
- Land at Woodlands Drive is bounded on three sides by residential development and does not fulfil any of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt set out in paragraph 1.5 of PPG2. The site would make a contribution to the supply of housing land within the Borough, representing a logical “rounding off” of the existing urban area. **(Objection 257)**
- Land at Pendlebury Fold is currently used for industrial purposes, and in part has been previously-developed land. The Green Belt allocation of the site does not reflect either that or the opportunities for redevelopment the site offers. It should be identified as a major developed site within the Green Belt. **(Objection 260)**

- Land at Manchester Road/Snydale Way constitutes a major developed site within the Green Belt. It has substantial industrial development and is inappropriately defined as Green Belt. The site should be included within the list of major developed sites. **(Objection 262)**
- Land at Leigh Tenement Farm is virtually completely developed with agricultural and residential buildings. It does not form open space between the industrial development to the east and the A6 to the west and does not meet the criteria for Green Belt designation. It could contribute to the employment land supply and should be removed from the Green Belt. **(Objection 264)**
- Land at Bank Top, Astley Bridge should be removed from the Green Belt. It is a small area of agricultural land situated between residential development at Thornham Drive and the Bank Top Site of Biological Importance that would form a better boundary for the Green Belt. It does not meet the purposes of including land within the Green Belt as stated in Policy G1. The site was once part of an agricultural holding that has largely been developed. The land is not a viable agricultural unit and is subject to trespass, removal of fencing and disposal of garden waste. The site is in a sustainable location; Green Belt should be reviewed across the Borough; while the site would also appropriately be considered as safeguarded land. **(Objections 564 and 567)**
- Land adjacent to Morris Farm, Chew Moor should be included within the “village envelope” as shown on the adopted plan - and not within the Green Belt. **(Objection 1102)**
- Green Belt zoning is inappropriate given that the land adjacent to Morris Farm, Chew Moor is a narrow strip of redundant farmland with clearly defined boundaries. It should be allocated for housing. **(Objection 1104)**
- Green Belt zoning is inappropriate given that this is a limited area of redundant farmland outside Chew Moor village, between it and the M61 - and adjacent to a football ground, pavilion and farm buildings. **(Objection 1106)**
- Land between Rumworth Road and the railway should be removed from the Green Belt to enable it to be developed as a housing site. **(Objection 1176)**
- Land at Slack Fold Lane should be removed from the Green Belt, its designation preventing the housing needs of the Borough being met. **(Objection 1552)**
- Policy G1 is inconsistent with PPG2 (Revised), as it relates to Green Belt purposes and objectives. **(Objection 1581)**
- Green Belt policies should recognise the development potential of strategically located sites within the Green Belt at key roadside locations. The development potential of land at Junction 4 of the M61 should be recognised as a “roadside facility”. **(Objection 1590)**
- A review of Green Belt boundaries is encouraged and the land to the south of Meads Grove, Middle Hulton, should be removed from the Green Belt to enable future housing requirements to be met. **(Objection 1593)**
- A review of Green Belt boundaries is encouraged and land to the west of Slack Fold Lane should be removed from the Green Belt to enable future housing requirements to be met. **(Objection 1597)**
- A review of Green Belt boundaries is encouraged and land to the east of Duchy Avenue, Over Hulton, should be removed from the Green Belt to enable future housing requirements to be met. **(Objection 1601)**

- Given the Council's intention to adopt a landscape character approach, the landscape character of the Green Belt could provide a context within which development would be suitable. **(Objection 1857)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.1 Bowlands Hey, Ditcher's Farm and Lee Hall are 3 substantial areas of land that adjoin the urban edge of Westhoughton - to the west, north and east respectively. They are largely undeveloped. The Council did not dispute the evidence of SWAN that Westhoughton was the subject of substantial population growth between 1981 and 1991. In considering the objections, national and regional - and local considerations - need to be taken into account. The adopted plan (1995) approved Green Belt boundaries in the Borough. PPG2 (Revised) indicates that the essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence (paragraph 2.1). Once the general extent of a Green Belt has been approved, it should be altered only in exceptional circumstances (2.6). A similar consideration applies to detailed boundaries defined in earlier development plans (2.6). While the 3 sites have been defined as Other Protected Open Land (OPOL) on the Proposals Map through Policy R2, paragraph 03.07 of the plan indicates that some of the R2 land could be appropriate for development at some time in the future. This would not be during the plan period up to 2011, and not without a further review of the UDP. This provision reflects, generally, paragraph 2.12 and Annex B to PPG2 (Revised) on safeguarded land.
- 4.2 Regional Planning Guidance indicates that there is no need to undertake a strategic review of the Green Belt in Greater Manchester. To define these 3 substantial areas as Green Belt would have strategic implications, without the availability of a Greater Manchester context. Through both evidence at a Hearing, and by written representation, I have considered the "local" case for Green Belt designation. Firstly, to paragraph 1.5 of PPG2 (Revised). Designation would be likely to assist in preventing the unrestricted sprawl of Westhoughton, encroachment in the countryside, as well as the prevention of neighbouring towns from merging into one another - here taking into account the location of Hindley, Atherton and the main Bolton urban area. It appears to me, however, that sufficient general control would be established by Policy R2, as well as by national planning guidance in PPG7 (revised). There was no significant evidence before me that "historic" Westhoughton has sufficient setting and special character to justify inclusion of the land within the Green Belt. Further, I am not persuaded that Green Belt designation is necessary to secure regeneration within the Borough.
- 4.3 Secondly, to other matters. SWAN argued - generally - that the nature of the landscapes at and about the 3 sites allowed extensive vistas, but the quality of the landscape is not relevant to the inclusion of land within a Green Belt or to its continued protection [paragraph 1.7 of PPG2 (Revised)]. It considered that the 3 sites, defined as OPOL, would not be necessary for development until after the period of the UDP in 2011. I have to assess this UDP. While I have no reason to doubt the wildlife sightings at the sites, they do not justify Green Belt designation. I have also considered all the other matters raised. None before me represent the exceptional circumstances sufficient to set aside the clear intentions of national and regional guidance and to which I give substantial weight. **(Objections 7, 1301, 1348 and 1791)**
- 4.4 I have established the national and regional context for the Green Belt policies of the plan at paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 above. It applies to the site at Woodlands Drive that is approved Green Belt, defined in the adopted plan and carried forward into the UDP. As a result, I give weight to national planning guidance in PPG2 (Revised) that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in earlier approved development plans should be altered

only exceptionally (paragraph 2.6). It is not unusual - as in this case - for land on the edge of the Green Belt to be surrounded by development on 3 sides. "Rounding off", implying to me the regularisation of urban form, is not - in my opinion - a sound basis for the definition of Green Belt boundaries. On my visit, I came to the clear view that the Green Belt in this part of the Borough - including the site - forms part of an extensive area of countryside. That, together with the area of OPOL to the west, separates the extensive development along Newbrook Road from Westhoughton. To remove the site from the Green Belt, with the intention of development, would result in encroachment into the countryside, reducing the openness of the Green Belt. There would be conflict with paragraphs 1.4 and 1.5 of PPG2 (Revised), reflected in Policy G1. **(Objection 257)**

4.5 The site is adjacent to the urban edge at Hunger Hill, its north-west boundary defining the Green Belt in both the adopted plan and the UDP. It is part of an extensive area of countryside, appropriately defined as Green Belt, that separates Hunger Hill from the main urban area of the Borough. Only a limited proportion of the site contains buildings, those to the south, the remainder being largely undeveloped and open - albeit with some evidence of previous development. The buildings on the site are washed over by Green Belt designation - a not unusual circumstance in areas of Green Belt countryside. I have to consider the objection site as a whole. Annex C to PPG2 (Revised) provides guidance on the future of major developed sites (mds) in the Green Belt. In my view, neither the buildings on the site nor the site on which they are located as a whole, would meet the test that a mds should be "substantial" (C1 of the annex). Here, to say the least, any redevelopment relating to the objection site as a whole would adversely affect the openness of the Green Belt in this location. The site is properly defined in the UDP. **(Objection 260)**

4.6 The site is adjacent to the east side of the Chequerbent roundabout at the junction of the A6 and A58, to the north of the A6 that separates it from Westhoughton. On the basis of my visit, a substantial proportion does not contain buildings. The Green Belt in this part of the Borough, both approved and proposed, comprises countryside that separates Hunger Hill from Westhoughton, notwithstanding the M61 to the north of the site. It is appropriately defined in what I consider to be a sensitive area of Green Belt. The buildings on the site are washed over by Green Belt designation - a not unusual circumstance in areas of Green Belt countryside. I have to consider the objection site before me, as a whole. Taking that into account, together with national planning guidance, I am not persuaded that the site should be described as "substantial" in terms of paragraph C1 to the annex, sufficient for the plan to identify it as a mds. Here, any redevelopment relating to the site as a whole would adversely affect the openness of the Green Belt in this sensitive location. The site is properly defined in the UDP. **(Objection 262)**

4.7 I have established the national and regional context for the Green Belt policies of the plan at paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 above. It applies to the land subject of this objection that is approved Green Belt, defined in the adopted plan and carried forward into the UDP. I give weight to national planning guidance in PPG2 (Revised) that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally (paragraph 2.6). The site forms part of an extensive area of countryside appropriately designated as Green Belt that, in its vicinity, separates the major settlements of Blackrod and Horwich at a relatively narrow section of the Green Belt. My site visit did not confirm the view of the objector that it is effectively developed. To remove it from the Green Belt, with an intended prospect of redevelopment, would result in encroachment into the countryside; a further merging of Blackrod and Horwich - albeit both are presently separated by a railway line; as well as a reduction in the

openness of the Green Belt. The objector has not persuaded me that there is any convincing requirement for employment land in this location. The presence of buildings on the site and the possibility of a Green Belt boundary at the A6 do not establish the exceptional circumstances sufficient for me to set aside paragraph 2.6 of national planning guidance. **(Objection 264)**

- 4.8 I have established the national and regional context for the Green Belt policies of the plan at paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 above. It applies to the land subject of Objections 564 and 567 that is approved Green Belt, defined in the adopted plan and carried forward into the UDP. I give weight to national planning guidance in PPG2 (Revised) that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally (paragraph 2.6). The site forms part of an extensive open area separating the built-up areas of Astley Bridge to the west and Bradshaw to the east, including what the Council told me is the Site of Biological Importance on either side of the Eagley Brook. The site is appropriately defined as Green Belt in the UDP. The general requirement of the objections is that the land should be considered for housing. To do so would conflict with national guidance on the purposes of including land in Green Belts, reflected by the policy. Further sprawl of a large built-up area would result, while developed parts of the Borough to west and east of the site would increasingly merge. There would be encroachment into the countryside. The development of the site would harm the openness of the Green Belt in what I consider to be a sensitive location, adding an element of urbanisation to this part of the Borough. While I agree with the objectors that an appropriate, physical, boundary to an amended Green Belt would exist to the east of the site adjacent to the SBI, that at present follows, generally, the clear line of the properties on Thornham Drive. I have carefully considered all the objectors' arguments in support of their wishes - not least the proximity of the site to services, problems of nuisance and trespass, and that the land does not form a viable agricultural unit. They do not represent the exceptional circumstances required under paragraph 2.6 of national planning guidance. **(Objections 564 and 567)**
- 4.9 The objector has not disputed the Council's evidence that the site is not within the Green Belt as defined on the Proposals Map and has outline planning permission for 2 dwellings. **(Objection 1102)**
- 4.10 I have established the national and regional context for the Green Belt policies of the plan at paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 above. It applies to the land subject of Objections 1104 and 1106 that is approved Green Belt, defined in the adopted plan and carried forward into the UDP. I give weight to national planning guidance in PPG2 (Revised) that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally (paragraph 2.6). Both sites are on the south side of Chew Moor, on either side of Pocket Nook Road. They form part of an extensive area of countryside about Chew Moor, appropriately defined as Green Belt. They protect the countryside from encroachment and help maintain the gaps between Chew Moor and Hunger Hill and Westhoughton, notwithstanding that the M61 lies between the village and the latter. The Green Belt is acceptably defined at these 2 sites. Neither the availability of other boundary definition or the current use of the land represent the exceptional circumstances required by paragraph 2.6 of national planning guidance. **(Objections 1104 and 1106)**
- 4.11 I have established the national and regional context for the Green Belt policies of the plan at paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 above. It applies to the land subject of Objection 1176 that is approved Green Belt, defined in the adopted plan and carried forward into the UDP. I give weight to national planning guidance in PPG2 (Revised) that detailed Green

Belt boundaries defined in earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally (paragraph 2.6). This area of land between Rumworth Road and the railway is close to residential development to the north and east, outside the Green Belt. I saw that building materials had been placed on part of the site; and that it also contains a building. Nonetheless, the site is largely open in character and forms part of an extensive area of countryside between Lostock and Westhoughton. Green Belt designation would prevent encroachment into the countryside consistent with paragraph 1.5 of PPG2 (Revised) as well as the sprawl of large urban areas, both reflected in Policy G1 of the plan. The objector has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances sufficient for me to set aside the clear intention of national planning guidance. **(Objection 1176)**

- 4.12 Although not a precise restatement of paragraphs 1.5 and 1.6 of PPG2 (Revised), paragraphs 04.03 and 04.04 reasonably and acceptably reflect it - albeit I see that the fourth word of paragraph 04.03 (ii) refers to “town” rather than “towns”. The latter is relevant to Bolton. This I take to be a drafting error that should be corrected. **(Objection 1581)**
- 4.13 I have established the national and regional context for the Green Belt policies of the plan at paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 above. It applies to the land subject of this objection that is approved Green Belt, defined in the adopted plan and carried forward into the UDP. I give weight to national planning guidance in PPG2 (Revised) that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally (paragraph 2.6). The land forms part of an extensive area of countryside, appropriately designated as Green Belt, adjacent to the M61 and between Farnworth and the extensive development to the south of Hulton Lane Ends. The Green Belt would help maintain the important gap between them. The objector has not established exceptional circumstances sufficient for me to set aside the clear intention of paragraph 2.6. Here, I note that a “roadside facility” does not form any of the acceptable categories of built development considered appropriate in a Green Belt in either the plan or national planning guidance at paragraphs 3.4 to 3.6 of PPG2 (Revised). If any proposal arising for a “roadside facility” at the site was considered to be inappropriate development within the Green Belt, the developer would be entitled to argue very special circumstances that - in its view - would be sufficient to overcome the long established presumption against inappropriate development. **(Objection 1590)**
- 4.14 I have established the national and regional context for the Green Belt policies of the plan at paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 above. It applies to the land subject of these objections that is approved Green Belt, defined in the adopted plan and carried forward into the UDP. I see that a small area of land adjacent to Highfield Road is allocated at Second Deposit as an Urban Recreation Site. I give weight to national planning guidance in PPG2 (Revised) that detailed Green Belt boundaries defined in earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally (paragraph 2.6). The sites, adjacent to the main urban edge of Bolton, are part of an extensive area of open countryside extending westwards towards Westhoughton, and appropriately defined as Green Belt. The sites protect the countryside from encroachment and prevent the sprawl of a large built-up area. The objectors’ evidence, including availability for housing, has not established exceptional circumstances sufficient for me to set aside the clear intention of national planning guidance. **(Objections 1552, 1593, 1597)**
- 4.15 I have established the national and regional context for the Green Belt policies of the plan at paragraphs 4.1 and 4.2 above. It applies to the land subject of this objection that is approved Green Belt, defined in the adopted plan and carried forward into the UDP. I give weight to national planning guidance in PPG2 (Revised) that detailed Green Belt

boundaries defined in earlier approved development plans should be altered only exceptionally (paragraph 2.6). The objection site, adjoining the urban edge at Duchy Avenue, is part of an extensive area of countryside to the north and south of Plodder Lane appropriately defined as Green Belt. The site is adjacent to the urban edge at Four Lane Ends. Its designation as Green Belt would prevent encroachment in the countryside and maintain the gap between Hulton Lane Ends and Farnworth. Notwithstanding its availability for housing, the objector has not demonstrated exceptional circumstances sufficient for me to set aside national planning guidance. **(Objection 1601)**

- 4.16 The context for Green Belt designation is established by paragraphs 04.02 to 04.05 of the plan - these reflecting, generally, paragraphs 1.4 and 1.5 of PPG2 (Revised). Although the plan indicates areas of landscape character within the Borough at Policy R5, paragraph 1.7 of PPG2 (Revised) indicates that the quality of the landscape is not relevant to the inclusion of land within a Green Belt or to its continued protection. The objector argues that a definition of the landscape character of the Green Belt would provide a context within which development would be suitable. That would be likely to establish a more onerous test than that in national planning guidance. **(Objection 1857)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.17 No change to the plan in response to Objections 7, 257, 260, 262, 264, 564, 567, 1102, 1104, 1106, 1176, 1301, 1348, 1552, 1581, 1590, 1593, 1597, 1601, 1791 and 1857.
- 4.18 Reflecting paragraph 4.12 above, the Council is advised to consider modifying the plan at paragraph 04.03 (ii) by deleting the word “town” and substituting “towns”.

POLICY G2: CONTROL OF DEVELOPMENT IN THE GREEN BELT

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
574	Mr A Johnson	No
589	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1460	Wigan Council	No
1591	Peel Investments (North) Limited	No
1973	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No

Summary of Objections

- Essential facilities for outdoor sports referred to in G2 (ii) require definition. **(Objection 574)**
- Criterion (iii) does not reflect PPG2 (paragraphs 3.4 to 3.6) where there is no reference to existing business premises. **(Objections 589 and 1460)**
- Green Belt policy should recognise the development potential of strategically located sites within the Green Belt at key roadside locations. The development potential of land at Junction 4 of the M61 should be recognised as a “roadside facility”. **(Objection 1591)**

- The policy should be amended in accordance with paragraph 3.11 of PPG2, to recognise that mineral extraction need not conflict with the purposes of including land within Green Belts - provided that high environmental standards are maintained and that the site is well restored. **(Objection 1973)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.19 Policy G2, reflecting PPG2 (Revised) at its second bullet point to paragraph 3.4, does not define that which would constitute an essential facility for either outdoor sport or outdoor recreation. It is for the decision-maker to establish that which is “essential” in the light of the circumstances of a specific proposal. **(Objection 574)**
- 4.20 Criterion (iii) of the policy includes business premises. That conflicts with the third bullet point of paragraph 3.4 - as well as paragraph 3.6 - to PPG2 (Revised). Neither paragraphs 04.07 and 04.08 of the plan, nor the Council’s evidence, provide any convincing justification for what I consider would represent a significant extension of national planning guidance on appropriate development in a Green Belt. Here, I have taken into account the Council’s evidence on past development plans. **(Objections 589 and 1460).**
- 4.21 A “roadside facility” does not form any of the acceptable categories of built development considered appropriate in a Green Belt, this in either national planning guidance or the UDP. I shall not recommend a modification to the plan involving an extension of long established national planning guidance. Reflecting that, any developer pursuing a roadside facility proposal considered to be inappropriate development within the Green Belt would be entitled to argue very special circumstances sufficient - in its view - to overcome the long established presumption against inappropriate development in the Green Belt. **(Objection 1591)**
- 4.22 Policies G2 to G6 reflect, generally, the intentions of PPG2 (Revised) to establish appropriate development. The guidance on appropriateness, at paragraphs 3.11 and 3.12, also indicates that mineral extraction need not be inappropriate development. That is not reflected in the plan. A lengthy and over-detailed plan would not result from an addition to the reasoned justification of this policy reflecting mineral extraction, consistent with national planning guidance. **(Objection 1973)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.23 Modify the plan in response to Objections 589 and 1460: at paragraph 04.06, Policy G2 (iii), delete the words “or business premises”.
- 4.24 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1973: expand the reasoned justification to Policy G2 to reflect paragraph 4.22 above.
- 4.25 No change to the plan in response to Objections 574 and 1591.

POLICY G3: RE-USE OF BUILDINGS IN THE GREEN BELT

The Objections

REF	Organisation	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1894	North West Tourist Board	No
2226	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy fails to identify tourism as a beneficial end-user in the re-use of buildings. Sensitively planned and managed tourism can bring about significant benefits to Green Belt areas and aid rural diversification. PPG7 (revised) should be taken into account. **(Objection 1894)**
- The second sentence of paragraph 04.10 does not accord with paragraph 3.8 of PPG2 (Revised) - “and other traditional farm buildings” should be deleted. **(Objection 2226)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.26 Policy G3, reflecting PPG2 (Revised) at paragraphs 3.7 to 3.10 does not list the uses acceptable in the re-use of buildings within a Green Belt, albeit both record farm diversification - the plan at paragraph 04.10. The policy would not exclude, in principle, a tourism use and PPG7 (revised) may be material to the decision-maker when assessing a specific proposal, as would other policies of the plan **(Objection 1894)**
- 4.27 The Council’s evidence refers to paragraph D3 of Annex D to PPG2 (Revised). This has been cancelled by paragraph 4.11 of PPG7 (revised) and I have taken into account paragraphs 3.15 to 3.17 there. I share the objector’s concern. The inclusion of the second sentence of paragraph 04.10 at Second Deposit, raising matters such as species protection and listed buildings, suggests a more onerous test of appropriateness on any re-use than prescribed in national planning guidance on Green Belts. While a development proposal within the Green Belt may raise issues relating to them, other policies of the plan would need to be taken into account. Those matters should not be included within a Green Belt policy that addresses appropriateness. The sentence should be removed. **(Objection 2226)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.28 Modify the plan in response to Objection 2226: at paragraph 04.10: delete the second sentence.
- 4.29 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1894.

POLICY G4: INFILLING IN THE GREEN BELT

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
5	L Gallagher	No
1152	Mr and Mrs A W Knight	No
1592	Peel Investments (North) Limited	No
1993	Mr D Lord	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy of limited infill development within Hart Common is supported. An estimate should be included of the scale of acceptable development, no more than 20-30 houses. **(Objection 5)**
- The village is fully built-up. This would prevent infilling taking place. **(Objection 1152)**
- The frontage houses on the north side of Plodder Lane should be allocated under the policy for limited infilling. This would not prejudice any of the primary purposes of including land within the Green Belt. **(Objection 1592)**
- The policy and supporting text are unnecessary and should be deleted. **(Objection 1993)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.30 Paragraph 3.4 of PPG2 (Revised), together with the box following paragraph 2.11, make provision for limited infilling in existing villages. The plan reflects national planning guidance in not specifying the number of dwellings that would be acceptable. There is no need for it to do so, any development proposal arising needing to be assessed in the light of its specific circumstances, including local and national policy. **(Objection 5)**
- 4.31 While Hart Common has a substantial built presence, my site visit satisfied me that it has the potential for limited infilling. **(Objection 1152)**
- 4.32 These frontage houses are clearly part of an extensive area of countryside designated as Green Belt in the adopted plan, that being carried forward appropriately into the UDP. The fourth indent to paragraph 3.4 of PPG2 (Revised) indicates that the construction of new buildings comprising limited infilling in existing villages is not inappropriate development. The objection site is neither an existing village nor part of one. To recommend a modification as requested by the objector would be likely to lead to encroachment in the countryside, adding elements of urbanisation to the Green Belt and reducing its openness. **(Objection 1592)**
- 4.33 The policy reflects the general intention of national planning guidance. The objector has submitted no significant evidence in support of his case. **(Objection 1993)**

RECOMMENDATION

- 4.34 No change to the plan in response to Objections 5, 1152, 1592 and 1993.

POLICY G5

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
261	The Hulton Estate	No
263	The Hulton Estate	No
1065	North West Water Ltd	No
1583	Charles Topham & Sons Limited	Yes
1584	Charles Topham & Sons Limited	Yes
1742	Messrs Alty	No
2241	Government Office for the North West	No
2363	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
2368	Charles Topham & Sons Limited	Yes
9001	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No

Summary of Objections

- Sites at Pendlebury Fold and Manchester Road/Snydale Way should be designated as major developed sites within the Green Belt. **(Objections 261 and 263)**
- The major water/waste treatment works at Kearsley, Lostock and south of Westhoughton should be identified as major developed sites in the Green Belt as development is likely to take place at all of these sites within the plan period. **(Objection 1065)**
- Policy G5 should allow for the partial redevelopment of major developed sites as well as infilling. Criterion (i) exceeds national guidance without justification. Criterion (iv) does not indicate, clearly, whether the requirement for infilling not to exceed the height of the existing buildings relates either, to the buildings being developed or, the general height of the buildings on the site as a whole. **(Objections 1583 and 2368) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- The Deakins Business Park, Egerton, is listed in the policy and shown on the Proposals Map. The site boundary would not allow for improvements and further development within. They would not compromise either, the open nature of the Green Belt or, the purposes of including land within it. Development has resulted in a significant environmental improvement and the boundary does not reflect either development that has taken place or the planning history at the site. The Proposals Map should be amended to include the fringe areas of the site, taking in existing buildings, areas of car parking and circulation space. **(Objection 1584) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- The site is an integral part of the Dunscair Industrial Estate. G5 (v) should allow either, minor extensions to existing premises or, the policy should incorporate the objection site at Second Deposit that is properly part of the estate. **(Objection 1742)**
- The words “or the partial redevelopment” have been added to the policy at Second Deposit, but the policy and the reasoned justification still relate to “infilling”. The reference to “partial redevelopment” should be extended to the criteria, or alternatively dealt with in Policy G6. **(Objection 2241)**

- The policy should refer to limited infilling or redevelopment at existing major developed sites. There is no justification for limiting such sites to partial redevelopment. Further, criterion (i) goes beyond national guidance without justification. **(Objection 2363)**
- Proposed Change No PC02 does not indicate whether the plan would allow the complete or only partial redevelopment of sites within the Green Belt for non-employment uses when an existing employment use ceases. This may prejudice the aims of PPG 3. **(Objection 9001)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 4.35 I have appropriately dealt with the issues relating to these 2 Objections at Policy G1, paragraphs 4.5 and 4.6 on Objections 260 and 262. **(Objections 261 and 263)**
- 4.36 These 3 sites within the approved and proposed Green Belt are in continuing use. The objector has not disputed the plans accompanying the Council's evidence that define the objection sites. A substantial proportion at each is open in nature albeit, for example, the Lostock site includes a covered reservoir. The sites are within areas that reflect Green Belt purposes. Taking into account the nature of the 3 sites, I am not persuaded that they should be defined as major developed sites. Development proposals arising would properly need to be considered against the development plan, national planning guidance and all material considerations. **(Objection 1065)**
- 4.37 I agree with the Council's evidence that, in the light of the planning history at the site, it should be included within the defined area of the Dunscair Industrial Estate. Proposed Change No PC48 would effect that. **(Objection 1742)**
- 4.38 I deal with these 5 Objections together, generally relating to the specific wording of the policy, and taking into account Agreed Statement AS/1583/02 with Objector 1583, 1584 and 2368. The Council now intends Proposed Change No PC02 covering both the policy and its reasoned justification. It is not entirely satisfactory. National planning guidance in PPG2 (Revised) at Annex C does not limit potential redevelopment to "partial", "complete" redevelopment may be justified (C4). The Council argues that as the sites are in continuing use, future developments are likely to be small-scale. That may change, and the Council does not control the ownership of the sites. The Council has not persuaded me that I should depart from the intention of national planning guidance. Similarly, as argued by 2363, criterion (i) establishes a more onerous requirement than national policy, not least as paragraph C8 to Annex C requires that redevelopment proposals should be considered in the light of all material considerations. The Council has not submitted any convincing evidence to justify this limitation. The reasoned justification at paragraph 04.15 should be reworded to reflect my recommendation. The Second Deposit version, together with the Proposed Change, has acceptably clarified plan intentions in respect of criterion (iv) and is the subject of agreement between Council and Objector 1583, 1584 and 2368 (AS/1583/02). **(Objections 1583, 2241, 2363, 2368 and 9001)**
- 4.39 The Council's evidence indicates that the Second Deposit boundary of the site did not reflect the extent of built development on the site or a planning permission for the erection and refurbishment of buildings. It proposes a change to the boundary of this major developed site to reflect this (Proposed Change No PC03). It has been agreed by the objector in an Agreed Statement (AS/1583/02) at Plan 3. Having visited the site and considered the plans enclosed with the Statement, I have no reason to come to a different view. **(Objection 1584)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.40 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1742: amend the Proposals Map in accordance with Proposed Change No PC48 reflecting Plan 3 to the Council’s evidence.
- 4.41 Modify the plan in response to my overall consideration of Objections 1583, 2241, 2363, 2368 and 9001:
 - (a) delete the first 4 lines of paragraph 04.14 and substitute the following: “04.14 G5. The Council will permit development proposals for the limited infilling, or the complete or partial redevelopment, of the existing major developed sites within the Green Belt, that are identified below and defined on the Proposals Map, providing that the proposal:
 - (i) is contained within the boundary shown on the Proposals Map;
 - (ii) has no greater impact upon the purposes of including land within the Green Belt than the existing development;
 - (iii) does not exceed the height of the existing buildings on the site; and
 - (iv) does not lead to a major increase in the developed proportion of the site”.
 - (b) amend the reasoned justification at paragraph 04.15 to reflect the reworded policy and paragraph 4.38 above.
- 4.42 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1584: amend the Proposals Map as it relates to the Deakins Business Park to reflect Proposed Change No PC03.
- 4.43 No change to the plan in response to Objections 261, 263 and 1065.

POLICY G6: REDEVELOPMENT OF MAJOR DEVELOPED SITES IN THE GREEN BELT

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
2242	Government Office for the North West	No

Summary of Objections

- The word “redevelopment” should be reinstated in the first sentence of the policy to reflect the policy title and PPG2. **(Objection 2242)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

4.44 The policy is specific to the former Wallsuches Bleachworks. It is a major developed site in the Green Belt where the relevant national guidance is Annex C to PPG2 (Revised) on the future of major developed sites. That clearly indicates that the future of such sites need not necessarily involve redevelopment. I share the general view of the Council, reflected at Second Deposit, that the correct emphasis at the site bearing in mind the substantial listed building presence, should involve re-use and regeneration - consistent with the planning history and paragraph C11 of Annex C. The Council’s

commitment to “regeneration” as opposed to “redevelopment” is justified. Nonetheless, some minor “tidying-up” is required to reflect the above. The heading to the policy indicates that it addresses the “redevelopment” of major developed sites in the Green Belt. That is not the intention of a policy that is specific to one site. To aid clarity, I see no convincing reason why that heading should not be deleted from the plan and replaced by “Wallsuches Bleachworks, Horwich: A Major Developed Site in the Green Belt”. In the interests of consistency, the second word of paragraph 04.17, “redevelopment”, should be replaced by “regeneration”. Finally, the last 2 criteria to the policy should be renumbered. **(Objection 2242)**

RECOMMENDATION

4.45 No change to the plan in response to Objection 2242 as before me, but the Council should, however, consider the following modifications to the plan.

- (a) at paragraph 04.16, delete the heading to the policy and replace with: “Wallsuches Bleachworks, Horwich: A Major Developed Site in the Green Belt”
- (b) at paragraph 04.17, first line, delete the word “redevelopment” and substitute “regeneration”
- (c) renumber the last 2 criteria to paragraph 04.16 as (iv) and (v)

OMISSIONS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
534	National Grid Company Plc	No
535	National Grid Company Plc	No
536	National Grid Company Plc	No

Summary of Objections

- Development required by the company would not be acceptable under Policies G1, G2 and G3. The policies should be amended or a new policy included in the plan to allow utilities to carry out essential developments. **(Objections 534, 535, 536)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

4.46 Statutory Undertakers have permitted development rights, including within Green Belts. These are set out in Part 17 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995. They are intended to reflect operational requirements and there is no basis for me to depart from them. The application of Green Belt policy is long established and any proposal arising from the objector that did not benefit from permitted development rights would need to be assessed in the light of the development plan and national planning guidance. **(Objections 534, 535, 536)**

RECOMMENDATION

4.47 No change to the plan in response to Objections 534, 535 and 536.

CHAPTER 5 - NATURE CONSERVATION

POLICY N1

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1697	Mr D Southworth	No
2326	Mr P Waring	No
2348	English Nature	Yes
2424	SWAN	No
9014	Government Office for the North West	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy should refer to the need for environmental assessments. The words “encourage” and “permit” at First Deposit should be deleted and the Council should take a more cautious stance when considering developments. **(Objection 1697)**
- The inclusion of the word “unacceptably” adds uncertainty and would weaken the policy. **(Objections 2326, 2348 (conditionally withdrawn) and 2424)**
- The deletion, in Proposed Change No PC04, of the word “unacceptably” from the Second Deposit version would not accommodate development that, while adversely affecting the natural environment or biodiversity, would be acceptable subject to certain provisos. **(Objection 9014)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.1 The need, or otherwise, for environmental assessments is prescribed primarily by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999 No 293) rather than legislation on the preparation of development plans. Any development proposal arising that needed to be assessed against this policy would be required to submit an assessment if required by the regulations. There is, therefore, no need to refer to this in the UDP. The word “permit” in a development plan policy reflects good practice, applicable to all developments subject to the tests of the policy. The word “encourage”, however, implies an aim rather than a statement of planning policy and should be deleted. The policy should be worded appropriately. Here, the second sentence repeats the first in a negative fashion. I doubt its necessity. I shall recommend therefore, partly on an advisory basis, a revised policy as at paragraph 5.3 below. The requirement should be whether a development proposal would have an adverse effect. It follows that a similar modification should be made to the Part 1 policy at paragraph 02.03. **(Objection 1697)**
- 5.2 Proposed Change No PC04, that I support, would delete the word “unacceptably”. As I shall recommend a revised wording of the policy, the change is not necessary. It is for the decision-maker to establish whether, in the light of all material considerations, any

adverse effect of a proposal would be unacceptable. **(Objections 2326, 2348, 2424 and 9014)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

5.3 Modify the plan in response to my overall consideration of Objections 1697, 2326, 2348, 2424 and 9014: delete paragraphs 05.01 and 02.03 and substitute:

“05.01(02.03) N1. The Council will permit development proposals that do not adversely affect the natural environment and biodiversity.”

POLICY N2: NATURE CONSERVATION SITES

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
591	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1975	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No
2191	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	No
1125	English Nature	No

Summary of Objections

- Regard should be given to the relative significance of nature conservation designations. As currently drafted, there is little difference in the circumstances which might allow planning permission to be granted under Policies N2 and N3. N2 should be more restrictive than N3. The reasoned justification to the policy is more restrictive than the policy itself. Planning permission should not be refused if development can be subject to conditions or if other material factors are sufficient to override nature conservation considerations (PPG9 para 27). **(Objection 591)**
- The word affect should be deleted and substituted with cause an unacceptable adverse effect upon, this to reflect national planning guidance. **(Objection 1975)**
- The change, at Second Deposit, moving the policy away from the precautionary principle is not supported. **(Objection 2191)**
- The plan should state that SSSIs are shown on the Proposals Map. **(Objection 1125)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.4 The policy deals with Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs) where the Council proposes a further change (Proposed Change No PC05). The addition of the words “or is likely to” to the first paragraph of 05.04 is acceptable as it is consistent with paragraph 29 of PPG 9 and represents a precautionary approach at SSSIs. The importance to be given to SSSIs is indicated in the first line of the Second Deposit policy through “.....specially scrutinize...”. This also reflects paragraph 29. I share the concern of Objector 591, however, on the reasoned justification at paragraph 05.05. Unlike the policy itself, it implies that development would not be permitted if there was any adverse

effect on a SSSI, either biological or geological. Paragraph 05.05 should be reworded to be consistent with the policy. Objector 591 raises the appropriate use of conditions, these dealt with in the second paragraph to 05.04 and in PC05 there. In my view, they do not reflect the last sentence of paragraph 27 and the first sentence of paragraph 28 to PPG 9 - not least as they seek to ensure enhancement of a site's nature conservation interest. That is onerous. It may well be that a condition or obligation would have the effect of enhancing an interest, but that should not be a requirement of the policy. It would be sufficient for the policy to reflect the first sentence of paragraph 28 of the guidance and applicable to pre-decision assessment. It follows, therefore, that I do not accept the second part of the Council's Proposed Change No PC05 and I shall recommend accordingly. **(Objections 591 and 2191)**

- 5.5 Development plans should be sufficiently precise to enable them to be implemented readily. The policy seeks, reasonably, to establish whether a development proposal would have an adverse effect on a SSSI. If so, it would be the responsibility of the decision-maker to establish, in the light of all material considerations, whether that would be unacceptable. **(Objection 1975)**
- 5.6 At Second Deposit, Policy N2 has been changed. It indicates that SSSIs are shown on the Proposals Map. **(Objection 1125)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.7 Modify the plan in response to Objections 591 and 2191:
- (a) amend the first paragraph of 05.04 in accordance with Proposed Change No PC05.
 - (b) At Proposed Change No PC05, delete the second paragraph of 05.04 and substitute: "Where there is a risk of damage to a Site of Special Scientific Interest, the Council will consider the use of conditions or planning obligations in the interests of nature conservation."
 - (c) amend the reasoned justification at paragraph 05.05 to reflect paragraph 5.4 above.
- 5.8 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1975 and 1125.

POLICY N3

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
592	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1976	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No

Summary of Objections

- The UDP should have regard to the relative significance of the various nature conservation designations. The policy needs to be less restrictive than N2 and reworded accordingly. It

should refer to the use of conditions and other material factors that may be sufficient to override nature conservation considerations. **(Objection 592)**

- The word unacceptable should be inserted before adverse effect, this to reflect government guidance. **(Objection 1976)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.9 This objector has not, in my opinion, materially disputed the principle of the inclusion within the UDP of either Sites of Biological Importance (SBIs) or Local Nature Reserves. They both represent sites of substantive nature conservation value (paragraph 18 of PPG 9) that have been defined within the UDP (24). It is reasonable, therefore, that a “protective” policy should be applied to them - that, the overall intent of N3. While negatively worded, it - fairly - indicates the type of development that would not be permitted. That permitted would be subject to the test of mitigation, again reasonable. This “sequence of events” is, in my view, acceptable in principle. As Objector 592 records, the policy is similar to Policy N2 - but that policy refers to special scrutiny and national policy. The disagreement between the parties relates, clearly, to the “weight” to be accorded to the designations in N2 and N3. In my opinion, the development control process would be required to apply relevant weight to proposals under the 2 policies in the specific circumstances of each case, including national planning guidance. Turning to the use of conditions, I see no reason why the policy should not - as with N2 - again reflect the first sentence of paragraph 28 of the guidance. Finally, any reasonable local planning authority would take into account all material considerations when considering a development proposal. **(Objection 592)**
- 5.10 Development plans should be sufficiently precise to enable them to be implemented readily. The policy seeks to establish whether a development proposal would have an adverse effect on a Local Nature Reserve or SBI. If so, it would be the responsibility of the decision-maker to establish whether any adverse effect would be unacceptable, in the light of all material considerations. **(Objection 1976)**
- 5.11 Proposed Change No PC06 would correct a cartographic error on the boundary of the Knoll Wood (South) Site of Biological Importance. I see no reason to disagree.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.12 Modify the plan in response to Objection 592: delete the last sentence of paragraph 05.06 and substitute: “Where there is a risk of damage to a designated site under this policy, the Council will consider the use of conditions or planning obligations in the interests of nature conservation.”
- 5.13 Modify the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC06.
- 5.14 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1976.

POLICY N4

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
593	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1302	Mrs C Morris	No
1537	Westbury Homes Ltd/Wain Estates Ltd	No
1901	Wimpey Homes	No
1977	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No
2081	Westhoughton/Hulton Park Liberal Democrats	No
2228	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No
1311	Combined Property Control	Yes
2376	The House Builders Federation	No
1296	Westhoughton Town Council	No
537	National Grid Company Plc	No
9000	Arrowcroft North West Limited	No

Summary of Objections

- The Council should have regard to PPG 9 and the relative significance of nature conservation designations. Planning permission should not be refused if development can be approved subject to conditions or if other material factors are sufficient to override nature conservation considerations. The policy should be less restrictive than N2 and N3. **(Objection 593)**
- Land north of Westhoughton High School is unallocated, but it is open space with wildlife and should be included within the adjacent wildlife corridor and shown on the Proposals Map. It would give public access to recreational land. **(Objections 1296, 1302 and 2081)**
- The Green Corridor shown on the Proposals Map at Ditcher's Farm should be removed. **(Objection 1537)**
- The reasoned justification states that where Green Corridors pass through Other Protected Open Land areas, the entire area is to be maintained as links in the Green Corridor. This is not necessary in order to maintain a Green Corridor. That across Ditcher's Farm, Westhoughton should be removed. **(Objection 1901)**
- For reasons of clarity, the word unacceptability should be inserted after would in the third line of the policy. **(Objection 1977)**
- The Second Deposit addition of a reference to the Biodiversity Action Plan at criterion (iii) does not accord with guidance in paragraph 18 of PPG9. The same weight should not be given to a protected species and a Biodiversity Action Plan species, a document that is intended as non-statutory supplementary planning guidance that should not be referred to in the policy. The final sentence of the first paragraph of 05.10 is unclear in its relationship to the Green Belt. **(Objection 2228 and 2376)**

- The Green Corridor at Watermead Works, Tonge Valley does not reflect the extent of the current planning permission for industrial development of the site. **(Objection 1311) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- Through plan policies on Other Protected Open Land, the Green Belt and Green Corridors - any development required by the company to meet its operational requirements on land so designated would not be acceptable. A policy should be introduced to the plan to allow utilities to carry out essential developments in Other Protected Open Land, the Green Belt and Green Corridors, or else the existing policies should be amended to allow essential utility development to take place. **(Objection 537)**
- The use of the words directly or indirectly in paragraph 05.10 of Proposed Change No PC07 is unclear, as is the relationship to Policies N2 and N3, while the plan should clarify what is meant by “these designations” in the proposed change. **(Objection 9000)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.15 Although negatively worded, the intent of the policy is clear - this to establish the circumstances in which development within a Green Corridor would be acceptable. Objector 593 does not express concern on the relevance of the 3 criteria. It has not disputed the Council’s evidence that SSSIs, for example, form a key part of the Green Corridor network. Here, the 3 additional sentences the Council now proposes to add to paragraph 05.10 (Proposed Change No PC07) would acceptably establish the relationship of the policy to N2 and N3, allowing the relevant weight to be given to them. The use of conditions or planning obligations may allow a development to proceed that would otherwise have been refused planning permission. The Council proposes to add 2 further sentences at the end of the policy at paragraph 05.09 (Proposed Change No PC07) to meet this part of the objection. It is before me, but raises a difficulty. The second line of the policy at Second Deposit (paragraph 05.09) states that Green Corridors are identified for their “wildlife, recreation or amenity value”. This is consistent with CD B39. Yet, this part of the proposed change appears to limit conditions/planning obligations to only nature conservation. If the policy is to be consistent, it should be equally applicable to wildlife, recreation or amenity. I shall recommend accordingly, through the deletion of the words “on nature conservation”. Overall, subject to other conclusions below, there would be an acceptable control on development. **(Objections 593)**
- 5.16 On the basis of my visit, the site comprises a substantial area of improved grassland. The objectors give little convincing justification for its inclusion within a Green Corridor - not least habitats, species and process through this primarily urban landscape. To support the objections would, in my view, effect a substantial reduction in the importance that should be accorded to the Green Corridors of the plan within the Borough. While the site is unallocated on the Proposals Map, any specific development proposal arising would need to be assessed against all relevant policies of the plan. The Council’s view that there is no public access to the site has not been significantly disputed. **(Objections 1296, 1302 and 2081)**
- 5.17 As a matter of record, I consider that the objector seeks the insertion of the word “unacceptably” rather than “unacceptability”. Development plans should be clear, succinct and easily understood (PPG12 at paragraph 3.1). They should indicate the kind of development that would be permitted. The overall wording of the policy is generally consistent with this approach - albeit negatively worded. It seeks, reasonably, to establish whether a development proposal would have an adverse effect on a Green Corridor. The form of words suggested by the objector would add little in terms of

clarity. In the light of the policy, it is for the decision-maker to establish whether a proposal would be unacceptable. One further matter, not the subject of objection. Criterion (iii) introduces the words “cause harm to”. The plan’s general approach is to address an adverse affect/effect. The Council is advised to consider whether the words “adversely affect” should replace them in the criterion. **(Objection 1977)**

- 5.18 Through Proposed Map Change 53 at Second Deposit, the plan now reflects the planning history at the site. The objection has been conditionally withdrawn and I have no reason to disagree. **(Objection 1311)**
- 5.19 Although non-statutory, the Biodiversity Action Plan (CD B38) appears to me to be consistent with the intentions of the 1992 United Nations Biodiversity Convention. Further, PPG 9 indicates that wildlife corridors help to ensure the maintenance of a current range and diversity of flora and fauna (paragraph 15). The intent of the policy reflects that. As far as nature conservation is concerned, neither objector argues that Green Corridors in Bolton do not have a substantive nature conservation value consistent with paragraph 18. In my opinion, biodiversity and Green Corridor objectives rest comfortably together, justifying a reference to the former in the policy. The Council tells me, however, that it has adopted the Action Plan as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG), using the expertise of a range of organisations/professions. It, fairly, moves forward the overall intent of PPG 9 but does not form part of the UDP. National guidance in paragraph 3.17 of PPG 12 is clear. SPG should not be used to avoid public scrutiny - in accordance with statutory procedures - or delegate the criteria for decisions to it. In my opinion, this would be the effect of the addition to criterion (iii) at Second Deposit stage. While, therefore, the reference to the Action Plan itself should be removed from criterion (iii) it should, taking into account the above, be replaced by a reference to biodiversity priority species. The reasoned justification, at paragraphs 05.11 and 05.13, contains references to the Action Plan that suggest a test(s) based on it. The tests should be biodiversity, not the Action Plan itself. The additional 3 sentences to paragraph 05.10 following the second, as set out in Proposed Change No PC07 acceptably establish the relationship of the policy to N2 and N3. Turning to the Green Belt concern, the last sentence of paragraph 05.10 is unclear at Second Deposit and in the addition at Proposed Change No PC07. Both suggest to me that a test of appropriate development within a Green Corridor within the Green Belt would be Policy N4. While that may not be the Council’s intention, the wording is unclear. Conflict would be likely to arise with PPG2 (Revised), with confusion in the development control process. Securing nature conservation interests is an accepted objective of Green Belt policy. The reasoned justification should reflect that. **(Objections 2228 and 2376)**
- 5.20 I have dealt with the principle of Green Corridors above - CD B39 setting out the basis of the Council’s approach. These 2 objections relate to a corridor across land at Ditcher’s Farm. The plan at CD B39 is somewhat unclear - apparently showing the general location of corridors and also those areas of Other Protected Open Land that have a corridor passing through them. On the basis of my site visits to Ditcher’s Farm, it was far from clear to which land the corridor related, albeit the Proposals Map suggests a corridor on a broadly north-west to south-east axis. The Council’s evidence was that corridor land there had not been specifically defined. Its intention was, however, that any development proposals arising would necessitate either the maintenance of the corridor indicated or the provision of an alternative line. As the corridor has not been defined, that would appear to me to be somewhat unhelpful to the development control process. In the light of these 2 objections, the objectors would reasonably be entitled to identify in the plan 2 matters. Firstly, a justification for a Green Corridor at Ditcher’s Farm and, secondly, an explanation - or otherwise - of the apparent line shown on the

Proposals Map, this having equal applicability to other areas of Other Protected Open Land that apparently have Green Corridors passing through them. **(Objections 1537 and 1901)**

- 5.21 Statutory Undertakers have permitted development rights. These are set out in Part 17 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995. They are intended to reflect operational requirements and there is no basis for me to depart from them. Any proposal arising from the objector that did not benefit from permitted development rights would need to be assessed on its specific planning merits in the light of the development plan, national planning guidance and all material considerations. **(Objection 537)**
- 5.22 In the context of this nature conservation policy, the words “directly” or “indirectly” are sufficiently clear to indicate plan intentions; the relationship of the policy to N2 and N3 is acceptably explained in Proposed Change No PC07 at paragraph 05.10; while “these designations” clearly relates to SSSIs and SBIs. **(Objection 9000)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.23 Modify the plan in response to my consideration of Objections 593, 2228 and 2376:
- (a) paragraph 05.09, criterion (iii): delete the words “Biodiversity Action Plan” and substitute: “biodiversity”. In the reasoned justification to the policy, the references to the Action Plan should, instead, reflect biodiversity requirements.
 - (b) paragraph 05.09: amend the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC07, subject to the deletion of the words “on nature conservation”.
 - (c) paragraph 05.10: amend the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC07 as it applies to new sentences 3, 4 and 5.
 - (d) paragraph 05.10: delete the last sentence of Proposed Change No PC07 and substitute: “Within the Green Belt, the features that link or identify Green Corridors may assist in securing Green Belt objectives.
- 5.24 Modify the plan in response to Objections 1537 and 1901: the reasoned justification to the policy should be amplified to reflect paragraph 5.20 above.
- 5.25 No change to the plan in response to Objections 537, 1296, 1302, 1311, 2081 and 9000.
- 5.26 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1977, but the Council should consider my further views at paragraph 5.17 above.

POLICY N5: LANDSCAPE FEATURES

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
67	English Heritage	No
594	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
2333	Mr P Waring	Yes

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1172	Mr S Macaulay	No
1177	Mr M Lucas	No
1698	Mr D Southworth	No
1832	The Woodland Trust	No
1560	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No

Summary of Objections

- The landscape features in the policy are not only important for their flora and fauna value but also the contribution they make to the character and appearance of the historic landscape. That should be reflected in the text. Policies N5 and R5 should be combined. **(Objection 67)**
- The word reinstate in the first paragraph of the policy suggests that features affected by development must be replaced. It is not clear if this is the intention or whether mitigation measures might be taken elsewhere. Clarity is required. **(Objection 594)**
- The inclusion of additional habitats at Second Deposit is supported, but the list should also include spoils heaps or, a reference that new habitats may be added as the Bolton Biodiversity Action Plan progresses. **(Objection 2333) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- The woodland designation to the rear of properties on Conningsby Close should be removed, part of it extending across private gardens there. **(Objections 1172, 1177)**
- The need for environmental assessments is not given enough value. The policy should be amended to allow them to be carried out. This would be consistent with a cautious approach. **(Objection 1698)**
- Semi-natural/ancient woodland (SNAW) is a rich habitat for biodiversity and absolute protection should be given to it through a rewritten policy. The policy only refers to the larger areas of this habitat, but there are a number of smaller presences that would not be protected by the policy. **(Objection 1832)**
- The inclusion of lakes, lodges and reservoirs in the list of landscape features will unduly restrict options for the redevelopment of brownfield sites, as they are often associated with industrial development. **(Objection 1560)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.27 Landscape Character Areas (LCAs) indicated under Policy R5 would be likely to include landscape features listed in N5. It appears to me, however, that the 2 policies have separate purposes. R5 establishes the Council's approach to development within LCAs and is appropriately located within a chapter on the countryside. Policy N5 addresses another matter, specific landscape features that have a major fauna and flora importance. While the 2, clearly, have linkages - the need for clarity in the plan justifies their separation. Where relevant, development proposals would need to be assessed against both - firstly, the test of landscape character and, secondly, the test of landscape features. To combine them would result, in my opinion, in an overly-complicated and detailed policy. The general aspirations of the objector are not prejudiced by the plan. **(Objection 67)**

5.28 At Second Deposit, the Council has replaced "reinstate" with "retain". That reflects the objection and would represent an acceptable planning consideration. **(Objection 594)**

- 5.29 Proposed Change No PC08 would add spoil heaps to the list of landscape features. I see no reason to disagree. **(Objection 2333)**
- 5.30 The Proposals Map does not include a woodland designation through Policy N5, that to the rear of Conningsby Close/Saxby Avenue/Hardman's Lane relating to an Urban Recreation Site [URS (Policy O2)]. This has a substantial tree presence. The Council has, however, corrected a cartographic error on the Proposals Map at First Deposit stage through Proposed Map Change 60. The URS does not now impinge on properties at Conningsby Close. **(Objections 1172 and 1177)**
- 5.31 The need, or otherwise, for environmental assessments is prescribed primarily by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999 No 293) rather than legislation on the preparation of development plans. Any development proposal arising that needed to be assessed against this policy would be required to submit an assessment if required by the regulations. There is, therefore, no need to refer to this in the UDP. Overall, the policy establishes an acceptable approach for the assessment of development proposals. **(Objection 1698)**
- 5.32 "Absolute protection" cannot be given to SNAW - included within the list of landscape features. The specific circumstances of an individual proposal may, however, require that substantial weight should be given by the decision-maker to a SNAW presence. This appears to me to be reflected in the policy statement at paragraph 05.15 and also the reasoned justification. I do, however, share the objector's concern at the use of the word "larger" as it applies to SNAW. None of the other listed features are so described, albeit there may be both large and small ponds, ditches and reservoirs. The word should be deleted. **(Objection 1832)**
- 5.33 Lakes, lodges and reservoirs in this Metropolitan Borough, partly reflecting a textile tradition, are significant local features of the landscape - albeit some may no longer be used for their original purpose. A number would be likely to be of flora and fauna significance. While considering, carefully, the alternatives to the policy suggested by the objector - I come to the view that the policy would establish an acceptable level of control and would not prejudice the redevelopment of brownfield sites **(Objection 1560)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.34 Modify the plan in response to Objection 2333: amend the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC08.
- 5.35 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1832: at paragraph 05.15: "Features", delete the word "Larger".
- 5.36 No change to the plan in response to Objections 67, 594, 1172, 1177, 1560 and 1698.

INSPECTOR'S FURTHER REMARKS ON THE POLICY

- 5.37 I have dealt with the objections above. While 594 at First Deposit sought clarity, that related to a specific element of the policy. While not the subject of objection, the overall structure and content of the policy is unsatisfactory - this leading in my view to substantial uncertainty in the development control process. The Council should consider the following.
- 5.38 To begin, it is far from clear whether the landscape features listed are all to be taken as of "major importance" (paragraph 05.15) for wild fauna and flora whenever a

development proposal affects them - every hedgerow and every stone wall, for example. Alternatively, does the policy only relate to development proposals that may affect a hedgerow, stone wall etc that have established (my emphasis) “major importance” for fauna and flora ? Reasonably, in my view, it should relate to the latter. Whichever, the policy and reasoned justification should be clarified through a modification. As I am not certain of the Council’s intentions, I cannot suggest a rewording of the policy. On mitigation measures, this appears to me to relate to those circumstances where the Council would permit development that adversely affects the landscape features. Here, the first paragraph of 05.15 is too long. It should be split into 2 sentences - the first ending at the fourth line of the policy after the word “features”. The second sentence would deal with mitigation in those circumstances where the Council would permit development that would have an adverse effect. One final point for the Council. I assume that the “affect” referred to in the first line of the policy at 05.15 is intended to be “adverse”. If so, the policy should say so - referring to “adversely”.

POLICY N6

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1434	Railtrack Plc	No
1999	Environment Agency	No
2019	Mr A Partington	No
2340	English Nature	No
2397	Peel Investments (North) Ltd	No
1131	English Nature	No

Summary of Objections

- The western part of Red Moss may have potential to be developed as a rail freight site to serve existing and potential business in the area. **(Objection 1434)**
- First Deposit criterion (ii) should resist extensive culverting unless for access purposes with reference made to the Agency’s policy on culverting (1999). The changed criterion (ii) at Second Deposit should be deleted, that at First Deposit reinstated. Whether or not a watercourse should be culverted is not strictly a planning policy consideration. It is a matter for the Environment Agency under the Land Drainage Act 1991 (2397). **(Objections 1999 and 2397)**
- Land at Gibb Farm should not be designated as a potential local nature reserve. There is a lack of clarity associated with the policy boundaries; it is difficult to reconcile the designation with operations on the farm; the policy fails to recognise the existing mineral deposits; the area is unsuitable for comprehensive woodland planting/outdoor recreation; while the area is isolated with few facilities to support the proposed use. **(Objection 2019)**
- Greenfield sites should be added to the policy criteria as they could be affected by development and would benefit from the creation of wildlife habitats. **(Objection 1131)**

- The policy is supported but should be cross-referenced to Policy D3: Landscaping. **(Objection 2340)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.39 The Local Nature Reserve shown on the Proposals Map is indicative, any precise boundaries yet to be considered by the parties. Objector 2019, when I heard this objection, did not - in my opinion - convincingly contest the principle of the designation. Boundaries would need to be the subject of consultation and agreement. Taking that into account, the indicative proposal need not prejudice the principle of a rail-freight site. **(Objections 1434 and 2019)**
- 5.40 Nature conservation and biodiversity both represent interests of acknowledged importance. In pursuing these interests, it would be reasonable for the Council to assess the effect on them of a development proposal involving extensive culverting. The Council has fairly addressed, at Second Deposit, Objection 1999. The First Deposit criterion (ii), encouraging the reopening of culverted watercourses, represented an aim rather than a statement of planning policy and has properly been deleted at Second Deposit. Nonetheless, the reasoned justification should clarify the purpose of Second Deposit criterion (ii) as it relates to a development plan. It is not there at present. Further, Second Deposit criterion (ii) should not refer to "... or in exceptional circumstances". The words imply uncertainty. I see no need for the reasoned justification to include reference to the Environment Agency's policy on culverting, this being likely to be one of a number of material considerations in the assessment of development proposals. **(Objections 1999 and 2397)**
- 5.41 Policy N6 establishes the Council's policy approach to biodiversity and nature conservation. The plan would need to be considered as a whole in any assessment of development proposals. Policy D3, Landscaping, applies to development generally. While there are linkages between a number of policies, extensive cross-referencing between policies would need to be consistent throughout the UDP and would be likely to result in an over-complicated plan. **(Objection 2340)**
- 5.42 National planning guidance in PPG 9 indicates that wildlife heritage is not confined to statutorily designated sites but also to the countryside and many urban areas (paragraph 14). No general distinction is, therefore, drawn between locations. I share the general view of the Council that a greenfield site need not necessarily have a greater justification for protection and habitat creation than a brownfield site. Nonetheless, in response, the Council proposes a further change to the plan at Proposed Change No PC09. The addition of the word "particularly" there would not prejudice other locations. **(Objection 1131)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.43 Modify the plan in response to Objections 1999 and 2397:
- (a) at Second Deposit criterion (ii), delete the words "or in exceptional circumstances".
 - (b) amplify the reasoned justification to clarify the development plan purpose of criterion (ii). In so doing, the Council should address words there such as "presumption" and "where appropriate" - not generally consistent with a development plan.
- 5.44 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1131: amend the plan at paragraph 05.19 (iv) in accordance with Proposed Change No PC09.
- 5.45 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1434, 2019 and 2340.
-

POLICY N7 (N8): TREES, WOODLAND & HEDGEROWS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
595	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1858	The Countryside Agency	No
2377	The House Builders Federation	No
2398	Peel Investments (North) Ltd	No
9015	Government Office for the North West	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy should comply with PPG7 Annex D at paragraph D4. On 1858, the policy should be strengthened by a commitment to secure an overall net gain from development for the environmental, economic and social well being of the Red Rose Forest. Decisions on development proposals should secure a contribution to the implementation of the community forest, whether or not trees are lost. Planning obligations can secure community forest benefits. **(Objections 595 and 1858)**
- The requirement of the reasoned justification at Second Deposit (05.25) for applicants to undertake a tree survey on land outside a development site is unreasonable. **(Objections 2377 and 2398)**
- Proposed Change No PC10 at N7 (ii) does not indicate the circumstances in which the Council would require tree planting. **(Objection 9015)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.46 This policy deals with the Red Rose Forest. Objection 595 appears to me to relate to the last 2 sentences of paragraph D4 to Annex D of PPG7 (revised) - planting - the Annex providing advice on the role of community forests. The apparent Council response at Second Deposit (an additional paragraph 05.25) - based on the last sentence of paragraph 9.1 of its evidence - seems to have limited relationship to the PPG7 (revised) objection. It addresses tree surveys. Nonetheless, it is before me and - subject to my recommendation on Objections 2377 and 2398 below - its intent is acceptable. The Council now proposes further changes to the policy and reasoned justification as set out in Proposed Change No PC10. Those to paragraph 05.22 reasonably reflect D4 to Annex D - albeit criteria (i) and (ii) should be directly related to the development, consistent with D4. Reflecting 9015, a developer would be reasonably entitled to establish why tree planting is required as part of its proposal. Although the reasoned justification at renumbered paragraph 05.23 indicates that an aim of the Red Rose Forest Plan is to create a well wooded landscape, that being reasonable, the justification for criterion (ii) should further explain the requirement at new development proposals. **(Objections 595 and 9015)**

5.47 Turning to 1858, PPG1(Revised) indicates that decisions on planning applications in the light of the development plan should take into account whether the development proposed “would cause demonstrable harm to interests of acknowledged importance”

(paragraph 40). There is no statutory requirement placed upon developers for their proposals to secure an overall net gain from development. Paragraph 36 of the guidance, read together with Circular 1/97, advises that obligations - subject to certain criteria - can enable a developer to overcome obstacles that would otherwise prevent planning permission being granted. In my opinion, the general thrust of this objection conflicts with national planning guidance. Nonetheless, at Second Deposit, and through PC10 - primarily at renumbered paragraphs 05.23 and 05.24 - the Council has sought to clarify its intentions. They are helpful, the reference to planning obligations in 05.24 of the Proposed Change being acceptable in that context. **(Objection 1858)**

- 5.48 On these objections, the principle of tree surveys is not in dispute. Paragraph 05.25 (Second Deposit) relates to existing trees on a development site and on adjacent land that might be affected by the proposal. It is unreasonable for the Council to require a tree survey on land outside an application site, not least as it may be outside the control of an applicant for planning permission and access to it may not be available. **(Objections 2377 and 2398)**
- 5.49 One further matter that the Council is advised to consider. This Part 2 policy is written as an aim rather than as a statement of planning policy that indicates the type of development that would be permitted. The Council is advised to consider whether the policy should simply say that the Council will permit development proposals that reflect the intentions of the Red Rose Forest by:

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.50 Modify the plan in response to my overall consideration of Objections 595, 1858 and 9015: amend the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC10, subject to the following:
- (a) at criterion (i) of Proposed Change No PC10, following the word “appropriate”, add the words “and directly related to the development”.
 - (b) at criterion (ii) of Proposed Change No PC10, following the word “planting”, add the word “directly”.
 - (c) the reasoned justification should amplify the requirements of criterion (ii), reflecting paragraph 5.46 above.
- 5.51 Modify the plan in response to Objections 2377 and 2398: at paragraph 05.25 at Second Deposit, third line: add a full stop after the word “site” and delete the rest of the sentence.
- 5.52 The Council is advised to consider rewording the policy to reflect paragraph 5.49 above.

POLICY N8 (N7)

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
578	Mr A Johnson	No
1173	Mr S Macaulay	No
1178	Mr M Lucas	No
1561	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
2356	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No

Summary of Objections

- Trees should be preserved at all costs and pruning should only be carried out when essential. No trees should be felled or pruned in the breeding season unless they are unsafe. All trees in the Council's ownership should have a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). **(Objection 578)**
- Land to the rear of Conningsby Close has been incorrectly designated small woodland and open space that extends across private garden areas there. The woodland should be designated as a TPO and it should not include trees within the gardens of private properties. **(Objections 1173 and 1178)**
- The wording of the policy is unclear. It should be clarified to establish the requirement for replacement; other structures as well as buildings may be adversely affected by tree(s); and the policy should reflect those trees that do not make a significant contribution to the amenity of the area. **(Objections 1561 and 2356)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 5.53 On the basis of the evidence before me, the objection does not relate to trees within a TPO or conservation area, rather to the tree presence in the Borough as a whole. The objector's requirements are unreasonable. Trees cannot be preserved at all costs, such an approach being likely to preclude development that would meet wider planning objectives. A preclusion of tree felling or pruning during the "breeding season" would represent an unreasonable intrusion into the rights of property holders. To include all trees within the Council's ownership as a TPO would result in trees with limited amenity value being protected. **(Objection 578)**
- 5.54 The Proposals Map does not include a woodland designation in this location, rather a proposed Urban Recreation Site (URS) under Policy O2. The Council has acknowledged a cartographic error on the Proposals Map as it relates to the URS that has been corrected through Proposed Map Change 60 at Second Deposit. The recreation site does not now impinge on properties at Conningsby Close. The designation has a substantial tree presence including a TPO. This includes trees, outside the recreation site, within the rear gardens of properties. Any proposal for the felling or pruning of a tree within the TPO would need to be considered against the criteria to Policy N8. **(Objections 1173 and 1178)**
- 5.55 These are First and Second Deposit Objections. The objector's suggested use of the word "encourage" in the policy represents an aim rather than a statement of planning policy. In this policy, "authorize" is acceptable. The Second Deposit addition of the word "protected" to the last sentence of paragraph 05.28 has not sufficiently clarified its intent - neither for that matter would the change requested by the objector. The policy is directed towards TPOs and conservation areas but it is not clear if the Council's addition at Second Deposit relates solely to a TPO, or to both a TPO and a conservation area. I shall recommend a clarification of the policy giving clearer guidance - not least by the deletion of the words "where possible". They imply uncertainty. It would be for the decision-maker to assess "possibility" in the light of a clear policy framework. Structures as well as buildings may be adversely affected by tree(s). It is reasonable for the policy to proceed, overall, on the basis that trees covered by either a TPO or within a

conservation area have amenity value. It would, again, be for the decision-maker to assess the specific contribution of an individual tree. Here, the Council's proposed additional second sentence to the reasoned justification at paragraph 05.29 (Proposed Change No PC11) is acceptable. The policy and reasoned justification as recommended below would provide an appropriate basis for replacement. **(Objections 1561 and 2356)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

5.56 Modify the plan in response to Objections 1561 and 2356:

- (a) at paragraph 05.28, criterion (ii), after the word "buildings", add the words "or other structures;"
- (b) at paragraph 05.28, delete the last sentence and substitute: "Any tree, or trees, subject to this policy that is felled should be replaced in the same locality by a tree, or trees, of suitable size and species."
- (c) amend paragraph 05.29 in accordance with Proposed Change No PC11.

5.57 No change to the plan in response to Objections 578, 1173 and 1178

POLICY N9: SPECIES PROTECTION

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1562	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
1037	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	No

Summary of Objections

- PPG9 states that "species protection" should be a material consideration in determining a development proposal. It is not, therefore, necessary to include it as part of the policy and should be deleted. **(Objection 1562)**
- The policy should have more strength, definition and clarity. **(Objection 1037)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

5.58 Objector 1562 has not, in my view, significantly disputed the relevance of species protection to the development control process, through a development plan. I have taken into account paragraph 47 of PPG 9. The guidance also indicates that national policies should contribute to the abundance and diversity of wildlife and its habitats (paragraph 2) and that the key to the conservation of wildlife is the protection of the habitat on which it depends (4). In the specific circumstances of this objection, there is no convincing reason why those clear statements of intent should not be carried forward into a policy of the UDP that includes species protection. **(Objection 1562)**

5.59 The policy, overall, provides a reasonable statement of the Council's intent. I have carefully considered all the additions to the policy sought but an excessively detailed and over-complicated policy would result - not least as some are requirements through other

than the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. In response to the objection, the Council brings forward Proposed Change No PC12. While it makes a limited contribution to the policy, it does reflect its general intention and is acceptable - albeit it includes the word “appropriate”, preferably deleted. One further matter, not the subject of objection, which the Council is advised to consider. The policy statement at paragraph 05.30 at Second Deposit refers to “cause harm”. In the interests of plan consistency, the Council should consider whether a more appropriate reference would be to “adversely affect”.
(Objection 1037)

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.60 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1037: amend paragraph 05.30 in accordance with Proposed Change No PC12.
- 5.61 The Council is advised to consider modifying the plan to reflect the last 4 sentences of paragraph 5.59 above.
- 5.62 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1562.

CHAPTER 6 - ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

POLICY EM1

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1718	Mr D Southworth	No

Summary of Objection

- The policy should refer to the need for environmental assessments. **(Objection 1718)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

- 6.1 The need, or otherwise, for environmental assessments is prescribed primarily by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999 No 293) rather than legislation on the preparation of development plans. Any development proposal arising that needed to be assessed against this policy would be required to submit an assessment if required by the regulations. There is, therefore, no need to refer to this in the UDP. **(Objection 1718)**
- 6.2 On an advisory matter as elsewhere in the plan, and not the subject of specific objection, the first line of the policy at paragraph 06.01 includes the word “encourage”. That represents an aim rather than a statement of planning policy. The Council is advised to consider modifying the plan to delete the word - the policy indicating that the Council will permit development proposals that.... . It follows that the same should apply to the Part 1 policy at paragraph 02.04.

RECOMMENDATION

- 6.3 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1718 but the Council is advised to consider modifying paragraphs 06.01 and 02.04 to reflect paragraph 6.2 above. This, as follows:
- “06.01 (02.04) EM1. The Council will permit development proposals that make Bolton a cleaner and safer place.”

POLICY EM3

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1978	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No

Summary of Objection

- To ensure clarity and to reflect PPG1 (Revised) at paragraph 36, the end of the policy should refer to government guidance and established best practice. **(Objection 1978)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

- 6.4. While brief, the intent of the policy and its reasoned justification is sufficiently clear - albeit negatively worded. In assessing a development proposal, the decision-maker would need to take into account all material considerations, including relevant national planning guidance. The addition to the policy sought is not necessary. Here, I note that the reference to PPG1 (Revised) is within a context of planning obligations and conditions. On an advisory basis, the Council should, firstly, consider on this policy wording it positively. Secondly, whether a proposal is “unacceptable” is for the decision-maker to establish - in the light of the development plan, national planning guidance and all material considerations. Thirdly, therefore, the Council is advised to consider a policy that indicates that the Council will permit development proposals that do not adversely affect levels of air, water, land, noise or light pollution. **(Objection 1978)**

RECOMMENDATION

- 6.5 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1978, but the Council is advised to consider a further modification to the plan to reflect paragraph 6.4 above.

POLICY EM4: CONTAMINATED LAND

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
579	Mr A Johnson	No
1133	English Nature	No
1134	English Nature	No
1719	Mr D Southworth	No
2001	Environment Agency	No
2399	Peel Investments (North) Ltd	No

Summary of Objections

- The Council should only encourage the development and remediation of contaminated land if it has not become an environmental asset to the Borough. All contaminated land needs to be fully investigated and monitored for its biodiversity aspects before any remediation occurs. The policy should include reference to the potential for nature conservation on contaminated sites. **(Objection 579)**
- Contaminated land may be important for wildlife and nature conservation. This should be recognised in the policy. Ecological surveys should be required as part of the policy and mitigation measures required to conserve/protect the ecology of a site. **(Objection 1133)**
- The policy should include cross-referencing to Policies N5 and N9. **(Objection 1134)**

- It should make reference to the need for environmental assessments. **(Objection 1719)**
- The policy should refer to measures necessary to remediate an area with the aim of protecting the environment itself. It does not address potential contamination from landfill gas at former landfill sites. **(Objection 2001)**
- At Second Deposit, it is not necessary for investigations to be carried out by the “applicant”. Any necessary could be carried out by the landowner. The policy implies that investigations would have to be duplicated. **(Objection 2399)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.6 I have no reason to doubt the generality of this objector’s response to the Council’s evidence as it relates to the potential value of contaminated land, not least in ecological terms. In my view, Policy EM4 has a specific intent. It provides a policy requirement to assess possible contamination when development proposals arise. It is a response mechanism, not one requiring all contaminated land to be investigated to establish any nature conservation or community interest. It is acceptable as such and the policy is generally consistent with PPG23 at Section 4 and Annex 10. Contaminated land may, indeed, have a nature conservation interest and I note the objector’s reference to the Nob End SSSI. In assessing the effect of proposals arising on contaminated land on a nature conservation interest, the Council would have available to it the policies in Chapter 5 that include a biodiversity interest. The plan would need to be read as a whole. Bearing in mind the thrust of the policy, and the need for all relevant policies of the plan to be taken into account, the addition sought by the objector is not justified. **(Objection 579)**
- 6.7 Contaminated land may have a nature conservation interest. The policy reflects the general provisions of PPG23 at Section 4 and Annex 10. It is intended to establish the nature of potentially contaminated land when development is proposed. In assessing a development proposal, the Council would reasonably be expected to consider any nature conservation interest present on the site against the policies of Chapter 5. **(Objection 1133)**
- 6.8 There are, undoubtedly, numerous linkages between the various policies of the UDP. Cross-referencing would need to be applied consistently throughout the plan. To do so, would result in an overly-complicated and detailed UDP. All policies relevant to a development proposal would need to be considered. This would not prejudice a nature conservation interest. **(Objection 1134)**
- 6.9 The need, or otherwise, for environmental assessments is prescribed primarily by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999 No 293) rather than legislation on the preparation of development plans. Any development proposal arising that needed to be assessed against this policy would be required to submit an assessment if required by the regulations. There is, therefore, no need to refer to this in the UDP. **(Objection 1719)**
- 6.10 Bearing in mind the purpose of the policy, it would seek to protect the environment when development proposals arise on contaminated land. That would reasonably include proposals at former landfill sites. There are other powers available under a separate statutory regime to protect public health. **(Objection 2001)**
- 6.11 The policy relates to development proposals arising on land that may have been contaminated - reasonably involving a planning application. Paragraph 6 of Annex 10 to PPG23 indicates the role of the “applicant” in designing a scheme that includes proposals for site investigation. **(Objection 2399)**

RECOMMENDATION

6.12 No change to the plan in response to Objections 579, 1133, 1134, 1719, 2001 and 2399.

POLICY EM5: DERELICT LAND AND BUILDINGS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1563	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	Yes
1979	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy makes specific reference to a non-statutory document, inappropriate as part of the policy. **(Objection 1563) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- The policy is unduly restrictive. It does not allow for the beneficial reclamation of derelict and despoiled land outside the urban area, contrary to PPG7 at paragraph 3.14 and MPG3 at paragraph 14. **(Objection 1979)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.13 This First Deposit objection has been conditionally withdrawn following the Council’s deletion at Second Deposit of the policy reference to its strategy for derelict land reclamation. I agree. While I note that the reasoned justification at paragraph 06.14 indicates the Council’s intention to develop a strategy for derelict land and buildings, it is an acceptable amplification of the Council’s approach. **(Objection 1563)**

6.14 In response to this objection, the Council proposes a change to the Second Deposit version, through an addition to paragraph 06.14 (Proposed Change No PC13). I am not persuaded by its merits. To begin, the clear intention of the Second Deposit policy is to permit the reclamation and beneficial use of derelict land and buildings within “the defined urban area”, albeit not defined satisfactorily in the plan. In my opinion, the general thrust of national policy on reclamation applies to both urban and rural areas. Here, for example, the Borough has a history of mineral extraction outside built-up areas, much coal-related. Yet, the wording of this policy at Second Deposit stage gives a clear signal to developers that it is directed to the urban area only. On this objection, there is no convincing evidence before me from the Council as to why the policy should not apply to the Metropolitan Borough as a whole, reflecting the national approach. MPG3 (revised), albeit addressing coal mining and colliery spoil disposal, stresses the priority that should be given to environmental improvements by the restoration of previously derelict areas (paragraph 14). This principle applies, reasonably, to rural as well as urban areas. Similarly, PPG7 (revised) advises that the re-use of rural buildings can help prevent dereliction (3.14). While the Council argues that the wording of the policy reflects the plan priority for sustainable urban regeneration, it has not persuaded me that this would be prejudiced by the policy referring, clearly, to a Borough-wide application. Further, paragraph 06.14 does not justify a solely “urban” application of the policy.

6.15 Taking all the above matters into account, I consider that this objection has merit.

Proposed Change No PC13 confirms my concern and does little to assist. While the Council considers that, outside the “urban area”, Green Belt and Other Protected Open Land policies would apply, national planning guidance does not indicate that the reclamation and beneficial use of derelict land and buildings, there, would be unacceptable as matters of principle. I see no basis for a distinction on this policy between “urban” and “rural”. The Council’s proposed change has not been substantiated and I do not accept it. I agree, therefore, with the objector that the policy should not include reference to the defined urban area. **(Objection 1979)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.16 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1979: at paragraph 06.13, Second Deposit, delete the words “within the defined urban area”.
- 6.17 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1563.

POLICY EM6: ENERGY CONSERVATION AND EFFICIENCY

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1564	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
2365	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No

Summary of Objections

- At First Deposit, it is unlikely that development can reduce energy consumption - the policy should indicate that development should minimise rather than reduce energy consumption. The reference to alternative technology should be removed as it is unspecific, unduly onerous and inappropriate. Issues of layout and design should be included in the supporting text. **(Objection 1564)**
- At Second Deposit, the deletion of the reference to alternative technology is supported but concern remains over the policy reference to development reducing energy consumption as opposed to minimising it. Further, the change of wording from “expect all” to “only permit” is not supported. **(Objection 2365)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.18 At Second Deposit, the objector has supported the removal of the reference to “alternative technology”. I agree. PPG 12 indicates that UDP policies should be clear, succinct and easily understood (paragraph 3.1). “Development Plans: a good practice guide” advises that policies should indicate the kind of development would be permitted (page 87). The Second Deposit policy more appropriately reflects these elements of guidance than the form of words suggested by the objector. Energy conservation and the efficient use of energy should be taken into account in development plan policies (paragraph 4.4 to PPG 12). The overall intent of the policy is consistent with this. As to the appropriateness of the word “reduce”, the policy addresses development proposals and related planning matters on energy consumption. Quite properly, those considerations seek a reduction in consumption that would be unlikely to be the case

without them. Here, “By Design: Better places to live” indicates that layout considerations for housing can influence the potential to reduce energy requirements within the home (page 51) and they are acceptable within the policy. Similarly, “By Design: Urban design in the planning system” defines energy efficiency as the extent to which the use of energy is reduced through the way in which buildings are constructed and arranged on site (page 90). My clear balance of judgement is to support the use of the word “reduce” rather than “minimize”. Part of Objection 2365 relates to the use of the word “only” in the policy at paragraph 06.15. On this objection, it adds little to the policy that would be clearer in its intent by its deletion. **(Objections 1564 and 2365)**

RECOMMENDATION

- 6.19 Modify the plan in response to Objections 1564 and 2365: at paragraph 06.15, delete the word “only”.

POLICY EM8

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
69	English Heritage	Yes
1720	Mr D Southworth	No
1859	The Countryside Agency	No

Summary of Objections

- Windfarms can impact, adversely, on the historic environment. Criterion (ii) to the policy should be amended to refer to the historic environment or archaeological features. **(Objection 69) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- The policy should refer to the need for environmental assessments. **(Objection 1720)**
- The siting of windfarms or turbines should not interfere with public access. On bridleways, horses may be disturbed - resulting in a potential danger to riders and members of the public. A criterion should be added that states that any windfarm or individual generator should be located at least 3 times the height of the turbine to blade tip from any bridleway. **(Objection 1859)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.20 This First Deposit objection has been acceptably met by the change to the plan at Second Deposit. **(Objection 69)**
- 6.21 The need, or otherwise, for environmental assessments is prescribed primarily by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999 No 293) rather than legislation on the preparation of development plans. Any development proposal arising that needed to be assessed against this policy would be required to submit an assessment if required by the regulations. There is, therefore, no need to refer to this in the UDP. **(Objection 1720)**

6.22 Criterion (vii) to the policy seeks to prevent a reduction in public rights of way as a result of a development. This would include bridleways. While PPG22 indicates that a set-back distance may be appropriate (paragraphs 36 and 37 of the Annex), this is generally directed towards road and railway safety. While I note the view of the Rights of Way Committee, the evidence before me does not indicate that it has yet appeared in national planning guidance. Clearly, however, any bridleway and its users likely to be affected by a proposed development would be a material consideration in the assessment. **(Objection 1859)**

RECOMMENDATION

6.23 No change to the plan in response to Objections 69, 1720 and 1859. On an advisory basis, however, criterion (ix) refers to “unacceptable intrusion”. As elsewhere in the plan, the Council should consider “adverse effect on”.

POLICY EM9: HAZARDOUS INSTALLATIONS

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1721	Mr D Southworth	No

Summary of Objection

- The policy should make reference to the need for environmental assessments. **(Objection 1721)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

6.24 The need, or otherwise, for environmental assessments is prescribed primarily by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999 No 293) rather than legislation on the preparation of development plans. Any development proposal arising that needed to be assessed against this policy would be required to submit an assessment if required by the regulations. There is, therefore, no need to refer to this in the UDP. **(Objection 1721)**

RECOMMENDATION

6.25 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1721

POLICY EM10: SURFACE WATER RUN-OFF

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1212	The House Builders Federation	No

Summary of Objection

- The provision by developers of mitigation works to control surface water run-off is a legitimate planning matter, but its long-term maintenance is not. That is the responsibility of other agencies. **(Objection 1212)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

6.26 The preface to PPG 25, and paragraph 2, together indicate that flood risk should be considered at all stages of the planning and development process to reduce the risk of flooding and the damage that floods cause. The guidance also indicates the role of developers in the funding and maintenance of flood defences. Paragraphs 40 - 42 advise that increased run-off can have a significant impact on flooding. Here, Appendix E to the guidance at E14, records that the planning and design process should include agreements on maintenance. In my opinion, the nature of flood risk requires a long-term perspective. The Council's approach in EM10 reflects, generally, national guidance. While the detail of any condition/agreement would depend on the specific circumstances of each case, the policy establishes an acceptable policy framework. 2 other matters for the Council to consider on an advisory basis. Firstly, and reflecting PPG 25, the reasoned justification should indicate that sustainable drainage systems can reduce the environmental impact of development and may allow development to proceed that would otherwise be refused. Secondly, development plan policies should indicate the type of development that would be permitted. The first sentence of paragraph 06.24 should preferably state that the Council will permit development proposals that are designed to minimize the increase in surface water run-off and the loss of natural surface water features. **(Objection 1212)**

RECOMMENDATION

6.27 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1212 but the Council is advised to consider modifying the plan at paragraph 06.24 to reflect the 2 matters raised at paragraph 6.26 above.

POLICY EM11: FLOOD PROTECTION

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1213	The House Builders Federation	No
2002	Environment Agency	No

Summary of Objections

- The wording of the policy should more clearly indicate acceptable development, the policy being too restrictive. **(Objection 1213)**
- While written in a positive way, the policy should indicate that the Council would strongly oppose development within the flood plain. Floodplain boundaries shown on the Proposals Map should be indicative. Maintenance access is required along any watercourse, subject to land drainage byelaw controls, that should be dealt with at application stage **(Objection 2002)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.28 National planning guidance in paragraph 57 of PPG 25 indicates that the susceptibility of land to flooding is a material consideration in determining planning applications. In general, the policy reflects that - indicating the type of development that would be permitted. The paragraph also goes on to require applicants for planning permission to assess the risk posed by the development. The latter is acceptably stressed by the second paragraph of 06.27, added at Second Deposit stage, as well as paragraph 06.27 (i) (a), (b) and (c) - these providing guidance to the development control process. While development plan policies should not be over-detailed, the overall coverage of the policy is acceptable. In addition, the Council proposes to change the policy, as well as the reasoned justification at paragraph 06.29, these addressing the need for conditions/agreements on compensatory measures (Proposed Change No PC14). They are reasonable, albeit the additional paragraph at 06.27 should refer, preferably, to “permitted” rather than “allowed”. **(Objection 1213)**
- 6.29 At Second Deposit, the Council changed the policy to indicate that flood plains are shown indicatively on the Proposals Map, reflecting the objection. The policy statement at paragraph 06.27 indicates the type of development that would be permitted. As criterion (iii) is part of a policy on development within floodplains, it appropriately relates to them - including maintenance access to watercourses. **(Objection 2002)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.30 Modify the plan in response to Objections 1213: amend the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC14, subject to the qualification in the last sentence of paragraph 6.28 above.
- 6.31 No change to the plan in response to Objection 2002.

POLICY EM12: WATER RESOURCES AND QUALITY

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
2229	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No
2378	The House Builders Federation	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy/reasoned justification should refer to the restoration benefits of proposals that would secure improvements to water quality. The word “unacceptable” should be added before “adverse effect”. **(Objection 2229)**
- Measures to reduce the demand for water, including water efficient devices, at the Second Deposit reasoned justification are not a land-use issue - appropriately dealt with by other legislation. **(Objection 2378)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.32 It is for the decision-maker to establish whether an “adverse effect” would be unacceptable in the light of all material considerations. The intention of the policy is supported - this, generally, to prevent development proposals that would adversely affect water supply/quality. Development proposals (including restoration) that would not have this effect would be assessed accordingly. **(Objection 2229)**
- 6.33 The intent of the policy is suitably amplified in the first 3 sentences of the reasoned justification at paragraph 06.31. I am not persuaded, however, that the land-use planning system would represent the appropriate means of implementing water reduction measures and devices - powers under other legislation being available. The last sentence of paragraph 06.31 should be deleted from the plan. **(Objection 2378)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.34 Modify the plan in response to Objection 2378: at paragraph 06.31, delete the last sentence.
- 6.35 No change to the plan in response to Objection 2229.

POLICY EM13: UNSTABLE LAND

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
2249	Government Office for the North West	No
2230	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No

Summary of Objections

- The last sentence of the policy at 06.32 at Second Deposit is incomplete, while (v) and (vi) are not criteria - rather conditions that may be imposed on a planning permission. **(Objection 2249)**
- The reasoned justification to the policy should acknowledge that the surface mining of coal provides an opportunity for the stabilization of ground affected by past shallow workings, as well as dealing with surface dereliction. This would facilitate the regeneration of coalfield areas. Such a change would reflect national planning guidance. **(Objection 2230)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.36 The Council now proposes a change (Proposed Change No PC15). This deals with the incomplete sentence and indicates that criteria (v) and (vi) at Second Deposit would represent appropriate conditions that may need to be imposed on any development. While PC15 extends the coverage of the second paragraph of 06.32, it generally reflects the advice in PPG 14. **(Objection 2249)**
- 6.37 While the aspiration of the objector is understandable, the same principle would apply to other forms of development. The potential offered by surface coal mining towards stabilization would not be prejudiced by the policy. That potential would, reasonably, be taken into account in the assessment of any development proposal. **(Objection 2230)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.38 Modify the plan in response to Objections 2249: amend the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC15.
- 6.39 No change to the plan in response to Objection 2230.

OMISSIONS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
2000	Environment Agency	No
2008	Environment Agency	No

Summary of Objections

- The plan has not adequately addressed the issue of water quality. There are a number of discharges from existing developments that are causing problems. It is unclear how the plan strategy will impact on, or exacerbate, water quality problems in the Borough. Overflow from water treatment works is already causing difficulties in the Horwich/Middlebrook area. The allocations in the plan should be assessed by the Council, Environment Agency and North West Water to ensure they are not contrary to Regional Planning Guidance. **(Objection 2000)**
- There should be a policy on infrastructure to ensure that plan proposals have appropriate water supply and foul drainage systems. Infrastructure improvements may need to be phased. **(Objection 2008)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 6.40. Policy EM3 addresses the potential pollution implications of development proposals. Second Deposit Policy EM12 provides the basis for an assessment of the implications of development proposals for water resources and quality. The means of improving existing discharges is a matter for the Agency and others. **(Objection 2000)**
- 6.41. Although the plan does not contain a general policy on water infrastructure, EM10 and EM12 deal with surface water run-off and water resources and quality - H3 including an infrastructure criterion. The water industry has a separate legislative regime. Any

reasonable local planning authority would undertake appropriate consultations with the Agency on development proposals. Sufficient control would exist, including any need to phase development. **(Objection 2008)**

RECOMMENDATION

6.42 No change to the plan in response to Objections 2000 and 2008.

CHAPTER 7 - DESIGN AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

POLICY D1

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1214	The House Builders Federation	No
1565	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
1980	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No

Summary of Objections

- While not disagreeing with the intention of the UDP, the use of “and preserves local distinctiveness” in the policy would be open to subjective interpretation. It is arguable whether some parts of the Borough have any “distinctiveness”. **(Objection 1214)**
- Development would only be permitted that makes a positive contribution to good urban design. It should seek to prevent demonstrable harm to urban design or local distinctiveness and, where possible, make a positive contribution. **(Objection 1565)**
- The policy does not accord with PPG1 paragraph 36. The words “only permit” should be replaced by “encourage” and the word “unacceptably” should be inserted before “damages”. **(Objection 1980)**

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.1 Local distinctiveness, and the need to support it through design, is an accepted part of national planning guidance [for example, PPG1(Revised) at paragraph 18 and PPG7 (revised) at paragraph 2.11]. The general requirement of the policy represents, therefore, a sound planning principle. My extended presence in the Borough confirms that there are a substantial number of areas of local distinctiveness, albeit including some areas of limited environmental quality. I assume that it is not the intention of the policy that development should seek to preserve that distinctive feature. Here, the reasoned justification does not explain what is meant by local distinctiveness and how the Council would address it through the development control process. It should do. **(Objection 1214)**
- 7.2 National planning guidance in paragraphs 13 to 20 of PPG1(Revised) indicates the importance that government places on the design aspects of development. Good design should be the aim of all those involved in the development process; applicants should be able to indicate that regard has been had to relevant development plan policies; and that policies should encourage good design. The principle of this UDP policy is acceptable. As to the wording, any development that contributes to good urban design represents a benefit. The converse would apply - the likelihood of harm needing to be assessed by the decision-maker. As the objector is seeking clarity, it appears to me, therefore, that the use of the word “positive” contributes little to the policy. On this objection, concern

also reflects - in my view - the use of the word “only”. The policy should simply say that the Council will permit development proposals that contribute to good urban design and preserve local distinctiveness. Although not the subject of specific objection, it follows that the same applies to the identical Part 1 policy at 02.05. Similarly, the second sentence of D1 - that largely repeats the intent of the first in a negative fashion - is not necessary in my opinion. **(Objection 1565)**

7.3 While I have considered the references to paragraph 36 of PPG1(Revised), they are within a general review of planning obligations and conditions. The use of the word “encourage” in the policy would imply an aim rather than a statement of planning policy. Within the context established by the policy, it is for the decision-maker - taking into account all material considerations - to decide whether a proposal would be unacceptable. **(Objection 1980)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

7.4 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1214: amend the reasoned justification to reflect paragraph 7.1 above.

7.5 The Council is advised to modify the plan in response to Objection 1565: delete paragraphs 07.01 and 02.05 and substitute: “07.01 (02.05) D1. The Council will permit development proposals that contribute to good urban design and preserve local distinctiveness.”

7.6 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1980.

POLICY D2: DESIGN

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1371	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
1860	The Countryside Agency	Yes
1996	Environment Agency	No
2084	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
2041	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No

Summary of Objections

- While generally supported, the policy should be strengthened to make it more positive and enforceable - through, for example, the use of the words “must”, “shall” or “will” - rather than “should”. The phrase “responsible innovation” may guide subjective and unsympathetic schemes towards a conclusion, not possible using objective criteria. “Outstanding qualities” need to be defined. **(Objections 1371 and 2041)**
- This should be an over-arching policy that applies to all forms of built development across the whole of the Borough. **(Objection 1860) (conditionally withdrawn)**

- Good design and practice in controlling surface run-off can protect rivers and groundwater from the effects of pollutants in urban areas. All new large-scale development should assess the feasibility of incorporating sustainable urban drainage within the scheme. A criterion should be added to the policy that would incorporate sustainable urban drainage systems. **(Objection 1996)**
- Development would only be permitted that makes a positive contribution to good urban design. It is too onerous. It should seek to prevent demonstrable harm to urban design or local distinctiveness and, where possible, make a positive contribution. **(Objection 2084)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.7 Before turning to the objections, I see that the first 2 lines of the policy are broadly similar to the first part of D1.
- 7.8 I consider the Council's phraseology to be acceptable, not least as a development plan cannot compulsorily require action by developers in pursuit of their proposals. Design Statements for proposals cannot be forced upon applicants. Similarly, applicants are reasonably advised to refer to Planning Control Policy Notes. They cannot be made compulsory. Responsible innovation and outstanding qualities are matters in reasonably common usage, the former included within national planning guidance at paragraph 19 of PPG1(Revised). It is for the decision-maker to interpret them as they apply to development proposals. The Council cannot compel a developer to submit a design statement in the form prescribed in paragraph 07.07. It is reasonable for the Council to record its expectations. The use of the word "should" is acceptable. **(Objections 1371 and 2041)**
- 7.9 While I see no justification for an over-arching policy, D2 is Borough-wide in its application. While the objector, in reading the policy, will have noted the reference to urban design, this is a generic phrase for a process that is clearly understood to apply to all development, irrespective of location. Unfortunately, the reasoned justification, consistent with the objector's general concern, confuses the matter. Criteria 07.07 (c) and (e) refer respectively to "urban context" and "urban sustainability". Context and sustainability are Borough-wide in their relevance. The word "urban" should be deleted from both. This would satisfy the overall thrust of the objection. This is now proposed by the Council through its Proposed Change No PC16. Here, I query whether the first "for" in criterion (e) should be "of". **(Objection 1860) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- 7.10 Policy D2 is directed, broadly, towards the visual appearance of development, together with its wider social implications. Paragraph 07.06 of the plan seeks a raising in the standard of the design and quality of all development. The policy intent reflects PPG1(Revised). Paragraphs 4.1 and 4.4 of PPG 12 do indicate, respectively, that the effective protection of the environment is a government objective and that drainage issues are a relevant environmental consideration in development plans. It appears to me, however, that the plan sets out to cover them in Chapter 6, where I have made a recommendation on sustainable drainage systems following paragraph 6.26 of my Report. It would be inappropriate within this specific policy on design. **(Objection 1996)**
- 7.11 I have dealt with the general concern of this objector in response to its similar objection 1565 to D1 at paragraph 7.2 above. A similar modification to D2 is required. **(Objection 2084)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.12 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1860: amend the plan at paragraph 07.07 in accordance with the Council’s Proposed Change No PC16.
- 7.13 Modify the plan in response to Objection 2084: delete paragraph 07.05 and replace with: “07.05 D2. The Council will permit development proposals that contribute to good urban design. Proposals should:
- (i) be compatible with, or improve, their surroundings - in terms of their layout, density, height, massing, architectural style, materials and landscaping;
 - (ii) create a safe and secure environment which minimizes the possibility of crime; and
 - (iii) be accessible and useable to people of a range of mobility and physical ability.”
- 7.14 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1371, 1996 and 2041.

POLICY D3: LANDSCAPING

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
604	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1861	The Countryside Agency	Yes
2243	Government Office for the North West	No
1138	English Nature	No
1372	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy should apply either to all development (as stated in the first line of the policy) or, to development which falls within the five listed categories. If it applies to all development, then it is not necessary to list the categories. **(Objection 604)**
- The criteria appear to weaken the policy by implying that if the criteria do not apply, good quality landscaping will not be necessary. The policy should be redrafted. **(Objection 1861) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- “Where appropriate” should be defined. There should be examples of the circumstances in which developments would, or would not, be required to incorporate good quality landscaping schemes. **(Objection 2243)**
- The policy should be cross-referenced to Policy N6 as the biodiversity of the Borough may be enhanced through landscaping schemes. **(Objection 1138)**
- While generally supported, it should be strengthened to make it more positive and enforceable - through, for example, the use of the words “must”, “shall” or “will”. **(Objection 1372)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.15 Objectors generally seek clarity from the policy. At Second Deposit, the Council recast D3, simplifying it - primarily by the deletion of the 5 criteria. Generally, I agree. Not all development proposals would require a landscaping scheme. "Where appropriate" creates uncertainty. It goes without saying that a landscaping scheme should be of "good quality". The intent of 07.10 at Second Deposit is to give examples of landscaping schemes, not all being relevant to a specific development proposal - the words "where possible" also indicating uncertainty. Further, the use of the word "such" on the first line of 07.09 is not necessary. As a development control policy, there is no need for it to be cross-referenced to N6 - the decision-maker being required to consider the plan as a whole and all material considerations. The Council's phraseology is acceptable. All the policy needs to say is that, where required, development proposals should include a landscaping scheme. 07.10 would indicate examples of landscaping schemes. **(Objections 604, 1861, 2243, 1138 and 1372)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.16 Modify the plan in response to my overall assessment of Objections 604, 1861 and 2243:
- delete the first 3 lines of paragraph 07.08: substitute: "07.08 D3. Where required, development proposals should include a landscaping scheme."
 - amend the reasoned justification at paragraph 07.09: delete the word "such".
 - amend the reasoned justification at paragraph 07.10: delete the first line and substitute: "Examples of landscaping schemes would:"
 - delete the words "where possible" from 07.10 (b).
 - the reasoned justification should be consistent with paragraph 7.15 above.
- 7.17 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1138 and 1372

POLICY D5: PUBLIC ART

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
605	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1216	The House Builders Federation	No
1566	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
1699	Mr D Southworth	No
2043	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No

Summary of Objections

- It is unreasonable to expect the provision of works of art etc for all development in the categories covered by the policy, regardless of the nature of development. It would be preferable to negotiate with developers for such provision. Where planning obligations are used, they need to meet the tests set out in Circular 1/97. Works of art should be encouraged not expected, the provision of works of art in development schemes being voluntary. Public

art should not justify development, the Council should be more cautious in its approach. The policy should be deleted as the definition of art is entirely subjective. **(Objections 605, 1216, 1566, 1699, 2043)**

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

7.18 To begin, I note that the adopted plan at Policy CE1/7 includes a policy that in appropriate cases, encourages the provision of works of art. In my view, the concept of public art is sufficiently understood for it to be addressed in the plan (2043). The DETR publication “By Design - Urban Design in the planning system” indicates that “works of art..... give identity and enhance the sense of place” (page 26). Public art can be the subject of a topic-based policy in a development plan (page 46). It would not, therefore, be seen as justifying development (1699). In my opinion, a policy is justified. Each case would need to be considered in the light of its specific circumstances, but a development plan policy should indicate a Council’s intention. This the policy sets out to achieve. The role of conditions/obligations would form part of the normal development control process, but subject to the tests of Circulars 11/95 and 1/97. Bearing in mind objector concern, however, the general tenor of the policy should be amended, with the reasoned justification being expanded to reflect the national context and the requirements of the relevant Circulars (605, 1216, 1566). **(Objections 605, 1216, 1566, 1699, 2043)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.19. Modify the plan in response to my overall assessment of Objections 605, 1216 and 1566:
- (a) delete paragraph 07.14: substitute the following: “07.14 D5. Built development proposals within the urban area should incorporate or provide works of art, craft or decoration on sites involving: ...”
 - (f) expand the reasoned justification at paragraph 07.15 to reflect paragraph 7.18 above.
- 7.20. No change to the plan in response to Objections 1699 and 2043.

POLICY D6: TELECOMMUNICATIONS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
51	Vodafone Ltd	No
1343	Mr D Crausby MP	No
1344	Mrs R Kelly MP	No
1655	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
1722	Mr D Southworth	No
1828	One2One Personal Communications	No
2044	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
2209	One2One Personal Communications	No
2403	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No

Summary of Objections

- The spirit of the policy is not the subject of objection, but policy and criteria references to “only”, “of equal value” and “sites or features of importance” are unclear. The policy in PPG8 should be substituted. **(Objection 51)**
- Public concern over the public health effects of masts should be reflected. Restrictions should be imposed on the siting of masts so that they are distanced from residential areas, schools and other establishments accommodating children. A precautionary approach should be followed, prescribing a distance within which development would not be permitted. The Second Deposit version has not met these concerns. **(Objections 1343, 1344, 1655 and 2403)**
- The policy should make reference to the need for environmental assessments. **(Objection 1722)**
- The First and Second Deposit versions of the policy variously include ambiguous references and much that is superfluous given the government guidance that is in place. The diverse nature of telecommunications development requires a more simplistic approach, based on a presumption in favour of development - taking into account all material considerations - including operational requirements. The policy should be reworded accordingly. **(Objections 1828 and 2209)**
- Account should be taken of the potential damage to listed buildings as a result of telecommunications development. **(Objection 2044)**

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.21 This First Deposit objection refers to a now cancelled version of PPG8. D6 was redrafted at Second Deposit, generally omitting the disputed phrases. The objector sought a policy that reflected the wording in the cancelled version of PPG8. While taking into account its views, I have assessed the policy against the current version, including in response to Objections 1828 and 2209. **(Objection 51)**
- 7.22 PPG8 establishes national planning guidance on telecommunications. It acknowledges the objectors’ view that there is public concern over health considerations. The guidance is, however, clear. Development plan policies should include criteria-based policies to guide telecommunications developments when no specific sites are identified in the plan (paragraphs 37 to 41 of the appendix). The general thrust of Policy D6 reflects the guidance. Local planning authorities should not implement their own precautionary policies (101). In my opinion, this would be the effect of recommending a modification to the Council to meet the objectors’ wishes. Local health concern on a specific proposal would be a material consideration for the decision-maker. The objectors have submitted no convincing evidence why I should depart from national planning guidance. **(Objections 1343, 1344, 1655 and 2403)**
- 7.23 The change to the plan sought by the objector at both First and Second Deposit stages seeks a rewording of the policy along similar lines that I have carefully considered. The UDP has been changed at Second Deposit. That, in my opinion, is the starting point. I have no reason to doubt the objector’s good practice - not least to endeavour to undertake suitable landscaping and camouflage schemes as well as innovative mast designs. I shall not, however, be recommending a presumption in favour of telecommunications development, notwithstanding any assessment of all material considerations. That does not appear in PPG8 and conflicts with the general thrust of national planning guidance. Having assessed the objections, it appears to me that the objector - generally - does not take issue with the broad intentions of the policy criteria,

rather that they represent controls available under other legislation and should be omitted. Here, I am told, Second Deposit criteria (i) and (ii) are not necessary as they are already reflected in license conditions. Similarly, criterion (ii) [siting, scale and appearance] already reflects the objector's practice - notwithstanding that not all base stations involve a free-standing mast. I also accept its view that satisfactory coverage may require a location within a designated area [criterion (iv)]. It is clear that the telecommunications industry has its own statutory regime. A development plan has its. Here, the public at large is entitled to be able to see how development proposals that may affect them, or their vicinity, are to be assessed by the local planning authority. The policy is worded positively, indicating that development would be permitted, subject to criteria. Taking into account, however, the prior approval procedure for permitted development, the Council should consider the substitution of the word "approve" for "permit" in the first line of paragraph 07.16 - albeit not the subject of specific objection. Criteria (i) to (iv) reflect, generally, the intentions of paragraphs 64 to 81 of the appendix to PPG8. Objector concern on the inclusion of criterion (v) is, in part, justified - in that it is not necessary but for a different reason. The principle of it is material, but it represents a matter appropriately considered after any decision to approve. The intention should be included in the reasoned justification as a matter that the Council would seek to achieve. **(Objections 1828 and 2209)**

- 7.24 The need, or otherwise, for environmental assessments is prescribed primarily by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999 No 293) rather than legislation on the preparation of development plans. Any development proposal arising that needed to be assessed against this policy would be required to submit an assessment if required by the regulations. There is, therefore, no need for me to refer to this in the UDP. **(Objection 1722)**
- 7.25 2044 was made at First Deposit. The Second Deposit version indicates at criterion (iv) that, in assessing the effect of development proposals, a consideration will be listed buildings or their setting. **(Objection 2044)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.26 Modify the plan in response to Objections 1828 and 2209:
- (a) at the first line of paragraph 07.16, delete the word "permit" and substitute "approve".
 - (b) delete criterion (v) to paragraph 07.16, reflecting paragraph 7.23 above. Amplify the reasoned justification to the policy to indicate that this is a matter that the Council may wish to seek.
- 7.27 No change to the plan in response to Objections 51, 1343, 1344, 1655, 1722, 2044 and 2403.

POLICY D7: CONSERVATION AREAS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
606	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1068	McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Limited	Yes
1097	Marks & Spencer Plc	No
1567	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	Yes
1656	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
2045	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
2244	Government Office for the North West	No
2357	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy is not clear. The statutory test is to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of a conservation area and the policy conflicts with it. The First Deposit requirement to conserve and enhance the character and appearance of conservation areas is too restrictive. The Second Deposit version again fails the statutory test. **(Objections 606, 1068 (conditionally withdrawn), 1097, 1567 (conditionally withdrawn), 2244 and 2357)**
- Inadequate protection is given to the built environment, not least to standards of workmanship. Reference should be made to English Heritage standards and best practice. The policy does not indicate the sanctions or legal requirements that would be applied to proposals. A Planning Control Policy Note is referred to, which may not necessarily be applied. **(Objections 1656 and 2045)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

7.28 The desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of conservation areas is prescribed by Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, not by the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and a development plan through Section 54A. That relates to development and I shall recommend a modification to the policy to reflect, clearly, the statutory position. The objections address, generally, 2 matters - the duty under Section 72(1) together with the implementation of the policy. Firstly, the policy and its reasoned justification should reflect the requirements of Section 72(1) throughout - preserve *or* enhance the character *or* appearance (my emphases) of the conservation area. There is no justified basis for the UDP to proceed otherwise. The Second Deposit version of the policy does not reflect that, both in the first 2 lines of the policy as well as the criteria. Secondly, my recommendations would provide appropriate protection within conservation areas to the built environment - there being further enforcement controls available to the Council. Here, I note concern over standards of workmanship. I see no reason why the reasoned justification should not refer to the English Heritage publications, included within PPG 15 at Annex D, that establish good practice in conservation areas. An appropriate reference would be before the last sentence of paragraph 07.23 - preceding the advice for applicants to refer to the relevant policy note, itself acceptably advisory. **(Objections 606, 1068, 1097, 1567, 1656, 2045, 2244 and 2357)**

7.29 I have carefully considered all the objections. The Council has brought forward Proposed Change No PC17. While helpful, somewhat, it only relates to paragraph 07.21 (i) of the Second Deposit version and omits part of the statutory test, as do the first 2 lines of the policy. Here, criterion (i) appears to me to repeat the intent of those 2 lines and I doubt its necessity. In the light of objections and the above, the policy needs to be clarified and should proceed on the basis of the recommendations below.

RECOMMENDATIONS

7.30 Modify the plan in response to my assessment, overall, of Objections 606, 1068, 1097, 1567, 1656, 2045, 2244 and 2357:

- (a) delete paragraph 07.21 and replace with:
 “07.21 D7. The Council will permit development proposals that preserve or enhance the character or appearance of conservation areas. They should:
 - (i) be of appropriate height, size, design, materials, roofscape and plot width;
 - (ii) retain materials, features, trees and open spaces that contribute to the character or appearance of the conservation area;
 - (iii) utilize appropriate materials for highway and footpath surfacing; and
 - (iv) not adversely affect important views into, and across, a conservation area.”
- (b) amend the reasoned justification at paragraph 07.22 to reflect the requirement under Section 72(1), consistent with paragraph 7.28 above.
- (c) amend the reasoned justification at paragraph 07.23 to refer to English Heritage good practice in conservation areas, consistent with paragraph 7.28 above.

POLICY D8

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1658	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No

Summary of Objection

- Inadequate protection is given to the heritage of the built environment. The policy should require the inspection and recording of features where internal modifications and/or the removal of features are permitted. **(Objection 1658)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

7.31 This policy deals with the demolition of an unlisted building or feature within a conservation area. By way of background, conservation area consent procedures for the demolition of most buildings within a conservation area are dealt with under Section 74 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and not the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act, that includes Section 54A. A development plan can

only address development proposals. The policy does not do that. Although not the subject of specific objection by 1658, I shall recommend a modification to the policy in order to clarify the position, but am not persuaded that the word “conclusively” is justified in the policy. That is for the decision-maker to assess in the light of all material considerations. Under the consent procedures, the Royal Commission on the Historical Monuments of England must be notified of all proposals to demolish listed buildings, and allowed access to buildings that it wishes to record before demolition takes place. As far as unlisted buildings within a conservation area are concerned, the Council - in the specific circumstances of a demolition proposal - would be able to consider the imposition of a suitably worded condition on any consent, requiring recording. To assist the objector and the public at large, the Council should expand the reasoned justification to the policy to explain the procedures. **(Objection 1658)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.32 Firstly, modify the plan in response to Objection 1658: amend the reasoned justification to reflect the last sentence of paragraph 7.31 above.
- 7.33 Secondly, the Council should consider a further modification to the plan to reflect paragraph 7.31 above. The first 4 lines of paragraph 07.24 should be deleted and replaced by the following: “07.24 D8. The Council will permit development proposals - involving the demolition of an unlisted building or feature within a conservation area that contribute to its character or appearance - provided that the applicant can demonstrate that:”

POLICY D10 (D9): LISTED BUILDINGS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
607	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1373	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
1657	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
1568	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
2047	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No

Summary of Objections

- Unclear phrases should be clarified as should the limited circumstances in which the demolition of listed buildings would be permitted. The requirements for alteration/extension should be clear from the policy. **(Objection 607)**
- Although the policy is generally supported, the criteria should be amended to make them more positive and enforceable, not least a strengthening of the requirements placed upon applicants. **(Objection 1373)**
- To address a past record of “poor workmanship”, there should be reference to English Heritage’s statement of standards and best practice. **(Objection 1657)**

- Policy D9, at First Deposit, does not reflect guidance set out in PPG 15 relating to the tests for demolition and alteration of listed buildings. A more robust approach to resisting the demolition of listed buildings is required. **(Objections 1568 and 2047)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.34 To begin, the Council at Second Deposit changed the plan substantially. D10 now covers the alteration or extension to listed buildings, a new D11 at Second Deposit dealing with the demolition of listed buildings. That is to be supported. In the light of concern over clarity and intentions, however, there is a need for some “tidying up” of the plan. As D10 now addresses alteration/extension, the heading to the policy should say that. Similarly, there should be a heading to D11, demolition of listed buildings. I shall recommend appropriate modifications. Next, the Council should bear in mind that listed building consents are dealt with through the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. As no development is involved in the grant of listed building consent, Section 54A of the 1990 Act does not apply. This should be reflected in both policies, relating them to development proposals.
- 7.35 Turning to the objections, the Second Deposit version - now with 2 policies - has improved the clarity of the Council’s listed building intentions. That, together with my recommendations following the above, would provide more appropriate control - bearing in mind the importance the government attaches to the protection of the historic environment. **(Objections 607 and 1373)**
- 7.36 A development plan cannot require specific standards of workmanship that may be undertaken following an agreed scheme of works. It is reasonable, however, for it to indicate that development proposals involving alteration/extension work to listed buildings should follow sound principles. In my view, they are provided by Annex C to PPG 15, augmented by “The Repair of Historic Buildings: Advice on Principles and Methods”. There should be a reference to them in the reasoned justification and there would be no unacceptable duplication with PPG 15. I see no reason why it should not also indicate that applicants should “also” refer to the Council’s Planning Control Policy Note - Listed Buildings. **(Objection 1657)**
- 7.37 The Second Deposit version of the plan, together with my recommendations, would reflect PPG 15 and provide a sufficiently robust approach to listed buildings. **(Objections 1568 and 2047)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.38 As the objections have a broadly similar intent, the Council should modify the plan in response to my overall consideration of Objections 607, 1373, 1657, 1568 and 2047:
- (a) delete the heading to paragraph 07.29 and substitute: The Alteration and/or Extension of Listed Buildings.
 - (b) add a heading to paragraph 07.32: The Demolition of Listed Buildings.
 - (c) delete the first 6 lines of paragraph 07.29 and substitute the following:

“07.29 D10. The Council will permit development proposals for the alteration and/or extension of listed buildings provided that they do not adversely affect their character, appearance, setting or historic fabric. Development proposals for listed building consent will also be assessed against the following criteria:

 - (i) the materials, features and details of the proposal;

- (ii) its character in terms of height, size, design, scale and roofscape; and
- (iii) the setting and open spaces that surround the listed building.”
- (d) delete the first 2 lines of paragraph 07.32 and substitute the following:
 “07.32 D11. The Council will permit development proposals for the demolition of listed buildings provided that: …………….”
- (e) delete the last sentence of paragraph 07.31 and substitute: “Development proposals covered by this policy should take into account Annex C to PPG 15 as well as ‘The Repair of Historic Buildings: Advice on Principles and Methods’, published by English Heritage. Applicants should also refer to the Planning Control Policy Note - Listed Buildings”.

POLICY D12 (D10)

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
73	English Heritage	No
1374	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No

Summary of Objections

- The plan should reflect the advice in PPG 15 that the continuation of the existing use of a listed building is the first option to be considered. Problems associated with the conversion of some listed buildings to residential use should be addressed. **(Objection 73)**
- Although the policy is generally supported, the reasoned justification at paragraph 07.35 should indicate that applicants “must” refer to the Planning Control Policy Note. **(Objection 1374)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.39 The policy deals with alternative uses for listed buildings. While it, and its reasoned justification, reasonably reflect the general intentions of PPG 15, I accept that the reasoned justification should more appropriately reflect paragraph 3.10 of the guidance. The first option when the future use of a building is considered is the continuation or reinstatement of the use for which the building was originally designed. Otherwise sufficient control is included within the policy, including conversions to residential use. **(Objection 73)**
- 7.40 The last sentence of paragraph 07.35 fairly draws the attention of applicants to where further guidance may be found. The use of the word “should” there reflects the status of the Note, the UDP not being able to require specific action by applicants **(Objection 1374)**
- 7.41 The Council should note that a word appears to be missing before the word “historic” on the last line of paragraph 07.34

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.42 Modify the plan in response to Objection 73: amend paragraph 07.35 of the reasoned justification to reflect paragraph 7.39 above.
- 7.43 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1374.

POLICY D13 (D11): HISTORIC PARKS AND GARDENS

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
2049	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No

Summary of Objection

- The text should be amended to refer to “Smithills Hall and Park” rather than “Smithills Hall”. (**Objection 2049**)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

- 7.44 The objector has not contested the view of the Council that the Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England, by English Heritage, refers to Smithills Hall. (**Objection 2049**)

RECOMMENDATION

- 7.45 No change to the plan in response to Objection 2049

POLICY D14 (D12): ARCHAEOLOGY

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1981	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No

Summary of Objection

- The policy does not accord with PPG1 paragraph 36. The words “adversely affect” should be deleted and substituted with “result in an unacceptable adverse impact upon”. (**Objection 1981**)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

- 7.46 The general intention of the policy reflects the advice in PPG 16 that UDPs should include policies for the protection, enhancement and preservation of sites of archaeological interest and of their settings (paragraph 15). Further, where nationally

important archaeological remains whether scheduled or not, and their settings, are affected by proposed development, there should be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation (8 and 27). The guidance specifically uses the word “affected” and bearing in mind paragraph 8, the Council is reasonably entitled to seek to resist development that would adversely affect remains, subject to an assessment of all material considerations. The modification sought by the objector would weaken the policy and conflict with the clear intention of national guidance. It is for the decision-maker to determine whether an unacceptable impact would result. I see no conflict with paragraph 36 of PPG1(Revised), this generally addressing planning obligations and conditions. **(Objection 1981)**

RECOMMENDATION

7.47 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1981.

POLICY D15 (D13)

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1700	Mr D Southworth	No

Summary of Objection

- The Council does not protect its archaeological sites and must take a more cautious approach when considering developments. **(Objection 1700)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

7.48 It is not for me to comment on whether - in the past - the Council has, or has not, protected archaeological sites. Paragraphs 27 and 28 of PPG 16 provide guidance on dealing with planning applications affecting archaeological remains and their setting. The general intention of the policy reflects them. Sufficient control would be available to the Council consistent with national guidance. **(Objection 1700)**

RECOMMENDATION

7.49 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1700.

OMISSIONS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
2075	English Heritage	No
2076	English Heritage	No

Summary of Objections

- There should be an additional policy for the designation and review of conservation areas. **(Objection 2075)**
- The chapter should include a policy to cover buildings at risk and the issue of enabling development. **(Objection 2076)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 7.50 Development plans should not contain policies that duplicate the effect of other legislation, this being the case with the designation and review of conservation areas through Section 69 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990. It would be inappropriate to include such a policy in the UDP. **(Objection 2075)**
- 7.51 A development plan establishes a land-use framework for the assessment of development proposals. It cannot require action on buildings at risk, this within a context of no specific duty on owners to keep their buildings in a good state of repair. Other legislation addresses the upkeep and repair of historic buildings. Sections 48 and 54 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 make provision, for example, for urgent works and repairs. I have no reason to doubt the Council's good intentions on listed buildings, and those at risk, in the work it has undertaken through non-statutory documents. I also share its view that the issue of enabling development is more appropriately addressed through planning briefs. **(Objection 2076)**

RECOMMENDATION

- 7.52 No change to the plan in response to Objections 2075 and 2076.

CHAPTER 8 - OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION

8.1 During the Inquiry, a revised version of PPG17 was issued. I have taken it into account in my Report, together with the further observations of Chapter 8 objectors on it - all having been carefully considered. All references in my Report are, therefore, to the 2002 version of the guidance.

POLICY O1

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1701	Mr D Southworth	No
2406	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No

Summary of Objections

- The Council is too eager to encourage and permit development. (**Objection 1701**)
- The Second Deposit version of the plan weakens the Council's commitment to an audit of the Borough's recreational land and facilities. (**Objection 2406**)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.2 Developers, and others with an interest in land and/or buildings, have a right to submit development proposals to be assessed against the requirements of the statutory planning system. The policy establishes an acceptable context for that. (**Objection 1701**)
- 8.3 At paragraph 08.03 of the plan, Second Deposit, the Council now "intends to carry out" - rather than "is committed to conducting" - an audit of the Borough's recreational land and facilities. I consider the wording to be acceptable and have no reason to doubt the Council's good intentions in this respect. I am not able to prescribe Council procedures. (**Objection 2406**)
- 8.4 On an advisory matter, and as elsewhere in my Report, I draw the Council's attention to the wording of the policy - albeit not the subject of objection. It does not relate to development proposals and is before me as an aim rather than a statement of planning policy - not least through the reference to "... and give favourable consideration to...". It follows, therefore, that I should come to the same conclusion on the identical Part 1 policy at paragraph 02.06. The Council is advised, therefore, to consider a rewording of the policy as set out in paragraph 8.6 below.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.5 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1701 and 2406.

8.6 The Council is advised to consider a rewording of the policy: “08.01 (02.06) O1. The Council will permit development proposals that protect and improve recreational land and facilities.”

POLICY O2: PROTECTION OF RECREATIONAL OPEN SPACE

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
571	Mr and Mrs G Kenyon	No
1168	Lostock Sports Club	No
1174	Mr S Macaulay	No
1179	Mr M Lucas	No
1186	Westhoughton Junior Amateur Rugby Club	No
1346	Westhoughton/Hulton Park Liberal Democrats	No
1350	Mr J Nicholson	No
2210	BAe Systems	No
1471	Sport England	No
1482	Sport England	No
1569	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
1639	The Emerson Group	No
1659	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
1692	Woodford Industries Ltd	No
1693	Westhoughton Cricket Club	No
1715	Mr D Southworth	No
1798	SWAN	No
2080	Westhoughton/Hulton Park Liberal Democrats	No

Summary of Objections

- Land to the rear of parts of Laburnum Park and Ryeburn Drive should not be designated as recreational open space. It is woodland, inappropriate for recreation and has resulted in nuisance that requires the public to be excluded. **(Objections 571 and 1350)**
- The policy should indicate that it refers to both public and private open space. **(Objection 1168)**
- The plan incorrectly designates small woodland and open space that extends across private garden areas to properties on Conningsby Close. **(Objections 1174 and 1179)**
- Land north of St George’s School, The Hoskers, has not been designated under the policy as public open space. **(Objections 1186 and 1346)**
- While the generality of Policy O2 is supported, criterion (i) does not provide for a proper consideration of all possible means of alternative provision. **(Objection 2210)**

- All playing fields - whether in public, private, or educational ownership - should be included on the Proposals Map as protected recreational open space. **(Objection 1471)**
- Criterion (ii) should be deleted. The references to “significant” and “small part of the site” are difficult to interpret. **(Objection 1482)**
- Policy O2 should be simplified and expressed as a positive policy setting out clear criteria which state the circumstances where development would be appropriate. Criteria (i) and (iv) at Second Deposit are too onerous. **(Objection 1569)**
- The protection of the recreational space is an unnecessary constraint on the successful redevelopment of the British Aerospace site, contrary to the aims of Bolton WIDE. **(Objection 1639)**
- There should be reference to the involvement of the community when there is a proposal for the development of recreational open space. **(Objection 1659)**
- The designation of land at Eldercot Road as an Urban Recreation Site (URS) is unnecessary and could inhibit or prevent the satisfactory development and/or improvement of the land in the future. Past sporting uses of the site have been abandoned due to the quality of the land. **(Objection 1692)**
- Westhoughton Cricket Club should not be protected under Policy O2 as this could prejudice the Club's opportunities to dispose of the site for development and fund relocation to a better facility elsewhere. **(Objection 1693)**
- There should be a sequential approach to development in order to safeguard green field sites. **(Objection 1715)**
- On criterion (i), the provision of an alternative recreational site may not justify the loss of an existing facility where facilities that have been built up over a number of years may not be able to be repeated at the relocation site. **(Objection 1798)**
- Land south of Cricketers Way, Westhoughton should be designated protected open space. **(Objection 2080)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.7 To begin, and taking into account objection, I see merit in this policy being worded positively rather than negatively - indicating the type of development that would be permitted. Further, for example, the use of the word “exceptions” in the policy indicates uncertainty - as does “appropriate”. I shall recommend accordingly, albeit the general thrust of the policy is acceptable. Here, there are no substantive objections before me that the criteria-based approach of the policy is inappropriate.
- 8.8 This site has been designated as an URS. On the basis of my visit, I saw no reason to doubt it. The objectors have not significantly contested the Council's evidence that an area of open space was implemented through a legal agreement following a planning permission for housing development. While there is a substantial tree presence, this does not in my view prejudice the designation of the URS - albeit the nature of activity would be likely to be largely informal. The site includes 2 ponds and I saw on my visit that it is well used - here, there being a number of tracks through it. To deny public access to any part would conflict with the general intention of Policy O2. There are powers available to other agencies to deal with nuisance at the site. The legal status of the land is a matter between objectors and the Council. I have to consider the specific circumstances of the objections. Having carefully considered all objector evidence, I do not intend to recommend a modification to the plan. **(Objections 571 and 1350)**

- 8.9 In my opinion, is clear from the policy - and its reasoned justification - that it is the Council's intention is to apply it to both public and private recreational open space. For the avoidance of doubt, the policy should say so. **(Objection 1168)**
- 8.10 These objections, in my opinion, relate to a proposed URS to the rear of properties on Saxby Avenue and Cox Green Road. The Proposals Map does not include a small woodland designation in this location. The Council has acknowledged a cartographic error on the Proposals Map as it related to the recreation site and has corrected this through Proposed Map Change 60 at Second Deposit stage. The URS does not impinge on properties at Conningsby Close. **(Objections 1174 and 1179)**
- 8.11 At Second Deposit, land north of St George's School has been designated as an URS (Proposed Map Change 62). The rugby club's concern over an alternative site offered by the Council is a matter between them. **(Objections 1186 and 1346)**
- 8.12 The Second Deposit policy, including criterion (i), establishes an appropriate statement of the Council's land-use intention. The Council argues that each case would need to be considered in the light of its specific circumstances and seeks to avoid lengthy and over-detailed plans. I share the general sentiment. Any reasonable local planning authority, in discussion with a potential developer, would investigate all possible mechanisms of achieving criterion (i). **(Objection 2210)**
- 8.13 I share the Council's view that, generally, playing fields within public ownership are reasonably identifiable and those used for education purposes are covered by Policy O3. More guidance is justified for other playing fields - reasonably through Policy O2. **(Objection 1471)**
- 8.14 It would be for the decision-maker to interpret "significant" and "small part of the site" in the light of the specific circumstances of each case. They represent acceptable tests. Criterion (ii) is justified. **(Objection 1482)**
- 8.15 The modification I recommend below would result in a positively worded policy. The tests at criteria (i) and (iv) are reasonable considerations for a local planning authority. **(Objection 1569)**
- 8.16 This industrial site allocation (numbered 41E at Second Deposit) excludes an adjacent URS. I viewed it from a number of points on Ox Hey Lane. It is clearly well used for formal recreation. PPG17 indicates that the government attaches considerable importance to open space, sport and recreation that underpin people's quality of life. It supports an urban renaissance by the creation of attractive environments, as well as supporting sustainable development (Planning Objectives - page 4 of the guidance). This substantial facility has an extensive employment area to the south extending to the railway line, as well as a mixture of uses to the north. The Council's position on this site appears to me to reflect the policy intentions of national planning guidance. Its inclusion under Policy O2 is justified. I have taken into account the objector's view that the Council's requirement may constrain the successful redevelopment of the British Aerospace site. It submits no convincing evidence that such a proposal would be likely over the period of the plan, and that the aims of Bolton WIDE would be prejudiced. Any such proposal that may arise, would need to be considered on its specific circumstances in the light of the criteria to the policy. The objector has not submitted an assessment that its facilities are surplus to the open space, sport and recreation requirements of the area, reflecting paragraph 10 of the guidance. **(Objection 1639)**
- 8.17 A main purpose of a development plan is to establish a policy context for the assessment of land-use proposals. Any planning application arising involving the loss of

recreational open space would, like any other, need to be the subject of consultation. The nature of that consultation, including dialogue with the local community, is largely a matter for the Council. It would be unreasonable of me, in the UDP, to seek to prescribe the Council's procedures. Overall, Policy O2 is sufficiently rigorous in its intent to protect recreational space. **(Objection 1659)**

- 8.18 The site is to the north of a former railway line, now filled. PPG17 indicates that the government attaches considerable importance to open space, sport and recreation that underpin people's quality of life. It supports an urban renaissance by the creation of attractive environments, as well as supporting sustainable development (Planning Objectives - page 4 of the guidance). This substantial area of land is, together with that to the south (also defined as an URS), within the main urban area of Bolton and surrounded by development. A former rugby activity appears to have ceased some time ago, but I saw that the site is well used by local residents. Its designation under Policy O2 is - in my view - justified, being consistent with the approach in national planning guidance. While the objector tells me that the site is unallocated on the adopted plan, I have to consider the objection before me. It acknowledges that the likely future use of that part of the site that has been filled would remain as open space but that the plan designation would adversely affect an emerging development scheme for the remainder. Any formal proposal would need to be assessed against the criteria of Policy O2. The objector has not submitted an assessment that its land is surplus to the open space, sport and recreation requirements of the area, reflecting paragraph 10 of the guidance. **(Objection 1692)**
- 8.19 PPG17 indicates that the government attaches considerable importance to open space, sport and recreation that underpin people's quality of life. It supports an urban renaissance by the creation of attractive environments, as well as supporting sustainable development (Planning Objectives - page 4 of the guidance). This substantial facility in the centre of a large urban area appears to me to reflect these clear policy intentions. Its designation under Policy O2 is, therefore, justified. While I understand the club's aspirations and the potential means of achieving them, its evidence indicates that relocation has not yet been considered as a realistic option. I cannot, therefore, conclude that there is any reasonable prospect of such a proposal coming forward over the period of the plan. Any proposal would need to be considered in the light of its specific circumstances. Policy O2 is sufficiently flexible to cater for a proper assessment. The objector has not submitted an assessment that its facilities are surplus to the open space, sport and recreation requirements of the area, reflecting paragraph 10 of the guidance. **(Objection 1693)**
- 8.20 At Second Deposit, the Council has acceptably added a further sentence to the reasoned justification at paragraph 08.06 to recognize the priority to be given to brownfield development. **(Objection 1715)**
- 8.21 Criterion (i), at Second Deposit, together with my recommended modification at paragraph 8.23 below, would establish sufficient control to meet this objector's concern. **(Objection 1798)**
- 8.22 The objector has not disputed the site plan accompanying the Council's evidence. The site relates to a somewhat limited area of land to the south of the highway verge at Cricketers Way, as well as to the north of the Mill Street playing fields and part of Westhoughton Cricket Club - both designated URSs under Policy O2. While I saw some evidence of public passage across the land and limited planting, it is somewhat overgrown. For want of a better phrase, I would describe it as "land left over after

development”. It should not be included within the land addressed by the policy.
(Objection 2080)

RECOMMENDATIONS

8.23 Modify the plan in response to my overall consideration of Objections 1168 and 1569: delete paragraph 08.04 and substitute:

“08.04 O2. The Council will permit development proposals that result in the loss of, or damage to, public or private recreational open space - including parks, children’s play areas, playing fields, sports grounds, allotments and amenity open space - provided that:

- (i) alternative open space provision, to either an equivalent or better standard or of equivalent community benefit, is made as part of the proposal. It should be in place before the commencement of the development;
- (ii) the site is in need of significant improvement that can be secured by the development of a small part of the site, provided that this can be achieved without adversely affecting the recreational, townscape or nature conservation value of the site;
- (iii) the development is for a non-commercial community use; is ancillary to the recreational use of the area; and does not adversely affect the recreational, townscape or nature conservation area of the site; or
- (iv) it is established that limited benefit would result from retaining the site as recreational open space when assessed against present or future needs.

Existing sites of 0.1 hectares or more subject to this policy, and within the urban area, are shown on the Proposals Map.

Development proposals will not be permitted that would adversely affect a Green Corridor”.

8.24 No change to the plan in response to Objections 571, 1174, 1179, 1186, 1346, 1350, 1471, 1482, 1639, 1659, 1692, 1693, 1715, 1798, 2080 and 2210.

POLICY O3: PROTECTION OF EDUCATION RECREATION FACILITIES

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1486	Sport England	No
1660	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
1800	SWAN	No

Summary of Objections

- Criterion (ii) of the policy appears to repeat criterion (iv) of Policy O2. The former should be deleted. **(Objection 1486)**
- There should be reference in the policy to the involvement of the community when there is a proposal for the development of recreational open space. **(Objection 1660)**
- The minimum educational requirements for playing fields may not be enough to serve the needs of a school or college - either at the present, or in the future. **(Objection 1800)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.25 The objector has not disputed the Council's evidence that the objection should have referred to criterion (iv) of Policy O2. I agree. It does not seek a change to the wording of criterion (ii), rather its deletion. The 2 criteria relate to different policies - overall recreational provision (O2), as well as that for education facilities (O3). They establish reasonable tests for the assessment of proposals. Both are relevant and the deletion of criterion (ii) to O3 would weaken the policy. **(Objection 1486)**
- 8.26 A main purpose of a development plan is to establish a policy context for the assessment of land-use proposals. Any planning application involving the loss of education recreation facilities would need to be the subject of consultation. The nature of that consultation, including dialogue with the local community, is largely a matter for the Council. It would be unreasonable of me, in the UDP, to seek to prescribe the nature of it. A reasonable Council would balance all material considerations. Policy O3 is sufficiently rigorous in its intent to protect education recreation facilities. **(Objection 1660)**
- 8.27 This First Deposit objection has been acceptably addressed at Second Deposit, this to ensure that present and future educational requirements would be met. **(Objection 1800)**
- 8.28 Finally, the Council is advised to reconsider the wording of the policy. While worded negatively, it includes "exceptions" that reduce certainty in the plan process. A revised, positive, wording is set out in paragraph 8.29 below that the Council is advised to consider. Also, the Council should consider whether the word "and" needs to be inserted on the second line of criterion (ii) after the word "term,".

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.29 The Council is advised to consider a revised wording to the policy as follows: "08.07 O3. The Council will permit development proposals that would result in the loss of school or college playing fields, provided that:.....". Here, the word "and" may be missing on the second line of criterion (ii) after the word "term,".
- 8.30 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1486, 1660 and 1880.

POLICY O4 (DELETED AT SECOND DEPOSIT): PROVISION OF NEW RECREATION OPPORTUNITIES

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1478	Sport England	No
1702	Mr D Southworth	No
1755	Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	Yes
1802	SWAN	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy is too restrictive; provides insufficient guidance on the types of recreational facilities that would be acceptable; makes no reference to the sequential approach for leisure facilities where town centres are the first preference; while recreation facilities should be subject to the criteria applied to other development. The Council is too eager to encourage and permit development. **(Objections 1478, 1702, 1755 [conditionally withdrawn] and 1802)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

8.31 The intent and application of this First Deposit policy was unclear. It was deleted at Second Deposit. I have no reason to disagree.

RECOMMENDATION

8.32 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1478, 1702, 1755 and 1802.

POLICY O4 (O5): PROVISION OF OPEN SPACE IN NEW DEVELOPMENTS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1069	McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Limited	Yes
1217	The House Builders Federation	No
1479	Sport England	No
1570	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
1661	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
1703	Mr D Southworth	No
1804	SWAN	No
612	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
2211	BAe Systems	No

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
2245	Government Office for the North West	No
2358	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
9024	Westhoughton Town Council	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy should address a proven deficiency in open space, should indicate a proper requirement for commuted sums, and should not refer to “normally” - while any exceptions to the policy should be the subject of criteria against which they would be assessed. The implications of very large developments should be in the policy and not the reasoned justification. **(Objections 612 and 2245)**
- These First and Second Deposit objections consider that the policy is contrary to Circular 1/97; long term maintenance is not defined; onerous and undefined content should be deleted; the development threshold should be increased to 500 dwellings; while the phrase “normally involve” (08.11) should be replaced with “may, where appropriate, involve”. The threshold paragraph at Second Deposit should be prefaced by “where appropriate”, the threshold for open space provision being better explained with reference to national standards; while criterion (ii) that refers to a “contribution to the enhancement of existing recreational facilities” should be explained - indicating how contributions will be assessed. **(Objections 1570 and 2358)**
- The policy should not require all development over a threshold to provide open space, unless those needs can already be met wholly or in part. Any requirement for long term maintenance should not apply to all open space - small areas should be excluded. **(Objection 1217)**
- The nature of a proposed development may affect the need for open space. In sheltered housing schemes, for example, it is often neither necessary nor desirable to provide recreational or public open space. **(Objection 1069) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- All new dwellings, down to a single dwelling, can potentially generate demand for additional or enhanced places for sport and should contribute towards the cost of new or improved facilities. **(Objection 1479)**
- It is onerous to expect that individual housing applications can address the standards laid down by the NPPA, as is the requirement for a 10-year agreement to maintain land or equipment. Alternative arrangements for securing open space provision should be considered. **(Objection 2211)**
- Different age ranges may require varying play facilities that would need to be separated in the case of larger developments. The policy intention that children's play provision will not be required for flats should be deleted. **(Objection 1661)**
- The needs of the general community are not given enough value. The Council is too eager to encourage and permit development. The Council does not discourage large developments. **(Objection 1703)**
- The design of amenity open space should be improved, not least to minimize nuisance to residents and ensure a safe environment. **(Objection 1804)**
- Proposed Change No PC18 should require the policy to include planning briefs to address accumulated development sites. **(Objection 9024)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.33 Generally, the overall intent of the policy is acceptable - this to ensure amenity open space etc in housing developments. In my view, and reflecting concern, the first paragraph of 08.11 should establish the policy requirement - the other paragraphs representing considerations against which proposals would be assessed. This should include the Council's approach to "very" large developments set out in the reasoned justification at paragraph 08.14 at Second Deposit. Some may arise during the course of the plan. Further, the Second Deposit version of the policy includes phrases that imply uncertainty - "appropriate", "might include", "effective" and "adequate", for example - that should be deleted. The policy should, therefore, be modified.
- 8.34 Turning, then, to Objections 612 and 2245. The policy has been substantially changed at Second Deposit. Paragraph 08.11 now indicates that children's play provision will not be required for sheltered or special needs housing for elderly people. I agree. The use of the word "normally" has been removed and the Council in Proposed Change No PC18 now intends to remove the word from paragraph 08.14 of the reasoned justification. This would be consistent with certainty. Overall, it is reasonable for the Council to seek landscaping, amenity open space and children's play facilities in new developments. The fourth paragraph of 08.11 deals with developer contributions. The modification recommended below, taking into account the Second Deposit version, will clarify the requirement placed upon developers - each case needing to be assessed against Circular 1/97. Finally, PPG17, paragraph 6, indicates that open space standards are best set locally, national standards not being able to cater for local circumstances. The policy includes NPFA standards. There is no evidence from the Council that it has available to it sufficient information to produce local standard(s). While there is conflict with paragraph 6, other matters need to be taken into account. NPFA guidance at this time is, reasonably, better than none - assisting the development control process and being material. Nonetheless, a developer bringing forward a proposal would be entitled to prepare, and submit, its own assessment to the Council to justify its case. Further, I see no reason why the Council should not indicate in the reasoned justification to the policy its intention to undertake an assessment of local open space standards to reflect the clear requirements of PPG17. That should be a priority for it. In the light, therefore, of the objections, the Council should explain in the reasoned justification why it has used NPFA requirements and its intention to produce local standards. **(Objections 612 and 2245)**
- 8.35 The requirement for the policy to be seen to reflect Circular1/97 has been dealt with at 612 and 2245, as well as the use of the word "normally". The Council now intends that its maintenance requirement relates to a period of at least 10 years. I consider that to be acceptable - the principle of maintenance agreements being consistent with PPG17 at paragraph 13. The objector's suggested wording changes to the policy are not consistent with certainty. Taking that into account, it has not submitted any convincing evidence that the threshold levels in the policy are inappropriate. Nonetheless, in the interests of transparency, their basis should be amplified by the Council in the reasoned justification. **(Objections 1570 and 2358)**
- 8.36 While I have considered the objector's view that not all development over a threshold may need to provide open space, the policy provides a context within which the specific circumstances relating to a development can be assessed. I have dealt above, at paragraph 8.35, with concern relating to maintenance. Any further clarification of the policy is not necessary. **(Objection 1217)**

- 8.37 In the absence of any substantive case to the contrary, the policy has a reasonable threshold level, including maintenance requirements. There is no convincing reason before me why the policy framework established by the Second Deposit version would not allow the specific circumstances raised by the objector to be reasonably assessed as material considerations. Neither would it preclude arrangements for bonds or one-off payments. **(Objection 2211)**
- 8.38 The general intent of the policy - that housing developments should provide for landscaping, amenity open space and children's play - is reasonable. The objector argues, fairly, that provision should reflect the nature of the development. At Second Deposit, the Council has amended the plan to indicate that children's play provision will not be required for sheltered or special needs housing for elderly people. That meets the objection that has been conditionally withdrawn. I agree. **(Objection 1069)**
- 8.39 In support of its case, the objector refers me to development plan policies elsewhere but provides little detail of them or their vintage, not least whether they post-dated Circular 1/97. I have considered its policy for providing for sport through new development. I am not persuaded, however, that its requirement for single dwellings to contribute towards the cost of new or approved facilities for sport is reasonable - not least as any occupant(s) of a single dwelling may not generate a requirement and existing open space may not be lost through that development. There would be likely to be too remote a connection. A significantly larger development would, however, be likely to generate a requirement. In my opinion, the objection fails the tests in Circular 1/97 - particularly as to necessity; a direct relationship to a proposed single dwelling; while to apply it generally would not be reasonable in all respects. **(Objection 1479)**
- 8.40 Dependent on the size of a development, play facilities may require a range of provision that would need to be separated to take account of different age groups - not generally disputed by the Council. It argued that detailed requirements should be addressed by Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). I have considered a separate, and additional, policy but it appears to me that - to be meaningful - it would require some analytical justification. That is not before me or, apparently, available to the Council. It does not, however, prevent the Council undertaking an assessment when specific proposals arise. I see no reason why the reasoned justification to the policy should not record that the matters raised by the objector would be taken into account in the assessment of proposals. This would appropriately be achieved by an addition to the reasoned justification. Turning, then, to the provision of children's play provision in flats. At the Hearing session, and after assessing the evidence, it would be likely that some flatted development, either public or private, may include households with children - requiring some play space that may not otherwise be available. A development plan policy cannot, however, cater for all eventualities. Here, the Council fairly considered that the principle of a requirement for play provision in new flat developments would be unreasonable. In my view, the thrust of the policy is correct, this not preventing a reasonable local planning authority from assessing the specific circumstances of each case. **(Objection 1661)**
- 8.41 A development plan seeks to establish land-use policies, addressing the needs of the community. Developers, and others, with an interest in land and/or buildings have a statutory right to submit proposals. Proposed large developments cannot be precluded. Generally, the policy properly seeks to establish the type of development that would be permitted. **(Objection 1703)**
- 8.42 The Council considers the requirements of the objector would represent an excessive level of detail, more appropriately dealt with by future SPG. I disagree. In my view, the

safeguarding of the living conditions of nearby residents and the need to ensure safe play space are relevant planning considerations. The plan should reflect them.
(Objection 1804)

8.43 The policy, as recommended to be modified below, would establish sufficient control.
(Objection 9024)

RECOMMENDATIONS

8.44 Modify the plan in response to my overall consideration of Objections 612, 1570, 2245 and 2358:

(a) delete paragraph 08.11 and substitute: “08.11 O4. The Council will permit proposals for housing development that make provision for landscaping, amenity open space and children’s play. In assessing proposals, the following considerations will apply:

(i) the use of landscape features at the site;

(ii) development sites of 30 or more dwellings should include a minimum of 0.4 hectares per 1000 population (0.1 hectares per 100 houses and 0.05 hectares per 100 flats) of landscaped amenity open space - including the use of existing natural landscape features, site perimeter planting and the provision of landscaped buffers to play areas;

(iii) development sites of 30 or more houses suitable for family accommodation should include provision for children’s play. This requirement will be considered met where the developer can demonstrate that the houses proposed are within a safe, 400 metre walking distance of an existing equipped play area that has equipment and capacity to serve the new development. Otherwise, the proposal should:

either, make provision for children’s play within a safe 400 metre walking distance of the houses by a minimum of 0.8 hectares per 1000 population (0.2 hectares per 100 houses) of equipped and laid out play area

or, contribute to the improvement of existing recreational facilities in the vicinity to meet the demands arising from the proposed development.

Children’s play provision will not be required either for flats or for sheltered or special needs housing for elderly people.

(iv) very large developments, likely to accommodate 600 or more occupants, should provide open space provision to full NPFA standards - including that for youths and adults; and

(v) developments requiring the provision of land and/or equipment under this policy will include an agreement to ensure its maintenance for at least 10 years.”

(b) amplify the reasoned justification to the policy to explain the use of NPFA standards and the Council’s intention to provide local space standards.

(c) amplify the reasoned justification to the policy to explain the threshold levels adopted in the policy.

8.45 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1661. The reasoned justification to the policy should indicate that, in assessing proposals that would require the provision of play

facilities, consideration will be given to the requirements of different age-groups and any need to separate, physically, such provision.

- 8.46 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1804. The reasoned justification should indicate that the design of amenity open space will take into account the living conditions of nearby residents and the need to ensure a safe environment.
- 8.47 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1069, 1217, 1479, 1703, 2211 and 9024.

POLICY O5 (O7): CANALS & WATERWAYS

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1896	North West Tourist Board	No

Summary of Objection

- The policy should state the benefit for tourism of canal restoration and enhancement. **(Objection 1896)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

- 8.48 The policy reflects the general intention of paragraphs 12 and 13 of Annex B to PPG13 that seek to develop the potential of inland waterways. Both policy and guidance identify their recreational potential. In my opinion, an increase in recreation would bring with it tourism benefits. This should be acknowledged in the reasoned justification. In response to the objection, the Council proposes a further change (Proposed Change No PC19) that would include a reference to tourism in paragraph 08.18 of the reasoned justification. I agree. **(Objection 1896)**

RECOMMENDATION

- 8.49 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1896: amend paragraph 08.18 in accordance with Proposed Change No PC19.

POLICY O6 (O8)

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1897	North West Tourist Board	No

Summary of Objection

- The policy should make implicit the benefit of canal restoration and enhancement for the purposes of developing tourism. **(Objection 1897)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

8.50 Policy O6 is a more detailed development of the Council’s overall approach to canals and waterways, established by Policy O5. The opportunities for tourism should be recognized. The Council proposes a further change to the plan (Proposed Change No PC20) that would add a reference to tourism to paragraph 08.21. I agree. **(Objection 1897)**

RECOMMENDATION

8.51 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1897: amend the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC20.

POLICY O7 (O9): PUBLIC RIGHTS OF WAY

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
2246	Government Office for the North West	No

Summary of Objection

- The policy should be clarified to indicate that it only applies where public rights of way are affected by development proposals. It should not apply to all development. **(Objection 2246)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

8.52 Proposed Change No PC21 is intended to deal with this objection. The wording of the policy there, and at Second Deposit, is however somewhat convoluted. In the interests of the clarity sought by the objector, I shall recommend a modification. Here, 3 related matters concern me. While not the subject of specific objection, the Council should consider them on an advisory basis. Firstly, the use of the words “where appropriate” indicates uncertainty in the plan process. They should be deleted. Secondly, and following that, the policy implies a requirement for developers “where appropriate” to improve the rights of way network. That is, in my opinion, onerous - as well as imprecise. An improvement may well result from a development proposal, but that should not be a requirement of the policy placed upon a developer. Thirdly, the intention of the policy is to protect or retain the integrity of existing rights of way. I see no difference between them, one requirement would suffice - retain being acceptable. The reasoned justification at paragraph 08.23 would then reflect the above. **(Objection 2246)**

RECOMMENDATION

- 8.53 Modify the plan in response to Objection 2246: delete paragraph 08.22 and substitute:
 “08.22 O7. Development proposals affecting public rights of way will be permitted, provided that they retain their integrity.” The reasoned justification at paragraph 08.23 should reflect the policy.

OMISSIONS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
30	L Gallagher	No
1472	Sport England	No
1066	City of Salford	No

Summary of Objections

- There should be a policy reference, and an allocation on the Proposals Map, for a village green at the recreation ground, Chequerbent, Westhoughton. **(Objection 30)**
- There is no policy for new golf courses and driving ranges. The plan should either allocate sites or identify criteria against which the location of new facilities can be assessed. **(Objection 1472)**
- The UDP should include a specific policy/policies to promote and secure the protection and improvement of the Croal/Irwell valleys, reflecting the adopted plan and those of adjoining authorities. Such an absence would undermine the need for a common approach and prejudice funding for improvement measures. **(Objection 1066)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 8.54 There is little evidence before me on the nature of a “village green” at Chequerbent, sufficient to justify a policy reference and notation on the Proposals Map. **(Objection 30)**
- 8.55 Over the period of the plan, development proposals would be likely to arise for a wide range of open space and recreation facilities. Sport England has not submitted any meaningful evidence on any material shortage of golf courses and driving ranges within the Metropolitan Borough that would justify a specific policy. Generally, other policies of the plan would not prejudice the objector’s aspiration. **(Objection 1472)**
- 8.56 The Council has not significantly contested the objector’s view that the Croal/Irwell valley system represents an important recreation/wildlife feature that extends many miles, outwards, from close to the conurbation centre. It would be reasonable for me, therefore, to conclude that it is of sub-regional significance. This reflects an adopted plan (1986) for the valley. The adopted UDP includes a specific policy (CE17) that intends to conserve and enhance the open character and recreational value of the valley - albeit that other valley systems were included within the policy. Joint member and

officer arrangements are in place between the relevant authorities to manage and secure improvements. The Council argues that a number of other policies of the plan would meet commonly shared objectives. On the basis of an extensive site visit in the area, and an assessment of the evidence before me, I support the inclusion of a specific policy - notwithstanding other policies of the UDP. It would allow proposals arising to be placed in a sub-regional context; would facilitate appropriate weight to be given to other policies of the plan in the assessment of development proposals; and encourage consistency between authorities helping to maintain strategic features through the corridor. One policy would suffice, broadly reflecting CE17. That policy does not indicate, however, the type of development that would be permitted - while I am not persuaded that any additional policy should include the test of enhancing the open character and recreational value of the valley system. It should indicate the type of development that would be permitted, that being development which maintains the open character and recreational value of the Croal/Irwell valley. Here, the adopted plan includes other valleys. They are not the subject of objection. I leave it to the Council to consider whether the plan should be further modified to include them. The reasoned justification should establish the sub-regional significance of the corridor as a whole, and the contribution that the Bolton section makes to it, together with the need for co-ordination. The Proposals Map should include an appropriate notation, as in the adopted plan. Here, the objector has not disputed the map accompanying the Council's evidence that indicates the area subject of the objection. **(Objection 1066)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

8.57 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1066:

- (a) add an additional policy to Chapter 8, headed "The Croal/Irwell Valley": "The Council will permit development proposals that maintain the open character and recreational value of the Croal/Irwell valley".
- (b) the reasoned justification to the policy should reflect the considerations in paragraph 8.56 above.
- (c) the Proposals Map should be amended to include the area subject of the additional policy, this consistent with the last sentence of paragraph 8.56 above.

8.58 No change to the plan in response to Objections 30 and 1472

CHAPTER 9 - ACCESSIBILITY

POLICY A1

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1630	The Emerson Group	No
1662	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
1704	Mr D Southworth	No
1906	CED Promotion Partnership	No

Summary of Objections

- Exceptional circumstances, requiring locations away from public transport nodes may be necessary or appropriate and the policy should reflect that. **(Objection 1630)**
- Inadequate attention is given to pedestrian accessibility. The UDP should contain a commitment to a walking strategy, including pedestrian distance standards. **(Objection 1662)**
- The Council is too eager to encourage and permit development, requiring a more cautious approach with increased emphasis on traffic assessments. **(Objection 1704)**
- The policy lacks detail. It does not recognize the sustainability implications of different types of development. There is no provision for community enterprise. **(Objection 1906)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 9.1 To begin on an advisory basis, reflected elsewhere in my Report. There are 2 main matters here. Firstly, the policy is partly worded as an aim rather than a statement of planning policy - the word “encourage”. Secondly, the second part of the policy largely repeats the intent of the first - in a negative way. I doubt its necessity. The Council is advised to consider a revised wording of the policy as at paragraph 9.6 below. It follows, therefore, that the same considerations apply to the similar Part 1 policy at paragraph 02.07.
- 9.2 National planning guidance in PPG 12 encourages clear, succinct and easily understood plans (paragraph 3.1). The process should encourage certainty. “Development Plans: A good practice guide”, referred to in PPG 12, indicates the need for policies to establish the kind of development that would be permitted. The inclusion of “exceptional circumstances” in the policy that may justify a departure from it, would conflict with that guidance and increase uncertainty. Any such proposal that may arise would need to be considered against the plan as a whole, national planning guidance and all material considerations. **(Objection 1630)**
- 9.3 I have no reason to doubt the general thrust of this First Deposit objection that accessibility is an important element of land-use planning, particularly for pedestrians. This reflects the general advice in PPG13, that walking is the most important mode of travel at the local level. The Council could not give any commitment to work on the preparation of walking distance standards for pedestrians. In the light of PPG13, the

Second Deposit policy fairly recognizes the importance of walking at paragraph 09.03, while Policy A16 covers the pedestrian environment. While the objector argues that the First Deposit housing allocations did not pay sufficient attention to pedestrians, they were deleted at Second Deposit. **(Objection 1662)**

- 9.4 Developers, and others with an interest in land and/or buildings, have a right to submit development proposals to be assessed against the requirements of the statutory planning system. All have to be fairly assessed. A development plan should indicate the type of development that would be permitted. This, generally, the policy seeks to establish. The objector argues for greater attention to be given to traffic assessments. PPG13 indicates that Transport Assessments (replacing Traffic Impact Assessments) should be prepared where developments will have significant transport implications (paragraph 23). While such a requirement is established by paragraph 09.18 to Policy A4 at Second Deposit, this policy relates to developer contributions. The requirement may reasonably arise through other policies of this chapter. Policy A1 provides, in my view, an overall context for it. The objection and the intent of PPG13 would be best met by a reference to Transport Assessments in the reasoned justification to this policy. It should indicate that - reflecting the advice in PPG13 - development proposals would require the submission of a Transport Assessment where they have significant transport implications. **(Objection 1704)**
- 9.5 The policy provides a context, with other relevant policies, within which specific development proposals can be assessed - including sustainability. The activities of community enterprise agencies would be able to work within it. While I note the objector's reservations on a lack of detail, the level of elaboration supported would be inappropriate to the policy. **(Objection 1906)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.6 The Council should consider modifying the plan at paragraphs 09.01 and 02.07: delete the paragraphs and substitute:
- “09.01(02.07) A1. The Council will permit development proposals that result in an integrated, and sustainable, land-use and transport system.” The reasoned justification should reflect the reworded policy, not least by the deletion of references to “encouraging”. Here, I see that paragraph 09.02 refers to a “provisional” Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan. Elsewhere in the plan, it is not indicated as having that status. It should be consistent throughout.
- 9.7 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1704: in the reasoned justification, add a reference to Transport Assessments, reflecting both the advice in PPG13 and the intent of the last 2 sentences of paragraph 09.18 (following Proposed Change No PC22). They should be deleted from that policy (A4).
- 9.8 No further change to the plan in response to Objection 1630, paragraph 9.6 above establishing an acceptable wording for the policy.
- 9.9 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1662 and 1906.

POLICY A2: (DELETED AT SECOND DEPOSIT)

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
2217	GMPTE	No

Summary of Objection

- Although appropriate transport assessments are required by PPG13, this should also be clear in the plan. **(Objection 2217)**

Inspector’s Reasoning and Conclusion

9.10 This objection should be read together with Objection 1704 (Policy A1). In my opinion, sufficient guidance is established by paragraphs 23 to 27 of PPG13 so that First Deposit Policy A2 was not justified. I have recommended an appropriate reference to Transport Assessments at paragraph 9.7 of my Report on Objection 1704. **(Objection 2217)**

RECOMMENDATION SPACING BELOW

9.11 No further change to the plan in response to Objection 2217

POLICY A3: (DELETED AT SECOND DEPOSIT)

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1769	Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	Yes

Summary of Objection

- The policy requires clarification, the policy reference in the heading to local facilities not being reflected in the policy. It should also incorporate a cross-reference to the provisions of the sequential approach and clarify that the plan does not envisage the creation of any new local or district centres. **(Objection 1769) (conditionally withdrawn)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

9.12 While I note the objector’s concern over the clarity of the policy, the Council reasonably argues that the matters it was intended to cover are addressed elsewhere in the plan that needs to be considered as a whole. I agree. The objection has been conditionally withdrawn. **(Objection 1769)**

RECOMMENDATION

9.13 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1769.

POLICY A2 (A4): SUSTAINABLE FREIGHT MOVEMENTS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1705	Mr D Southworth	No
1723	Mr D Southworth	No

Summary of Objections

- The Council is too eager to permit development, requiring a more cautious position with increased emphasis on traffic assessments. **(Objection 1705)**
- The policy should refer to the need for environmental assessments. **(Objection 1723)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

9.14 Developers, and others with an interest in land and/or buildings, have a right to submit development proposals to be assessed against the requirements of the statutory planning system. All have to be fairly assessed. A development plan should indicate the type of development that would be permitted. This, generally, the policy seeks to establish. I have dealt with the objector's views on traffic assessments at paragraph 9.4 to Objection 1704. **(Objection 1705)**

9.15 The need, or otherwise, for environmental assessments is prescribed primarily by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999 No 293) rather than legislation on the preparation of development plans. Any development proposal arising that needed to be assessed against this policy would be required to submit an assessment if required by the regulations. There is, therefore, no need to refer to this in the UDP. **(Objection 1723)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

9.16 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1705 and 1723.

POLICY A4 (A6): DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1571	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
1219	The House Builders Federation	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy conflicts with Circular 1/97, regarding its tests of necessity. The reasoned justification is unclear, requiring definition of “major development” and “significant impact”. **(Objections 1571 and 1219)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

9.17 To begin, I accept the Council’s Proposed Change No PC22 that removes a reference at paragraph 09.18 of the reasoned justification to deleted Policy A2. The Council argues that the policy is intended to ensure contributions in those circumstances that cannot be resolved satisfactorily through the use of conditions. Generally acceptable. While the general thrust of the policy reflects national planning guidance in PPG13, objection before me raises doubts on its necessity. While a policy is, in my view, justified - it should be simplified. Here, it refers to “would place additional demands upon the transport network”. That would, reasonably, include small-scale developments (a single dwelling, for example). While they would generate a limited increase in traffic, they would still place an additional demand upon the network, albeit I doubt whether such proposals - generally - should be within the scope of the policy. While, it is for the decision-maker to interpret the words “major” and “significant” in the reasoned justification, the policy should be more positive - directed to justified transport improvements - reflecting PPG13. I shall recommend an appropriate rewording of the policy, reflecting the objections. The reasoned justification at paragraphs 09.18 to 09.20 should be consistent with paragraphs 81 and 83-86 of PPG13, including a reference to the relevant tests in Circular 1/97. Paragraph 09.20 refers to the Greater Manchester (Provisional) Local Transport Plan. Other sections of the UDP do not indicate the provisional status of this document. I have recommended the deletion of relevant sentences of the reasoned justification at Objection 1704, paragraph 9.7 **(Objections 1219 and 1571)**

RECOMMENDATION

- 9.18 Modify the plan in response to my overall consideration of Objections 1219 and 1571:
- amend the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC22.
 - delete paragraph 09.17 and substitute: “09.17 A4. In assessing development proposals, the Council will consider developer contributions towards transport improvements as part of the development, particularly where this would deliver more sustainable transport options”.
 - the reasoned justification to the policy should further reflect paragraph 9.17 above.

POLICY A5 (A7): ROADS, PATHS, SERVICING AND CAR PARKING

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1572	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
2379	The House Builders Federation	No

Summary of Objections

- The intention of the policy at First Deposit is unclear. Secure cycle parking would not necessarily be appropriate in all development. **(Objection 1572)**
- The introduction of criterion (iv) at Second Deposit, read with the policy, would preclude otherwise acceptable proposals on matters over which developers have no control. **(Objection 2379)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

9.19 I note that, while the numbering of the criteria at Second Deposit stage was not consecutive, this has been corrected in Proposed Change No PC23. Generally, the policy as now before me reflects the overall intention of PPG13. A5 appears to me to be, largely, a design policy - albeit this is unclear in the reasoned justification. The first 4 criteria would represent reasonable design considerations in the assessment of development proposals. The last, (v), refers to public transport. Here, I do not share Objector 2379's concern. In my opinion, taking into account paragraph 09.23, the criterion reflects what the Council intends to be the sustainable approach of the UDP. Development located in proximity to public transport services, and designed to allow access by it, would be likely to encourage travel by other than the private car. Whether a public transport operator would wish, for example, to provide a service into a new development is a matter for it - taking into account specific circumstances. The plan should, however, allow for that potential. It would not, therefore, require developers to make provision for an unreasonable design element.

9.20 Turning to Proposed Change No PC23, this would add a further consideration - apparently, an adverse impact on the road network. It is not clear what it relates to. In my opinion, it should address the sound planning principle of the safety of highway users - including pedestrians, as well as the safe and efficient circulation of vehicles. Taking into account the above, the modification to the policy I shall recommend would establish sufficient clarity - without reference to the word "appropriate" at Second Deposit that indicates uncertainty in the development plan process. Here, on Objection 1572, the Council - at Second Deposit stage - has removed the requirement for secure cycle parking. This is acceptable in a policy that covers the general requirements of highway users, but I deal with the specifics of cyclist provision under Policy A17. **(Objections 1572 and 2379)**

RECOMMENDATION

9.21 Modify the plan in response to my overall assessment of Objections 1572 and 2379:

- (a) amend the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC23, subject to the following: delete paragraph 09.21 and substitute:

"09.21 A5. In assessing development proposals, the Council will permit those that have taken into account provision for:

- (i) pedestrians and cyclists;
- (ii) road design, layout and construction;
- (iii) vehicle servicing and access arrangements;
- (iv) car, cycle and motor-cycle parking; and
- (v) access to, and by, public transport

Development proposals should not adversely affect the safety of highway users, including pedestrians, as well as the safe and efficient circulation of vehicles.”

- (b) the reasoned justification to the policy should be amplified to include the design and highway safety approach of the policy.

POLICY A6 (A8)

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
617	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1158	McDonald's Restaurants Ltd	No
1663	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
2380	The House Builders Federation	No
2420	B&Q Plc	No

Summary of Objections

- The Council's car parking standards should be included in the plan - preferably as an appendix. **(Objection 617)**
- A certain level of off-street parking may be necessary for development to proceed. Car parking standards set to a maxima are excessively prescriptive. Parking standards should allow for an operational requirement, reflecting draft PPG13. **(Objection 1158)**
- The final line of the reasoned justification undermines the policy. The word “resisted” should be replaced by “opposed”. **(Objection 1663)**
- The policy is more restrictive than government policy and relies on supplementary planning guidance that is not part of the UDP. **(Objection 2380)**
- The statement in the reasoned justification that proposals that exceed maximum car parking standards will not be permitted is too rigid. The Council should reinstate “will be resisted” at First Deposit. **(Objection 2420)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

9.22 PPG13 indicates (paragraph 52) that policies in development plans should set maximum levels of parking for broad classes of development. I am not impressed by the Council’s reluctance to include its parking standards within an appendix that is part of the plan. The general requirement of the policy at Second Deposit is that new development will provide car parking based on the Council’s maximum car parking standards. On that basis, any developer would not be able to identify within the UDP the standards that it is required to meet. It should be. While PPG 12 advises, generally, against over-detailed plans - the inclusion of an appendix on this specific matter would not result in any material conflict. Here, the policy fails the advice in PPG 12 (paragraph 3.17) as it appears, at paragraph 09.28, to delegate planning decisions to a Planning Control Policy Note on car parking. It has not been the subject of public scrutiny through statutory

procedures. The addition of the standards as an appendix through a modification to the plan would introduce them to the development plan process. Further, the review process would allow flexibility to accommodate changing circumstances. **(Objections 617 and 2380)**

- 9.23 This objection was largely based on PPG13 (1994) and Draft PPG13 - both superseded. On the basis of the modification I recommend (Objections 617 and 2380 above), it would be for the Council to consider the level of detail appropriate to include as an appendix to the plan. The specific requirements of developers would need to be assessed against it. **(Objection 1158)**
- 9.24 At Second Deposit, the Council changed paragraph 09.28 on its last 2 lines from “will be resisted” to “will not be permitted”. This reflects sound development plan practice. **(Objections 1663 and 2420)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.25 Modify the plan in response to Objections 617 and 2380. Add a new appendix to the plan indicating the Council’s maximum car parking standards. Refer to it in the reasoned justification, thereby removing the need for a reference to the Council’s Planning Control Policy Note.
- 9.26 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1158, 1663 and 2420

POLICY A8 (A10)

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
619	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
2247	Government Office for the North West	No
2381	The House Builders Federation	No

Summary of the Objections

- Both the First and Second Deposit versions do not reflect paragraph 3.1 to PPG 12. It lacks clarity, not least through the use of undefined phrases such as “major development” and “should have regard to”. It does not indicate to developers the tests required to be met. **(Objections 619, 2247 and 2381)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

9.27 PPG13 variously uses the words “major” and “large” as they apply to developments - properly not specified in detail. It is for the decision-maker to interpret them in the light of the specific circumstances of a proposal. The policy places a requirement upon a developer for a proposal to meet the Council’s “locational criteria” - not defined in the UDP, but H3, E3 and S4 being relevant I am told by the Council. 2 matters here. Firstly, I support - overall - the Council’s approach to generally concentrate development within the urban area, subject to other recommendations in my Report. The thrust of the policy appears to me to reflect the broad intent of paragraph 20 to PPG13. Nonetheless,

while I am prepared to accept the Council’s reference to its locational criteria, the reasoned justification - through a modification - should establish what they are, primarily reflecting paragraph 20 to PPG13. Secondly, the Second Deposit policy includes a reference to Policies A7 and A12. It is far from clear whether these are the correct references. This now appears to be clarified by Proposed Change No PC24, referring to A5 and A10. While I do not, generally, support extensive cross-referencing within a policy, any such intent should be within the reasoned justification. I shall recommend a clearer rewording of the policy indicating the type of development that would be permitted. Here, clarity would be assisted by a heading to the policy - “Major Development” being acceptable. **(Objections 619, 2247 and 2381)**

RECOMMENDATION

- 9.28 Modify the plan in response to my overall assessment of Objections 619, 2247 and 2381:
- (a) add a heading to paragraph 09.31: “Major Development”
 - (b) delete paragraph 09.31 and substitute: “09.31 A8. The Council will permit major development proposals that reflect the plan’s locational criteria and which have taken into account:”
 - (c) reflecting paragraph 9.27 above, the reasoned justification should specify the relevant locational criteria.
 - (d) reflecting paragraph 9.27 above, the reasoned justification should confirm any cross - referencing to A5 and A10 and the basis for it, consistent with PC24.

POLICY A10 (A12): TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AND CALMING

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1057	LA21 Transport Working Group	No
1664	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy should stress road safety objectives and reduce traffic impacts in older residential areas - including speed reductions (to a maximum of 20mph) - to ensure the safety of children, particularly around schools and through the development of home zones. **(Objections 1057 and 1664)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

9.29 The general aspirations of the objectors for potential speed reductions in residential areas are reasonably reflected in the reasoned justification to the policy at paragraphs 09.38 and 09.39 at Second Deposit. **(Objections 1057 and 1664)**

RECOMMENDATION

9.30 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1057 and 1664.

INSPECTOR’S FURTHER COMMENTS ON THE POLICY

9.31 Although not the subject of objection, the structure of the policy at Second Deposit requires - in my view - further consideration by the Council. The first paragraph of 09.37 has 2 elements. The first sentence appears to give guidance on the priority to be given to cyclists, pedestrians and public transport - against the private motorist. The second sentence introduces design criteria for highway proposals associated with new development. Here, I make no further comment on the merits, or otherwise, of either. Nonetheless, the Council should reconsider the structure of the policy, not least whether the 2 elements should be separated into 2 policies, both worded positively rather than negatively. Uncertain and/or onerous phrases (“encouragement”, “improvement”, and “enhancement”) should be deleted.

POLICY A13 (DELETED AT SECOND DEPOSIT): PUBLIC TRANSPORT

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1716	Mr D Southworth	No
1766	Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	Yes

Summary of Objections

- There should be a sequential approach to development in order to safeguard greenfield sites. The Council is too eager to permit development, a more cautious approach being necessary, with greater attention to traffic assessments. **(Objection 1716)**
- The policy does not reflect national guidance. Developments that attract a lot of people should be encouraged to locate within town centres reflecting Revised PPG6. **(Objection 1766) (conditionally withdrawn)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

9.32 The intent of this First Deposit policy was far from clear - not least the relationship between, and purposes of, its 2 sentences. The Council’s evidence is that the policy intention within this deleted policy, sustainable development, is covered by other policies at Second Deposit. I generally agree, subject to my other conclusions on the plan. **(Objections 1716 and 1766)**

RECOMMENDATION

9.33 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1716 and 1766

POLICY A11 (A14)

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
35	L Gallagher	No
1767	Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	Yes
2218	GMPTE	No
2299	Mr A Riley	No

Summary of Objections

- New bus facilities and services associated with new developments should not lead to the diversion or replacement of services, or changes in bus frequency elsewhere. The provision of public transport to serve new development should be additional to the existing bus service network. **(Objections 35 and 2299)**
- The policy is too permissive. Its first sentence should encourage new development. **(Objection 1767) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- The term “locational criteria” is not fully explained and, therefore, the policy is unclear. This is also the case with Policy A12. **(Objection 2218)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 9.34 To begin, and on an advisory basis, the policy is in 2 parts. The first attempts to indicate the type of development that would be permitted, the second that which would not be permitted. I doubt the necessity of the latter. Next, I have dealt with the policy reference to “locational criteria” at paragraph 9.27 above. The same considerations apply to this policy.
- 9.35 Turning, then to Objections 35 and 2299 - any additional services would be likely to be the responsibility of another agency(s) and the UDP cannot require action by it (them). **(Objections 35 and 2299)**
- 9.36 The objector’s suggested use of the word “encourage” implies an aim rather than a statement of planning policy. **(Objection 1767)**
- 9.37 Consistent with paragraph 9.27 above, the plan should specify the Council’s “locational criteria”. **(Objection 2218)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.38 The Council is advised to modify the plan, both on an advisory basis and also in response to Objection 2218:
- (a) delete paragraph 09.43 and substitute: “09.43 A11. The Council will permit development proposals, which reflect the Council’s locational criteria, that improve bus facilities and services or give the bus increasing priority over the private car.”
 - (b) reflecting paragraph 9.27 above, the reasoned justification should specify the relevant locational criteria.
- 9.39 No change to the plan in response to Objections 35, 1767 and 2299.

POLICY A12 (A15)

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
622	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1706	Mr D Southworth	No
1058	LA21 Transport Working Group	No

Summary of Objections

- This policy is worded as a statement of the Council's intent. It does not make clear what is required and what will be permitted in terms of development proposals. **(Objection 622)**
- The Council is too eager to encourage and permit development, requiring a more cautious approach with increased emphasis on traffic assessments. **(Objection 1706)**
- Cycle/rail interchange facilities should be referred to as most of the population of the Borough is within easy reach of a station. **(Objection 1058)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 9.40 The use of the word “encourage” represents an aim rather than a statement of planing policy. As at paragraph 9.27 above, the reasoned justification should specify the relevant locational criteria. Again, partly on an advisory basis, the policy needs to be clarified. **(Objection 622)**
- 9.41 Developers, and others with an interest in land and/or buildings, have a right to submit development proposals to be assessed against the requirements of the statutory planning system. All have to be fairly assessed. A development plan should indicate the type of development that would be permitted. This, generally, the policy seeks to establish. I have dealt with this objector’s concern on traffic assessments at paragraph 9.4 of my Report. **(Objection 1706)**
- 9.42 The reasoned justification at paragraph 09.46 at Second Deposit has acceptably addressed this objection. **(Objection 1058)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.43 The Council is advised to modify the plan, both on an advisory basis and also in response to Objection 622:
- delete paragraph 09.45 and substitute: “09.45 A12. The Council will permit development proposals that reflect the plan’s locational criteria and would improve the quality of the waiting environment, and the range of facilities for passengers at existing public transport terminals and interchange facilities.”
 - reflecting paragraph 9.27, the reasoned justification should specify the relevant locational criteria.
- 9.44 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1706 and 1058.

POLICY A13 (A16)

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
623	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1436	Railtrack Plc	No
1690	Mr J Parkin	No
1806	SWAN	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy should indicate the circumstances that would result in planning permission being granted, as well as the criteria the Council would use to judge the acceptability of development in planning terms. **(Objection 623)**
- Rail freight will always have an impact on the surrounding environment through noise and vibration. The main considerations should relate, however, to the wider environmental benefits of carrying freight by rail. The final sentence of the reasoned justification is unhelpful as it would appear to place passenger and freight transport in opposition. Both should be encouraged. **(Objection 1436)**
- Access to stations by walking and cycling should be encouraged, with an indication of the developments that would not be permitted. An objective supporting pedestrian and cycling access should be included together with enhancement of rail services from the north-east of the Borough to the west. **(Objection 1690)**
- For a new station at Dobb Brow, land will be needed to provide a car park and Daisy Hill station is only a short distance away. The station would be located on the outskirts of Westhoughton, serving fewer houses than a central location. The station would generate traffic onto an already busy road. It is not required. **(Objection 1806)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

9.45 The policy has been substantially rewritten at Second Deposit. Through Objection 623, I deal with the generality of the policy - not least the circumstances in which planing permission would be granted where the Council is able to do so. The first part of paragraph 09.48 contains the word “encourage”, an aim rather than a statement of planning policy. Similarly, the policy indicates to me that matters (a) to (d) are, effectively, objectives. While the intent of the policy reflects overall national policy, it should indicate the type of development that would be permitted. In my opinion, (a) to (d) should form part of the reasoned justification where the Council’s reasonable aspirations would be recorded, with the policy reworded. The last sentence of the policy is not necessary. On this policy, I see no need for a list of criteria against which proposals would be judged. **(Objection 623)**

9.46 The first part of paragraph 09.51 (“The movement of freight by rail will be encouraged...”) effectively restates matter (d) of the policy statement. The Council does not have powers through a development plan to add, or prevent, additional freight paths being inserted into a line already used by passenger rail services. This is the

responsibility of other agencies. Whether consultation takes place is a matter for them. The objector is correct in relating its concern to new rail-freight facilities that may require planning permission, acknowledging local concern. The general intent of its suggested wording has merit and I shall recommend an appropriate modification to the plan. **(Objection 1436)**

- 9.47 The objector seeks additional policy objective(s). They are inappropriate in a development plan policy. In response to Objection 623, I am recommending to the Council a modification indicating the type of development that would be permitted. The enhancement of rail services cannot be required by the UDP. Appropriate pedestrian and cycling access to development is intended by other plan policies. **(Objection 1690)**
- 9.48 1806 objects to an indicative allocation on the Proposals Map for a new railway station at Dobb Brow. I have assessed the evidence before me at the Hearing session. In my view, the station would reflect the general intentions of PPG13. In particular, it would assist in making the fullest use of public transport (paragraph 6); contribute to the accessibility by public transport of jobs, shopping, leisure and services at both a local and sub-regional level (19); would reflect the Local Transport Plan for Greater Manchester (20); identifies a site that would be likely to widen choice for public transport passengers (48); as well as improving the potential for rail travel (74). All these matters weigh heavily in favour of the proposal and were not substantially contested by the objector. It argued a limited catchment area, together with some duplication of the service provided by Daisy Hill station - some distance to the east. I acknowledge that the catchment area population would be likely to be smaller than that at Daisy Hill and there would be some diversion of usage there, together with a limited extension of journey times outward from the conurbation. Nonetheless, my clear balance of judgement is that a station would be likely to effect an increased use of public transport and its principle should be supported.
- 9.49 Concern over the car parking implications of any proposal is not, on the basis of the evidence I heard, justified. The Council indicated at the Hearing that it did not intend to establish a major "park and ride" facility at the site, provision being made for around 25 cars, Policy A14 of the plan being available to assess park and ride facilities. Concern that parking facilities would extend either onto either Green Belt land to the west of the indicative allocation or onto recreational land about St George's School would be unlikely - other policies of the UDP ensuring sufficient control - a prospect generally accepted by the objector at the Hearing.
- 9.50 On the basis of my visit, the vicinity of the proposal would be likely to be able to accommodate the level of parking intended, that being the subject of a specific proposal - as would any access to Wigan Road. While the Council told me that further study was necessary, my site visit satisfied me that an acceptable access would be likely to be achieved. The indicative allocation on the Proposals Map for a new railway station at Dobb Brow is acceptable. **(Objection 1806)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.51 Modify the plan in response to Objection 623: delete paragraph 09.48 and substitute the following:
- "09.48 A13. The Council will permit development proposals that increase rail investment in the Borough". The Council's aspirations embodied in (a) to (d) and the last sentence of paragraph 09.48 should be included within the reasoned justification.

9.52 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1436: delete paragraph 09.51 and substitute the following:

“New rail-freight facilities are supported in principle. They can only be located where existing rail infrastructure is in place. The specific circumstances of any development proposal arising would need to be assessed - including any adverse effect on the environment, as well as the living conditions of nearby residents”.

9.53 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1690.

9.54 No further change to the plan in response to Objection 1806

POLICY A14 (A17)

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
624	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1707	Mr D Southworth	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy should indicate the circumstances in which planning permission would be granted for any development, as well as the criteria the Council would use. **(Objection 624)**
- The Council is too eager to encourage and permit development, requiring a more cautious approach with increased emphasis on traffic assessments. **(Objection 1707)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

9.55 The principle of the provision of “park and ride” facilities reflects PPG13 at paragraphs 59 to 63 - not least as they can support more sustainable travel patterns. While the wording of the policy at Second Deposit has been improved through a criteria-based approach, further clarification of it is necessary reflecting Objection 624. To begin, the use of the word “supported” in the first part of paragraph 09.52 does not represent a statement of planning policy, rather an aim. The policy should indicate the type of development that the Council would permit when it can do so. Here, matters (i) to (iv) of the policy are reasonable planning considerations but they, together with the first part of paragraph 09.52, need to be reworded to achieve the clarity sought by 624. The reasoned justification at paragraph 09.53 should also be amplified to further explain the Council’s approach. **(Objection 624)**

9.56 Developers, and others with an interest in land and/or buildings, have a right to submit development proposals to be assessed against the requirements of the statutory planning system. All have to be fairly assessed. A development plan should indicate the type of development that would be permitted. This, generally, the policy seeks to establish. I have dealt with traffic assessments at paragraph 9.4 above on Objection 1704. **(Objection 1707)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

9.57 Modify the plan in response to Objection 624:

- (a) delete paragraph 09.52 and substitute: “09.52 A14. The Council will permit development proposals for Park and Ride facilities subject to:
 - (i) the accessibility of the site by existing or new public transport services;
 - (ii) the proposal resulting in a reduction in vehicle trips by private car on the wider road network;
 - (iii) an assessment of traffic levels and road safety on the road network adjacent to a proposed site;
 - (iv) the effect of a proposal on the local environment and the living conditions of nearby residents.”
- (b) expand the reasoned justification to reflect the last sentence of paragraph 9.55 above.

9.58 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1707.

POLICY A16 (A19): PEDESTRIANS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
626	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
2248	Government Office for the North West	No
1665	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No

Summary of Objections

- At First Deposit, the policy should provide a more appropriate basis for decisions. At Second Deposit, the policy represents a statement of the Council’s intent and should indicate the type of development that would be permitted. **(Objections 626 and 2248)**
- The policy needs strengthening with reference to the Council's own walking strategy in the reasoned justification. The aesthetics of pedestrian routes is also an important consideration. **(Objection 1665)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

9.59 The policy has been amended, substantially, at Second Deposit. Its overall intention reflects advice in PPG13, matters (i) to (vi) representing valid land-use considerations. On Objection 2248, the policy should indicate the type of development that would be permitted. Further, the 6 means of improving the pedestrian environment set out in paragraph 09.56 include phrases relating to development that are unclear, indicating uncertainty in the plan process - “appropriate locations” (i), “sensitive areas” (ii), “as appropriate” (iii), and “inappropriate diversion” (v). The reasoned justification is of limited assistance. The intention of the policy should be clear and I shall recommend an

appropriate modification. Any off-site provision would be subject to the tests of national planning guidance. The reasoned justification would then amplify the Council's policy intention. **(Objections 626 and 2248)**

9.60 I note the Council's position on the strategic network of primary pedestrian routes. The needs of pedestrians would be acceptably met by the modification to the plan that I shall recommend. The reasoned justification at paragraph 09.58 fairly addresses route aesthetics. **(Objection 1665)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

9.61 Modify the plan in response to my overall assessment of Objections 626 and 2248: delete paragraph 09.56 and substitute:

- (a) "09.56 A16. The Council will permit development proposals that improve the environment for pedestrians. Considerations in the assessment of proposals will be:
- (i) the reallocation of road space for pedestrians;
 - (ii) traffic calming and management;
 - (iii) the provision of new, or the improvement of existing, pedestrian facilities as part of the development;
 - (iv) the impact of new development on all highway users, including pedestrians;
 - (v) the protection of pedestrian rights of way from closure or diversion arising from new development; and
 - (vi) the identification of safer pedestrian routes between important origins and destinations."
- (b) the reasoned justification at paragraphs 09.57 to 09.62 should be amplified to reflect paragraph 9.59 above.

9.62 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1665

POLICY A17 (A20): CYCLISTS

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
2259	McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd	No

Summary of Objection

- The policy is unduly onerous and inflexible. Developments such as sheltered housing for the elderly and nursing homes do not generate a need for cycle parking. **(Objection 2259)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

- 9.63 To begin, the structure and the content of this policy largely reflects A16 (A19) - that for pedestrians - and generally repeating my concern. I have, therefore, similar difficulties as reported above, not least as it does not relate to development proposals and, again, includes words that indicate uncertainty. Although Objector 2259 does not address the structure and overall wording of the policy, the Council is advised to consider modifying the policy on the basis of my recommendation below. It would clarify its intent.
- 9.64 The intention of the policy is to improve cycling provision to increase the use of this mode of transport. It is consistent with PPG13. While few occupants of sheltered accommodation or nursing homes would be likely to use cycles, such developments would generate trips by visitors and staff. I see no reason why provision for those needs should not be reflected in the policy, to encourage use - including secure parking. On this objection therefore, taking into account the clear intention of national planning guidance, the policy should seek to implement it. Any off-site provision would need to meet the tests of national guidance. Although the Council brings forward Proposed Change No PC25 to the reasoned justification, it is in response to Objections 538 and 1688 that address a different issue, that I have dealt with at paragraph 14.24 of my Report. (**Objection 2259**)

RECOMMENDATION

- 9.65 Reflecting paragraph 9.63 above, modify the plan as follows: delete paragraph 09.63 and substitute:
- “09.63 A17. The Council will permit development proposals that improve the environment for cyclists by:
- (i) reallocating road space;
 - (ii) providing for cyclists, including secure cycle parking;
 - (iii) safeguarding existing cycle routes;
 - (iv) assessing the effect of development proposals on cyclists;
 - (v) implementing a cycle route network, reflecting the Council’s cycling strategy.”
- 9.66 No further change to the plan in response to Objection 2259

POLICY A19 (A22): ROAD SCHEMES/IMPROVEMENTS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1573	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
1708	Mr D Southworth	No

Summary of Objections

- Policy A19 is contrary to national planning guidance. Specific proposals should be indicated on the Proposals Map and not by reference to a non-statutory document - The Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan (GMLTP). **(Objection 1573)**
- The Council is too eager to permit development, requiring a more cautious approach with increased emphasis on traffic assessments, **(Objection 1708)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 9.67 Overall, the general thrust of this policy is acceptable. It seeks to prevent development that would prejudice highway schemes necessary for an integrated transport strategy - in essence, a development control tool to implement an accepted strategic approach to development. Reasonably, highway schemes are necessary to achieve that end. Over the period of the plan, there would be likely to be a significant number - some small in scale, and also necessary to address local difficulties. Bearing in mind the intention of the policy, I share the view of the Council that it would be impractical to show them all on the Proposals Map. Here, PPG 12 stresses the need for the Local Transport Plan and the UDP to be consistent (paragraph 5.8). The objector does not argue that this is not the case. Nonetheless, the policy with its reasoned justification indicates - in my opinion - that development decisions would, effectively, be delegated to the GMLTP. It has not been subject to the same public scrutiny, under statutory procedures, as the UDP. I shall, however, support its generality - subject to a modification that reflects the objection, providing clarity and is positively worded. The reasoned justification should further record, and explain, the link between the UDP and the Local Transport Plan. **(Objection 1573)**
- 9.68 Developers, and others with an interest in land and/or buildings, have a right to submit development proposals to be assessed against the requirements of the statutory planning system. All have to be fairly assessed. A development plan should indicate the type of development that would be permitted. This, generally, the policy seeks to establish. I have dealt with the objector's views on traffic assessments in response to Objection 1704 at paragraph 9.4. **(Objection 1708)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.69 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1573:
- (a) delete paragraph 09.72 and substitute: "09.72 A19. The Council will permit development proposals that would not prejudice the construction of roads, road improvement schemes and junction improvements that form part of an integrated transport strategy."
 - (b) amplify paragraph 09.74 to explain the link between the UDP and the Local Transport Plan as it relates to an integrated transport strategy.
 - (c) at paragraph 09.74: delete the words: "or are identified as necessary in the Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan,".
 - (d) At the end of paragraph 09.74 add the following sentence: "A material consideration in the assessment of development proposals to be assessed under this policy will be the provisions of the Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan".
- 9.70 No further change to the plan in response to Objection 1708.

POLICY A20 (A23)

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
37	L Gallagher	No
1666	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
1686	Mr J Parkin	No
629	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1053	LA21 Transport Working Group	No
1196	Council for the Protection of Rural England	No

Summary of Objections

- The A5225 Wigan/Hindley/Westhoughton bypass has been withdrawn from the national trunk road programme. It has little support in either the Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan or Regional Planning Guidance (RPG). Its presence in the plan would detract from a proper consideration of other traffic management opportunities, would reduce the potential for railway use and increase car usage. It would result in the development of adjacent land. **(Objections 37, 629, 1053, 1196 , 1666 and 1686)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

9.71 Neither the policy and its reasoned justification nor the Council's evidence establish a convincing justification for the inclusion of this policy within the plan. Here, paragraph 09.77 indicates that funding options have yet to be explored or research undertaken into alternative solutions. That, in my opinion, is a clear indication of substantial uncertainty. I have no persuasive evidence from the Council to contradict objector concern that the designation on the Proposals Map does not reflect RPG. Further advice is given in PPG 12 at paragraphs 5.22 and 5.23. It is far from clear whether the alignment represents the "precise route" referred to in the guidance. I do not consider the scheme to be "sufficiently advanced". The Council is not, in my view, being realistic over the prospect of the scheme starting within the plan period. There is insufficient basis to justify a safeguarding policy and inclusion on the Proposals Map, not least as I am not persuaded from the evidence before me that the scheme would widen transport choices. An elaboration of the reasoned justification to the policy would not overcome my concern. As the policy has not been justified, I cannot Report on any alleged development/transport implications of the route. I note that the Proposals Map indicates that the A5225 project passes through other local authority land. While I am not told of any intentions there, that does not provide a justification for the policy in this development plan. **(Objections 37, 629, 1053, 1196, 1666 and 1686)**

RECOMMENDATION

9.72 Modify the plan in response to Objections 37, 629, 1053, 1196, 1666 and 1686: delete paragraphs 09.76 and 09.77. Delete from the Proposals Map the designation indicating the protected route of the A5225

POLICY A22 (A25): IMPLEMENTATION

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1667	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No

Summary of Objection

- The policy allows for non-sustainable development through paragraph 09.82 of the reasoned justification. It should be deleted. **(Objection 1667)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

9.73 The objector has not disputed the general thrust of the policy that addresses planning obligations. The disputed paragraph fairly records that circumstances may justify the location of development in areas away from public transport nodes. The Council should reconsider, however, the use of the words “general presumption” and “exceptional” in paragraph 09.82. The former is not reflected, generally, in the planning system while the latter indicates uncertainty. **(Objection 1667)**

RECOMMENDATION

9.74 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1667, but the Council is advised to consider a further modification to the plan at paragraph 09.82 to reflect paragraph 9.73 above.

OMISSIONS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1161	General Aviation Awareness Council	No
1054	LA21 Transport Working Group	No
1055	LA21 Transport Working Group	No
1056	LA21 Transport Working Group	No

Summary of Objections

- The plan should include a policy on general aviation. **(Objection 1161)**
- Efficient interchange between modes should be encouraged. **(Objection 1054)**
- The plan should refer to the potential expansion of light goods vehicles (lgvs) and van movements associated with expanding, information technology-based retailing and business opportunities. **(Objection 1055)**

- Staff as well as student movements should be included in Green Travel Plans for schools. **(Objection 1056)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 9.75 The objection refers to a now cancelled version of PPG13. While the current version of PPG13 at Annex B indicates that local planning authorities should consider the role of small airports and airfields, the Council argues that there are no significant flying sites within the Borough - not contested by the objector. Proposals may, however, arise. While I have considered development plan experience elsewhere, my balance of judgement is to share the view of the Council. They would not be precluded, subject to the tests of other policies of the plan - taking into account its themes and objectives. **(Objection 1161)**
- 9.76 The Council considers, generally, that the objection is met by the reference in Policy A1 to an integrated transport system, an outcome being to encourage better interchange between modes. Objector and Council appear to me to have the same objective. While, as the Council argues, A1 is a “theme” policy, it should reasonably include those matters relevant to it. Here, Chapter 3 of PPG13 “Managing Travel Demand”, indicates at paragraph 48 the importance that government places on the integration of different modes of transport. This, in my opinion, is particularly relevant to a Metropolitan authority. Policy A1 would be the appropriate place to include modal interchange, at both paragraphs 02.07 and 09.01. **(Objection 1054)**
- 9.77 Over the period of the UDP, there would be likely to be an increase in lgv deliveries as a result of home and technology-based activities. It is not the function of the planning system to discourage them. Development proposals would need to be assessed within that context. Here, the third bullet point to paragraph 88 of PPG13 (albeit within a context of Travel Plans) indicates that home delivery services - as well as environmentally friendly delivery and freight movements - can contribute to sustainable transport objectives. The plan should reflect that. While, in my view, a new policy is not justified - an appropriate reference should be made in the reasoned justification to Policy A2. **(Objection 1055)**
- 9.78 The Council has recorded 1056 as an omission. Nonetheless, paragraph 09.16 fairly records the relevance of Travel Plans to expanding schools. This, together with the policy itself, would reasonably include staff as well as student movements. I note, however, that paragraph 09.14 includes a reference to Draft PPG13, now replaced. The Council should delete it. **(Objection 1056)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 9.79 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1054: at paragraphs 02.07 and 09.01 following the word “system”, add the following: “, including modal interchange.” - this additional to the recommendation at paragraph 9.6.
- 9.80 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1055: at paragraphs 09.10 to 09.12 (Policy A2), add a reference to reflect the third bullet point to paragraph 88 of PPG13.
- 9.81 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1161 and 1056 but, on the latter, the Council should consider my comment at paragraph 9.78 above.

CHAPTER 10 - HOUSING

INSPECTOR'S OVERVIEW OF POLICIES H1 AND H2

Inspector's Note: In this overview, I have considered all objections to the 2 policies, as well as the representations made at the Round Table Session (RTS) by objectors and Council. Individual objections are listed at the tables at the beginning of each policy, are summarized there - with the relevant conclusions and recommendations cross-referenced to this overview.

- 10.1 I reopened the RTS on Policies H1 and H2 in the light of the Secretary of State's Proposed Changes (SoSPC) to Draft Regional Planning Guidance. I have carefully considered all the evidence submitted to the RTS. The final version of Regional Planning Guidance (RPG) has been issued. It confirms an annualized building rate, net of clearance, from April 2002 to 2006 and beyond, subject to any review of the guidance. At the reopened RTSs, participants generally supported this as the appropriate way to proceed. I agree. It results in an annual average rate of housing provision in Bolton of 450 houses, net of clearance, as in the SoSPC. The Council, here, took the view that the plan - when adopted - should reflect RPG, consistent with PPGs 3, 11 and 12. That fairly deals with First Deposit concern that there was little basis for the figure in H1. That moves me forward to the next matter.

The "Urban Area"

- 10.2 Neither, the Second Deposit version nor, the Proposals Map, specifically define the "urban area" referred to in Policy H1. The Second Deposit version does, however, define countryside - this comprising the Green Belt, as well as Other Protected Open Land (OPOL) that may be required for future development - but not before 2011 and not without a further review of the UDP (paragraphs 03.02 and 03.07 at Second Deposit). It is reasonable for me to consider the urban area, generally, as that land remaining. Nonetheless, the lack of definition of the "urban area" is a failing of the UDP that I have addressed at paragraph 3.22 of my Report.

Assessment of Housing Provision in the Plan

- 10.3 To begin and recap, the resumed RTS session generally supported an annual building rate of 450 dwellings per annum over the remainder of the plan period from April 2002 to March 2011. I support that approach. It leads to a requirement of 4050 dwellings from April 2002. This is, however, net of clearance. Here, the clearance rate was the subject of dispute between the Council and a number of objectors. The Council's position was that provision should be made for clearance at a rate of 20 dwellings (public and private) per annum, this - I note - within an agreed context of the substandard quality of much of the Borough's housing stock. The Council's approach, I was told, would properly reflect the likely availability of resources; that Bolton had not been designated as a "pathfinder" authority; and that likely new arrangements for the administration of its housing stock would delay action. Here, I do consider it appropriate for the Council to take into account its view of the likely level of resources available.

- 10.4 Nonetheless, the Council's case was less than convincing, not least as one objector submitted evidence at the RTS (RTS/26) that a relevant Council department expected a significant increase in public sector and private clearance over the next 5 years. It would result in at least 500 dwellings being lost from the housing stock. This would prejudice the UDP's reliance on windfalls. Whether that expectation and intention bear fruit is, in my view, still a matter of conjecture. Nonetheless, I do consider that the Council has underestimated the likely level of clearance. Taking into account all the evidence on this matter, my balance of judgement is that the plan should make provision for an increased annual clearance rate of 50 dwellings per annum in the period from April 2002 to March 2011. This would, partly, reflect a likely increased Council impetus in the latter years of the plan, while acknowledging that the Council's good intentions may not result in total.
- 10.5 I can deal with completions briefly. In the light of the First Secretary of State's approach to RPG (an annualized building rate post 2002), they have little relevance, a view shared by participants at the RTS. The Council's figure of large sites with planning permission at the end of March 2002 (around 1450 dwellings after slippage) represents a reasonable basis on which to proceed - here taking into account the likelihood of some element of double counting. To summarize so far, therefore, the UDP should make provision for a RPG requirement from April 2002 to March 2001 of about 4050 dwellings. Adding an allowance for clearance (450), provision should amount to 4500 dwellings - less those outstanding large sites with planning permission. This should be expressed as an annualized building rate. At Second Deposit, and in its Proposed Changes (PC44 and PC45), the Council expects the requirement to be met through a major windfall contribution.

Windfalls and other Elements of National Planning Guidance

- 10.6 Neither, the Second Deposit version nor, the Council's Proposed Changes provide for allocations, windfalls being expected to meet much of the requirement. This general approach was opposed in 2 main respects - it conflicted with various elements of national planning guidance, while windfalls in Bolton would be insufficient. Here, is a UDP at Second Deposit that - primarily through the absence of allocations - seeks to concentrate required development within the urban area with a major contribution by windfalls. As a matter of principle, I do not find that approach unacceptable, reflecting much of the general approach in PPGs 1, 3 and 13. There, for example: the focus for additional housing should be existing towns; priority should be given to re-using previously-developed land within urban areas; more sustainable forms of development should be encouraged; while, at the local level, there should be accessibility to jobs and services by other than the private car. The Council's approach reflects them in these respects.
- 10.7 Against that, there was substantial objector concern that the plan conflicted with national planning guidance - primarily in PPG 3, all of which I have taken into account. Here, generally, the argued emphasis on windfalls gives little clear guidance on the location of new development; it does not identify sites for the managed release of housing (after making a reasonable allowance for windfalls) over the plan period; and would not provide a choice of sites. The reliance on windfalls is not based on an Urban Capacity Study (UCS), that submitted to the RTS by a number of objectors coming, in their view, to a decidedly different conclusion.
- 10.8 Let me deal with these matters. The plan does not, in my opinion, reflect the general intention of PPG 3 on the matters raised by the objectors. While a "windfall" approach may be acceptable, the clear intention of national planning guidance is that it should be substantiated. Both PPG 3 and "Planning to deliver" indicate that windfall sites will be

an important source of supply in many areas. They can, however, complicate the managed release of sites, a UCS helping to reduce the uncertainty that reliance on windfalls can create. On this UDP, I agree - there being an over reliance on windfalls rather than allocations. The evidence of the Council did not persuasively contest the general conclusion of the UCS, submitted by a number of objectors, that the windfall allowance in the plan would not meet the Council's expectations.

- 10.9 In response, the Council questioned the approach of the submitted UCS - not least, assumptions more applicable to other parts of the country. The UCS is, in my view, sufficiently robust - fairly reflecting "Tapping the potential". In the light of that, the Council's past-trends approach to windfalls needs to be viewed with a substantial degree of caution. Here, for example, an objector argued persuasively that the past intensification of development in certain parts of the Borough would be unlikely to continue at that rate into the future, there being little remaining potential for it. Fairly, however, the Council argued that recent completions confirmed its windfall estimate, including the development of previously-developed land. While the Council also argued that there has been a history of over-provision in Bolton, there can be no guarantee that either of those scenarios would continue into the future, not least in the light of the submitted UCS. I do, however, share the view of the Council that the plan should guard against over-provision and that an UCS should not be taken as implying a finite capacity for an area. Generally, in my experience, the development industry continues to identify sites. These matters do not substantially affect my conclusion. Having carefully considered all the evidence before me, I come to the view that the UCS submitted to the RTS should be given substantial weight, subject to a limited increase in the windfall contribution based on the Council's arguments. That, results in a shortfall in supply of about 1200 dwellings. While that is towards the bottom of the range before me submitted by objectors, I consider it to be realistic and reflects the need to be cautious in the allocation of land for housing in the Borough

Location of the Shortfall

- 10.10 As I have identified a likely shortfall in housing supply that needs to be provided in the plan, at around 1200 dwellings, I now turn to where it should be located and, then, the period when it should be made available. As set out in Chapter 4 of my Report, I confirm the Green Belt boundaries established in the adopted plan and carried forward into the UDP, reflecting PPG2 (Revised) and RPG.
- 10.11 RTS/19 indicates the objector criteria that should be used to identify the suitability of sites for additional housing allocations, agreed by participants at the RTS - other than RTS/18 requested additional considerations at PPGs 3 and 13. They all reflect, generally, the approach in them and are reasonable. Turning to sites within the urban area, it was not in dispute at the RTS that allocated First Deposit housing sites deleted at Second Deposit, without status, offered limited potential. This would not meet the supply necessary over the period of the plan.
- 10.12 While the Council would have available its knowledge of the urban area(s) and the UCS in its assessment of potential allocations, I need to consider urban extensions. The Council, at both RTSs and Inquiry sessions, did not express a view on the merits - or otherwise - of any or, a preferred location should such land be required to be identified. In addition to the main urban area of Bolton, the Metropolitan Borough comprises a number of what I reasonably consider to be relatively "free-standing" urban areas - Westhoughton, Horwich, Blackrod and Little Lever, and with countryside adjacent.

- 10.13 Taking into account the constraints imposed by the Green Belt, I need to consider OPOL defined under Policy R2. It has a general presence about the urban area(s) of the Borough. The Council indicates that some could be appropriate for development, but not before 2011 and a further review of the UDP. I have come to a different assessment. Here, I have no reason to doubt that the objection sites there are generally available for development - albeit there would be a likely need for infrastructure investment to take place to allow them to make a contribution to housing supply. A comparative assessment of strategic locations for new housing development is required. A number of objectors did submit such assessments, and contradictory, all of which I have taken into account. RTS 18/19, together with national planning guidance would enable the Council to reach conclusions as part of the plan process. As I was told at the Inquiry, there can be no certainty where occupants of new housing development would work, that being beyond the control of the planning system. Nonetheless, in my view, an important factor would be the location of potential sites in relation to services, at varying levels, that would reduce the need to travel - consistent with the plan's broadly sustainable approach.
- 10.14 Further, I see no need for one site to be allocated to meet the shortfall that I have identified. It may be likely that a combination of allocated land at more than one location would appropriately meet the requirement. That is a matter for the Council to establish, taking into account the search criteria. Here, I have considered making recommendations on specific objection sites. There is, however, a major failing of the UDP on the supply of land for housing. Not least, in the interests of fairness to objectors, this is a matter for the Council to address and be tested.

“Caution”

- 10.15 The Council stressed the need to concentrate development in the urban area - substantially based on windfalls, to avoid the use of greenfield sites. While I have come to the view that additional housing land needs to be allocated - caution should, indeed, be exercised in that process. The overall approach of the Council is consistent with the need for the continued regeneration of the urban areas of the Borough. Excessive areas of additional land allocated for housing should be avoided. Nonetheless, RPG and national planning guidance should be balanced, objectors arguing for allocations. This I have done, and conclude that the additional land that I consider would be necessary would be the way for the plan to proceed.

Phasing

- 10.16 Objectors at the RTS supported it, as a matter of principle, largely based on the need for additional land for housing to be identified. The Council took the opposite view reflecting its windfall approach, phasing not being necessary. I consider allocation(s) to be justified. Both PPG 3 and “Planning to deliver” emphasize that the “plan, monitor and manage” approach requires the managed release of housing sites. I agree, on this plan, as it would safeguard against what I consider to be unrealistic windfall assumptions. The phasing requirements before me at the RTS from objectors had a number of forms. They generally pre-date RPG, that establishes a 2002 base date for the plan. 9 years remain for the UDP. The windfall contribution would be likely to decrease over the latter years of the plan. My judgement is that windfalls, in the 4 years up to 2006 - together with the contribution made by large sites with planning permission - would, reasonably, be likely to make a major contribution to the annualized rate required by RPG. Thereafter, a contribution would be necessary from allocations. This would need to be monitored. The Council considered that a review of the plan, around 2006, would be able to resolve any shortfall. I am not impressed. That would take some time to achieve, while there would be likely to be some time before any allocated sites would

make a contribution to housing supply. There would be uncertainty in the development control process.

Monitoring

- 10.17 As I propose, therefore, to recommend additional housing allocation in the last 5 years of the plan, there will be a need for the plan to include monitoring arrangements, reflecting the “plan, monitor and manage” approach embodied in PPG 3. Before me is RTS/17, generally supported by objectors at the RTS, that supports an additional policy in the plan. Its principles are acceptable.

Conclusions on my Overview of H1 and H2.

- 10.18 These are as follows. Firstly, the numeric provision of the plan should proceed on the basis of RPG. Secondly, there would be likely to be a shortfall in the supply of housing land over the period of the plan to meet the RPG requirement. Next, allocations should be made to meet that requirement. Fourthly, the identification of the allocations should reflect RTS 18 and 19, together with national planning guidance - primarily in PPGs 3 and 13. Fifthly, a phasing policy should be included in the plan, - this relating to the period from April 2006 when the allocations should make a contribution to required housing supply. Finally, a monitoring policy should be included that generally reflects RTS/17.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 10.19 The Council should revisit this part of the housing chapter. It should bring forward modifications based on 4 policies:
- * **Policy H1** would establish the RPG requirement for Bolton as an annualized building rate, the reasoned justification explaining the basis for it.
 - * **Policy H2** would allocate site(s), identified on the Proposals Map, for about 1200 dwellings - the reasoned justification explaining the basis for the policy allocations.
 - * **Policy H3** would provide for the release of allocated sites(s) from 2006, subject to monitoring.
 - * **Policy H4** would establish a monitoring process over the remaining years of the plan.
 - * Other policies, together with their reasoned justification, would need to be renumbered.
- 10.20 I shall make recommendations on the Green Belt sites before me in this chapter. These are consistent with my conclusions in Chapter 4 that Green Belt boundaries defined in the adopted plan and carried forward into the UDP should be maintained. As to the other sites subject to objection, I have considered making recommendations on them. I take the clear view however, that this part of the plan represents a major weakness of it. Its resolution should be addressed by the Council through the plan process. Other objections on H1 and H2, relating to the wording of the policies, are dealt with and the Council will need to consider them in bringing forward the 4 policies I have referred to in paragraph 10.19 above.
- 10.21 It follows, therefore, that I do not accept the Council’s Proposed Changes Nos PC44 and PC45 that will need to be revisited in the light of my recommendations above.

POLICY H1

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1079	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
1103	Mr H Gregory	No
1105	Mr H Gregory	No
1107	Mr H Gregory	No
1153	Mr and Mrs A Knight	No
1532	Westbury Homes Ltd & Wilcon Homes (formerly Wain Estates Ltd)	No
1673	Wilcon Homes (Wain Estates Ltd)	No
1902	Wimpey Homes	No
1991	Mr D Lord	No
2236	Robert Fletcher (Stoneclough) Ltd	No
2250	Government Office For The North West	No
2301	Morris Homes Ltd	No
2303	Westbury Homes Ltd & Wilcon Homes (Wain Estates Ltd)	No
2353	Botany Investments Ltd	No
2354	Elite Homes (North) Ltd	No
2359	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
2382	The House Builders Federation	No
2389	Wimpey Homes	No
2391	Wilcon Homes (Wain Estates Ltd)	No
2394	Peel Investments (North) Ltd	No
2400	Persimmon Homes Ltd.	No
2447	Alfred McAlpine Developments Ltd	No
2454	Bellway Estates	No
630	Department of the Environment, Transport & the Regions	No
1220	The House Builders Federation	No
1539	Bellway Estates	No
1545	Persimmon Homes Ltd.	No
1553	Alfred McAlpine Developments Ltd	No
1554	Beazer Strategic Land	No
1574	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
1594	Peel Investments (North) Limited	No
1598	Peel Investments (North) Limited	No
1602	Peel Investments (North) Limited	No
253	The Hulton Estate	No
258	The Hulton estate	No
48	The Trustees of the 1951 R E Morley Settlement	No
1637	The Emerson Group	No
1907	CED Promotion Partnership	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy should clarify what is meant by “safe neighbourhoods” and how this relates to design. **(Objection 1079)**
- The policy should support community housing solutions, “eco” housing and neighbourhoods, as well as the integration of residence and work. **(Objection 1907)**
- Various areas of land about Morris Farm, Chew Moor are suitable for housing and Green Belt designation is inappropriate. **(Objections 1103, 1105 and 1107)**
- The brownfield site behind Hart Common Public House should be considered for housing under Policy H1 and in association with Policy G4. **(Objection 1153)**
- Should the RPG process require a review of Green Belt boundaries then, land to the south of Meads Grove, Middle Hulton; to the east of Duchy Avenue, Over Hulton; and to the west of Slack Fold Lane is suitable for housing development and would contribute to supply. **(Objections 1594, 1598 and 1602)**
- Present Green Belt land at Woodlands Drive would represent a logical “rounding off” of the urban area, suitable for housing development. **(Objection 258)**
- The allocation of land at Crown Lane, Horwich for employment use at First Deposit is unsuitable. It should be allocated for housing. **(Objection 48)**
- Objectors raise varying concern on the numeric provision of the policy, not least a justification of the First and Second Deposit versions, an explanation of the calculation of the housing requirement in the policy and its locational implications. The plan provides insufficient land for housing that would prevent a wide choice of quality housing and everyone having the opportunity of a decent home. The First Deposit version does not reflect “plan, monitor and manage” and should refer to preferred areas of search in the event of a housing shortfall. The Second Deposit version reduces housing provision and should provide for development on the edge of urban areas. Additional land should be allocated for housing, not least to reflect previous rates in the Borough and continuing economic growth, with a substantially reduced reliance on windfalls. There is little guidance on the treatment of urban brownfield land while the plan does not acknowledge the practical difficulties in bringing forward previously-developed sites. The policy statement of 8201 houses at Second Deposit has no flexibility and should not be a maximum. The policy should refer to “at least”. The policy should include a phased approach for new housing. It does not refer to the search sequence in PPG 3. **(Objections 1220, 1532, 1539, 1545, 1553, 1554, 1574, 1637, 1673, 1902, 1991, 2236, 2303, 2353, 2354, 2359, 2382, 2391 and 2394)**
- Objections relate to the relationship of the policy to emerging RPG. The First Deposit housing figure should remain pending adoption of RPG, the reduction at Second Deposit being premature, not least as the Draft RPG figure is the subject of objection. In the absence of adopted RPG, housing provision should at least reflect that in the adopted UDP, preferably past development trends. Future stages of UDP preparation should reflect the housing requirement established by RPG. At Second Deposit, the supply figure in the policy does not appear to relate to draft RPG and the reasoned justification of the policy should be cross-referenced to Policy H2. **(Objections 630, 2250, 2301, 2389, 2400, 2454 and 2447)**
- Land at Roscoe’s Farm, Westhoughton should be developed for housing as it would make a valuable contribution to the supply of housing land within the Borough and is consistent with national planning guidance. **(Objection 253)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 10.22 I have appropriately dealt with these “strategic” objections at paragraphs 10.1 to 10.21 above. **(Objections 1220, 1532, 1539, 1545, 1553, 1554, 1574, 1637, 1673, 1902, 1991, 2236, 2303, 2353, 2354, 2359, 2382, 2391 and 2394)**
- 10.23 The Second Deposit version has removed the reference to “safe neighbourhoods” in the reasoned justification. In my view, the concept is a design matter that may be material to the consideration of a specific housing proposal, but inappropriate within a policy that seeks to establish the level of housing provision over the period of the plan. **(Objection 1079)**
- 10.24 Policy H1 would establish the level of housing over the period of the plan. As such it is inappropriate for it to include specific forms of provision - albeit I note that the reasoned justification at both First and Second Deposit includes aims to achieve a range of housing. Although the plan includes a policy for affordable housing dealt with below at Policy H4, the Council’s view is that it reflects the requirements of national planning guidance. The plan also contains a policy on the use of dwellings for business purposes (E7). In general, I do not consider that the principle of the specific forms of housing advocated by the objector would be precluded by the UDP. I share the view of the Council, however, that to include policies for them - and others - would result in an over-elaborate plan in conflict with the intention of PPG 12. **(Objection 1907)**
- 10.25 I have dealt with the Green Belt objections to these sites in Chapter 4. There, and in paragraph 10.8 above, I have concluded that a review of Green Belt boundaries is not justified, save that the site at 1103 has outline planning permission for 2 dwellings. While I have carefully considered the objections, none overcome my conclusion in this respect. **(Objections 258, 1103, 1105, 1107, 1594, 1598 and 1602)**
- 10.26 Turning to Objection 1153, the site is approved Green Belt in the adopted plan, carried forward into the UDP. It is generally to the rear of frontage properties on Wigan Road, albeit the south-east boundary of the site adjoins it. The Green Belt in this general location comprises an area of open countryside to the west of Westhoughton. In my view, it serves a number of the purposes established by paragraph 1.5 of PPG2 (Revised), primarily to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas and to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. This is reflected in Policy G1 of the Second Deposit version of the plan. To allocate the site for housing would add an element of urbanisation to the Green Belt, leading to encroachment into a general area of countryside. The openness of what I consider to be a sensitive area of Green Belt would be reduced. In support of its case, the objectors consider the site to be brownfield. On the basis of my visit, I am not persuaded - the site comprising an area of grazing land to the north of Wigan Road. Nonetheless, that would not outweigh - in my view - the clear intention of paragraph 2.6 to PPG2 (Revised). **(Objection 1153)**
- 10.27 This is a First Deposit objection. Industrial Site allocation 47E, there, was deleted at Second Deposit stage. Planning permission has been granted for housing development on the site. That development is nearing completion. **(Objection 48)**
- 10.28 I have carefully considered the objections. For the reasons set out above at paragraphs 10.1 to 10.21, the plan should proceed on the basis of RPG. **(Objections 630, 2250, 2301, 2389, 2400, 2454 and 2447)**
- 10.29 This site would need to be considered by the Council in response to my overview of Policies H1 and H2. **(Objection 253)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 10.30 To reflect paragraphs 10.1 to 10.21 above, modify the plan in response to Objections 1220, 1532, 1539, 1545, 1553, 1554, 1574, 1637, 1673, 1902, 1991, 2236, 2303, 2353, 2354, 2359, 2382, 2391 and 2394.
- 10.31 To reflect paragraphs 10.1 to 10.21 above, modify the plan in response to Objections 630, 2250, 2301, 2389, 2400, 2454, and 2447.
- 10.32 No change to the plan in response to Objections 48, 1079, 1907, 1103, 1105, 1107, 1153, 1594, 1598, 1602, 258 and, at this stage of the plan, 253.

POLICY H2: ALLOCATED SITES

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
2237	Robert Fletcher (Stoneclough) Ltd	No
2302	Morris Homes Ltd	No
2304	Westbury Homes Ltd & Wilcon Homes (formerly Wain Estates Ltd)	No
2308	Bellway Estates	No
2349	English Nature	No
2360	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
2383	The House Builders Federation	No
2392	Wilcon Homes (formerly Wain Estates Ltd)	No
2395	Peel Investments (North) Ltd	No
2401	Persimmon Homes Ltd.	No
2448	Alfred McAlpine Developments Ltd	No
2251	Government Office For The North West	No
2390	Wimpey Homes	No
254	The Hulton Estate	No
259	The Hulton Estate	No
544	The Hulton Estate	No
565	Mrs M Riley	No
566	Mr J Kay & Mrs N Platt	No
631	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1155	Mr & Mrs A W Knight	No
1175	Mr L Halliwell	No
1221	The House Builders Federation	No
1533	Westbury Homes Ltd & Wilcon Homes (formerly Wain Estates Ltd)	No
1541	Bellway Estates	No
1546	Persimmon Homes Ltd.	No
1551	Alfred McAlpine Developments Ltd	No

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1555	Beazer Strategic Land	No
1575	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
1576	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
1595	Peel Investments (North) Limited	No
1599	Peel Investments (North) Limited	No
1603	Peel Investments (North) Limited	No
1632	The Emerson Group	No
1633	The Emerson Group	No
1668	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
1672	Mr A Partington	No
1674	Wilcon Homes (formerly Wain Estates Ltd)	No
1743	Stakehill International Limited	No
1749	Arrowcroft North West Limited	No
1830	Morris Homes Ltd.	No
1903	Wimpey Homes	No
1995	Mr D Lord	No
635	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
650	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
2258	Government Office For The North West	No
2307	Leigh Lancashire Estate	No
2264	The Emerson Group	No
1181	Mr A Hinds	No
1385	Brazley Residents Association	No
1390	Mrs Donnington	No
1391	Mrs J Nuttall	No
1392	Mr and Mrs D Cowley	No
1394	Mr and Mrs R Allwood	No
1395	Mr P Wooff	No
1396	Mr R Parkinson	No
1397	Mr K Moore	No
1398	Mr and Mrs I Newton	No
1399	Mr R Warwick	No
1400	Mr G Webster	No
1402	Mr and Mrs R Grundy	No
1403	Mr J Kenyon	No
1406	Mr and Mrs Hopps	No
1407	J Hopps	No
1408	Miss Hopps	No
1409	Mrs G Hopps	No
1410	Mr A Hinds	No
1413	Mr and Mrs Scott	No
1414	Mr and Mrs Lown	No
1415	Mr and Mrs K Hibbert	No
1417	Mr M Monaghan	No
1418	Mr and Mrs B Gaskell	No

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1422	Mr J Wilkinson (Objector deceased)	No
1619	Cllr Ronson	No
1675	Wain Estates Ltd.	No
1298	Westhoughton Town Council	No
1345	Westhoughton/ Hulton Park Liberal Democrats	No
2005	Environment Agency	No
1299	Westhoughton Town Council	No
1347	Westhoughton/ Hulton Park Liberal Democrats	No
49	The Trustees of the 1951 R E Morley Settlement	No

Summary of Objections

- The Second Deposit policy inappropriately addresses the redevelopment of brownfield sites for residential use. Large unallocated sites within urban areas would be likely to come forward. **(Objection 2237)**
- Land at Church Street/Manchester Road, Westhoughton should be allocated for housing, as in the adopted plan. The site is much larger than the land requirement for a primary school (2CP) that covers the whole site. The reduction in housing provision at Second Deposit indicates that sites identified are insufficient to meet demand. **(Objections 1830 and 2302)**
- Land at Ditcher's Farm should be allocated for housing as there will be a significant shortfall in housing provision over the plan period, requiring further sites to be allocated. Ditcher's Farm is in a sustainable location. It should be identified under a new policy and designated on the Proposals Map as a Preferred Area of Search. **(Objections 1533, 1903 and 2304)**
- As brownfield land or former industrial sites may have nature conservation or landscape interest, there should be a cross-reference to Policies N5, N9 and EM5 of the plan. **(Objection 2349)**
- Objectors variously consider that: the UDP should not only indicate those sites that are allocated, but also the sequence in which development should take place; the policy is unlikely to provide a wide choice of good quality housing and a decent home for everyone; insufficient land has been allocated to meet the housing requirement; there is a substantial reliance on large unallocated sites coming forward; the policy is overly prescriptive and unnecessary; the non-completion allowances are questionable and it would be better to give realistic rates rather than start from a figure from which deductions are made; there is a lack of allocated sites in the Horwich and Blackrod areas; while the estimated windfall allowance is unsubstantiated and the reliance on it is contrary to the plan-led system. **(Objections 635, 1221, 1576, 1632, 1995, 2251, 2307, 2308, 2360, 2383, 2390, 2392, 2395, and 2448)**
- Land at Lee Hall, Westhoughton should be allocated for housing as part of a comprehensive mixed-use development. That would include improved passenger transport facilities at Daisy Hill Station, bus/rail interchange facilities, a local centre and community facilities and an extension to Hall Lee Bank Park to include a new playing facility. **(Objections 544, 1546 and 2401)**

- Land at Roscoe's Farm, Westoughton should be allocated for housing as it would make a valuable contribution to the supply of housing land within the Borough and is consistent with government guidance. **(Objection 254)**
- The development of land at Woodlands Drive for housing would represent a logical "rounding off" of the urban area. **(Objection 259)**
- Although land at Bank Top, Astley Bridge is approved Green Belt, it is of poor agricultural quality and should be used for development, preferably housing. **(Objections 565 and 566)**
- Policies and Proposals Map should only include sites without planning permission. Otherwise, Appendix 4 should be headed housing sites with planning permission. **(Objections 631, 650 and 2258)**
- Land behind the Hart Common Public House, Hart Common is brownfield land and should be considered for housing development. **(Objection 1155)**
- Land between Rumworth Road, Lostock, and the railway should be allocated for housing. **(Objection 1175)**
- Land at Bowlands Hey should not be designated as Other Protected Open Land. It should be either a strategic allocation or, a phased release in phase 2 - both after 2004 and consistent with "plan, monitor and manage". **(Objection 1541)**
- Land at Slack Fold Lane, Bolton would represent a modest extension to the urban area to assist in meeting the need for additional housing. Policy H2 and the supporting text need to make clear the basis on which the components of the supply of housing have been calculated. **(Objection 1551)**
- The Knowles Farm site, Horwich would offer a sustainable solution to contribute to housing supply. Policy H2 and the supporting text need to make clear the basis on which the components of the supply of housing land have been calculated. **(Objection 1555)**
- Land at the Hollins, Plodder Lane should be allocated for housing and not as Other Protected Open Land. It is bounded on three sides by existing development and is well located to the existing public transport network. Part of the site has already been recognised as having potential for housing development. The objection site before the Inquiry has been reduced. **(Objection 1575)**
- Should it emerge through the RPG process that a review of Green Belt boundaries is necessary to enable future housing requirements to be met, then land to the south of Meads Grove, Middle Hulton; to the west of Slack Fold Lane; and to the east of Duchy Avenue, Over Hulton would be suitable for housing development and contribute to housing supply. **(Objections 1595, 1599 and 1603)**
- The Walmsley site at Crompton Way is in a sustainable location with good accessibility and complies with PPG 3. The site should be allocated for housing development. **(Objection 1633)**
- The plan does not indicate that an analysis of accessibility, particularly pedestrian, has been undertaken to a clearly defined rationale. **(Objection 1668)**
- Land off Moss Lane, Horwich should be allocated for a mixed-use development. The site is well located for business uses. The proximity to the railway station makes this a good location for business and residential use, allowing less dependence on the car for travel to work. **(Objection 1672)**

- Land at Suckling Calf Farm, Old Lane is outside the Green Belt and is an area of unusable waste land bounded by housing on all sides. It can be allocated for development without harming the plan's objectives and the appearance or setting of the locality. **(Objection 1674)**
- The Stakehill International site off Chew Moor Lane, Westhoughton would be appropriate for residential development should any redevelopment opportunity arise during the lifetime of the UDP. Redevelopment of the site for housing would be fully in accordance with the Council's housing strategy and the guidance in PPG 3. The site is within the urban area, is reasonably well located to service facilities at Westhoughton and adjoins site 31H. **(Objection 1743)**
- Land at Lever Park Avenue, Horwich should be allocated for housing and not as Other Protected Open Land. It is well related to existing development, the highway and public transport network, local amenities, and would represent "rounding-off" of the built-up area. The adjacent wildlife corridor would not be prejudiced. **(Objection 1749)**
- First Deposit housing site 54H, Heaton Grange, deleted at Second Deposit, has historically been regarded as an appropriate housing allocation. It should be a commitment and not deleted at Second Deposit stage. **(Objection 2264)**
- First Deposit housing allocation 58H (Fall Birch Hospital) should be deleted. The site does not have a suitable access while the junction of Fall Birch Road and Chorley New Road is inadequate. Existing traffic and road safety problems would be compounded, the environment of the area would be adversely affected, while the existing physical and social infrastructure may not have sufficient capacity to accommodate the new development. **(Objections 1181, 1385, 1390, 1391, 1392, 1394, 1395, 1396, 1397, 1398, 1399, 1400, 1402, 1403, 1406, 1407, 1408, 1409, 1410, 1413, 1414, 1415, 1417, 1418, 1422, and 1619)**
- First Deposit Appendix 4, Site 58H. should provide more detailed information on the junction improvement essential if the development is to proceed. **(Objection 1675)**
- Land at Cherwell Road, Westhoughton is the only open space in the locality, is unsuitable for development, First Deposit allocation 59H should be removed and the site designated public open space. **(Objections 1298 and 1345)**
- Site specific environmental information should be included in First Deposit Appendix 4 in respect of sites 2H, 4H, 23H and 28H. **(Objection 2005)**
- First Deposit housing site 48H - at Wigan Road/Cricketers Way, Westhoughton - should be designated as public open space to meet a need in the area. Access would be unsuitable. **(Objections 1299 and 1347)**
- Land at Crown Lane, Horwich is unsuitable for industrial use, would be more suitable for residential development and should be allocated accordingly. **(Objection 49)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 10.33 I have dealt with the issues arising from these objections in my overview of Policies H1 and H2 at paragraphs 10.1 to 10.21 above. They will need to be taken into account by the Council in its assessment of additional land for housing. **(Objections 635, 1221, 1576, 1632, 1995, 2237, 2251, 2307, 2308, 2360, 2383, 2390, 2392, 2395 and 2448)**
- 10.34 In the light of my overview of Policies H1 and H2, these sites will need to be considered by the Council in its analysis of land necessary to meet required allocations. **(Objections 254, 544, 1533, 1903, 2304, 1541, 1546, 1555 1575, 1633, 1672, 1674, 1743, 1749 and 2401)**

- 10.35 I have dealt with the Green Belt implications of these sites in Chapter 4. There, and at paragraph 10.4 above, I have concluded that a review of Green Belt boundaries is not justified. **(Objections 259, 565, 566, 1155, 1551, 1175, 1595, 1599 and 1603)**
- 10.36 Fall Birch Hospital was still in use at the time of my visit. These objections were made at First Deposit stage. Appendix 4, there, included an allocation of 57 dwellings at the hospital (58H). The Second Deposit version does not include allocations - 58H being deleted from the plan. Appendix 4 at paragraph 21.01 now relates to sites with planning permission. While I note the wide range of objector concerns over the development of the site for housing, no specific proposal is before me at Second Deposit. Nonetheless, I take the view that the Council will need to consider this site in its assessment of additional land required for housing, following my overview of Policies H1 and H2. **(Objections 1181, 1385, 1390, 1391, 1392, 1394, 1395, 1396, 1397, 1398, 1399, 1400, 1402, 1403, 1406, 1407, 1408, 1409, 1410, 1413, 1414, 1415, 1417, 1418, 1422, 1619)**
- 10.37 In a Council assessment of land necessary to meet the requirement for additional allocations to be made in the plan, the Council will need to consider land remaining after completion of Wingates School. **(Objections 1830 and 2302)**
- 10.38 A number of policies may be relevant to the assessment of development proposals, the plan needing to be considered as whole. Any cross-referencing would need to be undertaken on a consistent and comprehensive basis. In my view, an excessively detailed and complicated plan would result, contrary to the advice in paragraph 3.1 of PPG 12. **(Objection 2349)**
- 10.39 The plan appropriately deals with the needs of pedestrians at Chapter 9 where I have dealt with a similar objection by the Civic Trust at paragraph 9.60 of my Report. **(Objection 1668)**
- 10.40 The Second Deposit version does not include allocations. The heading to Appendix 4 at Proposed Change No PC26 now refers to housing sites with planning permission. **(Objections 631, 650 and 2258)**
- 10.41 Housing allocations included in the plan at First Deposit stage were deleted at Second Deposit (Proposed Map Change 46 relating to Cherwell Road). The objectors have not disputed the Council's evidence that planning permission has been granted for housing. It would be inappropriate to designate this site as public open space. **(Objections 1298 and 1345)**
- 10.42 Proposed Change No PC26 would add further site descriptions. I agree. **(Objection 2005)**
- 10.43 Proposed Map Change 41, at Second Deposit, deleted housing allocation 54H. The objector has not disputed the Council's evidence that a full planning permission for housing has been granted at the site. **(Objection 2264)**
- 10.44 This is a First Deposit objection. At Second Deposit, Site 58H at Appendix 4 was deleted from the plan. Any development proposal that may arise at the site would need to be assessed against relevant policies of the plan, that may include highway considerations. **(Objection 1675)**
- 10.45 The objectors have not disputed the Council's evidence that the site has planning permission for a housing development for elderly persons' accommodation, that included the access to the site. **(Objections 1299 and 1347)**

10.46 This is a First Deposit objection. Employment allocation 47E, there, was deleted at Second Deposit stage. Planning permission has been granted for housing development on the site. That is approaching completion. **(Objection 49)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

10.47 The issues raised by these objectors have been appropriately covered in my overview of Policies H1 and H2. My conclusions there are before the Council - Objections 635, 1221, 1576, 1632, 1995, 2237, 2251, 2307, 2308, 2360, 2383, 2390, 2392, 2395 and 2448

10.48 These objections sites will need to be considered by the Council in the identification of land necessary to meet the further requirement for housing land following my overview of Policies H1 and H2 - Objections 254, 544, 1533, 1903, 2304, 1541, 1546, 1555 1575, 1633, 1672, 1674, 1743, 1749, 1830, 2302 and 2401, together with Objections 1181, 1385, 1390, 1391, 1392, 1394, 1395, 1396, 1397, 1398, 1399, 1400, 1402, 1403, 1406, 1407, 1408, 1409, 1410, 1413, 1414, 1415, 1417, 1418, 1422, 1619 and 1675.

10.49 Modify the plan in response to Objection 2005: amend the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC26

10.50 No change to the plan in response to Objections 49, 1298, 1299, 1345, 1347, 1668, 2264 and 2349.

10.51 No change to the plan in response to Objections 259, 565, 566, 1155, 1551, 1175, 1595, 1599 and 1603.

10.52 Modify the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC26 as it relates to Objections 631, 650 and 2258.

POLICY H3: DETERMINING HOUSING APPLICATIONS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
2238	Robert Fletcher (Stoneclough) Ltd	No
2305	Westbury Homes & Wain Estates	No
2361	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
2384	The House Builders Federation	No
2396	Peel Investments (North) Ltd	No
2402	Persimmon Homes Ltd.	No
2449	Alfred McAlpine Developments Ltd	No
1144	English Nature	No
1534	Westbury Homes Ltd & Wain Estates	No
1578	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
1695	Travis Perkins	No
1709	Mr D Southworth	No
1774	SWAN	No
1994	Mr D Lord	No

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1049	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	No

Summary of Objections

- The amendments, at Second Deposit, do not fairly reflect an appropriate policy for the redevelopment of brownfield sites for residential use. **(Objection 2238)**
- At First Deposit criterion (i), sites should be identified as safeguarded land. At Second Deposit, the policy should include sites within or on the edge of the urban area in sustainable locations. Similarly, the policy should indicate the circumstances under which greenfield sites would be acceptable. **(Objections 1534 and 2305)**
- At First Deposit, Policy H3 should not be restricted to “large sites” only. The test for greenfield sites is not in accordance with PPG3. At Second Deposit, criterion (iv) goes beyond national guidance contained in PPG3, failing to address their relative sustainability as advised by paragraphs 30 and 31 to PPG 3. Criterion (ii) should not refer to tenures. The policy should be reworded. **(Objections 1578 and 2361)**
- The policy does not reflect the Government's guidance in PPG3. The reference to “tenures” in criteria (ii) should be deleted as should the whole point of (iv). **(Objection 2384)**
- Criterion (iv) at Second Deposit is too rigid and imposes an onerous requirement on any prospective applicant. While it is accepted that PPG 3 seeks to direct development to previously-developed land, it does not automatically follow that a greenfield site should be rejected until all previously developed land has been taken up or is judged unsuitable for housing development. **(Objection 2396)**
- The policy refers to the “urban area” which is not defined. There is no indication of how criterion (ii) would be measured. The wording of criterion (iv) takes no account of site suitability, availability, or economic viability. Nor, does it allow for development to take place in one part of the Borough where previously-developed sites exist at locations in other parts of the Borough. **(Objections 2402 and 2449)**
- The policy should be cross-referenced to policies to N5, N9 and EM5 and the nature conservation chapter. **(Objections 1049 and 1144)**
- The Travis Perkins site at Farnworth site is not allocated and lies outside the defined town centre. This could give rise to uncertainty and speculative applications for alternative uses for the site, including housing. **(Objection 1695)**
- Large-scale developments overburden local infrastructure and would be subject to environmental regulations. **(Objection 1709)**
- At First Deposit, the policy implies that greenfield development is still a possibility. When considering the development of windfall sites there should be regard to the cumulative effect of a number of small developments upon infrastructure. **(Objection 1774)**
- At First Deposit, the policy does not reflect PPG 3 concerning inter alia, the sequential approach and should be amended to reflect this. **(Objection 1994)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.53 To begin, the policy was substantially rewritten at Second Deposit.

10.54 There are many linkages between policies and chapters of the plan. Individual development proposals would need to be assessed against the plan as a whole. Any

- cross-referencing would need to relate to the whole plan to ensure consistency. To do so, would result in an over-complicated and detailed plan. **(Objections 1049 and 1144)**
- 10.55 In the light of my conclusions at paragraphs 10.1 to 10.21 above, there is no need for the policy to address safeguarded land. Within the context established there, Policy H3 would establish appropriate control for an assessment of proposals on land at the edge of the urban area in “sustainable locations”. **(Objections 1534 and 2305)**
- 10.56 Policy H3 at Second Deposit does not now refer to large unallocated sites. It is not the purpose of a development plan to restate national planning guidance. PPG 3, as others, should be taken into account by local planning authorities in the preparation of development plans. The intent of the Second Deposit version of the policy reasonably reflects paragraphs 31 and 32 of PPG 3, including sustainability issues. The reference to tenures in criterion (ii) reflects paragraph 10 of the guidance, albeit the Council should elaborate the reasoned justification to indicate how it would assess proposals in this respect. **(Objections 1578 and 2361)**
- 10.57 The objector argues that the supporting text to Policy H3 should be amended to indicate that the policy applies only to previously-used and empty properties, not sites currently in a viable use. It is, however, the right of prospective developers to propose development - irrespective of whether land or buildings are in a positive and viable use, or empty. In such a circumstance, prejudice to a future operation may be a material consideration for the decision-maker. A development plan cannot guarantee continuing occupation. The general intention of Policy H3 is to provide planning guidance on those circumstances whereby housing development would be acceptable within the urban area. **(Objection 1695)**
- 10.58 A development plan cannot preclude the submission of large-scale development proposals. Any arising would need to be assessed against the plan as a whole and taking into account the views of the relevant agencies. They may also be subject to environmental regulations. **(Objection 1709)**
- 10.59 The Second Deposit version, together with Circular 08/00, would address the generality of this objector’s concern. Sufficient control would be available. **(Objector 1774)**
- 10.60 I have carefully considered the rewording of the First Deposit policy suggested by the objector. Accessibility is included within criterion (i) at Second Deposit. His other criteria would duplicate other policies of the plan. **(Objection 1994)**
- 10.61 At Second Deposit, the policy and plan, generally promote the redevelopment of brownfield sites - there being no allocated sites. While, in my overview of Policies H1 and H2, I see the need for allocations - they are for the Council to establish and bring forward as part of the plan process. Any further sites, the subject of development proposals, would need to be assessed against the plan as a whole, including Policy H3. **(Objection 2238)**
- 10.62 I do not support this Second Deposit objection. In my opinion, “tenure” is clearly a material planning consideration, as reflected in paragraph 10 to PPG 3. This, in Bolton, is particularly relevant where there are concentrations of terraced housing and, no doubt, a need to establish mixed and balanced communities. As indicated above, paragraph 10.56, this should be further explained by the Council. **(Objection 2384)**
- 10.63 The lack of a clear definition of the “urban area” has been dealt with at paragraph 3.22 of my Report. The measurement of criterion (ii) has been dealt with at paragraph 10.56 above. In any assessment of a proposal arising that needed to be considered under

criterion (iv), a reasonable planning authority would consider matters such as economic viability, this throughout the Council's area. **(Objections 2402 and 2449)**

10.64 Similarly, I do not support this Second Deposit objection. Criterion (iv) represents an attempt by the Council to implement both national planning guidance and the urban concentration approach of the plan. Although not worded in the same way as paragraph 32 to PPG 3, it has its same general intent and should be supported. **(Objection 2396)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

10.65 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1049, 1144, 1534, 1578, 11695, 1709, 1774, 1994, 2238, 22305, 2361, 2384, 2396, 2402 and 2449, subject to the reasoned justification to the policy further explaining the way in which the Council would ensure a range of tenures.

POLICY H4: AFFORDABLE HOUSING

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1635	The Emerson Group	No
2252	Government Office For The North West	No
2306	Westbury Homes & Wain Estates	No
2362	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
2385	The House Builders Federation	No
632	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1080	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
1222	The House Builders Federation	No
1540	Bellway Estates	No
1579	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	No
1866	The Countryside Agency	No
9005	Robert Fletcher (Stoneclough) Ltd	No

Summary of Objections

- These first and Second Deposit objections variously express doubt on the need for the policy; consider it conflicts with Circular 06/98; is not based on a rigorous and realistic assessment of need through a Housing Needs Survey open to public scrutiny; does not indicate the number of affordable homes that should be provided (including types and locations); is arbitrary; and should not be based on a requirement. **(Objections 632, 1080, 1222, 1540, 1579, 1635, 1866, 2252, 2306, 2362, 2385 and 9005)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 10.66 Objections to this policy were made at both First and Second Deposit stages. Having carefully considered all the objections, the main issue is whether a policy for affordable housing has been justified for inclusion within the UDP. While it is the intention of national planning guidance that a community need for affordable housing should be met by local planning authorities, affordable housing policies in development plans should have a sound basis - not least as they may place a requirement upon the development industry. The most relevant guidance is in PPG 3 and Circular 06/98. Generally, a UDP policy seeking affordable housing in suitable housing developments should be based on a demonstrable lack of affordable housing to meet local needs as assessed by up-to-date surveys and other information (PPG 3: paragraph 14). That assessment should be rigorous, making clear the assumptions and definitions used and including a variety of factors (06/98: paragraph 6). Any policy for affordable housing should be based on an understanding of the needs of the area over the period of the plan (06/98: paragraphs 5 and 6). Further, UDP policies for affordable housing should include the matters set out in the 3 bullet points to PPG 3 (paragraph 15). Little of this information is before me from the Council. Its Second Deposit version of the policy still raises the expectation of an element of affordable housing on suitable sites, albeit expressed as a result of "negotiation". Neither CD B15 nor CD B36 address my concerns.
- 10.67 I come, therefore, to the conclusion that the policy has not been justified and that it would place an unduly onerous requirement upon developers. In response, the Council's evidence, in my view, acknowledged the deficiencies of the policy when assessed against PPG 3 and Circular 06/98. There appears to be no imminent prospect of a Housing Needs Survey coming forward from the Council. It argued that the policy is a basis for negotiating the delivery of affordable housing through the planning system. Affordable housing, nationally, does need to be delivered, but it should be justified locally through the development plan system. This, the Council has failed to do, while the wording of the Second Deposit policy adds to my concern. Here, criterion (i) requires an identified housing need to be identified for people on low incomes. This should already, reasonably, have been available to developers at application stage through the requirements of PPG 3 and Circular 06/98. Policy H4 should be deleted from the plan. In the light of this conclusion, objections relating to the precise wording of the policy are not necessary for me to consider. It also follows that I do not accept the Council's Proposed Change (No PC27). **(Objections 632, 1080, 1222, 1540, 1579, 1635, 1866, 2252, 2306, 2362, 2385 and 9005)**

RECOMMENDATION

- 10.68 Modify the plan in response to my overall assessment of Objections 632, 1080, 1222, 1540, 1579, 1635, 1866, 2252, 2306, 2362, 2385 and 9005: Policy H4 and its reasoned justification (paragraphs 10.38 to 10.41) should be deleted, paragraphs being renumbered.

POLICY H5 (H7)

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1082	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
1580	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Ltd	No
1669	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
2439	SWAN	No

Summary of Objections

- Reference in the reasoned justification of the policy to seeking “socially mixed communities” is arbitrary and misguided and should be deleted. **(Objection 1082)**
- Not all housing sites would necessarily be appropriate for higher density development. The existing pattern and form of development in the vicinity should be taken into account, allowing for exceptions at a higher density. **(Objection 1580)**
- The policy is inadequate to support sustainability and urban regeneration, being simplistic rather than spatially sensitive. Differing density requirements are justified, not least a higher figure for areas associated with the urban core. **(Objection 1669)**
- The supporting text to the policy at paragraph 10.51 should not exclude items 6, 7, 8 and 9. **(Objection 2439)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

- 8.69 This policy deals with new housing density. First Deposit Policy H7 has been recast as Policy H5 at Second Deposit, and I deal with all objections to the policies here. First Deposit Objection 1082 has been met by the deletion at Second Deposit of the reference to socially mixed communities. I agree, not least as it did not represent to me a matter that would be able to be achieved through planning legislation. The Council’s policy on density is not, in my opinion, “futile”. Its general intention reflects national planning guidance in PPG 3. **(Objection 1082)**
- 10.70 Policy H5 (Second Deposit) fairly reflects national planning guidance in PPG 3 at paragraphs 57 and 58. The objector’s First Deposit objection argues that local circumstances should be taken into account. This has been acceptably addressed in the policy itself at paragraph 10.48, as well as at paragraph 10.53. **(Objection 1580)**
- 10.71 This First Deposit objection (H7) was maintained at Second Deposit. Both objector and Council appear to me to have the same overall objective - this that the raising of densities is in the interests of sustainable development. I find Policy H5, at Second Deposit, to be generally consistent with PPGs 3 and 13. Paragraph 10.52 indicates the need to achieve higher densities around existing centres and close to public transport nodes. Within this context, the specific requirements sought by the objector have not been sufficiently justified for me to recommend a modification to include them in the plan. Here, it has not disputed the Council’s evidence that recent developments in the town centre have been achieved at densities substantially higher than the figure in the policy. It provides an acceptable framework to meet local and national planning objectives. **(Objection 1669)**

10.72 The policy establishes a net density requirement for new housing reflecting the minimum figure in the second bullet point to paragraph 58 of PPG 3. The objector does not object to the principle of a net density policy. The elements that it seeks to include in the calculation are inappropriate, relating to areas of land that would not be developed for housing and associated uses. The policy restates national planning guidance set out in Annex C to PPG 3, that advises local authorities to follow the advice there. **(Objection 2439)**

RECOMMENDATION

10.73 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1082, 1580, 1669 and 2439.

POLICY H6: SITES FOR GYPSIES

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
634	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1081	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No

Summary of Objections

- The reasoned justification should explain why the Council has not formally identified or allocated any additional sites for gypsies before adopting a criteria-based policy. Alternatively, a policy indicating suitable locations should be considered. **(Objection 634)**
- The majority of itinerants are not gypsies. The plan should address nuisance caused by itinerants as a result of inadequate provision and seek to overcome the resulting problems. **(Objection 1081)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

10.74 At Second Deposit, the Council deleted the reference in paragraph 10.59 to the absence of an identification or allocation of additional sites for gypsies. As the Council intends a criteria-based policy, the reasoned justification should explain the basis of its approach and why it does not identify suitable locations - this reflecting the general intent of paragraph 12 to Circular 1/94. Further, the Council indicates that “gypsies” in the policy are those as defined in Section 16 the Caravan Sites Act 1968. That should be made clear in the reasoned justification. In the interests of clarity, reflecting both Objection 1081 and the Council’s past practice provision, Proposed Change No PC28 would also include travelling show people within the policy. Although they are excluded from the definition of gypsies, Circular 22/91 encourages local planning authorities to make provision for them. The proposed change is supported, but the heading to the policy should reflect it. There are powers under other than planning legislation to deal with nuisance. One further matter, not the subject of objection - this relating to criterion (ii) - that the Council is advised to consider. It includes the words “unacceptably adverse impacts” that contribute little to clarity. As elsewhere in the plan, it is sufficient for it to refer to “adversely affect” - the decision-maker assessing whether that would be unacceptable. **(Objections 634 and 1081)**

RECOMMENDATION

10.75 Modify the plan in response to my overall assessment of Objections 634 and 1081:

- (a) amend the heading to Policy H6 to “Sites for Gypsies and Travelling Show People”.
- (b) amend the plan to reflect Proposed Change No PC28.
- (c) amend the reasoned justification to the policy at paragraph 10.59 to explain the Council’s criteria-based approach and its definition of “gypsies”.
- (d) the Council is advised to consider a further modification to the plan at paragraph 10.58 to reflect the last 3 sentences of paragraph 10.74 above.

CHAPTER 11 - COMMUNITY PROVISION

POLICY CP1

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
545	The Hulton Estate	No
1550	Persimmon Homes Ltd	No
1867	The Countryside Agency	No
1908	CED Promotion Partnership	No
1670	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No

Summary of Objections

- Land at Lee Hall, Westhoughton is of sufficient size to provide for the development of community facilities in an accessible location, this as part of a mixed-use scheme of residential and employment development. **(Objections 545 and 1550)**
- The plan should include a commitment to protect and retain existing facilities and services. **(Objection 1867)**
- Community facilities encouraged and permitted should be conditional upon a community involvement in, and the control and availability of, facilities to all sectors of the community. Provision should be made for “one-stop-shops” - in particular, facilities for economic development and enterprise support. **(Objection 1908)**
- The policy inadequately promotes sustainability and the protection of existing community facilities. Libraries require a specific policy statement to ensure safeguards are in place for their protection. The preservation, and extension, of allotment provision should be referred to in the policy. **(Objection 1670)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 11.1 The policy deals with the development of community facilities across the Metropolitan Borough and is positive in its intent. It, and the reasoned justification, satisfies me that the provision of community facilities would be a material consideration in the assessment of development proposals. The merits, or otherwise, of the Lee Hall site for development are dealt with in Chapters 10 and 12. **(Objections 545 and 1550)**
- 11.2 CP1 would permit the development of community facilities. Comprehensive examples are given at paragraph 11.02. They generally relate to public services. A land-use development plan cannot commit an authority/agency to the protection and retention of existing facilities - any changes in provision may be the result of organisational change, not least under other legislation. **(Objection 1867)**
- 11.3 For similar reasons, a development plan cannot require community involvement in the control and availability of facilities. The same applies to “one-stop-shops”. Although the reasoned justification at paragraph 11.02 at Second Deposit has included a reference

to them, this I take as an indicative example of the type of community provision important to social well-being. **(Objection 1908)**

- 11.4 At Second Deposit, the Council added libraries to paragraph 11.02. The policy itself acceptably reflects sustainability through a requirement for accessible locations. The objector's evidence persuades me, however, that allotments are an important community facility. I see no convincing reason why they should not be added to the list of community provision that plays an important role in people's lives. **(Objection 1670)**
- 11.5 Finally, an advisory matter, not the subject of specific objection for the Council to consider. The policy statement at paragraph 11.01 includes the word "encourage". As elsewhere in the plan, that represents an aim rather than a statement of planning policy. The Council should consider modifying the plan to delete the word, the policy indicating that the Council will permit development proposals for community facilities in accessible locations. It follows, therefore, that I must come to a similar view on the identical Part 1 policy at paragraph 02.09.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 11.6 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1670: at paragraph 11.02, line 4, after "one-stop-shops," add "allotments,".
- 11.7 No change to the plan in response to Objections 545, 1550, 1867 and 1908.
- 11.8 The Council should also consider modifying the plan at paragraphs 11.01 and 02.09 to reflect paragraph 11.5 above.

POLICY CP2

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1985	Morris Homes Ltd	No

Summary of Objection

- The Wingates, Westthoughton school site (2CP) is allocated for housing in the adopted plan and remains suitable for housing. The Proposals Map site in the UDP is much larger than the area of land required for this school. Access to it from Church Street is substandard and would result in an unacceptable loss of amenity for adjoining residents. **(Objection 1985)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

- 11.9 On my visits, I saw that construction of the school is well advanced and had no significant concern over access arrangements. Proposed Change No PC29 to text and Proposals Map would reflect the current position. **(Objection 1985)**

RECOMMENDATION

- 11.10 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1985 in accordance with Proposed Change No PC29.

POLICY CP3

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1909	CED Promotion Partnership	No

Summary of Objection

- Educational institutions should be required to expand their community provision and have increased community sector control, including monitoring and evaluation processes. **(Objection 1909)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

11.11 The UDP cannot require or prescribe either increased community provision or organisational arrangements for educational institutions. **(Objection 1909)**

RECOMMENDATION

11.12 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1909.

CHAPTER 12 - EMPLOYMENT AND THE ECONOMY

POLICY E1

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1724	Mr D Southworth	No
1868	The Countryside Agency	No
1910	CED Promotion Partnership	No
1915	CED Promotion Partnership	No
1916	CED Promotion Partnership	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy should make reference to the need for environmental assessments. **(Objection 1724)**
- Chapter 12 appears to be urban based. It ignores the importance of employment provision in rural areas. Rural employment should not be viewed in isolation. **(Objection 1868)**
- The needs of people not in the employment market should be addressed, as well as the contribution made by the voluntary sector and community enterprises. Inward investment is not necessarily sustainable and proposals arising should be assessed on this basis. Employment opportunities are only part of the solution to local economic/regeneration issues. The characteristics and needs of the unwaged, non-mainstream areas of the economy should be addressed. **(Objections 1910, 1915 and 1916)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 12.1 The need, or otherwise, for environmental assessments is prescribed primarily by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999 No 293) rather than legislation on the preparation of development plans. Any development proposal arising that needed to be assessed against this policy would be required to submit an assessment if required by the regulations. There is, therefore, no need to refer to this in the UDP. **(Objection 1724)**
- 12.2 This strategic policy seeks, generally, to concentrate office, industrial and warehouse development within the urban area. It reflects the broad intent of national planning guidance, not least in PPGs 1 and 13. Policies for the Green Belt and Other Protected Open Land address employment provision outside the urban area. **(Objection 1868)**
- 12.3 A development plan establishes policies for the use of land, creating a development framework within which a number of agencies can work. The UDP can neither prescribe nor control their role and activities. Reasonably, the employment policies of the plan should have as an objective the provision of employment opportunities, achieved through both land-use policies and the activities of other agencies. I have no reason to doubt the Council's evidence that a number are involved within Bolton, that would include the needs of those not in the employment market. Part of the provision of

employment may arise over the period of the plan through inward investment. The objectives of the plan seek to ensure sustainable development, specific proposals needing to be assessed against the plan as a whole. (**Objections 1910, 1915 and 1916**)

RECOMMENDATIONS

12.4 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1724, 1868, 1910, 1915 and 1916.

POLICY E2: OFFICES, INDUSTRIAL AND WAREHOUSING ALLOCATIONS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
57	Morbaine Limited	No
546	The Hulton Estate	No
548	Firwood Paints and Varnish Co Limited	No
1099	Bolton WIDE	No
1118	D & A Motors	No
1628	The Emerson Group	No
1638	The Emerson Group	No
1768	Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	No
1310	Combined Property Control	Yes
1982	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No
80	N and V Jones	No
265	Sara Hall	No
266	Mr J Morris	No
540	Mr J Fisher	No
554	Mr G Lee	No
559	Mr Boydell	No
560	Mr W Jenkins	No
568	Mrs E Jones	No
569	D and S Melia	No
2006	Environment Agency	Yes
1164	Lostock Sports Club	No
1889	BAe Systems	No
2212	BAe Systems	No
1078	Mr A Taylor	No
1100	Mr and Mrs E Jolley	No
1101	Mr P Fletcher	No
1108	The Trustees of the 1951 R E Morley Settlement	No
1119	Mrs and Miss Wilkinson	No
1163	Mr and Mrs L Burtonwood	No
1180	P and A Parkinson	No
1430	D and G Renshaw	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy is too restrictive and does not allow the Council to use its discretion in the consideration of proposals on allocated sites. The policy should include the word “normally” before “only permit”. **(Objection 57)**
- The allocations in the policy would not accommodate a range of employment uses to meet the Borough’s needs. The basis for the policy should be made clear. Land at Lee Hall would offer a high quality business-park location for inward investors close to a junction of the M61. It is the only site in the Borough that offers that potential, reflected in the adopted plan. Further, an allocation of land at Lee Hall would contribute to the provision of employment land. **(Objections 546, 1099 and 1628)**
- The industrial allocation in the adopted plan at Oakenbottom Mill should be restored under this policy and identified on the Proposals Map. The site had a planning permission for industrial floorspace. It is “brownfield” in a sustainable location, sufficiently removed from the residential area. **(Objection 548)**
- No 10 Stoneclough Road, Kearsley is not allocated on the Proposals Map but should be recognised for its potential to expand as an employment site. **(Objection 1118)**
- The policy is too restrictive. The word “only” should be removed. **(Objection 1638)**
- The undeveloped parts of the Middlebrook development should be allocated for B1, B2 and B8 uses. **(Objection 1768)**
- Land at Watermead Works shown on the Proposals Map does not reflect the boundary of the existing planning permission for the site that establishes industrial development for a larger area. **(Objection 1310) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- The allocation of the Salford Road site (38E Second Deposit: 40E at First Deposit) is supported but it should be extended to reflect the area that has planning permission. **(Objection 1982)**
- Site 47E (Crown Lane, Horwich), First Deposit, is unacceptable. It is a greenfield site with a substantial nature conservation interest and is an important open space in the area, any development constrained by the floodplain. Its development would result in traffic congestion. The site should be designated as Other Protected Open Land. **(Objections 80, 265, 266, 540, 554, 559, 560, 568, 569, 1078, 1100, 1101, 1108, 1119, 1163, 1180 and 1430)**
- Appendix 5 relating to specific E2 sites should include information regarding environmental concerns - for example, the risk of flooding, landfill gas and wildlife habitats. **(Objection 2006) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- At First Deposit, the dual allocation at the Lostock Sports Club shown on the Proposals Map, for both employment and an Urban Recreation Site, should be changed to restrict it to the latter. **(Objection 1164)**
- At First Deposit stage, (Site 44E: British Aerospace Lostock), the playing field part of the site should be for employment or residential use. At Second Deposit stage, the objection related to Proposed Map Change 31 that deleted the playing field from the allocation (now renumbered 41E). There should be the option of residential use there, in a mixed-use development. **(Objections 1889 and 2212)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 12.5 The objector does not argue that the allocations proposed under Policy E2 are not justified. The addition of the word “normally” would imply uncertainty, in conflict with the need for development plans to indicate the type of development that would be permitted. **(Objection 57)**
- 12.6 The adopted plan included an allocation at Lee Hall (17E) for industrial, warehousing and business purposes. That has not been carried forward into the UDP, all the land there being designated as Other Protected Open Land (OPOL). The Council, in this plan, is entitled to undertake a review of the Borough’s requirement for employment purposes. CD B14 establishes the relevant background and I have taken into account the Inspector’s Report into the adopted plan (CD B18). None of the objectors have - in my opinion - persuasively contested the Council’s position that, not least, an acceptable level of land, overall, would be available for employment purposes taking into account constraints and slippage. It would be likely to be more than past take-up levels and sites are reasonably well distributed across the Borough. Generally, I share the Council’s view that its approach reflects the urban concentration approach of the plan, consistent with national planning guidance, and that it would acceptably meet the needs of business. Further, I am in no doubt that a “cautious” approach should be adopted for employment purposes, to prevent the unjustified release of greenfield sites. Here, land at Lee Hall would represent an attractive location for inward investment. I am not persuaded that such a prospect would be unable to be met by other locations in the Borough that the Council has identified, while RPG does not place a specific requirement upon the Borough to make available a major site for inward investment. Against that, the objection site would be reasonably accessible by public transport while a satisfactory highway access would be likely to be achieved. Ecological and agricultural land quality matters should not be taken as an objection. I have carefully weighed all these matters, including the planning history at Lee Hall. I support the position of the Council. The objectors have not convinced me that an employment allocation should be made at this area of OPOL. **(Objections 546, 1099 and 1628)**
- 12.7 The adopted plan allocation (39E) was surrounded by (OPOL) that included the employment buildings to the south of the site. The OPOL designation has been carried forward into the UDP that now washes over the objection site. The objector has not disputed the Council’s evidence - reflected in CD B14 - that the plan, through E2 and E5, has generally provided sufficient land to meet the needs of business and economic growth. I am not persuaded that the site should be allocated for employment use. The UDP before me, effectively represents a review of the adopted plan. In so doing, the Council is entitled to take a “fresh look” at policies and allocations. The site has been mainly cleared. It has a clear visual relationship with the extensive area of countryside that separates the adjacent urban areas. While, apparently from my site visit, part of a former mill complex, that does not establish a justification for its allocation. The site is not within the urban area. The Council’s evidence is that there are no current planning permissions for new industrial development at the site, not contested by the objector. I support the Council’s case. **(Objection 548)**
- 12.8 Reasonably, the Council considers that Policy E2 and the reference in paragraph 12.05 to the listing of allocated sites in Appendix 5 relates, generally, to larger areas and not individual businesses. Proposals relating to them would need to be assessed against other policies. The objector’s aspirations for its business as reported to me may not - in principle - be affected by Policy E2, subject to a consideration of the specific planning merits of any proposal. Public understanding of the policy would, however, be increased

if the plan indicated the scope of Appendix 5. Taking the above into account, there is no justification for the site to be allocated through Policy E2 and Appendix 5. **(Objection 1118)**

- 12.9 At Second Deposit, the Council has relocated the word “only”. On this objection, I give weight to the objector’s view that PPG 3 at paragraph 42 indicates that employment allocations may not be taken up over the period of a plan and that such designations may not be compatible with other national advice. While I accept the general thrust of the policy, development plans should indicate the type of development that would be permitted. A clear statement of the Council’s intentions would still be established by the deletion of the word “only”, any other material considerations arising from a proposal still needing to be taken into account. Here, I have taken into account the objector’s view that the Second Deposit version has aided clarity, but still represents an objection. **(Objection 1638)**
- 12.10 This First Deposit objection has been conditionally withdrawn. I agree - as the Council has changed the Proposals Map to reflect the planning history at Watermead Works. **(Objection 1310)**
- 12.11 The objector has not contested the Council’s evidence on the planning history at the site and vicinity, other plan provisions, as well as Proposed Map Change 78. Strategically, and taking into account CD B14, it has not substantively argued that the designation of the site for B1, B2 and B8 development is necessary to meet any likely overall shortage in Borough-wide provision. On more local considerations - the Council’s evidence satisfies me that a combination of plan allocations, employment use protection and planning permissions would make accommodation of the objection unreasonable. **(Objection 1768)**
- 12.12 The Council accepts that allocation 38E at Second Deposit stage should be extended to reflect the area of the Cutacre site granted planning permission by the Secretary of State. Proposed Change No PC31 would effect that. I have no reason to disagree. Based on the Council’s evidence, it appears to me that a consequential modification should be made to the site area at Appendix 5, paragraph 22.03. **(Objection 1982)**
- 12.13 These objections were made at First Deposit stage. Employment allocation 47E was deleted at Second Deposit stage. Planning permission was granted for housing development on the site in 2000. The Council considers that the site should be considered as making a windfall contribution to housing supply over the period of the plan. On the basis of my visits, the housing development was nearing completion. It would be inappropriate to consider the site as OPOL defined under Policy R2. **(Objections 80, 265, 266, 540, 554, 559, 560, 568, 569, 1078, 1100, 1101, 1108, 1119, 1163, 1180 and 1430).**
- 12.14 At Second Deposit stage, the Council amended a number of the site descriptions in Appendix 5, in response to the objector’s concern, by the addition of further text. The objection in relation to those sites was withdrawn. A drafting error precluded appropriate text being added to the remaining sites subject of the objection. This, the Council now proposes to rectify through Proposed Change No PC30. I agree. Consistency would result. **(Objection 2006)**
- 12.15 At First Deposit, the objection site was shown on the Proposals Map as being covered by both an employment allocation (44E) and an Urban Recreation Site (URS). At Second Deposit, Proposed Map Change 31 restricted the designation to that of an URS and renumbered the employment allocation as 41E. The objection has been met. The site description of 41E in paragraph 22.03 still, however, retains the First Deposit comment

that “relocation of the playing fields will be required in accordance with Policy O2”. As the Second Deposit site allocation no longer includes the URS, this part of the description should be deleted. **(Objection 1164)**

- 12.16 As indicated in paragraph 12.15 above, the overlapping designations have now been separated. The objector has not argued convincingly that this has prejudiced the employment objectives of the plan and I have come to a similar view. I have dealt with the open space and recreation implications at the site in Chapter 8 at paragraph 8.16. While I have carefully considered the objector’s view that the site should be considered as a whole - leading to a mixed development through a planning brief that would provide windfall housing - sufficient flexibility would be provided by Policy O2. **(Objections 1889 and 2212)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 12.17 No change to the plan in response to Objections 546, 1099 and 1628.
- 12.18 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1118: amend the last sentence of paragraph 12.05 to indicate that the allocations covered by Policy E2 relate to generally larger areas than individual businesses.
- 12.19 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1164: at paragraph 22.03: Site description: 41E: British Aerospace, Lostock (10.54 ha): delete the second sentence.
- 12.20 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1638: at paragraph 12.03, first line, delete the word “only”.
- 12.21 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1982:
- (a) amend the Proposals Map allocation of site 38E to reflect the area granted planning permission by the Secretary of State, in accordance with Proposed Change No PC31.
 - (b) at paragraph 22.03, site 38E, amend the site area to reflect that granted planning permission by the Secretary of State.
- 12.22 Modify the plan in response to Objection 2006: amend the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC30.
- 12.23 No change to the plan in response to Objections 57, 80, 265, 266, 540, 548, 554, 559, 560, 568, 569, 1078, 1100, 1101, 1108, 1119, 1163, 1180, 1310, 1430, 1768, 1889 and 2212

POLICY E3: SITING OF OFFICES AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT ON UNALLOCATED LAND (A2 AND B1 USES)

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1710	Mr D Southworth	No
1983	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd.	No

Summary of Objections

- The Council is too eager to encourage and permit development. The Council does not discourage large developments. **(Objection 1710)**
- Criterion (i) restricts commercial and industrial development in the countryside and does not allow for furthering the aims of sustainable development in rural areas. **(Objection 1983)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 12.24 Developers, and others with an interest in land and/or buildings, have a right to submit development proposals to be assessed against the requirements of the statutory planning system. That cannot preclude large development proposals. All have to be fairly assessed. A development plan should indicate the type of development that would be permitted. This, generally, the policy seeks to establish. **(Objection 1710)**
- 12.25 The policy establishes the Council's overall approach to A2 and B1 uses on unallocated land. The general intent reflects national planning guidance, not least in PPGs 1 and 13. Other policies of the plan deal with the Green Belt and Other Protected Open Land. **(Objection 1983)**
- 12.26 On a matter of plan consistency, the Second Deposit version has added the word "unacceptable" to criterion (iv). Elsewhere, the plan addresses an adverse effect. It is for the decision-maker to establish whether a proposal would be unacceptable following a consideration of the plan as a whole, national planning guidance and all material considerations. The Council is advised to consider modifying the criterion, such that a proposal would not adversely affect the amenities of any adjoining uses.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 12.27 The Council is advised to consider a modification to the plan to reflect paragraph 12.26 above.
- 12.28 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1710 and 1983.

POLICY E4: GENERAL INDUSTRIAL AND WAREHOUSING DEVELOPMENT ON UNALLOCATED SITES

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1711	Mr D Southworth	No
1984	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No

Summary of Objections

- The Council is too eager to encourage and permit development. The Council does not discourage large developments. **(Objection 1711)**
- Criterion (i) restricts commercial and industrial development in the countryside and does not allow for furthering the aims of sustainable development in rural areas. **(Objection 1984)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 12.29 Developers, and others with an interest in land and/or buildings, have a right to submit development proposals to be assessed against the requirements of the statutory planning system. That cannot preclude large development proposals. All have to be fairly assessed. A development plan should indicate the type of development that would be permitted. This, generally, the policy seeks to establish. **(Objection 1711)**
- 12.30 The policy establishes the Council's overall approach to B2 and B8 uses on unallocated land. The general intent reflects national planning guidance, not least in PPGs 1 and 13. Other policies of the plan deal with the Green Belt and Other Protected Open Land. **(Objection 1984)**
- 12.31 On a matter of plan consistency, the Second Deposit version has added the word "unacceptable" to criterion (iv). Elsewhere, the plan addresses an adverse effect. It is for the decision-maker to establish whether a proposal would be unacceptable following a consideration of the plan as a whole, national planning guidance and all material considerations. The Council should consider modifying the criterion such that a proposal would not adversely affect the amenities of any adjoining uses.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 12.32 The Council is advised to consider a further modification to the plan to reflect paragraph 12.31 above.
- 12.33 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1711 and 1984.

POLICY E5: PROTECTION/REGENERATION OF EXISTING EMPLOYMENT AREAS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
549	Firwood Paint and Varnish Co Limited	No
1160	McDonald's Restaurants Ltd	No
1223	The House Builders Federation	No
2239	Robert Fletcher (Stoneclough) Ltd	No
2386	The House Builders Federation	No
50	The Trustees of the 1951 R E Morley Settlement	No

Summary of Objections

- Victoria Mill, Oakenbottom Road and associated land would continue to be a valuable employment location in the future. This should be reflected in the plan to provide certainty for a continuing employment use. **(Objection 549)**
- Class A3 restaurants are appropriate at employment sites as they are an ancillary service. **(Objection 1160)**
- The policy is a blanket protection of employment areas that contradicts PPG 3. Criterion (iv) at Second Deposit, referring to “an overall shortage”, does not indicate how such a judgement would be made. **(Objections 1223 and 2386)**
- At Second Deposit, the policy does not satisfactorily provide for the redevelopment of brownfield sites for residential use. Criterion (ii) should be extended to include amenity benefits arising from proposals. **(Objection 2239)**
- The policy should allow the release of land allocated for employment - in those circumstances where it would otherwise sterilise land that would be better used for housing. **(Objection 50)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.34 I have dealt with Objection 548 on adjacent land at paragraph 12.7 on Policy E2. As there, I consider site 549 to be appropriately included within an area of OPOL and is not within the urban area. Proposals would need to be assessed against the plan as a whole. Here, for example, the objector’s aspirations for the site would be assessed against Policy R2 (i) and (ii), these having a generally permissive approach to development at existing employment/industrial areas. The reasoned justification indicates that the policy deals with general areas and not specific buildings. Consistent with the objection, it should be amplified to indicate the approach of the plan to development at relatively small groups of employment buildings covered by OPOL designation. **(Objection 549)**

12.35 In my experience, Class A3 uses are frequently located within employment areas. While the objector argues that its operations may have a number of benefits - including the availability of food without having to travel further afield - the Council considers that the policy would permit other than B1, B2 and B8 uses, subject to the criteria therein. Overall, they are reasonable criteria in the light of the policy’s intent, but some flexibility should be added. The aspiration of the objector would be met by an addition to the

reasoned justification - this without compromising the approach of the Council. On this objection, an over-complicated policy would not result. Here, the plan does include a policy (S7) on take aways/restaurants, but this relates primarily to residential areas and local shopping centres. **(Objection 1160)**

- 12.36 These are First and Second Deposit objections. PPG 3 (paragraph 42) generally acknowledges that some allocations of land for employment are unlikely to be taken up and that such designations may not be compatible with PPGs. Non-housing allocations should be reviewed to establish whether they would be more appropriately used for other purposes. Policy E5 relates, however, to existing employment areas rather than allocations. I saw that the former have a substantial employment base. Together with E2 (allocations), the Council has, effectively, reviewed employment land provision. This objector has not submitted any convincing evidence that the Council's overall assessment is materially flawed. Turning to the policy itself, it is reasonable that it should seek to safeguard specified, existing employment areas. It acknowledges, however, that circumstances may arise that justify an alternative use. Criteria are established to test specific proposals. While I do not support the general thrust of the objection, justified concern has been established over criterion (iv) on "overall shortage". Development proposals would be subject to this test. While the words do, however, reflect reasonably common usage - the reasoned justification to the policy should indicate the way in which the Council would assess it. This would be need to be one of the key features of the monitoring process that I have dealt with at paragraph 17.4, to Chapter 17, of my Report. **(Objections 1223 and 2386)**
- 12.37 In my view, the policy intent is to strike a reasonable balance between the need to protect/regenerate existing employment areas and the likelihood of alternative uses arising from proposals. Here, a material consideration would be national planning guidance. As to criterion (ii), the objector's recommended wording is convoluted. The Council's, at Second Deposit, also gives me difficulty. It would be sufficient for the criterion to refer to the removal of an existing land-use conflict with neighbouring uses. Any reasonable local planning authority would be able to identify the issues involved. **(Objection 2239)**
- 12.38 This First Deposit objection sought the deletion of an industrial site - allocation 47E in Appendix 5 - and its allocation for housing. At Second Deposit stage, the allocation was deleted (Proposed Map Change 32). The objector has not disputed the Council's evidence that the site was granted planning permission for residential use in 2000. On the basis of my visits, the development is nearing completion. The objector's wish to see the site developed for housing has, in effect, been met. The intent of the criteria at Second Deposit stage represent reasonable considerations that should be applied in the consideration of proposals for alternative uses of existing industrial areas identified in the plan. **(Objection 50)**
- 12.39 Finally, although not the subject of specific objection, the policy has been worded unsatisfactorily and somewhat tortuously. Objection before me seeks clarity. The Council is advised to consider the following. The policy effectively addresses 2 matters - firstly, safeguarding and secondly, alternative uses. The policy should say that in 2 sentences. Such a policy would give clearer guidance. A form of words is advised below.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 12.40 Modify the plan in response to Objection 549: amend the reasoned justification to reflect paragraph 12.34 above.

- 12.41 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1160: add the following sentence to the reasoned justification at paragraph 12.14: “Other uses may be acceptable. Any proposal would be assessed against the policy as a whole, other policies of the plan, as well as the specific circumstances of each site.”
- 12.42 Modify the plan in response to Objections 1223 and 2386. The reasoned justification to the policy should indicate the way in which the Council would assess any “overall shortage” referred to in policy E5 (iv), consistent with my recommendation at paragraph 17.4 to Chapter 17.
- 12.43 Modify the plan in response to Objection 2239: paragraph 12.13: delete E5 (ii) and substitute: “(ii) the development proposal would remove an existing land use conflict with neighbouring uses.”
- 12.44 No change to the plan in response to Objection 50.
- 12.45 The Council is advised to consider a restructuring of the policy at paragraph 12.13 to reflect paragraph 12.39 above. It should consider:
 “12.13 E5. The Council will permit development proposals that safeguard the existing industrial areas - shown on the Proposals Map - for Office, Industrial and Warehouse (B1, B2 & B8) purposes. Development proposals for alternative uses or development will be assessed against the following criteria - and provided that the benefits of the proposal outweigh any disadvantages:.....”

POLICY E6: IMPROVEMENT OF EXISTING INDUSTRIAL AREAS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1725	Mr D Southworth	No
1746	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
2387	The House Builders Federation	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy should make reference to the need for environmental assessments. **(Objection 1725)**
- There should be continuing protection for remaining cotton mills, together with the encouragement of their continuing use. **(Objection 1746)**
- The policy should indicate the basis of the judgement for “an overall shortage”. **(Objection 2387)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 12.46 The need, or otherwise, for environmental assessments is prescribed primarily by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999 No 293) rather than legislation on the preparation of development plans. Any development proposal arising that needed to be assessed

against this policy would be required to submit an assessment if required by the regulations. There is, therefore, no need to refer to this in the UDP. **(Objection 1725)**

12.47 Mills are, clearly, a significant feature of the Borough and there is no significant evidence before me that this feature should not be dealt with in the plan. While development proposals affecting them would need to be assessed against the plan as a whole, Proposed Change No PC32 has recast the criteria for this policy and also rewritten the reasoned justification at paragraph 12.16. The former reflects the overall strategy of the plan. The reasoned justification adds to the Council's approach to existing industrial areas and premises and amplifies the Council's intent for mills within the Borough. That is helpful, with one reservation. The fourth and fifth sentences of the Proposed Change at paragraph 12.16 imply the delegation of decisions to a non-statutory document (the Council's Mill Strategy) that does not appear to have been the subject of public scrutiny in accordance with statutory procedures. While the potential offered by mills for industrial and business use is clear, those 2 sentences should be amended. **(Objection 1746)**

12.48 Proposed Change No PC32 has deleted Second Deposit criterion (ii) with its reference to an overall shortage. That would, in any event, be a key feature in the monitoring process that I deal with at paragraph 17.4 of my Report. **(Objection 2387).**

12.49 One further matter for the Council to consider, addressed elsewhere in my Report. Criterion (iv) to Proposed Change No PC32 includes the words "...no unacceptable impact on the amenities of any adjoining uses." It is for the decision-maker to establish whether a proposal would be unacceptable - taking into account the development plan, national planning guidance and all material considerations. In my view, a more appropriate wording would be "... not adversely affect....."

RECOMMENDATIONS

12.50 Modify the plan in response to my overall assessment of Objections 1746 and 2387: amend the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC32, subject to the following: delete sentences 4 and 5 to paragraph 12.16 and substitute: "Reflecting the Borough's industrial tradition, the policy seeks to retain mills in industrial use. Further advice is available in the Council's Mill Strategy."

12.51 The Council should also consider modifying the plan in response to paragraph 12.49 above.

12.52 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1725.

POLICY E7: WORKING FROM HOME

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
268	Orange Personal Communications Services Ltd	No
1911	CED Promotion Partnership	No

Summary of Objections

- A more appropriate home-based and tele-working policy would support the concept of a sustainable development strategy. The policy should distinguish between the different types of home-working and recognise that sustainability may need to take precedence, if necessary at some loss to amenity. **(Objections 268 and 1911)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.53 The policy reasonably reflects an increasing trend towards working from home in response to modern technology. This would be likely to support a reduction in the need for travel consistent with PPG13. I support its principle and its intention to protect the “amenity” of local residents. While there are a number of forms of home-working, the policy - together with others in the plan - is sufficiently robust to provide a context for the assessment of specific proposals. While, overall, I find the policy generally acceptable, the Council should consider my further comments below, consistent with objector requirements for clarity. They would improve the policy and assist in the development control process. PPG4 (paragraph 32) indicates that home-working does not necessarily require planning permission. Therefore, the policy itself should refer to “development” proposals on its first line. Next, the Second Deposit policy - as worded - would allow the use of a dwelling in a residential area for any business including, for example, Class A3 uses. That, in my view, is clearly not the intention of the policy. Although the heading to the policy is “Working from home”, the policy itself should reflect that. Finally, while the tests at the end of the policy are reasonable, they really address whether the “living conditions” of nearby residents would be adversely affected, rather than the somewhat vague word “amenity”. That would represent a more appropriate policy reference. The Council’s Proposed Change No PC33, referring to a Council Draft Planning Control Policy Note, is acceptably advisory - reflecting paragraph 32 of PPG4. While not part of the plan, it does not indicate that decisions on development proposals would be based on it. **(Objections 268 and 1911)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

12.54 No change to the plan in response to Objections 268 and 1911, but modify it in accordance with Proposed Change No PC33.

12.55 The Council should also consider modifying the plan to reflect paragraph 12.53 above. A more appropriate wording of the policy, for the Council to consider, would be as follows:

“12.17 E7. In residential areas, the Council will permit development proposals for the use of a dwelling for business working from home, in whole or in part, provided that they do not adversely affect the living conditions of nearby residents - in terms of noise, smells, traffic and a loss of off-street parking.”

POLICY E8: TOURISM

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1884	DEFRA	No

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1898	North West Tourist Board	No
1912	CED Promotion Partnership	No

Summary of Objections

- The promotion of tourism should be more prominent and the subject of a separate chapter or section, reflecting PPG 12. There is scope for diversification projects on farms, and in rural areas, to provide tourist accommodation and related activities. The policy is overly negative as it does not recognize the potential benefits and importance of tourism, particularly in relation to the Green Belt. **(Objections 1884 and 1898)**
- Tourism does not necessarily provide employment opportunities for local people. Development conditions should require it. Tourism activity can harm local residential areas. Proposals should be assessed for their sustainability implications. **(Objection 1912)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.56 National planning guidance in PPG 21 indicates that tourism makes a major contribution to the prosperity of many towns (paragraphs 1.1 and 3.4). Support for tourism is the general intent of the policy, reflected in paragraph 12.20. E8 permits tourism provision subject to a number of tests - these generally reflecting sound planning principles. Further, the policy should not be viewed in isolation - other policies of the plan being relevant. The generality of Chapters 13 and 14 is that a number of uses other than retailing would be acceptable in centres, reflecting Revised PPG6. This would include tourism. Concern has been expressed over the application of Green Belt policies on tourism. Overall, Chapter 4 reflects PPG2 (Revised) with its long established principles for the control of development in the Green Belt. Tourism development proposals, like others, would need to be assessed against the relevant tests, including those for the re-use of buildings. PPG 21 acknowledges the particular circumstances that apply within Green Belts. As appropriate control is established in the plan, policy/criteria for bed and breakfast and budget hotels etc are not justified and would be likely to result in an overly-complicated plan. **(Objections 1884 and 1898)**

12.57 National planning guidance in PPG 21 indicates that tourism makes a major contribution to the prosperity of many towns (paragraphs 1.1 and 3.4). While it would be reasonable that a substantial proportion of the resulting employment would be taken by local people, a development plan - a land-use document - cannot prescribe the nature of any employee. Any conditions imposed on development would need to meet the tests in Circular 11/95. While I acknowledge that tourism proposals may have a potential impact, the intention of Policy E8 is to provide for an assessment on the local area that, together with other relevant policies of the plan, would establish sufficient control - including sustainability. **(Objection 1912)**

RECOMMENDATION

12.58 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1884, 1898 and 1912.

OMISSIONS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1890	North West Tourist Board	No
2024	British Telecommunications Plc	

Summary of Objections

- There should be a separate chapter or section on tourism, a major employment generating activity. **(Objections 1890)**
- A policy should be included for established utility sites. It would ensure that favourable consideration would be given to the re-use of redundant sites to allow reinvestment towards improved service provision. **(Objection 2024)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

12.59 Taking into account paragraph 12.56 above, it follows that I do not consider that a separate chapter or section on tourism is justified. **(Objection 1890)**

12.60 I note that the objector has a property portfolio within the Borough, the disposal of some of which may be required over the plan period. The same consideration would apply to other land and property holders. It would be inappropriate to specifically accommodate the needs of utilities to the exclusion of other interests. I have considered the merits of an additional policy addressing surplus landholdings, and taken into account paragraph 4 of PPG4. The development process is there, however, to acknowledge that land/property may no longer be required for a previous use. All proposals would need to be considered against the policies of the plan as a whole. The status of the land may be a material consideration. The aspirations of the objector would not be prejudiced. For the plan to positively consider change of use would be inappropriate. **(Objection 2024)**

RECOMMENDATION

12.61 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1890 and 2024.

CHAPTER 13 - RETAIL AND LEISURE

POLICY S1

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1642	The Emerson Group	No
1712	Mr D Southworth	No
1745	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
1756	Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	Yes
1765	Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	No
1782	SWAN	No
1913	CED Promotion Partnership	No

Summary of Objections

- The scale of retail and leisure development should be qualified, to reflect that promoted by Policies S2, S3 and S4. The words “of appropriate scale” should be added after the word “development”. (**Objection 1642**)
- The Council is too eager to encourage and permit development. The Council does not discourage large developments. (**Objection 1712**)
- Retail developments should be sited within existing centres to prevent harm to them. (**Objection 1745**)
- The sequential approach is one of a number of national policy tests. The policy should be amended with the addition of the words “...and other national policy tests”. (**Objection 1756**) (**conditionally withdrawn**)
- This site at Burnden Park is unallocated. It should not be “white land”. The plan should indicate the preferred uses - retail and leisure not being acceptable. (**Objection 1765**)
- The policy, at First Deposit, uses the words “encourage” and “permit”. It should be more restrictive. It should also define what constitutes edge-of-centre in the reasoned justification. Out-of-centre developments are not supported. (**Objection 1782**)
- There is no support for local communities and enterprises. Retail and leisure developments can adversely affect a wider residential area and their sustainability implications should be assessed. Local facilities should be supported and conditions should be applied to development to secure the employment and training of local people. (**Objection 1913**)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

13.1 The policy at Second Deposit establishes a reasonable strategic framework within which other policies of the chapter would be implemented. The scale of any development proposal is clearly a material consideration in its assessment. This is reflected in the requirements of the policy for proposals to satisfy the tests embodied in national planning guidance and, in my view, continued in other policies of the plan. The scale of

a development is, therefore, one of a number of considerations that the decision-maker would need to take into account. I see no convincing reason why I should identify that in the policy, to the exclusion of others. **(Objection 1642)**

- 13.2 Developers, and others with an interest in land and/or buildings, have a right to submit development proposals to be assessed against the requirements of the statutory planning system. That cannot preclude large development proposals. All have to be fairly assessed. A development plan should indicate the type of development that would be permitted. This, generally, the policy seeks to establish. **(Objection 1712)**
- 13.3 The reasons for past planning decisions by the Council are a matter for it. Policy S1, at Second Deposit, establishes a strategic approach to retail and leisure development proposals on allocated/non allocated sites. It fairly reflects the intention of paragraphs 3.7 and 3.8 of PPG 12 and the box preceding paragraph 3.11 there, as well as - overall - the approach of Revised PPG6. Any specific proposals arising would also need to be assessed against the tests included within other policies of the chapter. Sufficient control would be available - the Council needing to consider proposals in the light of the policies and all other material considerations. **(Objection 1745)**
- 13.4 This First Deposit objection has been conditionally withdrawn following a change to the policy at Second Deposit that includes a reference to other national policy tests. I agree. **(Objection 1756)**
- 13.5 Chapter 13 relates to retail/leisure development. It identifies specific retail allocations; provides a criteria-based approach for the assessment of retail proposals outside defined centres; as well as guidance on retail development on unallocated sites within centres. I consider that this general approach should be supported, not least as it reflects the reality of the development process and is consistent, generally, with advice in paragraphs 1.14 and 4.2 of Revised PPG6. The objector has not submitted any convincing evidence that, either the allocations in Policy S2 are not realistic, or that the Council's overall approach to retail development on unallocated sites within centres (S3) and proposals outside defined centres (S4) is flawed. Understandably, in my view, the objection seeks to protect town centre interests. Policy S1, together with Policies S2 to S8 would provide sufficient control. Taking into account, therefore, the policy context of the plan, I am not persuaded that the relevant land at Burnden Park should be allocated - including a definition of unacceptable uses, not least as no specific use is sought for the site. Any proposal arising would need to be considered on its specific circumstances, in the light of the policies of the UDP and other material considerations. **(Objection 1765)**
- 13.6 At Second Deposit, the Council has properly deleted the word "encourage" as this implies an aim rather than a statement of planning policy. The use of the word "permit" is acceptable as development plans should indicate the kind of development that would be permitted. It would be inappropriate for the plan to define, specifically, "edge-of-centre" as this would be likely to vary within the Borough in the light of specific circumstances. This is reflected in paragraph 3.14 to Revised PPG6 - albeit that paragraph and Annex A refer, together, to a distance of 200-300 metres from the primary shopping area, including easy walking distance. The general thrust of this chapter does not support out-of-centre developments - again reflecting national planning guidance **(Objection 1782)**
- 13.7 I have no reason to doubt that a positive contribution is made to the community by local enterprises and agencies. The UDP is a land-use document that establishes a development framework within which they can operate. It cannot prescribe their role or make specific provision for them. The Council tells me that its wider, corporate, role is

supportive of them and I have no reason to doubt its good intentions in this respect. Any development implications of retail/leisure proposals would be assessed through the detailed policies of the plan, including sustainability. Planning conditions imposed on development would need to meet the tests set out in Circular 11/95. **(Objection 1913)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 13.8 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1642, 1712, 1745, 1756, 1765, 1782 and 1913.

POLICY S2: RETAIL ALLOCATIONS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
2414	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
542	The Hulton Estate	No
642	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1643	The Emerson Group	No
1671	Tesco Stores Ltd	No
1757	Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	Yes
1988	City Link Properties Ltd.	No
2007	Environment Agency	No
2285	Mr A Riley	No
2440	SWAN	No
2022	British Telecommunications Plc	No
2182	L Gallagher	No
9003	Morbaine Ltd	No

Summary of Objections

- In the last line of the reasoned justification, residential provision should be included. **(Objection 2414)**
- The site - at Lee Hall, Westhoughton - is of sufficient size to provide for local shopping facilities as part of a comprehensive, sustainable and mixed-use development. **(Objection 542)**
- At First Deposit, the plan does not show that the Council has considered either, the need for new retail development over the lifetime of the plan on the sites listed in the policy or, that it has adopted a sequential approach to identify sites not in the town centre. **(Objection 642)**
- The reasoned justification to the policy should explain that the scale of development will vary as to the size of the centre with explanation in Appendix 6 of the requirement on allocated sites. The mixed business area at Middlebrook should be added to the list of sites giving benefit from additional stores, Middlebrook performing a District Centre role. **(Objection 1643)**

- At First Deposit, the existing planning permission for retail development of the Tesco site at Mansell Way, Horwich should be reflected in the Plan at S2. **(Objection 1671)**
- The policy should allow for an appropriate element of leisure uses on sites R1 to R4. The existing J Sainsbury site in the Town Centre should be added to the list of retail allocations, with a permissive stance in relation to an appropriate element of leisure being incorporated into future redevelopment. The Bollings Yard/Railway Triangle should be also allocated under this policy. **(Objection 1757) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- Nortex Mill, Chorley Old Road, is not included within Policy S2. There are a mix of uses within the mill including a significant retail content. An allocation at the site would adjoin the District Centre and could integrate into it. Retail uses would contribute to the vitality and viability of the centre as a whole. **(Objection 1988)**
- At Appendix 6, the Central Street description there should include additional information on the adjacent River Croal watercourse. **(Objection 2007)**
- On Proposed Map Change 70, at Second Deposit, the deletion of the retail allocation at Pioneer Square, Westhoughton is not supported, this being suitable for new retail development. **(Objections 2182, 2285, 2440)**
- Property at Bury Road will shortly be surplus to requirements. It should be included in the policy as a retail allocation - given that it lies adjacent to Brightmet District Centre. **(Objection 2022)**
- Proposed Change No PC38, Trinity Street/Crook Street, should allow both bus and industrial operators to relocate. **(Objection 9003)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 13.9 To begin, Proposed Change No PC34 would “tidy up” the numbering of the Second Deposit version of the policy, albeit I see no reason why the roman numerals there should not be consecutive.
- 13.10 Reasonably, paragraph 13.07 acknowledges that the policy allocations may come forward either for retail as a whole or with retail as part of a mixed development. This is consistent, overall, with Revised PPG6 where paragraph 1.15 indicates that a range of uses may be appropriate. Here, town centre living is supported by the plan at Policy TC2, the plan needing to be considered as a whole. The aspiration of the objector would not be prejudiced. **(Objection 2414)**
- 13.11 This objection should be read together with my recommendations on Lee Hall at Chapters 10 and 12. Clearly, a material consideration in the assessment of any mixed-use development proposal at Lee Hall would be the need, or otherwise, for local shopping facilities. **(Objection 542)**
- 13.12 Not disputed by the objectors, it appears to me that the Council’s evidence acceptably justifies its approach - reflecting the recent retail study (CB B52). Other than the Trinity Street/Crook Street site (R2), the allocations at Second Deposit are within centres. While not normal for an allocation (R2) to be included in a plan that has the benefit of planning permission(s), I accept the Council’s reason for so doing in this case. Nonetheless, the reasoned justification to the policy is lacking in detail. Reflecting the objection, it should be amplified to indicate the basis for the allocations. Proposed Change No PC38 would give further information on Trinity Street/Crook Street at Appendix 6. It is to be supported - albeit there is no evidence from the Council why the appendix should not allow bus as well as industrial operators to relocate, consistent with 9003. **(Objections 642 and 9003)**

- 13.13 The objector - at First Deposit - has not disputed that the part of the objection relating to Middlebrook relates to the plan accompanying the Council's evidence. At Second Deposit, the Council has appropriately added to paragraph 13.06 a requirement for the scale of allocations developed to be compatible with the existing centre. That, together with Appendix 6, provides an adequate context for allocations. I have dealt in detail with the retail issues relating to the Middlebrook development, and the objector's wish to see it defined as a District Centre, at Objection 1644 to Policy S3 (paragraph 13.30 of my Report). **(Objection 1643)**
- 13.14 I saw that the site has been developed for a store, petrol filling station and car park. As the development has been completed, I see no reason why the site should be allocated and shown on the Proposals Map under this policy, or as a commitment designation. **(Objection 1671)**
- 13.15 At Second Deposit, the reasoned justification at paragraph 13.07 has been amended to indicate that leisure uses would be appropriate. Policy TC8 would accommodate retail and leisure uses at the Bollings Yard site. **(Objection 1757)**
- 13.16 The site is within the area of Westhoughton Local Town Centre defined on the Proposals Map. At First Deposit, it included a retail allocation at the site - this deleted at Second Deposit through Proposed Map Change 70. The land is presently vacant, between Cricketers Way and properties on Market Street, with a parade of commercial uses and a convenience store to the east. The area of the Local Town Centre defined in the plan generally reflects the advice in Annex A to Revised PPG6 - providing a range of facilities and services that are a focus for both the community and public transport. I saw a number of vacant premises within the town centre. The evidence before me does not indicate any reasonable prospect of this site being occupied by a Class A1 use, though Policy S3 would permit such a use within the town centre - the wish of the objectors not being prejudiced in that respect. National planning guidance indicates that vital and viable town centres may include a diversity of uses (paragraph 2.11 - second reference - to Revised PPG6), albeit retailing should continue to underpin the centre (2.18). I see no reason why vitality and viability would not be supported by a use at the site that reflects a diversity of use. **(Objections 2182, 2285 and 2440)**
- 13.17 I have taken into account the planning history at Nortex Mill. It is not in dispute that the objection site comprises about 2 hectares, extending from the frontage to Chorley Old Road to Bilbao Street. The objector has not submitted any convincing evidence why an allocation of this size is necessary to sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of the Chorley Old Road District Centre. A planning permission at the ground floor for retail use does not justify an allocation. Generally, this would equally apply to any building adjacent to a centre that has a similar permission. I do not support the objection, but have dealt with the objector's wish to see the site included within the defined area of the District Centre at Policy S3 (paragraph 13.34 of my Report). **(Objection 1988)**
- 13.18 The description of the Central Street, Bolton Proposed Retail Allocation in Appendix 6 was changed at Second Deposit stage to reflect a listed building presence. The Council now proposes a further change (Proposed Change No PC35) to meet the requirements of the objector on the adjacent River Croal. I see no reason to disagree. **(Objection 2007)**
- 13.19 This objection relates to land within a Protected Employment Site (PES) under Policy E5. There is no convincing evidence before me from the objector that the site has been improperly defined in that PES context - other than it will become surplus to requirements. It represents previously-developed land within the urban area that would be available for reoccupation by another employment use. It is outside the defined

Brightmet District Centre that, on the basis of my site visit, has been appropriately defined. While I have taken into account the relationship of the objection site to an allocation under this policy, it would represent an out-of-centre location contrary to the overall strategy of the plan and that of Revised PPG6. Any retail proposal arising at the site would be subject to the tests of Policy S4. **(Objection 2022)**

13.20 Proposed Change No PC36 would correct an error at Map Change 72 in relation to the Cambrian Works.

RECOMMENDATIONS

13.21 Modify the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC34.

13.22 Modify the plan in response to Objection 2007: amend the plan at Appendix 6 in accordance with Proposed Change No PC35.

13.23 Modify the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC36.

13.24 Modify the plan in response to my overall consideration of Objections 642 and 9003: amend the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC38 at Appendix 6, subject to paragraph 23.02 reflecting the last sentence of paragraph 13.12 above.

13.25 No change to the plan in response to Objections 542, 1643, 1671, 1757, 1988, 2022, 2182, 2285, 2414 and 2440.

POLICY S3: RETAIL DEVELOPMENT ON UNALLOCATED SITES WITHIN CENTRES

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
59	Morbaine Ltd	No
1183	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	No
1295	Westhoughton Town Council	No
1297	Westhoughton Town Council	Yes
1644	The Emerson Group	No
1694	Travis Perkins	No
1717	Mr D Southworth	No
1758	Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	Yes
1989	City Link Properties Ltd	No

Summary of Objections

- The boundary of Farnworth Town Centre does not reflect the full extent of the retail area and should include Higher Market Street, consistent with the adopted plan. **(Objection 59)**
- There is an inconsistency between the Proposals Map and Policy S3. Chorley Old Road is defined as a Local Town Centre on the former, a District Centre in the latter. It functions as a Local Town Centre, not as a District Centre - largely a result of the trade draw from the objector's store. **(Objection 1183)**

- Policy S3 would not protect retail outlets in Westhoughton Local Town Centre. Policy TC4 should apply to the centre to prevent the loss of retail outlets to commercial uses. **(Objection 1295)**
- The Silcocks site - off Mill Street, Westhoughton - is allocated for second-hand car sales. This is unsuitable in the town centre. The site should be used for sheltered housing. **(Objection 1297) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- Middlebrook retail warehouse park performs the role of a District Centre and should be included in this policy as it meets most of the criteria in the definition of District Centres in Revised PPG6. This is supported by survey evidence. It is an established major leisure, retail and mixed-use centre with excellent transport links. **(Objection 1644)**
- The Travis Perkins site on Albert Road, Farnworth is not allocated and lies outside the defined town centre of Farnworth. This could give rise to uncertainty and speculative applications for alternative uses for the site. **(Objection 1694)**
- The policy should state that there will be a sequential approach to development in order to safeguard green field sites. **(Objection 1717)**
- The policy should allow for retail and leisure development of appropriate scale and character in town and local town centres, this to reflect national guidance. Paragraph 13.11 needs to be consistent with paragraph 4.15 of Revised PPG6 on the status of developments. **(Objection 1758) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- Nortex Mill is not included within the defined area of Chorley Old Road District Centre. There has been a mix of uses within the mill including a significant retail content. The site adjoins the District Centre and should be included within it. **(Objection 1989)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

13.26 Firstly, I have taken into account the Inspector Report and Decision (CD B64) on application 51967/97, including paragraphs 19.112 to 19.121. Secondly, I see that the adopted plan included the objection site (broadly Higher Market Street) as part of Farnworth District Centre albeit, not - apparently - primary shopping frontage. The Council's evidence on this objection provides limited justification for the exclusion of the objection site from Farnworth Local Town Centre. I shall make my own assessment. To begin, the southern edge of the objection site is broadly a similar distance from Brackley Street - acknowledged by the Council as the core of the centre - as the northern edge of the defined Local Town Centre. Overall, the site is within reasonable walking distance of Brackley Street. While retail multiples and banks are about Brackley Street, the objection site has a range of diverse uses, their very presence indicating use by visitors to the centre. I do not consider that the units there no longer, overall, have a town centre role. While the vitality and viability is somewhat less than that part of the centre about Brackley Street, including footfall, my site observations did not suggest to me that this area of Higher Market Street was not viable in itself. I see no material conflict with Part 2 of Revised PPG6, while the Council has not told me of the changes that it considers have resulted to the extent of the centre since the adopted plan that would justify the exclusion of the objection site. Further, the Council's evidence does not provide any convincing case on the harm that would arise from meeting the objection. I have considered the appeal Report but am not persuaded that the specific circumstances of that case are directly comparable to the objection before me. In all the circumstances, I support the objection. **(Objection 59)**

13.27 The Council's evidence has not addressed the apparent inconsistency between policy and Proposals Map, the latter indicating that Chorley Old Road is a Local Town Centre. It

should do. The principle of a “hierarchy” in the policy reflects Annex A to Revised PPG6. That the hierarchy there is different to that in the plan is, reasonably, a matter for local discretion. What is far from clear is the basis of the hierarchical definition in both paragraphs 13.09 to 13.12 of the Second Deposit version and the Council’s evidence. Here, I note that the 4 Local Town Centres are in communities broadly separated from the main urban area of Bolton. The 4 District centres are broadly within. That seems an appropriate way for the plan to proceed. In my opinion, Chorley Old Road functions as a District Centre, but the basis of the hierarchy in S3 should be further explained in the reasoned justification. **(Objection 1183)**

- 13.28 The primary shopping frontage at Westhoughton defined in the adopted plan has not been carried forward into the UDP, this approach being restricted to Bolton Town Centre at TC4. I have noted the vacancy levels recorded in 1997 and 1999 at Westhoughton. My own site observations, on a number of visits to the town centre, indicate a reasonable Class A1 presence, but with a significant vacancy level. I have some doubt as to whether these, or any others arising, would represent a reasonable prospect of occupation by a retail use. In my opinion, Westhoughton Local Town Centre is insufficiently robust to sustain a policy that would require defined frontages to be occupied by a percentage of retail uses. Nonetheless, Policy S3 does have a permissive approach to retail proposals within the town centre on unallocated sites. In the specific circumstances at Westhoughton, the plan’s approach to support a diversity of town centre use to encourage its vitality and viability, reflecting Revised PPG6, is to be supported. **(Objection 1295)**
- 13.29 This vacant site within Westhoughton Local Town Centre has a planning permission for car sales, not yet appearing to have commenced and not allocated for that purpose. Any further development proposals arising would need to be considered against all relevant plan policies. Here, Policy TC2 permits new build proposals that support town centre living. This would include sheltered housing. The aspirations of the Town Council are not prejudiced by the plan and it has not argued that there is such a need for sheltered housing sufficient for me to recommend an allocation for that purpose. **(Objection 1297)**
- 13.30 The objection site is some distance from Horwich Local Town Centre as defined in the policy and cannot be described as an edge-of-centre site in terms of Revised PPG6. I have carefully considered the planning history at the site, including the Secretary of State’s Decision on planning application No: 45960/94 and dated 21 June 1996. It is clear there, that the Decision related to a proposal that would restrict the retail park by condition to the sale of primarily bulky goods, this effected through conditions R2, R3 and R6 of the planning permission. Objector 1644 has not contested that. In my opinion, the intention was to ensure that the site did not function as a District Centre in competition, across a wide range of facilities, with other shopping centres in the area. Here, Revised PPG6 indicates that, in preparing development plans and the need for new development, district and local centres should be given preference over out-of-centre sites, such as Middlebrook. That is the general thrust of the UDP. On an extended site visit to Middlebrook, I came to the clear view that it does not function as a district shopping centre as defined in Annex A to Revised PPG6. It does not have the range of retail units generally expected in them, while non-retail services are generally ancillary to other uses. Here, I have noted the objector’s view of the Breightmet District Centre but I share the opinion of the Council that it discharges a community role. Similarly, I have taken into account both the 2 superstores (both with floorspace restrictions) and the restaurant facilities present at Middlebrook. While Horwich Parkway railway station has been opened, that is some distance from the main units at the retail park. Although I am told from the objector’s survey data that 7% of visitors do so on foot, it acknowledges a

relatively low penetration by bus, confirming the Council's assessment that the site is not on a good public transport node. While 3 new bus services have begun since the survey, I am not persuaded that they would result in any substantive change to the survey data already before me at an out-of-centre development that is highly dependent on travel by private car. While I have assessed all the other data before me, I have come to the view that there have been no changes since 1996 that justify a departure from the principle of the Secretary of State's Decision or, from that in 2001 (Application No: 54520/99). To support the objection would not be consistent with the need to sustain and enhance existing centres and would increase, rather than reduce, travel by the private car. **(Objection 1644)**

- 13.31 In this part of Farnworth, the boundary of the Local Town Centre has - on the basis of my site observations - been appropriately defined, reflecting both the box preceding paragraph 2.1 of Revised PPG6 and its Annex A. Speculative development proposals are likely to arise on both allocated and unallocated sites, including retail. Any arising outside Farnworth centre, including the site, would need to be assessed against other policies of the UDP - including S4. Sufficient control would be available, including national planning guidance. **(Objection 1694)**
- 13.32 This First Deposit objection was conditionally withdrawn following Second Deposit changes. The Council has added leisure developments to the policy. National planning guidance indicates that they can be an acceptable use within centres. The Council has amended paragraph 13.11 to reflect the intent of paragraph 4.15 of Revised PPG6. The first sentence of 13.11 should clarify that the floorspace there is a gross figure while the last sentence does not read properly. The paragraph should also indicate that greater weight would be given to quantitative need - this reflecting the McNulty Statement of April 2003. **(Objection 1758)**
- 13.33 The policy at Second Deposit relates to retail and leisure development on unallocated sites within its defined centres. This reflects the first preference set out in paragraph 1.11 to Revised PPG6 and is generally consistent with the first objective at paragraph 1.1 - this to sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of town centres. **(Objection 1717)**
- 13.34 The site is adjacent to the edge of the District Centre boundary defined in the plan. On an extended visit to the District Centre, the Council's view that the centre has been appropriately defined taking into account the grouping of shops and other non-food services appeared to me to be reasonable, generally. There is, however, an existing and significant retail presence at the ground floor of Nortex Mill, with an existing planning permission for retail use there (Application 56182/00). Adjacent to the boundary of the District Centre, I have difficulty in establishing why the inclusion of Nortex Mill within the District Centre would be likely to adversely affect its vitality and viability. The site is within acceptable walking distance of the rest of the centre and is within an extensive residential area. My balance of judgement is that a development there, consistent with S3, would be likely to strengthen the centre. I have one reservation, however. This relates to the extent of the objection site that includes land to the rear of the mill, in other than retail uses. The Council should include Nortex Mill within the District Centre, but the amended boundary should be related, generally, to the mill building. **(Objection 1989)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 13.35 Modify the plan in response to Objection 59: amend the Proposals Map to include the objection site within the area of the Farnworth Local Town Centre.

- 13.36 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1183: firstly, the Proposals Map should be amended to indicate that Chorley Old Road is a District Centre, and secondly, the reasoned justification to the policy should more clearly indicate the basis for the hierarchical definition of Policy S3.
- 13.37 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1758: reword the reasoned justification to the policy to reflect the considerations in paragraph 13.32 above.
- 13.38 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1989: amend the Proposals Map to include Nortex Mill within the boundary of the Chorley Old Road District Centre, subject to the qualification at paragraph 13.34 above.
- 13.39 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1295, 1297, 1644, 1694 and 1717.

POLICY S4: ASSESSMENT OF RETAIL PROPOSALS OUTSIDE DEFINED CENTRES

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1726	Mr D Southworth	No
1759	Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	Yes
1785	SWAN	No
1990	City Link Properties Ltd	No
2263	City Link Properties Ltd	No
2415	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
2417	Tesco Stores Ltd	No
2421	B & Q Plc	No

Summary of Objections

- There should be reference to the need for environmental assessments. **(Objection 1726)**
- The criteria and reasoned justification should more closely reflect the provisions of Revised PPG6. **(Objection 1759) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- Out-of-town and edge-of-centre developments should not be allowed unless it can be proven, conclusively, that they would not harm existing centres. **(Objection 1785)**
- The policy does not reflect national planning guidance, including the use of inappropriate words/phrases - “adjacent” and “within the plan period”. There is a need to refer to the viability of sites, as well as the effect of proposed developments on nearby town, district and local centres. The policy should not require qualitative and quantitative factors to be taken into account. **(Objections 1990, 2263, 2417 and 2421)**
- Criterion (iii), at First Deposit, should be retained in its entirety as it reflects sustainability and national planning guidance. **(Objection 2415)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 13.40 The need, or otherwise, for environmental assessments is prescribed primarily by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999 No 293) rather than legislation on the preparation of development plans. Any development proposal arising that needed to be assessed against this policy would be required to submit an assessment if required by the regulations. There is, therefore, no need to refer to this in the UDP. **(Objection 1726)**
- 13.41 The Council amended the plan at Second Deposit in response to the objection that has been conditionally withdrawn. Subject to other recommendations below, the policy has been improved. **(Objection 1759)**
- 13.42 The intent of the policy, including its criteria, reflects - generally - Revised PPG6 and the Ministerial statement of February 1999, both seeking to focus retail developments within existing centres. **(Objection 1785)**
- 13.43 I share the Council's view that the First Deposit criterion would be difficult to measure and assess. A site accessible by a choice of means of transport would be likely to reduce the number of car journeys. **(Objection 2415)**
- 13.44 At Second Deposit and in Proposed Change No PC37 the policy has been improved such that, with one exception, I consider it to be acceptable. First, however, it now refers to the viability of other sites; refers to on-the-edge of rather than adjacent, as well as nearby town, district or local centres. The policy as now before me still refers, however, to within the plan period rather than over a reasonable period of time as advised by Revised PPG6. That wording should be used, it being for the decision-maker to interpret in the light of all material considerations. **(Objections 1990, 2263, 2417 and 2421)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 13.45 Modify the plan in response to my overall considerations of Objections 1990, 2263, 2417 and 2421: amend the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC37 subject to the deletion of the words "... the plan period" and the substitution of "... a reasonable period of time". The reasoned justification should be consistent with the reworded policy, including this recommendation.
- 13.46 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1726, 1759, 1785 and 2415.

POLICY S6: RETAIL WAREHOUSE PARKS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1645	The Emerson Group	No
1760	Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	Yes
2220	Morbaine Ltd	No

Summary of Objections

- Middlebrook should be removed from this policy as it performs the role of a District Centre under Policy S3 and should be included there, this supported by survey evidence. It is an established major leisure, retail and mixed-use centre with excellent transport links. **(Objection 1645)**
- The boundaries of the retail parks should be shown on the Proposals Map. The policy at paragraph 13.20 should reflect the last paragraph of the reasoned justification. **(Objection 1760) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- The policy is too restrictive and goes significantly beyond the provisions of PPG6. On retail parks, there is no requirement to demonstrate need or a sequential approach for applications to vary conditions for proposed changes within Class A1 of the Use Classes Order. **(Objection 2220)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 13.47 I have dealt in detail with the policy issues at the Middlebrook development at objection 1644 to Policy S3. In the light of the planning history, it is appropriately defined under this policy. To remove it, and designate the site as a District Centre, would conflict with the clear intention of the Secretary of State in the 1996 Decision and, in relation to which, there have been no substantive changes in circumstances. There would be conflict with the general intention of national planning guidance. **(Objection 1645)**
- 13.48 Second Deposit Proposed Map Changes 75-79 now show retail boundaries, rather than indicative notations, and the wording of the policy at paragraph 13.20 has been linked to Policy S4. This meets the objection that has been conditionally withdrawn. **(Objection 1760)**
- 13.49 On this Second Deposit objection, the policy relates to existing/permitted Retail Warehouse Parks and the objector has not materially contested its general content, rather the detail of its application. Here, paragraph 3.11 to Revised PPG6 seeks, generally, to ensure that out-of-centre retail developments, restricted by condition, do not change their composition over time - adversely affecting the vitality and viability of an existing centre. The objector correctly draws my attention to Class A1 of the 1987 Use Classes Order (abbreviated). I consider, however, that the Ministerial Statement (CD N50) addresses the wider policy context established by Revised PPG6 - this, overall, to promote, sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of existing town, local and district centres. Reasonably, therefore, to change the nature of the activity at a retail warehouse park would represent a new form of retail development not envisaged when the original development was granted planning permission. I support the Council's general approach. Nonetheless, the wording of the policy at paragraph 13.20 requires refinement to improve its clarity. In the specific circumstances of this objection, taking into account national planning guidance referred to above, a negatively worded policy would be acceptable. **(Objection 2220)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 13.50 Modify the plan in response to Objection 2220: delete the first paragraph of 13.20 and substitute: "13.20 S6. The Council will not permit development proposals for changes to the nature and pattern of the existing/permitted Retail Warehouse Parks - listed below and shown on the Proposals Map - where they would adversely affect the vitality and viability of the centres defined in Policy S3. Proposals will be assessed against the criteria in Policy S4:"

13.51 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1645 and 1760.

POLICY S7: HOT FOOD TAKE AWAYS AND RESTAURANTS

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1159	McDonald's Restaurants Ltd.	No

Summary of Objection

- The policy should provide choice and include flexibility in accordance with PPG1 (Revised). It appears to contain a presumption that all A3 uses would adversely affect the amenity of adjoining occupiers. Proposals would not be considered on their merits. **(Objection 1159)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

13.52 The general intention of the policy is acceptable - this to protect the living conditions of nearby residents as well as the operation of neighbouring uses. Consistent with the objector's concern over the application of the policy, I consider that it should be simplified - otherwise I foresee difficulty in the development control process. The policy is not clear. The first sentence of the policy, read together with the second, implies that the need to protect living conditions only applies to residential areas or local shopping centres (undefined) - albeit I assume that the latter refers to the S3 definition. Nonetheless, I saw that there was a significant residential presence in Town and District centres. There, the policy appears to indicate that the tests of acceptability would only relate to extraction flues and - in sensitive areas - hours of operation. Here, however, paragraph 13.25 refers also to traffic and noise considerations. TC2 supports Town and District Centre living, requiring a wider test than that implied in the policy. It is unclear what comprises a sensitive area and why hours of operation should be limited to them. I shall recommend an appropriate modification to the plan, reflecting the objection. It should apply across the Borough, sufficient control being established for the Council to assess all material considerations relating to a proposal. The Council has not persuaded me that there is a need for a policy that draws a distinction between varying definitions of shopping centres. The Council's Proposed Change No PC39 to the reasoned justification, directing applicants to available advice, is reasonable. **(Objection 1159)**

RECOMMENDATION

13.53 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1159:

- (a) amend the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC39.
- (b) delete paragraph 13.24 and substitute: "13.24 S7. The Council will permit development proposals for hot food take-aways and restaurants that do not adversely affect the living conditions of nearby residents or the operation of neighbouring uses. Proposals will be assessed against the following considerations:
 - (i) highway safety, including parking;

- (ii) noise and disturbance; and
- (iii) smells/odours.”
- (c) the reasoned justification at paragraphs 13.25 and 13.26 should be amended and amplified to reflect both my recommended modification to the policy and paragraph 13.52 above.

OMISSIONS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1764	Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	No
1870	The Countryside Agency	No
1182	Wm Morrison Supermarkets Plc	No
1885	DEFRA	No

Summary of Objections

- Land at Waters Meeting Road, The Valley, is unallocated and should not be “white land”. The plan should indicate the preferred uses - retail and leisure uses not being acceptable. **(Objection 1764)**
- The plan should include a policy that encourages the retention of village shops as important facilities for rural communities. **(Objection 1870)**
- Land adjacent to the existing Wm Morrison store, Chorley Old Road, is appropriate for retail development and should be so allocated in the plan. **(Objection 1182)**
- The policy does not recognize the contribution made by farm shops to the local rural community and rural diversification. A criteria-based policy should be considered. **(Objection 1885)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

13.54 Chapter 13 relates to retail/leisure development. It identifies, for example, specific retail allocations and provides a criteria-based approach for the assessment of retail proposals outside defined centres, as well as guidance on retail development on unallocated sites within centres. Generally, this approach should be supported, not least as it reflects the reality of the development process and is acceptably consistent with advice in paragraphs 1.14 and 4.2 of Revised PPG6. This objector has not submitted any convincing evidence that, either the allocations in Policy S2 are not realistic, or that the Council’s overall approach to retail development on unallocated sites within centres (S3) and proposals outside defined centres (S4) is flawed. Understandably, in my view, the objection seeks to protect town centre interests. Policy S1, together with Policies S2 to S8 would provide sufficient control. Taking into account, therefore, the policy context of the plan, I am not persuaded that the land at Waters Meeting Road should be allocated - including

a definition of unacceptable uses. Any proposal arising would need to be considered on its specific circumstances, in the light of the policies of the plan and other material considerations. **(Objection 1764)**

13.55 The site, a landscaped area, is adjacent to an existing store and within the boundary of the Chorley Old Road District Centre. The objector's retail aspirations for this relatively small site, through a development proposal, would be assessed against Policy S3. That adopts a generally permissive approach to retail developments on land within defined District Centres, consistent with Revised PPG6. Taking this into account, the objector has submitted no convincing arguments sufficient for me to recommend allocating the site under this policy. **(Objection 1182)**

13.56 Development plans should indicate the type of development that would be permitted. A policy that encourages the retention of village shops would not be appropriate - implying an aim rather than a statement of planning policy. The planning system is not able to prevent the closure of a village shop that may result from a commercial decision by the operator. Planning permission may, however, be required for a change to another use. Nonetheless, Revised PPG6 indicates that village shops play a vital economic and social role in rural areas (paragraph 3.20). While I am not persuaded that a specific policy is justified, it appears to me that the aspiration of the objector would be able to be met by a modification to Policy S5 dealing with local shopping facilities. Although this policy is not the subject of specific objection, 1870 is related to it. Here, I see no reason why local shopping facilities should be restricted to the urban area, not least as the reasoned justification at paragraph 13.18 applies equally to rural as well as urban areas. While the Council argues that there are no significant groupings of dwellings or villages within the Green Belt or Other Protected Open Land, that implies a prior judgement that no village shop proposals would arise in those areas. The plan should provide a positive context for those that do. In addition, the reasoned justification to S5 should reflect the intent of paragraph 3.20 to Revised PPG6. **(Objection 1870)**

13.57 As with 1870, Revised PPG6 at paragraph 3.21 indicates that farm shops can serve a vital function in rural areas, encouraging diversification. The recommended modification I make to policy R3 at paragraph 3.26 of my Report would reflect that. **(Objection 1885)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

13.58 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1870:

(a) delete paragraph 13.17 and substitute: "13.17 S5. The Council will permit development proposals for small-scale shopping facilities, designed to meet the needs of the immediate locality, in residential areas within the urban area and elsewhere - provided that they do not adversely affect the amenities of adjacent uses due to increased noise and traffic."

(b) expand the reasoned justification to Policy S5 to reflect paragraph 13.56 above.

13.59 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1764, 1182 and 1885.

CHAPTER 14 - TOWN CENTRES

POLICY TC1

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1156	McDonald's Restaurants Ltd	No
1713	Mr D Southworth	No
1899	North West Tourist Board	No
1914	CED Promotion Partnership	No

Summary of Objections

- There should be greater flexibility to allow a variety of uses in shopping centres, including changes from Use Classes A1 to A2 or A3. This would reflect national planing guidance and would help maintain the vitality and viability of town centres. **(Objection 1156)**
- The Council is too eager to encourage and permit development. The Council does not discourage large developments. It should be more cautious in its approach. **(Objection 1713)**
- Tourism, and its part in a strategic approach to the enhancement of the main shopping core of Bolton, should be reflected by an encouragement of town centre facilities that enhance tourism and increase visitors. **(Objection 1899)**
- Town centre development can impact, adversely, on surrounding areas and increase social exclusion. Planning conditions should restrict town centre employment to local people and sustainability considerations should be taken into account. **(Objection 1914)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

14.1 To begin, there is a lack of clarity over the application of this policy. On the basis of the reasoned justification at paragraph 14.02, together with Policy S3, it appears to me that it applies to the Bolton Sub-Regional Town Centre; the 4 Local Town Centres; as well as the 4 District Centres. My reading of the Second Deposit version is that the policy does not apply to the 9 Local Shopping Centres defined in S3. Yet, that policy brings within its compass all listed centres. The Council should clarify the coverage of the policy. Without it, there is a clear recipe for confusion in the development control process. Here, I remain to be convinced why the policy should not apply to Local Shopping Centres - bearing in mind the generality of its intent. Moving on, the policy is a restatement of the Part 1 policy at paragraph 02.12. I consider that Objection 1156 arises, partly, from the list of developments that would be permitted by the policy. The last sentence of paragraph 2.12 to Revised PPG6 sets out a substantial list of uses that may give variety to centres and, thereby, contribute to vitality and viability. Policy TC1 does not reflect them. It is not clear why the policy should be limited to the uses therein and whether, for example, a leisure facility would include the type of outlet operated by the objector. Here, some Class A3 uses - in my experience - can provide a boost to the evening economy. They can also establish, generally, frontages at least as attractive to

centre users as many Class A1 units, as well as increasing “footfall” along shopping frontages. The policy before me would, again, be likely to result in confusion in the development control process. Further, the use of the phrase “in appropriate locations” indicates uncertainty. The objector seeks greater flexibility and - in my view - clarity. Policy TC1 is a strategic policy for centres. It should reflect the first bullet point of paragraph 1.1 to Revised PPG6 - indicating that the Council will permit development proposals that sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of the designated centres. The reasoned justification would, then, need to be expanded to reflect the intent of paragraphs 2.11 (second reference to 2.11) and 2.12 of the guidance. I see no need for a list of acceptable uses. It follows, therefore, that a similar modification should be made to the Part 1 Policy TC1 at paragraph 02.12 of Chapter 2. **(Objection 1156)**

- 14.2 Developers, and others with an interest in land and/or buildings, have a right to submit development proposals to be assessed against the requirements of the statutory planning system. That cannot preclude large developments. All have to be fairly assessed. A development plan should indicate the type of development that would be permitted. This, generally, the policy seeks to establish. **(Objection 1713)**
- 14.3 Revised PPG6 (paragraph 2.12) refers to the need to make town centres more attractive to visitors and includes a list of appropriate activities, including those tourist-based that would be likely to sustain and enhance vitality and viability. CD B44 indicates that tourism continues to be a major growth sector in the local economy (page 17) while CD B67 has an existing borough-wide strategy that seeks to build business in Bolton through tourism, and where the town centre has a key role (page 13). The modification I recommend in response to Objection 1156 would not prejudice the tourist interest. **(Objection 1899)**
- 14.4 Individual proposals arising within town centres would need to be assessed against the plan as a whole and other material considerations, including sustainability. A development plan cannot specify those who should take up employment opportunities arising from potential developments. The merits, or otherwise, of any planning condition restricting job occupation would need to be assessed against the tests in Circular 11/95. **(Objection 1914)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 14.5 The Council is advised to consider paragraph 14.1 above.
- 14.6 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1156:
- (a) delete paragraphs 14.01 and 02.12 and substitute: “14.01 (02.12) TC1. The Council will permit development proposals that sustain and enhance the vitality and viability of the centres defined in Policy S3.”
 - (b) amplify the reasoned justification at paragraph 14.02 to reflect paragraph 14.1 above.
- 14.7 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1713 and 1914.
- 14.8 No further change to the plan in response to Objection 1899.

POLICY TC4: BOLTON TOWN CENTRE

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1157	McDonald's Restaurants Ltd	No
1962	Mr G Smith	No
2082	Westhoughton/Hulton Park Liberal Democrats	No

Summary of Objections

- The threshold for the percentage of frontage to be in non-A1 uses is too restrictive, not providing flexibility and should be deleted. The outlets operated by Objector 1157 do not impair vitality and viability. Proposals should be considered on their merits. **(Objections 1157 and 1962)**
- Westhoughton Town Centre would not be adequately protected from non-retail uses. **(Objection 2082)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

14.9 I note the Council's view that the policy carries forward the adopted plan (1995) but that predated Revised PPG6. That guidance recognizes the shopping function of the primary shopping area (paragraph 2.12); indicates that retailing should continue to underpin town centres (2.18); and that changes of use in a town centre can - cumulatively - cause local problems (2.25). The first 2 references are, however, within a general context of the benefits arising from diversification that the plan generally seeks to achieve through Policy TC1, as well as TC3 applying to the Evening Economy area within Bolton Town Centre. The frontage limitation policy applies to the defined Core Shopping Area there, reflecting the most significant retailing concentration. Objector 1157 argues that its outlets - not disputed by the Council - can attract similar levels of customers to Class A1 units and have shop fronts consistent with town centre units - 1962 that the deletion of the frontage control would be likely to reduce empty units in the town centre. My site observations, on the latter, did not give me any substantive cause for concern and it does not represent a justification for the removal of the control. The last sentence of the policy statement (14.07) indicates that proposals that would exceed the 25% frontage limit would be permitted if the vitality and viability of the centre were maintained. That is an acceptable test. While I am not inclined to discount the principle of the control, there is a clear need for the Council to explain, further, in the reasoned justification the basis for 25%. That is not there at present. In my opinion, a developer should be entitled to see it. **(Objections 1157 and 1962)**

14.10 The policy only applies to Bolton Town Centre. Nonetheless, on the basis of my visits to Westhoughton Town Centre, I saw that it had a reasonable presence of Class A1 uses but with a significant number of vacant premises. Here, a recent commercial development, including a convenience store, has taken place to the south of Market Street. I am not persuaded that a limit on non-retail uses at ground floor level, including estate agents, would be in the best interests of the centre - not least as Policy TC4 relates to primary shopping frontages that have not been defined at Westhoughton. There, it would be likely to lead to an increase in vacancy levels. It seems to me that variety and activity need to be increased in this centre. This would be best achieved by encouraging

investment in a wide mix of uses, including retail, to support diversification - including those that support the evening economy. This would be consistent with the general thrust of Revised PPG6. Policy S3 is sufficiently encouraging towards retail developments within Westhoughton centre. **(Objection 2082)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

14.11 Modify the plan in response to my overall consideration of Objections 1157 and 1962: amend the reasoned justification at paragraph 14.08 to reflect paragraph 14.9 above, this to substantiate the 25% frontage limit proposed.

14.12 No change to the plan in response to Objection 2082.

POLICY TC5

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1761	Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	Yes

Summary of Objection

- The reasoned justification should be amended to indicate that there is a national policy presumption in favour of developments for all key town centre uses in the mixed-use areas. **(Objection 1761) (conditionally withdrawn)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

14.13 This First Deposit objection has been conditionally withdrawn following the change to paragraph 14.11 that indicates that a mixture of uses would be appropriate as part of the overall development of the 3 sites defined in the policy. This is consistent with the intent of paragraph 2.12 to Revised PPG6. **(Objection 1761)**

RECOMMENDATION

14.14 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1761.

POLICY TC6

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1224	The House Builders Federation	No

Summary of Objection

- The “blanket protection” of the areas in the policy at First Deposit contradicts government guidance set out in PPG 3. **(Objection 1224)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

14.15 The Second Deposit version of the policy is intended to qualify the use classes acceptable at the 2 sites through the addition of the word “primarily”. While site specific proposals increase certainty, it is not clear from either the policy - or its reasoned justification - why the 2 areas of sites and premises have been identified in the plan and the use classes prescribed. In their absence, the objector understandably expresses concern at a blanket approach. Here, paragraph 14.13 of the reasoned justification generally applies to the town centre as a whole - the sentiments there being reasonable. The policy relates, however, to Shiffnall Street and Wood Street and there is no explanation for their specific identification. There should be. **(Objection 1224)**

RECOMMENDATION

14.16 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1224: amend the reasoned justification at paragraph 14.13 to reflect paragraph 14.15 above.

POLICY TC7 (DELETED AT SECOND DEPOSIT)

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1762	Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	Yes
2183	Mr G Smith	No

Summary of Objections

- The redevelopment of the Water Place and surrounding land, although primarily for leisure uses, could include a retail element. **(Objection 1762) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- The Second Deposit deletion of leisure use allocations L1, L2, and L3. **(Objection 2183)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

14.17 I share the Council’s view that the First Deposit policy was not necessary for the 3 sites - taking into account existing leisure/cultural uses and a leisure consent for L2. The aspiration of Objector 1762 for a retail element at Water Place would not be prejudiced as such a use is consistent, in principle, with Policy TC1 and Chapter 13. This objection has been conditionally withdrawn. Similarly, on 2183, leisure uses within Bolton Town Centre are supported by S8 of the plan. **(Objections 1762 and 2183)**

RECOMMENDATION

14.18 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1762 and 2183.

POLICY TC8 (TC9)

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1763	Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	Yes
1687	Mr J Parkin	No

Summary of Objections

- The range of acceptable uses at the Bollings Yard site should be extended to include retail and leisure uses, given its proximity to the rail/bus interchange. **(Objection 1763) (conditionally withdrawn)**
- The plan should acknowledge the potential offered by the development of the Bollings Yard site for the improvement of passenger facilities and access at Bolton Station. It should not prejudice direct east/west rail services. **(Objection 1687)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 14.19 This First Deposit objection has been conditionally withdrawn following the Council's change to paragraph 14.19 at Second Deposit. The site does have access to a choice of public transport and, reflecting paragraph 2.12 of Revised PPG6, relates to a range of uses - including those requested by the objector. Paragraph 14.19 of the reasoned justification acceptably reflects this, the policy needing to be read together with TC1. **(Objection 1763)**
- 14.20 In response to Objection 1763, the Council has extended at Second Deposit the range of potential uses at this site that offers a major Bolton Town Centre development opportunity. It acknowledges that it is close to a choice of public transport. The development of this site would be likely to result in a substantial increase in activity. I share the general view of the objector that the potential offered by the rail station and the choice of public transport should not be ignored - this to reduce the need to travel by car and to promote accessibility by public transport. This reflects national planning guidance in PPG13. Bollings Yard is clearly a key site in Bolton Town Centre and the uses there would be accessible by public transport. In my view, the objector's general aspirations for the site are consistent with those of the Council. He broadly seeks an acknowledgement of the public transport potential offered by the site that reflects the Council's stated sustainable approach of the UDP. While his requirements for east/west rail services have not been sufficiently substantiated, any implication of a development of the site in that respect would, reasonably, be taken into account by the Council. Nonetheless, the reasoned justification should be expanded to record that detailed proposals at the site should be consistent with any future improvement of passenger facilities and access at Bolton Station. **(Objection 1687)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 14.21 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1687: amend the reasoned justification to the policy to reflect paragraph 14.20 above.
- 14.22 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1763.

POLICY TC9 (TC10)

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1688	Mr J Parkin	Yes

Summary of Objection

- The provision of cycle routes and facilities in the town centre, as well as access through open spaces, is not properly covered. The reasoned justification should include the designation of appropriate cycle access and cross-town routes to facilitate access to the town centre by cycle. **(Objection 1688) (conditionally withdrawn)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

14.23 This objector attended the hearing session (in a non-participatory role) into Objection 538. That discussion, when closed, confirmed - afterwards - that both objectors have similar aspirations to the Council. As a result, the Council is bringing forward 2 further changes to clarify its intent. Proposed Change No PC25 to Policy A17, that I deal with here, links the needs of cyclists to the Council's Town Centre Transport Strategy that is being prepared - through an addition to the reasoned justification. Proposed Change No PC40, to this policy, would add the word "visual" before the word "links" at paragraph 14.20. Both are to be supported as they have satisfied the objectors and appropriately reflect the needs of cyclists. **(Objection 1688)**

RECOMMENDATION

14.24 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1688: amend the plan to in accordance with Proposed Changes Nos PC25 and PC40.

OMISSIONS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1747	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
538	Bolton Cycling Forum	Yes

Summary of Objections

- The need to revitalize the southern part of the Town Centre about Newport Street, mainly between Great Moor Street and Bolton Station, should be recognized in the plan. **(Objection 1747)**

- There is insufficient reference in the plan to the provision of cycle routes and facilities in the Town Centre, notwithstanding the Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan and European good practice. **(Objection 538) (conditionally withdrawn)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

14.25 The general area to which the objection relates is within the Bolton Town Centre as defined on the Proposals Map. On my site visit, I saw that the vitality and viability of this part of it was somewhat less than elsewhere. Nonetheless, the policies of the plan at Chapters 13 and 14 seek, generally, to maintain and improve the vitality and viability of Bolton Town Centre, here reflecting the intentions of Revised PPG6. They are sufficiently positive to address the development needs of this area. In addition, other Council initiatives are underway, including the Town Centre Strategy. **(Objection 1747)**

14.26 I have covered this objection at 1688 (TC9) at paragraph 14.23 above. It has been conditionally withdrawn. **(Objections 538)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

14.27 Modify the plan in response to Objection 538: amend the plan in accordance with my recommendation at 1688 (TC9) at paragraph 14.24 above.

14.28 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1747.

CHAPTER 15 - MINERALS

POLICY M1

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1727	Mr D Southworth	No
2233	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy should refer to the need for environmental assessments. **(Objection 1727)**
- To reflect MPG1 and MPG3, the First Deposit reference to minerals providing employment for people in Bolton (15.02) should be reinstated. There is also indirect local employment benefit from minerals development and the industry contributes to the sub-regional economy. **(Objection 2233)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 15.1 The need, or otherwise, for environmental assessments is prescribed primarily by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999 No 293) rather than legislation on the preparation of development plans. Any development proposal arising that needed to be assessed against this policy would be required to submit an assessment if required by the regulations. There is, therefore, no need to refer to this in the UDP. **(Objection 1727)**
- 15.2 MPGs 1 and 3 recognize that mineral operations can provide employment. This advice is reflected at paragraph 15.03 at Second Deposit. **(Objection 2233)**
- 15.3 Having dealt with the objections, I record on an advisory basis that Policy M1 at paragraph 15.01, together with the similar Part 1 policy at paragraph 02.13, refer to “appropriate locations” - indicating uncertainty in the plan. On this policy, the Council is advised to consider a rewording that would indicate that the Council will permit development proposals for the extraction of minerals, subject to other policies of the plan.

RECOMMENDATION

- 15.4 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1727 and 2233, but the Council is advised to consider modifying the plan to reflect paragraph 15.3 above.

POLICY M2: DETERMINING PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
79	English Heritage	No
553	Mrs R Kelly, MP	No
647	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1315	Mr J Booth	No
1320	Mrs E Booth	No
1332	Mr D Cooke	No
1337	Mrs E Cooke	No
1341	Mr D Crausby, MP	No
1490	Mrs P Aspden	No
1493	Mr P Aspden	No
1501	Mr F Crompton	No
1503	Mr R Crompton	No
1508	Mr E Crompton	No
1511	Mrs A Crompton	No
1515	Mrs D Crompton	No
1522	Mr J Crompton	No
1523	Mr A Crompton	No
1525	Mrs S Crompton	No
1871	The Countryside Agency	No
1888	DEFRA	No
2234	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No

Summary of Objections

- Minerals workings can impact upon all the component features of the historic environment and criterion (v) at First Deposit should include archaeology and historic landscapes. **(Objection 79)**
- At First Deposit, the policy lacks clarity and conflicts with national planning guidance through many of its criteria - including the need for a specific “stand-off” distance for mineral development where flexibility should be introduced. **(Objection 647)**
- Object to any proposal that reduces the quality of life of the community most directly affected, particularly commercial proposals based upon a profit motive and which would take several years to complete. **(Objections 1315 and 1320)**
- These objections are similar and relate, generally, to criterion (xiv) at First Deposit, continued as criterion (viii) at Second Deposit. A 200 metre stand-off measurement does not fully safeguard the health and well-being of residents living near to opencast mines, particularly on dust and noise, who require an acceptable level of residential amenity. Here, a minimum stand-off of 300 metres should be considered and particular care should be taken in the siting of opencast mines near schools. **(Objections 553, 1332, 1337, 1341, 1490, 1493, 1501, 1503, 1508, 1511, 1515, 1522, 1523, 1525)**

- Criterion (vi), at First Deposit, addressing the implications of proposals for areas of landscape character, should indicate that proposals should not have an unacceptable impact on the character of the local landscape. Planning obligations provide an opportunity to achieve a net gain from development. **(Objection 1871)**
- First Deposit criterion (iv) should reflect national planning guidance. Mineral development should not normally be permitted on the best and most versatile agricultural land - except where the applicant can demonstrate that site working, restoration and 5 year aftercare will be carried out in ways that preserve the site's potential to be used as best and most versatile land. **(Objection 1888)**
- The policy should provide a comprehensive set of criteria to assess mineral development. Those criteria deleted at Second Deposit should be reinstated; paragraph 15.05 deleted apart from the first sentence; as well as the last sentence of paragraph 15.09 with a replacement that reflects paragraph 8 of MPG3. **(Objection 2234)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

- 15.5 This is a First Deposit objection. At Second Deposit, the policy was the subject of substantial change that limited, generally, the criteria to the operational and strategic aspects of mineral development. I support that approach. To include within the policy all potential considerations relevant to a proposal would make it unacceptably complicated and detailed. In considering development proposals, all relevant policies of the plan would need to be taken into account - including those on archaeology and landscape. The aspirations of the objector would not be prejudiced in this respect. **(Objection 79)**
- 15.6 The Second Deposit policy intent is now acceptable subject to paragraphs below and one other matter. On the latter, criterion (ii) seeks a demonstration of “need” for a mineral when an Environmental Statement is required. Circular 2/99 (page 40 at Annex C) does not indicate that “need” has to be established in an Environmental Statement. The Council should justify its case on this part of the policy. **(Objection 647)**
- 15.7 I note that the adopted plan includes a 200 metre separation distance [Policy M2/1 (o)]. Mineral workings and sensitive development are not good neighbours. It is a sound planning principle that they should be separated. The distance required will depend on the type of mineral extraction, the nature of any nearby sensitive development and local considerations - including topography, micro-climate - as well as the nature of the mitigation measures that are possible. Reasonably, therefore, a 200 metre separation distance in some cases would need to be increased - in others it would be considered to be generous and should be reduced. A reasonable planning authority would assess the specific circumstances of each case and determine the distance required. Here, both objectors and Council generally agree on the principle of separation. A benefit of a specified distance is that it offers guidance to neighbours as to where mineral working should not take place. In commenting on a proposal, that would be likely to be their “first point of call” in determining views. It could, however, raise false aspirations - as mitigation measures could acceptably reduce it. Here, the Council’s evidence has not included any rigorous assessment of the merits of 200 metres. Quite simply, it has not been acceptably justified. It relates, mainly, to the adopted plan and practice at 2 sites, albeit their specific circumstances are not before me. While the adopted plan is material, I need to make a fresh assessment of the issues before me. Objector 647 argues for greater flexibility in the criterion, others for an increase in the separation distance - but there is little convincing evidence to support the latter case. The Council’s evidence seeks to agree a distance that is effective but reasonable, but it has not persuaded me that

this aspiration would not be satisfactorily achieved by a more flexibly worded version of the disputed criterion at Second Deposit. I support that approach. Here, I have taken into account paragraph 15.08 of the reasoned justification. Finally, I note that criterion (viii) is limited to opencast coal, sandstone and gritstone with no justification for this limitation. While there are no objections in this respect, the Council should consider explaining the application of the criterion in the reasoned justification. **(Objections 553, 647 as it relates to criterion xiv at First Deposit, 1332, 1337, 1341, 1490, 1493, 1501, 1503, 1508, 1511, 1515, 1522, 1523 and 1525)**

- 15.8 Objector 1315, also representing the views of the Over Hulton Anti-Opencast Group (an identical objection being submitted by Objector 1320) sought the reinstatement of criterion (i) to the First Deposit version of the UDP - this to ensure that the living conditions of residents are not adversely affected by mineral extraction. Objector 1315 conceded at the Hearing session that the intention of the development control criteria, proposed in Policy M3 of the Second Deposit version, would address his concern. They are generally comprehensive. I have noted the objectors' views on the planning appeal process as it relates to the planning history in the vicinity of their home. **(Objections 1315 and 1320)**
- 15.9 At Second Deposit, the Council recast the policy. This appears to me to have 2 benefits. Firstly, the criteria to the policy now concentrate, generally, on the operational and strategic implications of mineral exploration and working. Secondly, the First Deposit version included criteria more appropriately dealt with by other policies of the plan - for example SSSIs, listed buildings, conservation areas and archaeology. These have been deleted at Second Deposit, a clearer policy resulting. Here, the landscape implications - if any - of proposals would fall to be considered under Chapter 3. Where relevant, the decision-maker would need to consider planning obligations, but no requirement can be placed upon a developer for a proposal to achieve a net gain. **(Objection 1871)**
- 15.10 I accept the Council's view that the Second Deposit addition of paragraph 03.15 to Policy R4 acceptably addresses the objection. Development proposals would need to be assessed against the plan as a whole. **(Objection 1888)**
- 15.11 The Second Deposit version of the policy appropriately addresses the operational and strategic implications of mineral development. The disputed criteria are reasonably covered by other policies of the UDP, proposals needing to be assessed against the plan as a whole. Their inclusion would be likely to result in an excessively detailed and complicated policy. The 2 sentences at the end of the reasoned justification at paragraph 15.05 fairly amplify the Council's policy intention. The last sentence of 15.09 implies, however, that the presumption in paragraph 8 of MPG3 relates only to environmental grounds. Test (ii) there, includes a local or community benefit. The sentence should be amended accordingly. **(Objection 2234)**
- 15.12 Having dealt with the objections, I draw the Council's attention - on an advisory basis - to various phrases included within the Second Deposit version. These include "satisfactory provision", "adequate", as well as "acceptable/unacceptable". These either imply uncertainty or are matters for the decision-maker to establish in the light of all material considerations. The Council is advised to edit the policy rigorously, here indicating that the Council will permit development proposals for mineral exploration and working provided that

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 15.13 Modify the plan in response to my overall consideration of Objections 553, 647 [as it relates to criterion (viii)], 1332, 1337, 1341, 1490, 1493, 1501, 1503, 1508, 1511, 1515, 1522, 1523 and 1525.
- (a) at paragraph 15.04: delete criterion (viii) and substitute:
 “(viii) in determining development proposals for opencast coal, sandstone and gritstone workings - including associated operations - the Council will assess whether an adequate buffer zone can be established between the mineral development and neighbouring, incompatible non-mineral development or land uses;”
- (b) the Council should amplify the reasoned justification to explain the application of criterion (viii) to “opencast coal, sandstone and gritstone”, reflecting paragraph 15.7 above.
- 15.14 Modify the plan in response to Objection 2234: paragraph 15.09: delete the last sentence and substitute: “This introduces a presumption against these activities unless certain tests are met”.
- 15.15 Reflecting paragraph 15.6 above, and in response to my overall consideration of Objection 647, the Council should justify its case for criterion (ii) at Second Deposit.
- 15.16 The Council should further consider modifying the plan in response to paragraph 15.12 above.
- 15.17 No change to the plan in response to Objections 79, 1315, 1320, 1871 and 1888

POLICY M3: CONDITIONS TO BE APPLIED/LEGAL AGREEMENTS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1886	DEFRA	No
2254	Government Office for the North West	No

Summary of Objections

- The wording of criteria (x) and (xii) at First Deposit should be amended. The UDP should ensure satisfactory site restoration through conditions on soil stripping, storage and replacement. Conditions covering a 5-year aftercare period should also be included in criterion (xii). **(Objection 1886)**
- In criterion (xii) at Second Deposit, the word “maximum” should be inserted before “five year aftercare period” to fully accord with national policy on the aftercare of former mineral sites (MPG7: paragraph 58). **(Objection 2254)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

15.18 More detailed provision for restoration has been included at Second Deposit. Nonetheless, the intent of paragraph 58 iv. to MPG7 is clear. Aftercare, beginning with

compliance with a restoration condition, is limited to 5 years. The policy should reflect this, albeit aftercare may be extended by mutual consent. I note the Council's view that it would not be its intention to seek to impose an extension beyond 5 years. In the interests of certainty, however, the policy should be modified to reflect the clear intention of national guidance. **(Objections 1886 and 2254)**

RECOMMENDATION

15.19 Modify the plan in response to my overall assessment of Objections 1186 and 2254: at paragraph 15.11, M3, criterion (xii): on the third line following the word "a" add the word "maximum". On the fourth line after the word "period" add the following: ",unless extended by mutual consent,".

POLICY M4: NEED FOR MINERALS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
648	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
2255	Government Office for the North West	No
2260	Lancashire County Council	No
9006	Government Office for the North West	No

Summary of Objections

- The requirement for a demonstration of need at First Deposit is contrary to MPG1; the plan should indicate a commitment to the maintenance of the Greater Manchester aggregates landbank, including the level that is being maintained - this to reflect MPG6; while vague phrases should be removed from the policy to make clear how the policy will be implemented. Failure to maintain provision levels and landbanks within the Borough would increase pressure on Lancashire's mineral resources, would lead to a premature diminution of landbanks, with the need to release greater quantities of minerals than would otherwise be necessary. This would be to the detriment of Lancashire's environmental quality. Proposed Change No PC41 again fails to link the policy to either the current apportioned Greater Manchester share of regional aggregates or give information on the length of the aggregates landbank in Greater Manchester. **(Objections 648, 2255, 2260 and 9006)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

15.20 In response to the objections, the Council brings forward Proposed Change No PC41. That, together with the Second Deposit changes, has somewhat improved the policy. Turning to the evolution of the policy as now in the Proposed Change, the Second Deposit version is headed "Need for Minerals". MPG1 indicates that development control policies should not require developers to provide evidence on the need for the mineral in support of their planning applications (paragraph 40). Here, Policy M4 clearly addresses aggregate workings and any heading to it should reflect that, rather than need.

- 15.21 At Second Deposit, the Council has appropriately removed the need for minerals from the second line of the policy. Similarly, the Proposed Change has removed the word “need” from criterion (ii). The word “necessary” there, and in criterion (i), is somewhat similar in its intent to need. The policy requires further clarification.
- 15.22 Generally, the policy - as now proposed - has removed vague phrases, indicates the type of development that would be permitted and provides for a criteria-based approach. All are, generally, to be supported subject to my further conclusions below. One further point on the clarity sought by 648 and 2255, not the subject of specific objection that would improve the reasoned justification and which is advised to the Council. The last sentence of 15.15 at Second Deposit (15.14 at PC41) includes the words “ maintain smooth operation” as they relate to land banks of sites. Their intention is not clear. It appears to me that the Council’s intention is to ensure continuing production in line with the first sentence of the paragraph. The Council should consider an appropriate rewording.
- 15.23 I now deal with the required regional production of aggregates and the maintenance of reserves/landbanks. Here, I have taken into account final RPG. Here, policies for the maintenance of landbanks should be included in development plans, generally sufficient for at least 7 years of extraction in the case of sand and gravel (MPG6, paragraphs 62 and 63). This is particularly relevant within a region that relies heavily on imports of materials from other regions. The need to maintain landbanks is reflected in RPG. Criteria (i) and (ii) of the Second Deposit version of the policy statement at paragraph 15.13, and in Proposed Change No PC41, both refer to Greater Manchester - yet the reasoned justification to the policy gives little information on the current position there, on either production or reserves. A developer, reading the policy and its reasoned justification would - reasonably - be entitled to see some reference to the Greater Manchester position, leading to a more transparent policy. It would not. The reasoned justification should provide further detail on the current state of the Greater Manchester situation on both apportionment and reserves. Here, I intend to clarify the additional sentence at the end of renumbered paragraph 15.15 to Proposed Change No PC41, with its end date of 2006. The plan extends to 2011 but the implication is that the Council would only make provision to 2006. The time-scale of the UDP should be reflected. The additional last sentence to paragraph 15.16 of the Proposed Change largely restates national guidance. It should include a Bolton commitment to it, taking into account the Greater Manchester position.
- 15.24 Proposals would be subject to the 2 criteria of the policy - both needing to be met. Their implementation through the development control process concerns me, likely to result in uncertainty. This reflects the need for clarity requested by Objector 648 and 2255. Testing the Proposed Change, for example, it appears to me that a proposal that contributes to a supply of reserves within Greater Manchester [criterion (ii)] may not be justified in order to meet Greater Manchester’s share of the regional production of aggregates at any particular time [criterion (i)]. While the Council has identified the relevant considerations, the policy should reflect them. The decision-maker should form a balanced view of their merits. I shall recommend a modification to the policy. In the light of my recommendations, the aspirations of Lancashire County Council would not be prejudiced. **(Objections 648, 2255, 2260 and 9006)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

15.25 Modify the plan in response to my overall consideration of Objections 648, 2255, 2260 and 9006:

- (a) delete the heading to paragraph 15.13 “Need for Minerals” and substitute “Aggregate Mineral Workings”.
- (b) amend the plan in accordance with Proposed Change No PC41 subject to the following;
 - * delete paragraph 15.13 of Proposed Change No PC41 and substitute:

“15.13 M4. The Council will permit development proposals for new aggregate mineral workings, or extensions to existing workings, subject to an overall assessment of:

 - (i) any identified requirement for the proposal to make a contribution towards the maintenance of Greater Manchester’s share of the regional production of aggregates; and
 - (ii) any identified requirement for the proposal to make a contribution towards the maintenance of a supply of reserves with planning permission within Greater Manchester.”
 - * the reasoned justification should provide further information on the current Greater Manchester position on regional apportionment and landbanks.
 - * the Council should clarify the intention of the last sentence to paragraph 15.14 to PC41, reflecting paragraph 15.22 above.
 - * delete the last sentence of paragraph 15.15 to PC41 and substitute: “Reflecting MPG6, and pending its review, the Council will work together with other minerals planning authorities to make provision for the agreed regional apportionment of land-won aggregates requirement to 2006, together with its sub-regional apportionment, and beyond to 2011”.
 - * expand paragraph 15.16 to PC41 to indicate that the Council’s implementation of the plan will reflect MPG6.

OMISSION

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
252	The Wilton Estate	No
2020	Mr A Partington	No

Summary of Objections

- Minerals Areas of Search (AsOS) defined in the adopted plan should be carried forward into the UDP, their absence conflicting with national planning guidance. At Grundy Fold Farm,

Little Lever an AOS for coal working should be shown (252), at Gibb Farm, Horwich - opencast coal mining and sand (2020). **(Objections 252 and 2020)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

- 15.26 When I heard Objection 2020, the Council conceded that the absence of AsOS conflicted with the general requirements of national planning guidance in MPGs 1 and 3. I agree. The Council did not submit any meaningful evidence that the AsOS established in the adopted plan had been incorrectly defined or that there had been any significant change in circumstances since 1995, including the land covered by the 2 objections. On Objection 2020, the adopted plan's definition of the 2 Areas of Search, apparently based on geological and constraints mapping, appears to me to be consistent with the evidence submitted by the objector. The Council considers that the whole Borough should be considered as an AOS for minerals, notwithstanding that the plan does not say that. National planning guidance indicates that AsOS should indicate areas of possible future working. It was not part of the Council's evidence that land outside the defined areas in the adopted plan had any reasonable prospect of future working. Similarly, the limited number of mineral planning applications within the Metropolitan Borough does not justify the Council's position. An appropriately worded policy would, together with its reasoned justification, not lead to confusion and uncertainty.
- 15.27 I support, therefore, the objections. As to how this should be achieved, a new Policy M2 should be added with a renumbering of policies and paragraphs thereafter. The AsOS should be consistent with the adopted plan, albeit those for 252 and 2020 should reflect the objection sites - the Council not having objected to their extent. The Proposals Map would need to be amended accordingly. The reasoned justification to the policy should amplify the policy, explain the relationship to other policies of the plan and establish the context provided by MPG. **(Objections 252 and 2020)**

RECOMMENDATION

- 15.28 Modify the plan in response to Objections 252 and 2020
- (a) add a new policy M2, subsequent policies and paragraphs being renumbered: "15.04 M2. Areas of Search have been defined on the Proposals Map. These relate to sand, gravel, sandstone/gritstone and opencast coal. It is expected that any requirement for the particular minerals would be met primarily from within the Areas of Search identified in the plan, rather than outside them. Planning applications will be judged on their specific circumstances, having regard to other policies of the plan. Proposals for mineral extraction outside Areas of Search should be supported by reasons why any requirement could not be met from within the Areas of Search."
 - (b) amend the Proposals Map to include Areas of Search, consistent with paragraphs 15.26 and 15.27 above.
 - (c) the reasoned justification should reflect paragraph 15.26 and 15.27 above.

CHAPTER 16 - WASTE

POLICY W1

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
583	Mr A Johnson	No
1728	Mr D Southworth	No
2261	Lancashire County Council	No
1083	Bolton & District Civic Trust	No
2256	Government Office for the North West	No
9007	Government Office for the North West	No

Summary of Objections

- The policy lacks a strategic aspect, with no targets for the reduction of waste and a move away from landfill. The reasoned justification should state the year by which the reductions in landfill under the EC Landfill Directive should be achieved, rather than “Over the next 15 years” to avoid the information becoming out of date. (**Objections 583, 1083, 2256, 2261**)
- The policy should make reference to the need for environmental assessments. (**Objection 1728**)
- At Proposed Change No PC42, The Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) should be the first bullet point, other matters assisting in determining the BPEO for a particular waste stream. (**Objection 9007**)

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

16.1 At Second Deposit and through Proposed Changes Nos PC42 (W1) and PC43 (W2), this chapter has largely been restructured. This is an appropriate starting point. Acceptably, W1 now establishes a strategic approach - W2 a criteria-based approach for the assessment of proposals. Part of Proposed Change No PC42 is, unfortunately, ambiguous at the policy statement in paragraph 16.01. One reading would imply that it applies to all development - this that the Council will require development to reduce waste arisings. Overall, unreasonable - albeit that major developments would be expected to reduce waste arisings. The reasoned justification (16.06 to PC42) suggests, however, that the policy relates to waste management facilities that reduce waste arisings. More appropriate. Further, 16.01 also indicates that - in addition to re-use and recycling - the Council will permit the “disposal” of waste. That is unclear, appearing contrary to the approach of the plan that generally seeks a more sustainable approach to waste. I shall recommend a clarification of the policy. Here, I draw the Council's attention to the use of the words “in appropriate locations” (16.01). They add little to the policy, would create uncertainty, while the decision-maker would establish if a proposal was in an appropriate location, taking into account W2 - and other policies of the plan. Moving on, paragraph 16.02 to PC42 establishes the principles against which waste management practices and options would be determined. They should form part of the

policy statement at 16.01 - and in the order that they appear in Box 1 following paragraph 6 of PPG 10. On other matters, a development plan policy should not “encourage” development (PC42, 16.01) - an aim rather than a statement of planning policy - but indicate the type of development that would be permitted. Subject to the above, and my recommendations below at paragraph 16.3, the policy would acceptably clarify plan intentions. The reasoned justification in the Proposed Change properly reviews national targets, Bolton’s intentions in this respect, as well as those for minimization, re-use and recycling. It should, however, reflect the final stage of Regional Planning Guidance. One other matter that the Council is advised to consider, not included in the plan. This relates to waste management options that recover energy through, for example, the recovery of soil through composting. **(Objections 583, 1083, 2256, 2261 and 9007)**

- 16.2 The need, or otherwise, for environmental assessments is prescribed primarily by the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999 No 293) rather than legislation on the preparation of development plans. Any development proposal arising that needed to be assessed against this policy would be required to submit an assessment if required by the regulations. There is, therefore, no need to refer to this in the UDP. **(Objection 1728)**

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 16.3 Modify the plan in response to my overall assessment of Objections 583, 1083, 2256, 2261 and 9007:
- (a) Proposed Change No PC42: delete paragraphs 16.01 and 16.02: substitute the following and renumber paragraphs:

“16.01 W1. The Council will permit development proposals for waste management facilities that result in reductions in waste arisings that need to be disposed, as well as the re-use and recycling of waste. Proposals will be assessed against the following principles:

 - (i) the Best Practicable Environmental Option for each waste stream;
 - (ii) regional self sufficiency;
 - (iii) the proximity principle; and
 - (iv) the waste hierarchy.”
 - (b) the reasoned justification to the policy should then reflect the restructured policy, further amplify each principle and reflect the final stage of Regional Planning Guidance.
 - (c) the Council is advised to consider the last 2 sentences of paragraph 16.1 above
- 16.4 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1728.

POLICY W2: DETERMINATION OF PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Objections

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
584	Mr A Johnson	No
653	Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions	No
1872	The Countryside Agency	No
1887	DEFRA	No
2235	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	No
2262	Lancashire County Council	No
9008	Government Office for the North West	No

Summary of Objections

- Further information is required on where, and how, waste is currently disposed in the Borough, government targets for waste reduction, as well as the way in which they are to be achieved. **(Objection 584)**
- At First Deposit, decisions on waste management facilities should be taken on the principle of the Best Practicable Environmental Option (BPEO) - guided by, and developed from, the principle of regional self sufficiency, the proximity principle, and a waste hierarchy. The waste hierarchy should not be the predominant principle in the assessment of waste proposals. The policy includes inappropriate criteria. **(Objection 653)**
- At First deposit, criterion (vii) should require that proposals should not have an unacceptable impact on the character of the local landscape. Similarly, criterion (v), to reflect government guidance, should seek to protect the best and most versatile agricultural land, any development there requiring appropriate site working, restoration and aftercare. **(Objections 1872 and 1887)**
- Waste proposals have to be considered in a different context to other types of permanent land uses. The policy should provide a comprehensive set of criteria. Those deleted at Second Deposit should be reinstated. **(Objection 2235)**
- At Second Deposit, paragraph 16.04, the reasoned justification should indicate that the proposal comprises should be inserted after “demonstrate”. Considerations relating to the waste hierarchy, proximity and self-sufficiency should be included within Policy W1. There is no commitment to the provision of facilities to meet recycling and other targets. The UDP should reflect the current stage of Regional Planning Guidance. **(Objection 2262)**
- In Proposed Change No PC43, the reference in criterion (i) to the sequential approach should be explained. **(Objection 9008)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

16.5 To begin, proposed Change No PC43 - the Council's present proposal - includes a number of words that would either lead to uncertainty (for example “where possible”/“where appropriate”) or, do not reflect other plan wordings (“unacceptable”, for example). I shall recommend a modification. Further, the clear intention of PPG 10, at paragraph 33, is to support site-specific policies, otherwise a local planning authority

should justify a criteria-based approach. This UDP adopts the latter approach.

- 16.6 Objection 584 is at First Deposit. In my view, the Second Deposit version and Proposed Change No PC42 to W1 - together with my further recommended modifications to that policy – would address the need for a strategic approach, both on targets and the principles necessary to be followed in the consideration of proposals. Clearly, a UDP should provide detail on proposals necessary to implement the strategic approach. Here, therefore, I share the objector’s concern. Other than a reference to Raikes Lane (at paragraph 16.11 to PC43), I am not told of the Council’s existing facilities for waste or any overall provision that would be necessary to implement its strategic approach. Apparently, the re-opened Raikes Lane site would significantly reduce the need for scarce landfill space. It would not eliminate it. The Council acknowledges that there are no specific waste disposal allocations in the plan. PPG 10 indicates that Part II of a UDP should give detailed expression to the strategic waste policies in Part I - identifying existing, new or extended sites to make adequate provision for waste management facilities. In their absence, “areas of search” would be appropriate or comprehensive criteria. The Council should justify its approach (paragraph 33 to PPG 10). In the light of national guidance, I do not consider that an elaboration of the reasoned justification - assessing existing site provision and any that, overall, may be necessary to meet the strategic approach of Policy W1 - would conflict with good practice. **(Objection 584)**
- 16.7 The Second Deposit version of the policy improves the First. Acceptably, at Second Deposit, the Council has deleted the reference to the management of waste being based on the waste hierarchy (16.09). Further, the Council’s strategic approach is now intended to be within Policy W1. I agree. The Second Deposit version recast the criteria at W2 limiting them, generally, to the operational requirements of disposal facilities. I support that approach. The uncertainty arising from a number of the First Deposit criteria has been removed. To meet part of the objection, the Council added at Second Deposit the words “where appropriate” to the last 3 criteria of the policy. In my opinion, however, the Council was correct in its approach at First Deposit - the words “where appropriate” causing uncertainty. For example: landscaping and screening; working, restoration and aftercare; as well as pollution control; are all likely to be material considerations in the assessment of planning applications, including waste disposal. It is for the decision-maker to assess their relevance to a proposal. The plan should include them as criteria in their own right, without the qualification of “where appropriate”. Here, I also draw the Council’s attention to the use of the word “satisfactory” in the last 3 criteria to the policy at Second Deposit. Although not the subject of objection, the word is clearly imprecise. The Council may wish to reconsider its inclusion, the policy clearly stating the relevant criteria. Finally, the Council - at Second Deposit - has addressed the objector’s concern on working and restoration. The evolution of the policy - culminating in PC43 - together with my recommendations below would establish acceptable control, including the concern of Objector 9008 at the reference to the sequential test in PC43. **(Objections 653 and 9008)**
- 16.8 At Second Deposit the policy was recast, deleting a number of criteria, and carried forward into Proposed Change No PC43. Generally, with the exception of criterion (i) on the sequential approach, the criteria now before me in PC43 reasonably address the operational requirements and implications of disposal facilities. I support this approach, precluding an overly-complicated policy. Any proposals arising would need to be assessed against the plan as a whole, including any local landscape implications. This is reflected in paragraph 16.09 of the Council’s Proposed Change. **(Objections 1872, 1887 and 2235)**

- 16.9 The modification sought to the reasoned justification of the Second Deposit version has been acceptably made at paragraph 16.08 of the Council's Proposed Change No PC43. Policy considerations relating to the waste hierarchy, proximity and self-sufficiency are now within Policy W1. I have dealt with the land-use and site aspects of the policy at Objections 584, 653 and 9008. Paragraph 16.04 to PC42 refers to the requirements of Regional Planning Guidance, albeit it should refer to its final stage (**Objection 2262**)
- 16.10 Taking into account all the objections, I shall recommend a rewording of the Council's current position.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- 16.11 Modify the plan in response to my overall assessment of Objections 584, 653, 2235, 2262 and 9008: amend Proposed Change No PC43: delete paragraph 16.07 and substitute:
- “16.07 W2. The Council will permit development proposals for new, or extended, waste management facilities - provided that they reflect the principles set out in Policy W1. Proposals will also be subject to an overall assessment of the following:
- (i) the availability of rail or water access;
 - (ii) whether the access to the site, taking into account the traffic generated by the proposal, would adversely affect the safety of highway users in its vicinity - including pedestrians;
 - (iii) whether the traffic generated by the proposal would adversely affect the safety of highway users - including pedestrians - on links between the site and the strategic route network;
 - (iv) whether the proposal would protect and retain existing transport routes;
 - (v) whether the proposal would adversely affect the amenities of the occupiers of properties;
 - (vi) whether provision is made for screening and landscaping while work is in progress;
 - (vii) whether provision is made for a scheme of working, landscaping, restoration and aftercare, including progressive working and restoration; and
 - (viii) whether provision is made for leachate and landfill gas control, and dispersal, during and after tipping on the site.”
- 16.12 The reasoned justification should then reflect the recommended policy and substantiate the Council's criteria-based approach, and explain the basis for them.
- 16.13 The reasoned justification should provide further information on existing waste management facilities and any overall provision that may be necessary over the period of the plan.
- 16.14 No change to the plan in response to Objections 1872 and 1887.

OMISSION

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
2021	Mr A Partington	No

Summary of Objection

- The adopted plan allocation of a waste disposal site at Red Moss should be retained as: there is an over-reliance on a single incinerator to cope with increasing levels of waste and a varied strategy for disposal is more appropriate; the land at Gibb Farm is low grade agricultural land; while any proposal would be subject to Policies W1, W2, and W3. **(Objection 2021)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

16.15 I have taken into account the Strategic Waste Disposal Site designation on the Proposals Map of the adopted plan, as well as the land to which the objection before me relates. In my view, acknowledged by the objector, waste disposal at the objection site would involve the filling of a void following mineral extraction. I have dealt with this objector's concern on the absence of any Minerals Areas of Search at paragraphs 15.26 to 15.28 of my Report. Any proposal arising for a waste disposal facility would need to be assessed against all relevant policies of the plan, national planning guidance and all material considerations. That would allow the aspiration of the objector to be fairly assessed. In the specific circumstances of this objection, therefore, an allocation is not justified.

RECOMMENDATION

16.16 No change to the plan in response to Objection 2021

CHAPTER 17 - MONITORING AND REVIEW

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1917	CED Promotion Partnership	No

Summary of Objection

- The Council's intentions do not include proposals to include the community sector or communities in monitoring and review. **(Objection 1917)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

17.1 The UDP is a land-use policy document. Local planning authorities are required to keep the plan under review. As a land-use document, it cannot prescribe organizations that are to be involved in the monitoring and review process. While that is the responsibility of the Council, it intends to publish an annual monitoring report. In so doing, any reasonable local planning authority would ensure that it is available for public comment, including community interests. **(Objection 1917)**

RECOMMENDATION

17.2 No change to the plan in response to Objection 1917.

OMISSION

The Objection

REF	Objector	CONDITIONALLY WITHDRAWN?
1225	The House Builders Federation	No

Summary of Objection

- The intention of the chapter should be reflected in a policy, not just in the text. **(Objection 1225)**

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusion

17.3 Chapter 17 forms part of the plan and its general intentions reflect, generally, paragraphs 2.17 to 2.19 of PPG 12. A development plan addresses, however, the specific circumstances of its area, the key monitoring elements required may be specific to it. This is reflected in the last sentence of paragraph 2.17 of the guidance. While, therefore, the overall approach of the chapter is acceptable, it should be expanded to identify the critical features upon which the plan is based and the means of measuring them. These should include, for example, the supply of land for housing and employment purposes. With that achieved, I see no need for a specific policy. **(Objection 1225)**

RECOMMENDATION

- 17.4 Modify the plan in response to Objection 1225: amplify Chapter 17 to reflect paragraph 17.3 above, specifying the monitoring intentions for the critical features upon which the plan is based, and the means of measuring them.

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

APPENDIX 1: SCHEDULE OF OBJECTIONS AND SUPPORTING REPRESENTATIONS

Policy number	No.	Objector's Name	Inquiry Stage	Type	Status NB: outstanding representation unless withdrawn
PLAN					
Plan	1225	The House Builders Federation	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission at Chapter 17
Plan	1445	Mr P Welsby	1 st Deposit	Support	
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION					
Chapter 1	586	DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
Chapter 1	1789	SWAN (Save Westhoughton Act Now)	1 st Deposit	Objection	
Chapter 1	1851	The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
Chapter 1	1852	The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
Chapter 1	1891	North West Tourist Board	1 st Deposit	Objection	
Chapter 1	1904	CED Promotion Partnership	1 st Deposit	Objection	
Chapter 1	2225	RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
Chapter 1	2393	Peel Investments (North) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
Chapter 1	2435	SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	
Chapter 1	2436	SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	
Chapter 1	2437	SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	
Chapter 1	2438	SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
CHAPTER 2: PART 1 POLICIES					
Chapter 2	1121	English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	
Chapter 2	1892	North West Tourist Board	1 st Deposit	Objection	
CHAPTER 3: COUNTRYSIDE & THE RURAL ECONOMY					
R1	61	English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
R1	82	Mr K Moss	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	83	Mrs L Pilkington	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	84	Mr J Calderbank	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	85	Mrs J Southern	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	86	Mr D Hartley	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	87	Mr M Waring	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	88	Mr M J Acton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	89	Mr C Acton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	90	Mrs P Proctor	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	91	Mr W Olive	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	92	Mrs D Fairclough	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	93	Mr G Brownlow	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	94	Mrs K Heyes	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	95	Mr J Eastham	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	96	Mrs K Gregory	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	97	Mr & Mrs G Cowburn	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	98	Mr E Sutton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	99	Mr J Holmes	1 st Deposit	Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

R1	100	Mr & Mrs	J	Shelmerdine	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	101	Mrs	S	Foster	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	102	Mr	M	Watkinson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	103	Mrs	J	Hayden	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	104	Mrs	J	Crook	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	105	Mr	A	Murray	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	106	Mr	A	Higham	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	107	Mr	K	Fitzpatrick	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	108	Mrs	S	Fitzpatrick	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	109	Mr	D	Longworth	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	110	Mr	B	Calvert	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	111	Mrs	S E	Astin	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	112	Mr	C	Fairhurst	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	113	Mrs	K	Holden	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	114	Mr	R	Kenyon	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	115	Mr	R	Burrows	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	116	Mrs	T	Oliver	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	117	Mr	S	Oliver	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	118	Ms	L	Jones	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	119	Mr	P	Griffiths	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	120	Mrs	B	Dobson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	121	Mr	J	Dobson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	122	Mrs	A	Moss	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	123	Mr	I C	Martin	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	124	Mr	M	Hunger	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	125	Mr	F	Turner	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	126	Mr	K J	Wall	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	127	Mr	H I	Wall	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	128	Mrs	J	Jamil	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	129	Mr	R	Chesney	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	130	Mrs	J P	Podmore	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	131	Mr	M	Harris	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	132	Mr	J R	White	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	133	Mrs	R	Duckworth	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	135	Ms	K	Daft	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	136	Mrs	C	Crowther	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	137	Mrs	M	Carney	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	138	Mr	A	Valentine	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	139	Mr	W	Valentine	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	140	Mrs	K	McDonald	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	141	Mr	S	Wright	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	142	Mr	G	O'Neill	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	143	Mr	K E	Boardman	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	144	Mrs	A	Woodward	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	145	Mr	B	Wright	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	146	Mrs	J	Read	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	147	Mrs	I	Burrows	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	148	Mrs	C	Allenby-Carr	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	149	Mr	K	Threlfall	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	150	Mrs	B	Furby	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	151	Mrs	W	Brownlow	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	152	Mrs	J	Buckley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	153	Ms	L	Powell	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	154	Mr	S	Darby	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	155	Mr	F	Woolley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	156	Mr	J	Jones	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	157	Mr	W	Holden	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	158	Mr	D	Worthington	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	159	Mr	D	Gregory & Ms A Partington	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	160	Mr	N	Steele	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	161	Mrs	W	Wood	1 st Deposit	Support

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

R1	162	Mrs	E	Green	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	163	Mrs	M	Holmes	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	164	Mr	C	Pendlebury	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	165	Mr	D	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	166	Mr	D	Barber	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	167	Mr	R	Guest	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	168	Ms	J	Taylor	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	169	Mrs	R	Westby	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	170	Mr	H	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	171	Ms	V	Trafford	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	172	Mrs	E	Dickenson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	173	Mrs	A	Pooley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	174	Mrs	L	Hughes	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	175	Mrs	B	Morris	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	176	Mr	B	Walsh	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	177	Mrs	M	Cawthorne	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	178	Mr	A	Cawthorne	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	179	Mr	E	Poulsom	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	180	Mrs	P	Wood	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	181	Mrs	S	Branson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	182	Mr	B	Hunt	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	183	Mr	J	Jones	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	184	Ms	L	Dignam	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	185	Mr	D	Bolton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	186	Mrs	M	Horsfield	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	187	Mrs	F	Ormrod	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	188	Mr	D	Smethurst	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	189	Mr	D	Jones	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	190	Ms	A	Butler	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	191	Mrs	D	Calderbank	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	192	Mr	B	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	193	Mr	A	Wallwork	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	194	Mr	H	Fairhurst	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	195	Mr	M	Jones	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	196	Mrs	E	Carr	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	197	Mrs	F	McMahon	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	198	Mrs	S	Phillips	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	199	Ms	H	Healey	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	200	Mrs	A	Crook	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	201	Mrs	K	Riley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	202	Mr	M	Burke	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	203	Mr	E	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	204	Mr	H	Hart	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	205	Ms	L	Douglas	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	206	Mr	D	Pilkington	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	207	Mr	E	Ward	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	208	Ms	J	Critchlow	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	209	Mr	S	Caldwell	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	210	Mrs	L	Glithero	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	211	Mr & Mrs	G	Berry	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	212	Mr	K	Moran	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	213	Mrs	M	Heaton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	214	Mrs	C	Walsh	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	215	Mr	G	Challinor	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	216	Mr	S	Hargreaves	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	217	Mr	D	Bowery	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	218	Ms	F	Owen	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	219	Mrs	J	Unsworth	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	220	Mrs	J	Crowther	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	221	Mr	H	Hamblett	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	222	Mr	J	Mann	1 st Deposit	Support

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

R1	223	Mrs	J	Lakeledge	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	224	Mr	K	Lakeledge	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	225	Mr	A	Reece	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	226	Mr	B	Heywood	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	227	Mr	P	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	228	Mr	T	Peet	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	229	Mrs	I	Relfe	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	230	Mrs	J	Green	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	231	Ms	J	Davidson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	232	Mrs	M	Pendlebury	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	233	Mrs	E	Robinson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	234	Mr	J	Roland	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	235	Mr	K	Swinburn	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	236	Mr	C	Allen	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	237	Mr	G	Morley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	238	Mr	A	Robson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	239	Mrs	M	Walls	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	240	Mrs	G	Hallwell	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	241	Mrs	E	Hartley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	242	Mrs	A	Hallam	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	243	Miss	M	Martin	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	244	Mr	C	Lloyd	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	245	Mrs	S	Irving	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	246	Mr	A	Hoffman	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	247	Mr	A	Alker	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	248	Mr	W	Bolton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	249	Mr	E	Marshall	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	250	Mr	E	Faulkner	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	251	Mr	M	Lloyd	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	270	Mr	A	Roberts	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	271	Mr	A	Pimblett	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	272	Mr	L	Hamer	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	273	Mrs	J	Henning	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	274	Mr	G	Colclough	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	275	Mr	R	Henning	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	276	Mr	A	Turner	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	277	Ms	J	Longworth	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	278	Mr	P	Ashford	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	279	Mrs	N	Dekarski	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	280	Mr	D	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	281	Mrs	D	Barker	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	282	Mr	A	Ball	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	283	Mrs	A	Ball	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	284	Mrs	J	O'Malley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	285	Mrs	J	Keir	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	286	Ms	M	Keir	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	287	Mr	R	Hardman	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	288	Ms	J	Hargreaves	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	289	Ms	C	Partington	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	290	Mr	P	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	291	Mr	H	Wilson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	292	Ms	L	Croft	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	293	Mr	M	Fairclough	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	294	Mrs	P	Fairclough	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	295	Miss	J	Downs	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	296	Mrs	J	Wilkinson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	297	Mrs	K	Bushell	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	298	Mr	M.	Winstanley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	299	Ms	A	Lawton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	300	Mrs	S	Openshaw	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	301	Mr	J	Openshaw	1 st Deposit	Support

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

R1	302	Ms	J	McVae	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	303	Mrs	W	Rothwell	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	304	Mrs	J	Warren	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	305	Ms	K	Davies	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	306	Ms	L	Warren	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	307	Mrs	M	Barlow	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	308	Mrs	L	Burgess	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	309	Mr	A	Burgess	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	310	Mr	L	Swarsbrick	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	311	Ms	A	Wilson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	312	Mr	S	Harrington	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	313	Mr	C	Dooher	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	314	Mr	P	Walker	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	315	Mrs	A	England MBE.	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	316	Mr	J	Perkins	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	317	Mrs	A	Perkins	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	318	Mr	M	Vase	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	319	Mr	K	Mowle	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	320	Mrs	A	Heaton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	321	Mrs	F	Prince	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	322	Mr	S	Griffiths	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	323	Ms	B	Wheatley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	324	Mrs	J	Fogg	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	325	Mr	R	Fogg	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	326	Mr	T	Parry	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	327	Ms	V	Chadwick	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	328	Mrs	V	Chadwick	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	329	Mr	M	Ashton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	330	Mr	E	Hodge	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	331	Mr	W	Leyland	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	332	Mr	R	Naylor	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	333	Mr	C	Ashton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	334	Mrs	W	Heydon	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	335	Mr	M	Chadwick	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	336	Mr	J	Hemans	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	337	Ms	Y	Conner	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	338	Mrs	K	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	339	Mr	P	Seek	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	340	Mr	J	Bailey	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	341	Mr	F	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	342	Mrs	K	Campbell	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	343	Mrs	J	Higson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	344	Mrs	S	Riley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	345	Mr	B	Hodson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	346	Mr	A	Glithero	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	347	Mr	I	Wilcock	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	348	Mr	T	Howarth	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	349	Mrs	A	Howarth	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	350	Mrs	M	O'Neill	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	351	Mr	E	Podmore	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	352	Ms	L	Bolton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	353	Mrs	K	Guest	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	354	Mr	J	Cooper	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	355	Mr	J	Markland	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	356			Royal British Legion	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	357			Westhoughton Kids Club	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	358	Mrs	A	Evans	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	359	Mr	E	Gorton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	360	Ms	H	Ford	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	361	Mr	E	Bromilow	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	362	Mrs	S	Isherwood	1 st Deposit	Support

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

R1	363	Mr	C	Mullett	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	364	Ms	E	Ashton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	365	Mr	I	Edwards	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	366	Mr	G	Foden	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	367	Mrs	L	Liversage	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	368	Mrs	P	Birchall	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	369	Mrs	D	Leyland	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	370	Mrs	A	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	371	Ms	E	Jones	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	372	Mr	J	Pollard	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	373	Mr	S	Lythgoe	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	374	Mrs	C	Lythgoe	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	375	Mr	P	Bennett	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	376	Mrs	D	Peet	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	377	Ms	V	Swift	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	378	Mrs	J	Birt	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	379	Mr	A	Lee	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	380	Mr	M	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	381	Mr	D	Connah	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	382	Mrs	W	Simm	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	383	Mrs	E	Woodfield	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	384	Mr	J	Robinson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	385	Ms	K	Hill	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	386	Ms	D	Taylor	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	387	Mr	D	Hodgson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	388	Mr	J	Burrows	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	389	Mr	J	Challender	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	390	Mr	D	Owen	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	391	Ms	S	Owen	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	392	Mrs	H	Fletcher	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	393	Mr	S	Currass	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	394	Mrs	D	Rathod	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	395	Mrs	K	Rushton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	396	Mr	W	Mayoh	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	397	Mr	L	Connell	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	398	Mr	C	Connell	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	399	Mrs	A	Riley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	400	Mr	K	Gaynor	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	401	Ms	M	Guffogg	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	402	Mrs	M	Balderson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	403	Mr	J	Roscoe	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	404	Mr	D	Mangnall	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	405	Mrs	J	Haughton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	406	Mr	C	Wyatt	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	407	Mr	M	Thoms	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	408	Mrs	B	Roscoe	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	409	Mr	J	Godfrey	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	410	Mr	D	Simm	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	411	Mr	A	Seed	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	412	Mrs	G	Valentine	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	413	Mr	A	Sargeson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	414	Mr	B	Taylor	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	415	Mr	C	Beeston	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	416	Ms	C	Makinson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	417	Mr	J	Green	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	418	Ms	J	Hope	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	419	Mrs	I	Smalley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	420	Mr	C	Boland	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	421	Mr	D	Cooper	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	422	Mr	D	Bannister	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	423	Ms	N	Kennington	1 st Deposit	Support

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

R1	424	Mr	E	Whiteside	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	425	Mr	R	Dawson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	426	Mr	A	Barnes	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	427	Ms	J	Naylor	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	428	Mr	J	Bean	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	429	Mrs	A	Abbott	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	430	Mrs	A	Sims	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	431	Mr	G	Bannister	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	432	Mr	R	Gordon	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	433	Mr	H	Howarth	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	434	Mr	G	Ashton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	435	Ms	N	Hulme	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	436	Ms	M	Durkin	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	437	Ms	L	Aspinall	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	438	Mr	R	Nicholson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	439	Mr	W	Brooks	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	440	Mr	E	Higson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	441	Mr	I	Simm	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	442	Mrs	J	Ashton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	443	Mrs	J	Simm	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	444	Mr	R	Leyland	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	445	Mr	A	Hewat	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	446	Mr	R	Bullough	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	447	Mrs	N	Jones	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	448	Mr	D	Makinson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	449	Mr	C	Barlow	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	450	Mr	F	Dutton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	451	Mrs	L	Round	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	452	Mr	M	Pepper	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	453	Mrs	D	Jennings	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	454	Mrs	L	Gledhill	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	455	Mr	A	Sharples	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	456	Mr	E	Rothwell	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	457	Mr	E	Wilkinson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	458	Mr	N	Heydon	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	459	Mrs	M	Turner	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	460	Mrs	C	Seddon	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	461	Mr	P	Boardman	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	462	Mr	L	Shiels	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	463	Mr	S	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	464	Ms	M	Cousins	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	465	Mr	M	Powis	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	466	Mrs	M	Heaton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	467	Mr	J	Barrow	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	468	Mrs	A	Connah	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	469	Mr	G	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	470	Mr	J	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	471	Mrs	K	Gibbins	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	472	Mr	N	Vernon	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	473	Ms	A	Martino	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	474	Ms	S	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	475	Mr	J	Mayoh	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	476	Mrs	C	Corbett	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	477	Mr	A	Hibbert	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	478	Mrs	E	Hibbert	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	479	Mr	J	Guest	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	480	Mrs	J	Guest	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	481	Mrs	A	Woodward	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	482	Mr	R	Lowe	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	483	Mr	M	Hart	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	484	Mrs	M	Callis	1 st Deposit	Support

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

R1	485	Mrs	E	Kerfoot	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	486	Ms	L	Ashurst	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	487	Ms	V	Bimpson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	488	Ms	J	Peacock	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	489	Mr	E	Chadwick	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	490	Mr	P	Corbett	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	491	Mr	A	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	492	Ms	J	Haliwell	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	493	Mr	J	Lowe	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	494	Mrs	M	Delanby	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	495	Mr	D	Bennett	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	496	Mrs	J	Welsh	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	497	Mr	P	Gerrard	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	498	Mr	G	Glaister	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	499	Mrs	I	Maloney	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	500	Mr	A	Heaton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	501	Mrs	J	Marlow	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	502	Mr	I	Chadwick	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	503	Ms	V	Booth	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	504	Mr	A	Riley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	505	Ms	K	Brown	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	506	Ms	J	Brown	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	507	Mrs	V	Meller	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	508	Mr	J	Meller	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	509	Mrs	M	Connor	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	510	Mr	W	Stringman	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	511	Ms	D	Willis	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	512	Mr	S	Heyes	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	513	Mr	A	Read	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	514	Mr	N	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	515	Mr	S	Bottomley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	516	Mr	B	Guest	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	517	Mr	B	Mayoh	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	518	Mr	S	Currass	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	519	Ms	J	Bottomley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	520	Mrs	M	Ramwell	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	521	Mrs	E	Parkinson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	522	Mr	C	Norrey	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	523	Mr	F	Winward	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	524	Mrs	K	Bispham	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	525	Mr & Mrs	D	Podmore	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	526	Mrs	E	Gill	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	527	Mr	F	Hall	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	528	Mr	S	Lunn	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	529	Mr	S	Woods	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	530	Ms	L	Ryan Campbell	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	531	Mr	G	Hodkinson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	532	Mr	A	Lawrence	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	557	Mr	F	Wagstaff	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	558	Mrs	S	Wagstaff	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	654	Mr	B	Harrison	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	655	Miss	C	Howcroft	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	661	Ms	C	Jones	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	662	Mr	T	Jones	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	663	Ms	E	Gray	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	664	Mrs	S	Martin	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	665	Mrs	I	Harrison	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	669	Mr	N	Gunner	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	670	Ms	S	Collier	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	671	Mr	A	Hatton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	672	Mrs	S	Hatton	1 st Deposit	Support

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

R1	673	Mrs	D	Jennings	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	674	Mr	F	Murphy	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	675	Mr	G	Young	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	676	Mr	D	Brown	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	677	Mr	G	Sharples	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	678	Mr	I	Aiker	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	679	Mr	K	Thurley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	680	Mr	P	Willoughby	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	681	Mr	J	Bentley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	682	Mrs	J	Kendall	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	683	Mr	M	Fothergill	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	684	Mr	E	Eastham	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	685	Mr	A	Crabtree	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	686	Mr	A	Forshaw	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	687	Mr	T	Marsh	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	688	Mrs	J	Butterfield	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	689	Mr	D	Edwards	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	690	Ms	L	Mason	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	691	Mr	A	Lowe	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	692	Mrs	J	Lowe	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	693	Mrs	D	Higham	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	694	Mr	A	Robb	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	695	Mr	F	Bibby	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	696	Ms	A	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	698	Mr	P	Lavelle	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	700	Mr	G	Parker	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	702	Mr	J	Ott	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	703	Mrs	A	Ott	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	704	Ms	F	MacQuarrie	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	705	Mr	A	Naylor	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	706	Mr	I	Holden	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	707	Mr	A	Mulligan	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	708	Mrs	J	Taylor	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	709	Mr	B	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	710	Mr	J	Hatton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	711	Mrs	M	Hatton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	712	Mrs	A	Winstanley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	713	Mrs	O	Winstanley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	714	Mr	A	Hardman	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	715	Mrs	B	Hardman	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	716	Mrs	M	Calderbank	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	717	Mr	F	Calderbank	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	718	Mrs	J	Colley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	719	Mr	D	Colley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	720	Mrs	A	Westhead	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	721	Mrs	N	Jones	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	722	Mr	W	Taylor	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	723	Mr	D	Townsend	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	724	Ms	A	Leech	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	725	Mr	J	Dix	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	726	Mr	G	Hibbert	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	732	Mr	K	Ridsdale	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	733	Ms	R	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	734	Mr	B	Jervis	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	735	Mr	T	Sadat-Shafae	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	736	Mr	P	Collier	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	737	Mrs	S	Collier	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	738	Mrs	K	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	739	Mr	L	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	740	Mr	T	Rothwell	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	741	Mr	I	Hulme	1 st Deposit	Support

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

R1	742	Mrs	K	Hulme	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	743	Mr	P	Dunville	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	744	Ms	C	Blake	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	745	Mrs	D	Bennett	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	746	Mr	E	Bennett	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	747	Mr	G	Lowe	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	748	Mrs	E	Lowe	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	749	Mrs	B	Hodkinson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	750	Mrs	E	Grundy	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	752	Mrs	S	Dunn	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	753	Ms	J	Dunn	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	754	Ms	V	Dunn	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	755	Mr	A	Dunn	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	756	Mr	K	Baron	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	757	Mr	F	Baron	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	758	Mr	T	Baron	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	759	Mrs	J	Collins	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	760	Mr	P	Collins	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	761	Ms	E	Paxford	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	762	Ms	G	Paxford	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	764	Mrs	A	Mehta	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	765	Mrs	J	Wilson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	766	Mr	J N	Wilson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	767	Mr	I	Calderbank	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	768	Mrs	P	Calderbank	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	769	Mr	M	Calderbank	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	770	Mr	F	Calderbank	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	771	Ms	D	Cairns	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	772	Mr	S	Cairns	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	773	Miss	K	Calderbank	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	774	Mr	S	Ward	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	775	Mrs	P	Kenyon	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	776	Mr	J	Kenyon	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	777	Ms	J	Kenyon	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	782	Mrs	C	Calderbank	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	787	Mr	B	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	788	Mrs	R	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	790	Mrs	C	Isherwood	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	792	Mr	S	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	794	Mr	A	Ralphs	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	795	Mr	P	Burnett	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	796	Mr	M	Fothergill	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	797	Miss	J	Hibbert	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	798	Mr	I	Wilson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	799	Mr	S	Ward & Miss J Chadwick	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	800	Mr	J	Knowles	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	801	Mr & Mrs	J	Barry	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	802	Mr	I	Austen	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	803	Mr	G	Fothergill	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	804	Mrs	L	Miller	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	805	Mr	M	Dyson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	806	Mrs	P	Pedder	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	807	Mrs	L	Lomax	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	808	Mr	R	Hinard	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	809	Mrs	L	Hinard	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	810	Mr	A	Pedder	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	811	Mr	J	Rudd	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	812	Mrs	L	Rudd	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	813	Mrs	J	Stake	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	814	Mr	M	Naylor	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	815	Mrs	J	Naylor	1 st Deposit	Support

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

R1	816	Mr	D	Oultram	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	817	Mrs	M	Oultram	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	818	Mr	M	Farington	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	819	Ms	C	Dixon	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	822	Ms	M	Hindley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	823	Mrs	J	Ramsbottom	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	826	Mr	G	Caterall	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	827	Mr	G	Gibbs	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	834	Ms	E	Hughes	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	836	Ms	L	Townsend	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	843	Ms	M	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	844	Mrs	J	Greenough	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	845	Mr	D	Broomhead	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	846	Mrs	J	Broomhead	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	848	Mr	I	Whittaker	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	852	Ms	M	Coop	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	853	Mr	S	Coop	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	854	Mrs	B	Seddon	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	855	Mr	A	Seddon	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	856	Mrs	J	Heywood	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	857	Mr	G	Heywood	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	868	Mrs	W	Mays	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	870	Mrs	M	Gifford	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	873	Mr	C	Fields	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	874	Mr	D	Hulme	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	880	Ms	C	Rushton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	882	Ms	J	Haddock	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	886	Mr	A	Kearns	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	887	Mrs	E	Shields	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	892	Mr	I	Lane	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	899	Mr	S	Swallow	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	900	Miss	L	Winterbottom	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	903	Mr	F	Monaghan	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	904	Mrs	C	Monaghan	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	907	Mr	A	Elding-Baines	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	911	Mr	M	Hughes	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	915	Mrs	A	Partington	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	916	Ms	E	Wolfenden	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	918	Ms	T	Spamer	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	919	Ms	G	Evans	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	920	Ms	M	Meadows	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	922	Capt.	M	Ramsbottom	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	925	Ms	J	Owen	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	926	Mr	C	Gleave	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	929	Mr	R	Dick	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	932	Ms	C	Naylor	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	933	Ms	D	Pugh	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	934	Mr	G	Sutton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	935	Mrs	J	Moss	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	936	Mr	G	Valentine	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	938	Ms	J	Kay	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	946	Mr	J	Hesketh	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	948	Mrs	I	Greer	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	949	Mrs	J	Taylor	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	952	Ms	P	Mills	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	953	Mr	E	Williams	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	954	Ms	C	Pollet	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	955	Mrs	F	Hassall	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	961	Mr	K	Winstanley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	962	Mrs	E	Dixon	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	964	Mr	M	Atherton	1 st Deposit	Support

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

R1	965	Mr	V	Battersby	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	966	Ms	A	Fisher	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	967	Ms	V	Worth	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	968	Mr	P	Ormshaw	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	969	Ms	J	Chadwick	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	970	Mr	B	Hulbert	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	971	Mr	C	Farrell	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	972	Mr	J	Simpson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	973	Mr	S	Baxter	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	974	Mr	B	Hodgkiss	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	975	Ms	C	Naylor	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	977	Mr	D	Beston	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	995	Mrs	L	Hill	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	996	Mr	R	Hollis	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	997	Ms	L	Soden	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1000	Mr	I H	Burrows	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1003	Ms	K	Martindale	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1004	Mr	S	Hindley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1005	Mrs	P	Mather	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1006	Miss	L E	Turner	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1007	Mr	A	Longworth	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1010	Mr	B F	Jones	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1012	Ms	K	Foster	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1016	Mr	K	Paxford	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1017	Ms	L	Walton	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1018	Mr	J	Henderson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1019	Ms	L	Hibbert	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1022	Mrs	M	Stansfield	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1025	Miss	M	Oultram	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1026	Drs	J &	Smyth	1 st Deposit	Support
			M			
R1	1059	Mr	C L	Golder	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1060	Mrs	D	Golder	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1061	Mr	R	Farnworth	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1062	Mrs	I	Farnworth	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1063	Mrs	A	Worswick	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1064	Mr	G	Worswick	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1230	Mr	M	Cafferky	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1231	Mrs	A	Cafferky	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1233	Mr	G	Briggs	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1234	Mr	K	Jameson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1235	Mr	S	Bottomley	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1236	Mr	S	Harrington	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1237	Mrs	B	Ball	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1238	Mr	C	Green	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1239	Mr	F	Green	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1246	Mr	S	Green	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1249	Mr	D	Gaskell	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1250	Mr	J	Gaskell	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1256	Mr	P	Path	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1263	Mrs	E	Jackson	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1264	Mr	B	Prescott	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1265	Mrs	A	Prescott	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1266	Ms	F	Harrington	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1267	Mr	G A	Ball	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1268	Mrs	D	Worrall	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1269	Mr	A	Clarke	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1270	Mrs	J	Clarke	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1271	Mr	D	Coyle	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1272	Mrs	V	Coyle	1 st Deposit	Support
R1	1276	Mr	D	Mitton	1 st Deposit	Support

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

R1	1277	Mrs	J	Mitton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	1279	Mrs	J	Jackson	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	1284	Ms	G	Auty	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	1285	Mr	G	Lovett	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	1286	Mrs	A	Pollard	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	1292	Mrs	A	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	1349	Mrs	C A	James	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	1440	Mr	N	Buck	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	1441	Mr	D	Chadwick	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	1448	Mr	J	Tudor	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
R1	1462			RSPB	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	1585			Charles Topham & Sons Limited.	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R1	1696	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R1	1843			The Forestry Commission	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	1853			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	1873			DEFRA	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	1905			CED Promotion Partnership	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R1	1969			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R1	2077	Mr	K	Wright	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	2086	Mrs	M	Hamblett	1 st Deposit	Support	
R1	2134			English Heritage	2 nd Deposit	Support	
R1	2309	Mrs	J	Hayden	2 nd Deposit	Support	
R2	1		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	54	Mr	A	Pollard	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	60	Mr	A	Pollard	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	62			English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
R2	81			Accland Bracewell Management Pension Fund	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	267	Mr	F	Purtill	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	533			National Grid Company Plc	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	543			The Hulton Estate	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	550	Mrs	R.	Kelly MP	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	555	Mrs	M	Holden	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	556	Mrs	D	Boddy	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	563	Mr	M	Birchall	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	570	Ms	K	Birchall	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	656	Mr	J	Fairbank	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	657	Mr	R	Neal	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	666	Mr	D	Matthews	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	667	Mrs	J	Ramsden	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	668	Ms	L	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	697	Ms	J	Cleworth	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	699	Mrs	G	Robinson	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	701	Mrs	J	Parker	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	727	Mrs	L	Pennington	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	728	Mr	E	Whiteley	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	729			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	730	Miss	S	Whiteley	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	731	Mr	N	Whiteley	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	751	Mr	A	Grundy	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	763	Mr	V	Mehta	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	778	Mr	M	Harrison	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	779	Mr	J	Harrison	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	780	Mr	G	Hurst	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	781	Mrs	D	Hurst	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	783	Mr	P	Grundy	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	784	Mr	J	Goodwin	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	785	Mr	S	Watkinson	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	786	Mrs	L	Watkinson	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	789	Mr	C	Rothwell	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	791	Mr	R	Podmore	1 st Deposit	Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

R2	793	Mr	A	Burnett	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	820	Miss	A	Boydell	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	821	Mrs	V	Dean	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	824	Mr	A	Whewell	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	825	Mrs	B	Whewell	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	828	Mr	F	Sharples	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	829	Mr	J	Sharples	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	830	Mr	B	Gannon	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	831	Mr	V	Gannon	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	832	Mrs	J	Crabtree	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	833	Mrs	T	Smillie	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	835	Mr	D	Townsend	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	837	Mr	J	House	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	838	Mrs	J	House	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	839	Ms	S	Calland	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	840	Mr	V	Woodward	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	841	Mr	A	England	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	842	Mrs	B	England	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	847	Mrs	A	Thomas	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	849	Mr	J	Hadcroft	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	850	Mr	L	Kermode	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	851	Mrs	J	Kermode	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	858	Mrs	J	Lowe	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	859	Mr	E	Fairhurst	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	860	Mr	A	Poulsom	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	861	Mr	J	Fairhurst	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	862	Ms	I	Picking	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	863	Mr	W	Hempstock	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	864	Mrs	A	King	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	865	Mr	G	King	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	866	Mr	C	Leigh	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	867	Mr	C	Westby	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	869	Mr	J	James	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	871	Mr	L	Booth	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	872	Mr	S	Clarke	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	875	Mrs	J	Tonge	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	876	Mrs	H	Withers	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	877	Mrs	S	Bissett	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	878	Mr	F	Hobbs	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	879	Mr	S	Morris	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	881	Mr	K	Sutton	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	883	Mrs	P	Lowe	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	884	Mr	M	Boydell	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	885	Ms	P	Bamber	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	888	Mrs	J	White	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	889	Mr	C	Roberts	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	890	Ms	K	Thorley	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	891	Mr	N	Bullough	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	893	Mrs	M	Hodgson	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	894	Mr	D	Hodgson	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	895	Mrs	M	Jones	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	896	Mrs	P	Hargreaves	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	897	Mr	R	Tarrant	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	898	Mr	J	Tarrant	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	901	Mr	J	Colclough	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	902	Ms	S	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	905	Mr	B	Driver	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	906	Mrs	J	Driver	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	908	Mrs	S	Cornish	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	909	Ms	S	Dixon	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	910	Mr	H	Goodman	1 st Deposit	Support

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

R2	912	Mr	V	Cunliffe	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	913	Ms	D	Draper	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	914	Mrs	P	Spamer	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	917	Mrs	L	Alker	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	921	Mr	E	Scholes	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	923	Mr	M	Ewell	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	924	Ms	K	Demoria	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	927	Mr	G	Whinnerah	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	928	Ms	J	Willetts	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	930	Mr	W	Lowe	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	931	Mr	M	Hesketh	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	937	Mr	V	Brown	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	939	Ms	J	Evans	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	940	Mrs	D	Dean	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	941	Mrs	S	Goulder	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	942	Ms	E	Robinson	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	943	Ms	K	Forrester	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	944	Mrs	L	Brown	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	945	Mr	P	Pettigrew	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	947	Mr	S	Broughton	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	950	Ms	W	Dunville	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	951	Mr	A	Cole	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	956	Mrs	M	Leach	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	957	Mr	S	Flood	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	958	Mr	R	Racz	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	959	Ms	S	Edge	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	960	Mr	A	Short	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	963	Mrs	C	Tonge	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	976	Mr	F	Roberts	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	978	Ms	D	Marshall	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	979	Mrs	J	Jones	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	980	Mrs	C	Furby	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	981	Mr	J	Jwaili	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	982	Mrs	N	Seddon	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	983	Mrs	M	Connell	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	984	Mrs	F	Hart	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	985	Mrs	E	Soudah	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	986	Miss	R	Perry	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	987	Ms	M	Showe	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	988	Mr	C	Fearick	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	989	Mrs	B	Elding-Baines	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	990	Ms	K	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	991	Ms	V	Price	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	992	Mrs	E	Paxford	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	993	Mr	S	Lesley	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	994	Mrs	E	Ashworth	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	998	Ms	H	Soden	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	999	Mr	M	Howard	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	1001	Mr	P	Heyworth	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	1002	Mr	C	Sudlow	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	1008	Mr	R	Dootson	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	1009	Ms	N	Price	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	1011	Mrs	G	Sharples	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	1013	Mr	H	Glancey	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	1014	Mr	D	Young	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	1015	Mr	P	Woods	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	1020	Mr	C	Sandford	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	1021	Ms	M	Woodcock	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	1023	Mr	E	Slater	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	1024	Mrs	S	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support
R2	1038			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Support

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

R2	1098			Bolton WIDE	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	1154	Mr & Mrs	A	Knight	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	1184	Messrs		W Cartwright & F H Lee	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	1189			Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE)	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
R2	1209			The House Builders Federation	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	1226	Mr	D	Clough	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1227	Mrs	J	Clough	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1228	Miss	R	Clough	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1229	Mr	A	Clough	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1232	Mr	A	Jackson	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1240	Mr	K	Naylor	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1241	Mr	C	Naylor	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1242	Mr	G	Gay	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1243	Mr	C	Grundy	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1244	Mr	J	Grundy	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1245	Mr	D	Grundy	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1247	Mr	P	McKernan	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1248	Mr	V	Grundy	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1251	Mr	H	Roughley	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1252	Miss	L A	Roughley	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1253	Miss	S D	Roughley	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1254	Mr	A	Roughley	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1255	Mrs	L	Roughley	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1257	Ms	R	Winstanley	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1258	Mr	H	Winstanley	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1259	Mrs	M	Heaton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1260	Mr	A	Heaton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1261	Mr	P	Collis	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1262	Mrs	C	Boyd	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1273	Mrs	B	Hindley	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1274	Mrs	L	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1275	Mr	A S	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1278	Mrs	L	Ball	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1280	Mr	J	Hughes	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1281	Ms	L	Hughes	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1282	Miss	S	Brazier	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1283	Mr	A	Taberner	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1287	Ms	H	Riley	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1288	Mr	E	Humphreys	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1289	Mr	S	Hough	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1290	Mr	E	Grundy	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1291	Ms	D	Moors	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1293	Mr	A	Swarsbrick	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1303	Mr	M	Cooper	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	1304	Mr	M	Cooper	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1312	Mr	J E	Booth	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1317	Mrs	E R	Booth	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1322	Dr	J	Rawcliffe	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1326	Mrs	R E	Rawcliffe	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1334	Mr	D	Cooke	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1339	Mrs	E	Cooke	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1340	Mr	J S	Worthington	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1431	Mr	L	Sale	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1432	Mr	J E	Thompson	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1433	Mr	M	Schmid	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1457			Ladybridge Residents Association	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1488	Mrs	P	Aspden	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1495	Mr	P J	Aspden	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1496			Hulton Park Labour Party	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1502	Mr	F	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

R2	1506	Mr	R	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1509	Mr	E	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1512	Mrs	A	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1520	Mrs	D	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1521	Mr	J	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1524	Mr	A	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1526	Mrs	S	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1535			Westbury Homes Ltd / Wain Estates Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	1549			Persimmon Homes Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	1556			Beazer Strategic Land	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	1596			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	1600			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	1623			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	1730	Mr	A	Blackman	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1734	Mr	M	Mellor	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1748			Arrowcroft North West Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	1753	Mr	L	Parker	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1787			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1788			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	1814	Mr	B	Laking	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1823	Mrs	J	Parker	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	1829			Graham Ball: (Chartered Surveyor)	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
R2	1854			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	1900			Wimpey Homes	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	1970			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	1992	Mr	D	Lord	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	2016	Mr	A	Partington	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	2056	Ms	C	Greenhalgh	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2074	Mrs	C	Sandiford	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2079	Messrs		W Cartwright & F H Lee	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R2	2087	Mr	A	Pollard	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2088	Mr	C	Bell	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2089	Mrs	P	Birch	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2090	Mrs	M	Pover	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2091	Mr	E	Tatton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2092	Mrs	S	Worthington	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2093	Mrs	D	Stones	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2094	Mr	G	Riley	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2095	Mr & Mrs	M	Peake	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2096	Mr & Mrs	R	Wrench	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2097	Mr	A	Sefton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2098	Mr	G	Warburton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2099	Miss	M	Rothwell	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2100	Mr	C	Harding	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2101	Mrs	G	Liles	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2102	Mr & Mrs	M	Farrow	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2103	Mr	A	Goodman	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2104	Mrs	J	Duckworth	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2105	Mr	W	Shoesmith	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2106	Mr & Mrs	T	Warburton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2107	Mr & Mrs	T	Boydell	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2108	Mr & Mrs	M	Lord	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2109	Mr	H F	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2110	Mr	A	Burrows	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2111	Mr & Mrs	S	Jones	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2112	Mr & Mrs	M	Coote	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2113	Mr	W	Doherty	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2114	Mr & Mrs	J	Wroe	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2115	Ms	T	McKay & Mr A Ikin	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2116	Mrs	M	Rushton	1 st Deposit	Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

R2	2117	Mrs	J	McHugh	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2118	Mr	A	Brydon	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2119	Mrs	A	Lowe	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2120	Mrs	E	Hindle	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2121	Mr	R	Lowe	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2122	Ms	H	Owen	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2123	Mr & Mrs	A	Brandreth	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2124	Mrs	B	Brydon	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2125	Miss	N	Roberts & Mr C Sellers	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2126	Mr & Mrs	S	Kay	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2127	Messrs		Leach, Challinor, Astley & Fearn	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2128	Mr	T	Samson	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2129	Mr	H	Jackson	1 st Deposit	Support	
R2	2135			English Heritage	2 nd Deposit	Support	
R2	2149		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
R2	2266	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
R3	63			English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
R3	587			Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR)	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R3	1043			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Support	
R3	1044			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
R3	1096			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
R3	1122			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
R3	1190			CPRE.	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
R3	1855			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R3	1874			DEFRA	1 st Deposit	Support	
R3	1893			North West Tourist Board	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R3	2136			English Heritage	2 nd Deposit	Support	
R3	2195			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Support	
R3	2240			Government Office for the North West (GONW)	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
R3	2334			English Nature	2 nd Deposit	Support	
R3	9009			GONW	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
R3	9025	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
R4	588			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
R4	1191			CPRE	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
R4	1624			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
R4	1882			DEFRA	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
R4	1971			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R4	2300			DEFRA	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
R5	64			English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R5	573	Mr	A	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Support	
R5	1192			CPRE	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
R5	1714	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R5	1856			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R5	1972			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
R5	2072	Mrs	C	Sandiford	1 st Deposit	Support	

CHAPTER 4: GREEN BELT

G1	2		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
G1	7		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	257			The Hulton Estate	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	260			The Hulton Estate	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	262			The Hulton Estate	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	264	Mr & Mrs	W	Ashworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	534			National Grid Company Plc	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
G1	561	Mr	G	Ball	1 st Deposit	Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

G1	564	Mrs	M	Riley	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	567	Mr	J	Kay & Mrs N Platt	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	1102	Mr	H	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	1104	Mr	H	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	1106	Mr	H	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	1176	Mr	L	Halliwell	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	1301			Westhoughton Town Council	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	1308			Botany Investments Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
G1	1348			Westhoughton/ Hulton Park Liberal Democrats	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	1442	Mr	D	Chadwick	1 st Deposit	Support	
G1	1459			Ladybridge Residents Association	1 st Deposit	Support	
G1	1552			Alfred McAlpine Developments Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	1557			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
G1	1581			Charles Topham & Sons Limited.	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	1587			Business Enterprises Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
G1	1590			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	1593			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	1597			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	1601			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	1732	Mr	A	Blackman	1 st Deposit	Support	
G1	1735	Mr	M	Mellor	1 st Deposit	Support	
G1	1750	Mr	L	Parker	1 st Deposit	Support	
G1	1790			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
G1	1791			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	1810	Mr	B	Laking	1 st Deposit	Support	
G1	1819	Mrs	J	Parker	1 st Deposit	Support	
G1	1839			Elite Homes (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
G1	1841			Elite Homes (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
G1	1857			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G1	2058	Ms	C	Greenhalgh	1 st Deposit	Support	
G1	2073	Mrs	C	Sandiford	1 st Deposit	Support	
G1	2150		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
G1	2267	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
G2	3		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
G2	535			National Grid Company Plc	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission.
G2	562	Mr	G	Ball	1 st Deposit	Support	
G2	574	Mr	A	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G2	589			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G2	1458			Ladybridge Residents Association	1 st Deposit	Support	
G2	1460			Wigan Council	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G2	1591			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G2	1736	Mr	M	Mellor	1 st Deposit	Support	
G2	1792			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
G2	1811	Mr	B	Laking	1 st Deposit	Support	
G2	1820	Mrs	J	Parker	1 st Deposit	Support	
G2	1973			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G2	2057	Ms	C	Greenhalgh	1 st Deposit	Support	
G3	4	Ms	L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
G3	65			English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
G3	536			National Grid Company Plc	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
G3	1045			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
G3	1123			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
G3	1793			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
G3	1894			North West Tourist Board	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G3	2137			English Heritage	2 nd Deposit	Support	
G3	2151		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
G3	2196			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Support	
G3	2226			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

G3	2268	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
G3	2335			English Nature	2 nd Deposit	Support	
G4	5		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G4	590			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
G4	1152	Mr & Mrs	A	Knight	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G4	1592			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G4	1794			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
G4	1993	Mr	D	Lord	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G4	2152		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
G4	2269	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
G5	6		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
G5	261			The Hulton Estate	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G5	263			The Hulton Estate	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G5	1065			North West Water Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G5	1582			Charles Topham & Sons Limited	1 st Deposit	Support	
G5	1583			Charles Topham & Sons Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
G5	1584			Charles Topham & Sons Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
G5	1742			Paul Nolan & Co	1 st Deposit	Objection	
G5	1795			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
G5	2153		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
G5	2241			GONW	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
G5	2270	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
G5	2363			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
G5	2368			Charles Topham & Sons Limited	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
G5	9001			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	Proposed Changes	Counter-Objection	
G5	9010			GONW	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
G5	9026	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
G5	9027	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
G6	66			English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
G6	1193			CPRE	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
G6	1558			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
G6	1611	Cllr	B	Ronson	1 st Deposit	Support	
G6	1796			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
G6	2138			English Heritage	2 nd Deposit	Support	
G6	2242			GONW	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
G6	2355			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn

CHAPTER 5: NATURE CONSERVATION

N1	1027			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Support	
N1	1085			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
N1	1120			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Support	
N1	1149			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Support	
N1	1210			The House Builders Federation	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N1	1443	Mr	D	Chadwick	1 st Deposit	Support	
N1	1463			RSPB	1 st Deposit	Support	
N1	1622	Mr	P	Watson	1 st Deposit	Support	
N1	1625			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N1	1697	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N1	1807			South Lancashire Bat Group	1 st Deposit	Support	
N1	1831			The Woodland Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
N1	1844			The Forestry Commission	1 st Deposit	Support	
N1	1974			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N1	2025			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

N1	2036	Mr	P	Waring	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N1	2227			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N1	2326	Mr	P	Waring	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
N1	2348			English Nature	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
N1	2424			SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
N1	9014			GONW	Proposed Changes	Counter-Objection	
N1	9017			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
N1	9028	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
N2	591			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N2	1028			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Support	
N2	1029			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N2	1086			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
N2	1124			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Support	
N2	1125			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N2	1464			RSPB	1 st Deposit	Support	
N2	1559			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N2	1875			DEFRA	1 st Deposit	Support	
N2	1975			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N2	2026			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
N2	2037	Mr	P	Waring	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N2	2064	Mrs	C	Sandiford	1 st Deposit	Support	
N2	2191			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
N2	2320	Mrs	J	Hayden	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N2	2336			English Nature	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N2	2425			SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N2	9018			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
N2	9029	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
N3	8		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
N3	592			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N3	1030			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Support	
N3	1087			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
N3	1109			County Bird Recorder, Greater Manchester	1 st Deposit	Support	
N3	1126			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Support	
N3	1465			RSPB	1 st Deposit	Support	
N3	1605	Cllr	B	Ronson	1 st Deposit	Support	
N3	1737	Mr	M	Mellor	1 st Deposit	Support	
N3	1751	Mr	L	Parker	1 st Deposit	Support	
N3	1813	Mr	B	Laking	1 st Deposit	Support	
N3	1822	Mrs	J	Parker	1 st Deposit	Support	
N3	1876			DEFRA	1 st Deposit	Support	
N3	1976			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N3	2017	Mr	A	Partington	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N3	2027			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
N3	2060	Ms	C	Greenhalgh	1 st Deposit	Support	
N3	2065	Mrs	C	Sandiford	1 st Deposit	Support	
N3	2154		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N3	2271	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N3	2337			English Nature	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N3	2426			SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N3	9030	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
N4	537			National Grid Company Plc.	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N4	541	Cllr	N	Peel & Cllrs White & Sherrington	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N4	551	Mrs	R.	Kelly MP	1 st Deposit	Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

N4	575	Mr	A	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	593			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N4	1031			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1088			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N4	1110			County Bird Recorder, Greater Manchester	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1127			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1296			Westhoughton Town Council	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N4	1302	Mrs	C	Morris	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N4	1306			Northern Trust Company Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N4	1311			Combined Property Control	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
N4	1313	Mr	J E	Booth	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1319	Mrs	E R	Booth	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1324	Dr	J	Rawcliffe	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1329	Mrs	R E	Rawcliffe	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1333	Mr	D H	Cooke	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1338	Mrs	E	Cooke	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1342	Mr	D	Crausby MP	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1451			Ladybridge Residents Association	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1466			RSPB	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1489	Mrs	P	Aspden	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1494	Mr	P J	Aspden	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1497			Hulton Park Labour Party	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1500	Mr	F	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1504	Mr	R	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1507	Mr	E	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1514	Mrs	A	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1518	Mrs	D	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1519	Mr	J	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1527	Mr	A	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1529	Mrs	S	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1537			Westbury Homes Ltd / Wain Estates Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N4	1731	Mr	A	Blackman	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1808			South Lancashire Bat Group	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1815	Mr	B	Laking	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1824	Mrs	J	Parker	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1877			DEFRA	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	1901			Wimpey Homes	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N4	1977			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N4	1997			Environment Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N4	2018	Mr	A	Partington	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N4	2028			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	2038	Mr	P	Waring	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N4	2061	Ms	C	Greenhalgh	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	2066	Mrs	C	Sandiford	1 st Deposit	Support	
N4	2081			Westhoughton / Hulton Park Liberal Democrats	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N4	2192			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N4	2228			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
N4	2310	Mrs	J	Hayden	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N4	2331	Mr	P	Waring	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N4	2338			English Nature	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N4	2376			The House Builders Federation	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
N4	2427			SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N4	9000			Arrowcroft North West Ltd	Proposed Changes	Counter-Objection	
N4	9019			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
N4	9031	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

N5	9		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	67			English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N5	552	Mrs	R.	Kelly MP	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	576	Mr	A	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	594			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N5	1032			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1089			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1128			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1129			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N5	1169	Mrs	V	Hough	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N5	1172	Mr	S	Macaulay	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N5	1177	Mr	M	Lucas	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N5	1194			CPRE	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N5	1314	Mr	J E	Booth	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1318	Mrs	E R	Booth	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1323	Dr	J	Rawcliffe	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1327	Mrs	R	Rawcliffe	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1331	Mr	D	Cooke	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1336	Mrs	E	Cooke	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1450			Ladybridge Residents Association	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1467			RSPB	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1491	Mrs	P	Aspden	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1492	Mr	P J	Aspden	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1498			Hulton Park Labour Party	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1499	Mr	F	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1505	Mr	R	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1510	Mr	E	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1513	Mrs	A	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1516	Mrs	D	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1517	Mr	J	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1528	Mr	A	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1530	Mrs	S	Crompton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1560			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N5	1698	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N5	1816	Mr	B	Laking	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1825	Mrs	J	Parker	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1832			The Woodland Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N5	1940			British Waterways	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	1998			Environment Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N5	2039	Mr	P	Waring	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N5	2062	Ms	C	Greenhalgh	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	2067	Mrs	C	Sandiford	1 st Deposit	Support	
N5	2155		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N5	2193			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N5	2272	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N5	2311	Mrs	J	Hayden	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N5	2333	Mr	P	Waring	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
N5	2339			English Nature	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N5	2428			SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N5	9032	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
N6	10		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	577	Mr	A	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	597			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N6	1033			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	1084			Red Moss Action Committee	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	1090			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	1111			County Bird Recorder, Greater Manchester	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	1130			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

N6	1131			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N6	1165	Mr & Mrs	J	Acton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	1166	Mrs	M	Rushton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	1423	Mr	J	Holdsworth	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	1434			Railtrack Plc	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N6	1452			Ladybridge Residents Association	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	1468			RSPB	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	1610	Cllr	B	Ronson	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	1621	Mrs	P	Hooton	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	1733	Mr	A	Blackman	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	1752	Mr	L	Parker	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	1812	Mr	B	Laking	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	1821	Mrs	J	Parker	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	1833			The Woodland Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	1999			Environment Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N6	2019	Mr	A	Partington	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N6	2029			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	2040	Mr	P	Waring	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N6	2059	Ms	C	Greenhalgh	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	2068	Mrs	C	Sandiford	1 st Deposit	Support	
N6	2156	Mrs	L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N6	2194			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N6	2273	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N6	2312	Mrs	J	Hayden	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
N6	2340			English Nature	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
N6	2397			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
N6	2429			SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N6	9020			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
N6	9033	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
N7	12		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
N7	595			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N7	1035			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Support	
N7	1092			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
N7	1113			County Bird Recorder, Greater Manchester	1 st Deposit	Support	
N7	1834			The Woodland Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
N7	1846			The Forestry Commission	1 st Deposit	Support	
N7	1858			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N7	2070	Mrs	C	Sandiford	1 st Deposit	Support	
N7	2157		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N7	2274	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N7	2313	Mrs	J	Hayden	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N7	2328	Mr	P	Waring	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N7	2377			The House Builders Federation	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
N7	2398			Peel Investments Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
N7	2430			SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N7	9015			GONW	Proposed Changes	Counter-Objection	
N7	9021			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
N7	9034	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
N8	11		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
N8	578	Mr	A	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N8	1034			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Support	
N8	1091			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
N8	1112			County Bird Recorder, Greater Manchester	1 st Deposit	Support	
N8	1170	Mrs	V	Hough	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

N8	1173	Mr	S	Macaulay	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N8	1178	Mr	M	Lucas	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N8	1561			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N8	1845			The Forestry Commission	1 st Deposit	Support	
N8	2069	Mrs	C	Sandiford	1 st Deposit	Support	
N8	2158		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N8	2275	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N8	2356			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
N8	2431			SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	
N8	9022			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
N8	9035	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
N9	1036			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Support	
N9	1037			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N9	1093			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
N9	1132			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Support	
N9	1469			RSPB	1 st Deposit	Support	
N9	1562			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
N9	1809			South Lancashire Bat Group	1 st Deposit	Support	
N9	2071	Mrs	C	Sandiford	1 st Deposit	Support	
N9	9023			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
N9	9036	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	

CHAPTER 6: ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

EM1	1718	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
EM1	2009			Environment Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
EM1	2010			Environment Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
EM2	13		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM2	596			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
EM2	1453			Ladybridge Residents Association	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM2	1739	Mr	J	Salt	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM2	2032			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM2	2052	Ms	C	Greenhalgh	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM2	2321	Mrs	J	Hayden	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
EM3	14		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM3	598			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
EM3	1454			Ladybridge Residents Association	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM3	1978			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
EM3	2000			Environment Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
EM3	2033			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM3	2053	Ms	C	Greenhalgh	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM4	579	Mr	A	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Objection	
EM4	599			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
EM4	1133			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	
EM4	1134			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	
EM4	1719	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
EM4	2001			Environment Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
EM4	2399			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
EM5	15		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM5	68			English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
EM5	600			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
EM5	1039			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM5	1046			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
EM5	1094			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM5	1135			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
EM5	1136			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

EM5	1202			CPRE	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM5	1563			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
EM5	1979			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
EM5	2139			English Heritage	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM5	2159		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM5	2202			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM5	2276	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM5	2314	Mrs	J	Hayden	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM5	2327	Mr	P	Waring	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM5	2341			English Nature	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM5	2351			The Verna Group	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM5	2364			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM5	9037	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
EM6	601			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
EM6	1211			The House Builders Federation	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
EM6	1564			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
EM6	1847			The Forestry Commission	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM6	2315	Mrs	J	Hayden	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM6	2365			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
EM7	602			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
EM7	1879			DEFRA	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM8	69			English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
EM8	580	Mr	A	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM8	1137			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
EM8	1207			CPRE	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
EM8	1449			Ladybridge Residents Association	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM8	1455			Ladybridge Residents Association	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM8	1720	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
EM8	1740	Mr	J	Salt	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM8	1859			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
EM8	1880			DEFRA	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM8	2054	Ms	C	Greenhalgh	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM8	2140			English Heritage	2 nd Deposit	Support	Conditionally Withdrawn
EM8	2325	Mrs	J	Hayden	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM8	2329	Mr	P	Waring	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM8	2342			English Nature	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM9	1721	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
EM10	581	Mr	A	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM10	1047			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM10	1203			CPRE	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM10	1212			The House Builders Federation	1 st Deposit	Objection	
EM10	1456			Ladybridge Residents Association	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM10	2034			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM10	2055	Ms	C	Greenhalgh	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM11	1200			CPRE	1 st Deposit	Support	
EM11	1213			The House Builders Federation	1 st Deposit	Objection	
EM11	1626			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
EM11	2002			Environment Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
EM11	2322	Mrs	J	Hayden	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
EM11	9038	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
EM12	2229			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
EM12	2319	Mrs	J	Hayden	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM12	2378			The House Builders Federation	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
EM12	2433			SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM12	2445	Mr	B	Howarth	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM12	2450			Environment Agency	2 nd Deposit	Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

EM13	2230			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
EM13	2249			GONW	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
EM13	2316	Mrs	J	Hayden	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM13	2434			S.W.A.N	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM13	2446	Mr	B	Howarth	2 nd Deposit	Support	
EM13	9011			GONW	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
EM13	9039	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	

CHAPTER 7: DESIGN & THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

D1	16		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
D1	78			English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D1	1204			CPRE.	1 st Deposit	Support	
D1	1214			The House Builders Federation	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D1	1357			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
D1	1565			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D1	1818	Mr	B	Laking	1 st Deposit	Support	
D1	1827	Mrs	J	Parker	1 st Deposit	Support	
D1	1980			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D1	2075			English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
D1	2076			English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
D2	17		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
D2	603			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D2	1195			CPRE	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D2	1358			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
D2	1371			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D2	1860			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
D2	1941			British Waterways	1 st Deposit	Support	
D2	1996			Environment Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D2	2041			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D2	2084			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D2	2160		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D2	2277	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D2	2323	Mrs	J	Hayden	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D2	9040	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
D3	18		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
D3	604			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D3	1138			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D3	1215			The House Builders Federation	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D3	1359			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
D3	1372			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D3	1627			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D3	1861			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
D3	2161		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D3	2243			GONW	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
D3	2278	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D3	2324	Mrs	J	Hayden	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D4	70			English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D4	1360			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
D4	1370			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D4	2042			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D4	2141			English Heritage	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D5	605			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D5	1216			The House Builders Federation	1 st Deposit	Objection	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

D5	1361			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
D5	1566			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D5	1699	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D5	2043			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D6	51			Vodafone Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D6	269			Orange Personal Communications Services Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D6	1042			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Support	
D6	1205			CPRE	1 st Deposit	Support	
D6	1343	Mr	D	Crausby MP	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D6	1344	Mrs	R	Kelly MP	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D6	1362			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
D6	1435			Railtrack Plc	1 st Deposit	Support	
D6	1655			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D6	1722	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	No
D6	1828			One2One Personal Communications Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D6	2023			British Telecommunications Plc	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D6	2044			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D6	2199			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D6	2209			One2One Personal Communications Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
D6	2330	Mr	P	Waring	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D6	2403			Bolton & District Civic Trust	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
D6	2453			Orange Personal Communications Services Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D7	19		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
D7	71			English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D7	606			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D7	1068			McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
D7	1097			Marks & Spencer Plc	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D7	1363			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
D7	1567			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
D7	1656			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D7	2045			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D7	2063	Mrs	C	Sandiford	1 st Deposit	Support	
D7	2142			English Heritage	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D7	2162		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D7	2244			GONW	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
D7	2279	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D7	2357			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
D7	9012			GONW	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
D7	9041	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
D8	20		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
D8	1052			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Support	
D8	1114			County Bird Recorder, Greater Manchester	1 st Deposit	Support	
D8	1139			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D8	1140			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Support	
D8	1364			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
D8	1658			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D8	2046			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D8	2200			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D8	2343			English Nature	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D9	2143			English Heritage	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D9	2164		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D9	2280	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D9	2317	Mrs	J	Hayden	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D10	21		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

D10	72		English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D10	607		DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D10	1115		County Bird Recorder, Greater Manchester	1 st Deposit	Support	
D10	1141		English Nature	1 st Deposit	Support	
D10	1365		Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
D10	1373		Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D10	1568		Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D10	1657		Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D10	2047		Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D10	2144		English Heritage	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D10	2165		L Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D10	2281	Mr	A Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D10	2344		English Nature	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D11	2145		English Heritage	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D11	2166		L Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D11	2282	Mr	A Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D12	22		L Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
D12	73		English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D12	1116		County Bird Recorder, Greater Manchester	1 st Deposit	Support	
D12	1366		Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
D12	1374		Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D12	2048		Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
D13	53		Garden History Society	1 st Deposit	Support	
D13	74		English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D13	608		DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D13	1367		Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
D13	1738	Mr	J Salt	1 st Deposit	Support	
D13	1895		North West Tourist Board	1 st Deposit	Support	
D13	2049		Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D13	2146		English Heritage	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D14	75		English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D14	609		DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D14	1368		Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
D14	1981		RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D14	2030		SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
D14	2050		Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
D14	2147		English Heritage	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D14	2422		SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D15	23		L Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
D15	76		English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D15	610		DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
D15	1369		Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
D15	1700	Mr	D Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
D15	2031		SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
D15	2051		Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
D15	2148		English Heritage	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D15	2163		L Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D15	2283	Mr	A Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
D15	2423		SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	

CHAPTER 8: OPEN SPACE & RECREATION

O1	24		L Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
O1	1066		City of Salford	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
O1	1185		Westhoughton Junior Amateur Rugby Club	1 st Deposit	Support	
O1	1444	Mr	D Chadwick	1 st Deposit	Support	
O1	1472		Sport England	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

							omission
O1	1480			Sport England	1 st Deposit	Support	
O1	1481			Sport England	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
O1	1701	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O1	1797			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
O1	2406			Bolton & District Civic Trust	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
O1	2452			Sport England	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
O2	25		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
O2	29		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
O2	30		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
O2	571	Mr & Mrs	G	Kenyon	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O2	1150			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
O2	1167			Lostock Sports Club	1 st Deposit	Support	
O2	1168			Lostock Sports Club	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O2	1171	Mrs	V	Hough	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
O2	1174	Mr	S	Macaulay	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O2	1179	Mr	M	Lucas	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O2	1186			Westhoughton Junior Amateur Rugby Club	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O2	1300			Westhoughton Town Council	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
O2	1346			Westhoughton / Hulton Park Liberal Democrats	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O2	1350	Mr	J	Nicholson	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O2	1424	Mrs	S	Riley	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
O2	1426	Mr	A	Riley	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
O2	1428	Miss	S	Brazier	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
O2	1471			Sport England	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O2	1482			Sport England	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O2	1483			Sport England	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
O2	1569			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O2	1612	Cllr	B	Ronson	1 st Deposit	Support	
O2	1639			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O2	1659			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O2	1692			Woodford Industries Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O2	1693			Westhoughton Cricket Club	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O2	1715	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O2	1798			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O2	1799			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
O2	2080			Westhoughton / Hulton Park Liberal Democrats	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O2	2167		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
O2	2181		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
O2	2210			BAe Systems	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
O2	2284	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
O2	2286	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
O2	2345			English Nature	2 nd Deposit	Support	
O2	2443			SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	
O3	26		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
O3	1187			Westhoughton Junior Amateur Rugby Club	1 st Deposit	Support	
O3	1486			Sport England	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O3	1487			Sport England	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
O3	1613	Cllr	B	Ronson	1 st Deposit	Support	
O3	1660			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O3	1800			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O3	1801			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
O3	2168		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
O3	2287	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
Deleted Policy O4	582	Mr	A	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

Deleted Policy O4	611			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
Deleted Policy O4	1188			Westhoughton Junior Amateur Rugby Club	1 st Deposit	Support	
Deleted Policy O4	1425	Mrs	S	Riley	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
Deleted Policy O4	1427	Mr	A	Riley	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
Deleted Policy O4	1429	Miss	S	Brazier	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
Deleted Policy O4	1478			Sport England	1 st Deposit	Objection	
Deleted Policy O4	1702	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
Deleted Policy O4	1755			Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
Deleted Policy O4	1802			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Objection	
Deleted Policy O4	1803			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
O4	27		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
O4	612			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O4	1069			McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
O4	1217			The House Builders Federation	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O4	1479			Sport England	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O4	1570			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O4	1629			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
O4	1661			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O4	1703	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O4	1804			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O4	1805			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
O4	2169		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
O4	2211			BAe Systems	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
O4	2223			Sport England	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
O4	2245			GONW	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
O4	2288	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
O4	2358			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
O4	9024			Westhoughton Town Council	Proposed Changes	Counter-Objection	
O4	9042	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
Deleted Policy O6	28		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
Deleted Policy O6	572	Mr	A	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
Deleted Policy O6	613			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
Deleted Policy O6	1040			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Support	
Deleted Policy O6	1151			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
Deleted Policy O6	1484			Sport England	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
Deleted Policy O6	1741	Mr	J	Salt	1 st Deposit	Support	
O5	1041			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Support	
O5	1095			Lancashire Wildlife Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
O5	1142			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
O5	1477			Sport England	1 st Deposit	Support	
O5	1588			Business Enterprises Ltd	1 st Deposit	Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

O5	1896			North West Tourist Board	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O5	1938			British Waterways	1 st Deposit	Support	
O5	2197			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Support	
O5	2332	Mr	P	Waring	2 nd Deposit	Support	
O5	2346			English Nature	2 nd Deposit	Support	
O5	9043	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
O6	1117			County Bird Recorder, Greater Manchester	1 st Deposit	Support	
O6	1143			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
O6	1589			Business Enterprises Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
O6	1897			North West Tourist Board	1 st Deposit	Objection	
O6	1939			British Waterways	1 st Deposit	Support	
O6	2198			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Support	
O6	2347			English Nature	2 nd Deposit	Support	
O6	9044	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
O7	614			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
O7	1476			Sport England	1 st Deposit	Support	
O7	2246			GONW	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
O7	2318	Mrs	J	Hayden	2 nd Deposit	Support	
O7	9013			GONW	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
O7	9045	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	

CHAPTER 9: ACCESSIBILITY

A1	31		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
A1	1054			LA21 Transport Working Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
A1	1161			General Aviation Awareness Council	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
A1	1206			CPRE.	1 st Deposit	Support	
A1	1630			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A1	1662			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A1	1676	Mr	J	Parkin	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
A1	1704	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A1	1848			The Forestry Commission	1 st Deposit	Support	
A1	1862			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Support	
A1	1878			DEFRA	1 st Deposit	Support	
A1	1906			CED Promotion Partnership	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A1	1918			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	
A1	1942			British Waterways	1 st Deposit	Support	
A1	2170		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
A1	2289	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
Deleted Policy A2	2217			GMPTE	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Dealt with at deleted Policy A2
Deleted Policy A2	32		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
Deleted Policy A2	615			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
Deleted Policy A2	1218			The House Builders Federation	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
Deleted Policy A2	1631			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
Deleted Policy A2	1919			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	
Deleted Policy A3	616			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
Deleted	1677	Mr	J	Parkin	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

Policy A3 Deleted	1769			Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
Policy A3 A2	33		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
A2	1055			LA21 Transport Working Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
A2	1614	Cllr	B	Ronson	1 st Deposit	Support	
A2	1705	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A2	1723	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A3	1056			LA21 Transport Working Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
A3	1678	Mr	J	Parkin	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
A3	1920			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	
A4	34		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
A4	1219			The House Builders Federation	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A4	1571			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A4	1689	Mr	J	Parkin	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
A4	1921			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	
A4	2171		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
A4	2290	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
A4	9046	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
A5	1572			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A5	1679	Mr	J	Parkin	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
A5	2379			The House Builders Federation	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
A5	9047	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
A6	617			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A6	1158			McDonald's Restaurants Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A6	1663			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A6	1680	Mr	J	Parkin	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
A6	2380			The House Builders Federation	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
A6	2420			B & Q Plc	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
A7	618			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
A8	619			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A8	2214			GMPTE	2 nd Deposit	Support	
A8	2247			GONW	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
A8	2381			The House Builders Federation	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
A8	9048	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
A10	620			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
A10	1057			LA21 Transport Working Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A10	1201			CPRE	1 st Deposit	Support	
A10	1664			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A10	1681	Mr	J	Parkin	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
A10	1863			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Support	
A10	1922			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	
A10	2432			SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	
Deleted	621			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
Policy A13 Deleted	1716	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
Policy A13 Deleted	1766			Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
Policy A13 Deleted	1864			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Support	
Policy A13 Deleted	1923			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	
Policy A13 A11	35		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A11	1682	Mr	J	Parkin	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
A11	1767			Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

							Withdrawn
A11	1865			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Support	
A11	1924			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	
A11	2218			GMPTE	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
A11	2299	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
A12	622			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A12	1058			LA21 Transport Working Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A12	1706	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A12	1925			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	
A12	2215			GMPTE	2 nd Deposit	Support	
A13	36		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
A13	623			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A13	1436			Railtrack Plc	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A13	1461			Wigan Council	1 st Deposit	Support	
A13	1615	Cllr	B	Ronson	1 st Deposit	Support	
A13	1690	Mr	J	Parkin	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A13	1806			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A13	1926			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	
A13	2172		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
A13	2291	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
A14	624			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A14	1683	Mr	J	Parkin	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
A14	1707	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A14	1927			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	
A14	2216			GMPTE	2 nd Deposit	Support	
A15	625			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
A15	1684	Mr	J	Parkin	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
A15	1928			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	
A16	626			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A16	1474			Sport England	1 st Deposit	Support	
A16	1665			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A16	2248			GONW	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
A17	627			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
A17	1475			Sport England	1 st Deposit	Support	
A17	1691	Mr	J	Parkin	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
A17	1943			British Waterways	1 st Deposit	Support	
A17	2259			McCarthy & Stone (Developments) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
A17	9049	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
A18	628			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
A18	1929			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	
A18	2035			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
A19	1573			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A19	1685	Mr	J	Parkin	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
A19	1708	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A20	37		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A20	547			The Hulton Estate	1 st Deposit	Support	
A20	629			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A20	1048			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
A20	1053			LA21 Transport Working Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A20	1196			CPRE	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A20	1531			Persimmon Homes Ltd	1 st Deposit	Support	
A20	1666			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A20	1686	Mr	J	Parkin	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A20	2201			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Support	
A21	1930			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	
A22	1667			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
A22	1931			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

CHAPTER 10: HOUSING

H1	48			Trustees of the 1951 R E Morley Settlement	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	253			The Hulton Estate	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	255			The Hulton Estate	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H1	258			The Hulton Estate	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	630			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1079			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1103	Mr	H	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1105	Mr	H	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1107	Mr	H	Gregory	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1153	Mr & Mrs	A	Knight	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1220			The House Builders Federation	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1532			Westbury Homes Ltd / Wain Estates Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1539			Bellway Estates	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1545			Persimmon Homes Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1553			Alfred McAlpine Developments Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1554			Beazer Strategic Land	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1574			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1594			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1598			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1602			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1637			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1654			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H1	1673			Wain Estates Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1754	Mr	L	Parker	1 st Deposit	Support	
H1	1770			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
H1	1817	Mr	B	Laking	1 st Deposit	Support	
H1	1826	Mrs	J	Parker	1 st Deposit	Support	
H1	1883			DEFRA	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H1	1902			Wimpey Homes	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1907			CED Promotion Partnership	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	1991	Mr	D	Lord	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H1	2236			Robert Fletcher (Stoneclough) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H1	2250			GONW	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H1	2301			Morris Homes Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H1	2303			Westbury Homes & Wain Estates	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H1	2353			Botany Investments Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H1	2354			Elite Homes (North) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H1	2359			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H1	2373			Northern Trust Company Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H1	2382			The House Builders Federation	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H1	2389			Wimpey Homes	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H1	2391			Wain Estates Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H1	2394			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H1	2400			Persimmon Homes Ltd.	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H1	2441			SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H1	2447			Alfred McAlpine Developments Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H1	2454			Bellway Estates	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H2	49			Trustees of the 1951 R E Morley Settlement	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	254			The Hulton Estate	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	256			The Hulton Estate	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	259			The Hulton Estate	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	544			The Hulton Estate	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	565	Mrs	M	Riley	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	566	Mr	J	Kay & Mrs N Platt	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	631			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	635			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

H2	650			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1050			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1155	Mr & Mrs	A	Knight	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1175	Mr	L	Halliwell	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1181	Mr & Mrs	A	Hinds	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1221			The House Builders Federation	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1298			Westhoughton Town Council	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1299			Westhoughton Town Council	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1305			Northern Trust Company Ltd	1 st Deposit	Support	
H2	1309			Botany Investments Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1345			Westhoughton/ Hulton Park Liberal Democrats	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1347			Westhoughton/ Hulton Park Liberal Democrats	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1385			Brazley Residents Association	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1386	Mr	F	Lewis	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1387	Mr	J M	Platts	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1388	Dr's	S & J	Hall	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1389	Mr	A	Hughes	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1390	Mrs	H M	Donnington	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1391	Mrs	J	Nuttall	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1392	Mr & Mrs	D	Cowley	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1393	Mr	W	Edwards	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1394	Mr & Mrs	R	Allwood	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1395	Mr	P	Wooff	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1396	Mr	R	Parkinson	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1397	Mr	K	Moore	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1398	Mr & Mrs	I R	Newton	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1399	Mr	R M	Warwick	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1400	Mr	G	Webster	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1401	Mrs	M	Williams	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1402	Mr & Mrs	R	Grundy	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1403	Mr	J	Kenyon	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1405	Mr	A. S.	Durbar	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1406	Mr & Mrs	I	Hopps	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1407	Mr	J	Hopps	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1408	Miss	A	Hopps	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1409	Mrs	G	Hopps	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1410	Mr & Mrs	A	Hinds	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1411	Mr & Mrs	J	Sharples	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1412	Mrs	D E	Birbeck	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1413	Mr & Mrs	C	Scott	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1414	Mr & Mrs	S	Lown	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1415	Mr & Mrs	K	Hibbert	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1416	Mr	D	Fox	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1417	Mr	M	Monaghan	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1418	Mr & Mrs	B	Gaskell	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1419	Mr & Mrs	C	Jennings	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1420	Mr	A	Temperley	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1421	Mrs	A	Pooler	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1422	Mr	J	Wilkinson (deceased)	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1473			Sport England	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1533			Westbury Homes Ltd / Wain Estates Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1541			Bellway Estates	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1546			Persimmon Homes Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1551			Alfred McAlpine Developments Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1555			Beazer Strategic Land	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1575			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1576			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1577			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

H2	1586			Business Enterprises Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1595			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1599			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1603			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1619	Cllr	B	Ronson	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1632			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1633			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1634			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1668			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1672	Mr	A	Partington	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1674			Wain Estates Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1675			Wain Estates Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1743			Stakehill International Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1749			Arrowcroft North West Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1775			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
H2	1830			Morris Homes Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1840			Elite Homes (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1842			Elite Homes (North) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	1903			Wimpey Homes	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	1995	Mr	D	Lord	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	2005			Environment Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H2	2011			Rexam Plc	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	2083	Mrs	A	Fox	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	2085			Graham Ball (Chartered Surveyor)	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	2130	Mr	F	Lewis	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H2	2131	Miss	A K	Temperley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H2	2132	Mrs	M	Williams	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H2	2133	Mr & Mrs	B	Travis	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H2	2184	Mr	M W	Greenhalgh	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H2	2185	Mr	C	Eccles	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H2	2186	Mr & Mrs	D	Fox	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H2	2187	Dr.	J M	Hall	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H2	2188	Mr	S	Dunbar	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H2	2189	Mr	R	Grundy	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H2	2203			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H2	2205			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H2	2213	Mr	K	Cox	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H2	2237			Robert Fletcher (Stoneclough) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H2	2251			GONW	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H2	2258			GONW	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H2	2264			The Emerson Group	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H2	2302			Morris Homes Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H2	2304			Westbury Homes & Wain Estates	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H2	2307			Leigh Lancashire Estate	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H2	2308			Bellway Estates	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H2	2349			English Nature	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H2	2360			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H2	2367	Mr	I	Cumming	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H2	2374			Northern Trust Company Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H2	2383			The House Builders Federation	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H2	2388	Mr & Mrs	J	Howard	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H2	2390			Wimpey Homes	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H2	2392			Wain Estates	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H2	2395			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H2	2401			Persimmon Homes Ltd.	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H2	2442			SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H2	2448			Alfred McAlpine Developments Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H2	9050	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
H3	38		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

H3	1049			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H3	1144			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H3	1534			Westbury Homes Ltd / Wain Estates Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H3	1578			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H3	1695			Travis Perkins	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H3	1709	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H3	1772			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
H3	1774			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H3	1932			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	
H3	1994	Mr	D	Lord	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H3	2008			Environment Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as omission at Chapter 6
H3	2013			Rexam Plc	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H3	2173		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H3	2238			Robert Fletcher (Stoneclough) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H3	2292	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H3	2305			Westbury Homes & Wain Estates	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H3	2361			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H3	2375			Northern Trust Company Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H3	2384			The House Builders Federation	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H3	2396			Peel Investments (North) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H3	2402			Persimmon Homes Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H3	2416			Rexam Plc	2 nd Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H3	2449			Alfred McAlpine Developments Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H4	632			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H4	1080			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H4	1222			The House Builders Federation	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H4	1540			Bellway Estates	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H4	1579			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H4	1635			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H4	1866			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H4	2252			GONW	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H4	2306			Westbury Homes & Wain Estates	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H4	2362			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H4	2385			The House Builders Federation	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
H4	9004			Robert Fletcher (Stoneclough) Ltd	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
H4	9005			Robert Fletcher (Stoneclough) Ltd	Proposed Changes	Counter-objection	
H4	9016			GONW	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
H4	9051	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
H5	1197			CPRE	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H5	1580			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H5	1636			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H5	2366			Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	2 nd Deposit	Support	
H5	2439			SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
Deleted policy H5	633			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
H6	634			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H6	1081			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
H6	9052	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
Deleted Policy H7	1082			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with at Policy H5 (H7)
Deleted Policy H7	1669			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with at Policy H7

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

CHAPTER 11: COMMUNITY PROVISION

CP1	545			The Hulton Estate	1 st Deposit	Objection	
CP1	1550			Persimmon Homes Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
CP1	1670			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
CP1	1867			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
CP1	1908			CED Promotion Partnership	1 st Deposit	Objection	
CP2	39		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
CP2	1294			Westhoughton Town Council	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
CP2	1616	Cllr	B	Ronson	1 st Deposit	Support	
CP2	1985			Morris Homes Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
CP2	2174		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
CP2	2293	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
CP2	9053	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
CP3	1909			CED Promotion Partnership	1 st Deposit	Objection	
CP3	1933			GMPTÉ	1 st Deposit	Support	

CHAPTER 12: EMPLOYMENT & THE ECONOMY

E1	40		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
E1	1074			The Verna Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E1	1547			Persimmon Homes Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E1	1724	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E1	1786			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
E1	1868			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E1	1910			CED Promotion Partnership	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E1	1915			CED Promotion Partnership	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E1	1916			CED Promotion Partnership	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E1	1944	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
E1	2024			British Telecommunications Plc	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
E1	2175		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
E1	2294	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
E1	2444			SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Support	
E2	41		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
E2	57			Morbaine Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	80	Mr & Mrs	N	Jones	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	265	Mrs	S	Hall	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	266	Mr	J	Morris	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	539	Mr	C	Pilling	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E2	540	Mr	J	Fisher	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	546			The Hulton Estate	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	548			Firwood Paints and Varnish Co Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	554	Mr	G	Lee	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	559	Mr	I	Boydell	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	560	Mr	W	Jenkins	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	568	Mrs	E	Jones	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	569	Mr	S	Melia	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	585	Mr	A	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Support	
E2	636			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E2	651			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E2	1051			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E2	1067			City of Salford	1 st Deposit	Support	
E2	1076			The Verna Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E2	1078	Mr	A	Taylor	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	1099			Bolton WIDE	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	1100	Mr & Mrs	E	Jolley	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	1101	Mr	P	Fletcher	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	1108			The Trustees of the 1951 R E Morley	1 st Deposit	Objection	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

				Settlement			
E2	1118			D & A Motors	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	1119	Mrs & Miss	C	Wilkinson	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	1163	Mr & Mrs	L	Burtonwood	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	1164			Lostock Sports Club	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	1180	Mr & Mrs	A	Parkinson	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	1310			Combined Property Control	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
E2	1430	Mr	D	Renshaw	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	1485			Sport England	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E2	1548			Persimmon Homes Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E2	1628			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	1638			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	1640			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E2	1768			Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	1776			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
E2	1836			The Post Office	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E2	1837			The Post Office	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E2	1838			The Post Office	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E2	1869			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E2	1889			BAe Systems	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	1945	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
E2	1982			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E2	1986			City Link Properties Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E2	2006			Environment Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
E2	2012			Rexam Plc	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E2	2204			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Support	
E2	2206			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Support	
E2	2207			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Support	
E2	2208			Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	2 nd Deposit	Support	
E2	2212			BAe Systems	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
E2	2221			Sport England	2 nd Deposit	Support	
E2	2222			Sport England	2 nd Deposit	Support	
E2	2265			The Emerson Group	2 nd Deposit	Support	
E2	2352			The Verna Group	2 nd Deposit	Support	
E2	9054	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
E2	9055	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
E3	42		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
E3	637			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E3	1710	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E3	1777			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
E3	1934			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	
E3	1946	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
E3	1983			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E3	2014			Rexam Plc	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E3	2176		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
E3	2231			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Support	
E3	2295	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
E4	43		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
E4	638			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E4	1711	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E4	1778			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
E4	1935			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	
E4	1947	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
E4	1984			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E4	2015			Rexam PLC	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E4	2177		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

E4	2232			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Support	
E5	50			Trustees of the 1951 R E Morley Settlement	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E5	549			Firwood Paints and Varnish Co Ltd.	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E5	639			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E5	1160			McDonald's Restaurants Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E5	1162	Mr	F	Bhutawala	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E5	1223			The House Builders Federation	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E5	1641			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E5	1779			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
E5	1948	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
E5	1987			City Link Properties Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E5	2239			Robert Fletcher (Stoneclough) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
E5	2386			The House Builders Federation	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
E6	640			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E6	1307			Northern Trust Company Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E6	1617	Cllr	B	Ronson	1 st Deposit	Support	
E6	1725	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E6	1744			Stakehill International Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
E6	1746			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E6	1780			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
E6	1949	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
E6	2387			The House Builders Federation	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
E6	9056	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
E7	268			Orange Personal Communications Services Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E7	1911			CED Promotion Partnership	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E7	1950	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
E7	9057	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
E8	1884			DEFRA	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E8	1890			North West Tourist Board	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
E8	1898			North West Tourist Board	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E8	1912			CED Promotion Partnership	1 st Deposit	Objection	
E8	1951	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	

CHAPTER 13: RETAIL & LEISURE

S1	641			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
S1	1642			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S1	1712	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S1	1745			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S1	1756			Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
S1	1764			Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
S1	1765			Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S1	1781			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
S1	1782			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S1	1870			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
S1	1913			CED Promotion Partnership	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S1	1952	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
S1	2350			The Verna Group	2 nd Deposit	Support	
S1	2418			Tesco Stores Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Support	
S2	44		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
S2	58			Morbaine Ltd.	1 st Deposit	Support	
S2	542			The Hulton Estate	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S2	642			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

S2	652			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
S2	1070			The Verna Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
S2	1071			The Verna Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
S2	1072			The Verna Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
S2	1077			The Verna Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
S2	1182			Wm. Morrison Supermarkets Plc	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
S2	1538			Sainsburys Supermarkets	1 st Deposit	Support	
S2	1643			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S2	1671			Tesco Stores Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S2	1757			Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
S2	1783			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
S2	1953	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
S2	1988			City Link Properties Ltd.	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S2	2007			Environment Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S2	2022			British Telecommunications Plc	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S2	2182		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
S2	2219			Morbaine Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Support	
S2	2285	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
S2	2414			Bolton & District Civic Trust	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
S2	2440			SWAN	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
S2	9058	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
S2	9060	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
Appendix 6	9059	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
Appendix 6	9002			Morbaine Ltd	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
Appendix 6	9003			Morbaine Ltd	Proposed Changes	Counter-Objection	Dealt with at Policy S2
S3	45		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
S3	59			Morbaine Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S3	1073			The Verna Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
S3	1075			The Verna Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
S3	1183			Wm. Morrison Supermarkets Plc	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S3	1295			Westhoughton Town Council	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S3	1297			Westhoughton Town Council	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
S3	1644			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S3	1694			Travis Perkins	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S3	1717	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S3	1758			Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
S3	1784			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Support	
S3	1954	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
S3	1989			City Link Properties Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S3	2178		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
S3	2296	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
S4	46		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
S4	643			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
S4	1438			Chorley Borough Council	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
S4	1726	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S4	1759			Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
S4	1785			SWAN	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S4	1885			DEFRA	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
S4	1936			GMPTE	1 st Deposit	Support	
S4	1955	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

S4	1990			City Link Properties Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S4	2179		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
S4	2263			City Link Properties Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
S4	2297	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
S4	2415			Bolton & District Civic Trust	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
S4	2417			Tesco Stores Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
S4	2421			B & Q Plc	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
S4	9061	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
S5	1956	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
S6	47		L	Gallagher	1 st Deposit	Support	
S6	644			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
S6	1437			Chorley Borough Council	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
S6	1608	Cllr	B	Ronson	1 st Deposit	Support	
S6	1645			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S6	1760			Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
S6	1957	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
S6	2180		L	Gallagher	2 nd Deposit	Support	
S6	2220			Morbaine Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
S6	2298	Mr	A	Riley	2 nd Deposit	Support	
S6	9062	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
S7	1159			McDonald's Restaurants Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
S7	1958	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
S7	9063	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
S8	645			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
S8	1439			Chorley Borough Council	1 st Deposit	Support	
S8	1646			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
S8	1937			GMPT	1 st Deposit	Support	

CHAPTER 14: TOWN CENTRES

TC1	1156			McDonald's Restaurants Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
TC1	1713	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
TC1	1747			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
TC1	1899			North West Tourist Board	1 st Deposit	Objection	
TC1	1914			CED Promotion Partnership	1 st Deposit	Objection	
TC1	1959	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
TC2	77			English Heritage	1 st Deposit	Support	
TC2	1647			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
TC2	1960	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
TC3	1961	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
TC4	1157			McDonald's Restaurants Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	
TC4	1649			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
TC4	1962	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Objection	
TC4	2082			Westhoughton/Hulton Park Liberal Democrats	1 st Deposit	Objection	
TC5	1650			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
TC5	1761			Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
TC5	1963	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
TC6	1224			The House Builders Federation	1 st Deposit	Objection	
TC6	1651			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
TC6	1964	Mr	G L	Smith	1 st Deposit	Support	
Deleted policy TC7	1652			The Emerson Group	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
Deleted policy TC7	1762			Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd	1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

Deleted policy TC7	1965	Mr	G L Smith		1 st Deposit	Support	
TC7	1966	Mr	G L Smith		1 st Deposit	Support	
TC7	2183	Mr	G L Smith		2 nd Deposit	Objection	
TC8	646		DETR		1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
TC8	1653		The Emerson Group		1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
TC8	1687	Mr	J Parkin		1 st Deposit	Objection	
TC8	1763		Bolton Town Centre Company Ltd		1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
TC8	1967	Mr	G L Smith		1 st Deposit	Support	
TC8	2419		Town and City Parking Ltd		2 nd Deposit	Support	
TC9	538		Bolton Cycling Forum		1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn and dealt with as an omission
TC9	1688	Mr	J Parkin		1 st Deposit	Objection	Conditionally Withdrawn
TC9	1968	Mr	G L Smith		1 st Deposit	Support	
TC9	9064	Cllr	N Critchley		Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	

CHAPTER 15: MINERALS

M1	252			The Wilton Estate		1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
M1	1351			Bolton & District Civic Trust		1 st Deposit	Support	
M1	1356			Bolton & District Civic Trust		1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
M1	1609	Cllr	B	Ronson		1 st Deposit	Support	
M1	1727	Mr	D	Southworth		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M1	2020	Mr	A	Partington		1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
M1	2233			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd		2 nd Deposit	Objection	
M2	79			English Heritage		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	553	Mrs	R.	Kelly MP		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	647			DETR		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	649			DETR		1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
M2	1145			English Nature		1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
M2	1146			English Nature		1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
M2	1315			Mr J E Booth		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	1316	Mr	J E	Booth		1 st Deposit	Support	
M2	1320	Mrs	E R	Booth		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	1321	Mrs	E R	Booth		1 st Deposit	Support	
M2	1325	Dr	J	Rawcliffe		1 st Deposit	Support	
M2	1328	Mrs	R E	Rawcliffe		1 st Deposit	Support	
M2	1330	Mr	D	Cooke		1 st Deposit	Support	
M2	1332	Mr	D	Cooke		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	1335	Mrs	E	Cooke		1 st Deposit	Support	
M2	1337	Mrs	E	Cooke		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	1341	Mr	D	Crausby MP		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	1352			Bolton & District Civic Trust		1 st Deposit	Support	
M2	1355			Bolton & District Civic Trust		1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
M2	1490	Mrs	P	Aspden		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	1493	Mr	P J	Aspden		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	1501	Mr	F	Crompton		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	1503	Mr	R	Crompton		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	1508	Mr	E	Crompton		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	1511	Mrs	A	Crompton		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	1515	Mrs	D	Crompton		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	1522	Mr	J	Crompton		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	1523	Mr	A	Crompton		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	1525	Mrs	S	Crompton		1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	1849			The Forestry Commission		1 st Deposit	Support	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

M2	1871			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	1888			DEFRA	1 st Deposit	Objection	
M2	2003			Environment Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
M2	2234			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
M3	1198			CPRE	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
M3	1353			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
M3	1886			DEFRA	1 st Deposit	Objection	
M3	2004			Environment Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
M3	2254			GONW	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
M4	648			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
M4	1354			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Support	
M4	2255			GONW	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
M4	2260			Lancashire County Council	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
M4	9006			GONW	Proposed Changes	Counter-Objection	
M4	9065	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	

CHAPTER 16: WASTE

W1	583	Mr	A	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Objection	
W1	1083			Bolton & District Civic Trust	1 st Deposit	Objection	
W1	1606	Cllr	B	Ronson	1 st Deposit	Support	
W1	1728	Mr	D	Southworth	1 st Deposit	Objection	
W1	2021	Mr	A	Partington	1 st Deposit	Objection	Dealt with as an omission
W1	2256			GONW	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
W1	2261			Lancashire County Council	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
W1	9007			GONW	Proposed Changes	Counter-Objection	
W1	9066	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
W2	584	Mr	A	Johnson	1 st Deposit	Objection	
W2	653			DETR	1 st Deposit	Objection	
W2	1147			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
W2	1148			English Nature	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
W2	1470			RSPB	1 st Deposit	Support	
W2	1872			The Countryside Agency	1 st Deposit	Objection	
W2	1887			DEFRA	1 st Deposit	Objection	
W2	2235			RJB Mining (UK) Ltd	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
W2	2262			Lancashire County Council	2 nd Deposit	Objection	
W2	9008			GONW	Proposed Changes	Counter-Objection	
W2	9067	Cllr	N	Critchley	Proposed Changes	Counter-Support	
W3	1199			CPRE	1 st Deposit	Objection	Withdrawn
W3	1850			The Forestry Commission	1 st Deposit	Support	
W3	1881			DEFRA	1 st Deposit	Support	

CHAPTER 17: MONITORING & REVIEW

Chapter 17	1917			CED Promotion Partnership	1 st Deposit	Objection	
------------	------	--	--	---------------------------	-------------------------	-----------	--

APPENDIX 2: INQUIRY DOCUMENTS

1. CORE DOCUMENTS

Document Number	Title/Author* *Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council unless indicated otherwise
CD B1	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - Second Deposit Written Statement
CD B1 A	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - Second Deposit Written Statement – <u>numbered paragraph version</u>
CD B2	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - Second Deposit Proposed Map Changes
CD B3	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - Second Deposit List of Plan Revisions and Map Changes
CD B4	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - First Deposit Written Statement
CD B5	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - First Deposit Proposals Map
CD B6	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - First Deposit Town Centre Inset Map
CD B7	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - Schedule of Representations to First Deposit Plan
CD B8	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - Schedule of Representations to Second Deposit Plan
CD B9	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan – First Deposit Statement of Public Participation
CD B10	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan – First Deposit Sustainability Appraisal
CD B11	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - Second Deposit Sustainability Appraisal
CD B12	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - Issues Paper
CD B13	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - Issues Paper – Summary of Consultation Responses
CD B14	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - Topic Paper – Employment and the Economy
CD B15	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - Topic Paper – Housing
CD B16	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - Topic Paper – Green Belt
CD B17	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - Planning the Way Ahead Adopted Edition
CD B18	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan Inspector's Report (Planning Inspectorate)
CD B19	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - Statement of the Council's Decisions and Reasons on the Inspector's Report, List of Inspector's Recommendations which the Council does not intend to adopt and Proposed Modifications to Bolton's Unitary Development Plan
CD B20	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - Statement of the Council's Decisions and Reasons on Objections to Modifications
CD B21	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan – Proposed Modifications to Bolton's Unitary Development Plan
CD B22	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan - Statement of the Council's Decisions and Reasons on Objections to Modifications
CD B25	Bolton Metro Housing Land Availability Study
CD B26	Bolton Metro Housing Land Availability Study
CD B27	Bolton Metro Housing Land Availability Study
CD B28	Bolton Metro Housing Land Availability Study
CD B29	Bolton Metro Housing Land Availability Study
CD B30	Bolton Metro Housing Land Availability Study
CD B31	Bolton Metro Housing Land Availability Study
CD B32	Bolton Metro Housing Land Availability Study
CD B33	Bolton Metro Housing Land Availability Study
CD B34	Bolton Metro Housing Land Availability Study
CD B35	Bolton's Housing Strategy
CD B36	Housing Requirements in Bolton: Current Patterns and Future Concerns
CD B37	Investing in Excellence - Greater Manchester Local Transport Plan 2001/02 – 2005/06 (AGMA and GMPTA)
CD B38	Where the Town Meets the Hills - A Biodiversity Action Plan for Bolton. Bolton Biodiversity Group
CD B39	Bolton's Green Corridors - Their Background, Justification and Potential for Enhancement
CD B40	A Landscape Character Appraisal of Bolton
CD B41	Bolton's Wildlife Strategy Lancashire Wildlife Trust/Bolton MBC
CD B42	Bolton Industrial Property Register
CD B43	Bolton Office Property Register
CD B44	The Bolton Plan
CD B45	The Vision for the Future
CD B46	Industrial Development Resource
CD B47	Bolton's Economic Development Strategy
CD B48	Environmental Assessment, land at Lee Hall, Westhoughton (HGP Planning Consultancy)

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

CD B49	Archaeological Desk-based Assessment – Lee Hall, Westhoughton (Wessex Archaeology)
CD B50	Ecological Constraints Survey – Lee Hall, Westhoughton (Ecological Services Ltd)
CD B51	Influence of bus-based park and ride facilities on users' car traffic (G Parkhurst) Transport Policy 7, 159-172)
CD B52	Bolton Retail Study 2001 (CB Hillier Parker)
CD B53	Assessment of Town Centre Vitality and Viability (CB Hillier Parker)
CD B54	Monitoring of Shopping Centres Vitality and Viability – Position in Greater Manchester (Greater Manchester Research)
CD B55	A Cycling Strategy for Bolton
CD B56	Correspondence from the Inspector via the Programme Officer to Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council and/or Objectors
CD B57	Draft Supplementary Planning Guidance for Telecommunications
CD B58	Cycle Tracks in Bolton
CD B59	Bolton's Unitary Development Plan Review – Public Inquiry opening statement
CD B60	Draft Private Sector Empty Property Strategy
CD B61	Working from home. Environment Department Planning Control Note 24
CD B62	Note of the Housing Round Table Session 22/23 January 2002
CD B63	Bolton Sports Village Development Appeal Decision Indicative Layout Plan and Zone Plan.
CD B64	Call-in Appeal Decisions Tesco Extra Middlebrook and Food Store Land at Bolton Road / Old hall Street, Kearsley.
CD B65	Assessment of Town Centre Vitality and Viability 2001 Update (CB Hillier Parker)
CD B66	Call-in Appeal Decisions Proposed Two-Storey Mixed Development, Middlebrook, Horwich, Bolton.
CD B67	Bolton Town Centre Strategy
CD B68	Bolton Metro Housing Land Availability Study
CD N1	PPG1* General Policy and Principles (Department of the Environment)
CD N2	PPG2* Green Belts (Department of the Environment)
CD N3	PPG3* Housing (Department of the Environment Transport and the Regions)
CD N4	PPG4* Industrial and Commercial Development and Small Firms (Department of the Environment)
CD N5	PPG5* Simplified Planning Zones (Department of the Environment)
CD N6	PPG6* Town Centres and Retail Development (Department of the Environment)
CD N7	PPG7* The Countryside: Environmental Quality and Economic and Social Development (Department of the Environment)
CD N8	PPG8* Telecommunications (Department of the Environment)
CD N9	PPG9* Nature Conservation (Department of the Environment)
CD N10	PPG10* Planning and Waste Management (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
CD N11	PPG11* Regional Planning (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
CD N12	PPG12* Development Plans (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
CD N13	PPG13* Transport (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
CD N14	Revised PPG13* Transport (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
CD N15	PPG14* Development on Unstable Land (Department of the Environment)
CD N16	PPG14* Annex 1: Landslides and Planning (Department of the Environment)
CD N17	PPG14* Annex 2: Subsidence and Planning (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
CD N18	PPG15* Planning and the Historic Environment (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
CD N19	PPG16* Archaeology and Planning (Department of the Environment)
CD N20	PPG17* Sport and Recreation (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
CD N21	PPG18* Enforcing Planning Control (Department of the Environment)
CD N22	PPG19* Outdoor Advertisement Control (Department of the Environment)
CD N24	PPG21* Tourism (Department of the Environment)
CD N25	PPG22* Renewable Energy (Department of the Environment)
CD N26	PPG22A* Annexes to PPG22 (Department of the Environment)
CD N27	PPG23* Planning and Pollution Control (Department of the Environment)
CD N28	PPG24* Planning and Noise (Department of the Environment)
CD N30	PPG25* Development and Flood Risk (Department of Transport, Local Government and Regions)
CD N31	Planning for Sustainable Development: Towards Better Practice (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
CD N32	Monitoring Provision of Housing through the Planning System Towards Better Practice (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
CD N33	By Design – Urban Design in the Planning System: towards better practice (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
CD N34	PPG13 A Guide To Better Practice – Reducing the need to travel through land use and transport

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

- planning (Department of the Environment and Department of Transport)
- CD N35 Tapping the Potential – Assessing urban housing capacity: towards better practice (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
- CD N36 Planning to Deliver: The managed release of housing sites: towards better practice. (Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions)
- CD N37 Circular 06/98 Planning and Affordable Housing (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
- CD N38 Design Bulletin 32 – Residential Roads and Footpaths (Department of the Environment, Department of Transport)
- CD N39 Places, Streets and Movements. A companion guide to Design Bulletin 32 – Residential Roads and Footpaths (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
- CD N40 Urban White Paper (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
- CD N41 Circular 08/00 – The Town and Country Planning (Residential Development on Greenfield Land) (England) Direction 2000 (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
- CD N42 Local Plans and Unitary Development Plans – A Guide To Procedures (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
- CD N43 Environmental Appraisal of Development Plans: A good practice guide (Department of the Environment)
- CD N44 Towards an Urban Renaissance – Report of the Urban Task Force – Executive Summary (Urban Task Force)
- CD N45 The Transport White Paper, A New Deal for Transport Better for Everyone (Extract) (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
- CD N46 Circular 01/97 Planning Obligations (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
- CD N47 Letter 19 May 2000, Change in Licensing Policy for Developments which affect European Protected Species (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
- CD N48 Statutory Instrument, 1999 No 3280, The Town and Country Planning (Development Plan) (England) Regulations 1999 (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
- CD N49 A Revision of PPG 17 Sport, Open Space and Recreation – Consultation Paper (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
- CD N50 Caborn Statement 11 Feb 1999. Hansard Vol 325 (Need for retail and leisure material planning consideration).
- CD N51 Circular 1/94 – Gypsy Sites and Planning
- CD N52 Circular 22/91 – Travelling Showpeople
- CD N53 Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 1999 (SI 1999 No. 293)
- CD N54 Circular 11/95 The Use of Conditions in Planning Permissions.
- CD N55 By Design Better Places to Live - A companion Guide to PPG 3 (Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions)
- CD N56 Circular 2/93 Public Rights of Way
- CD N57 PPG17* Planning for Open Space, Sport and Recreation (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister)
- CD R1 RPG13** Regional Planning Guidance for the North West (Government Office for the North West and Government Office for Merseyside)
- CD R2 Draft Regional Planning Guidance for the North West – ‘People, Places and Prosperity’ (North West Regional Assembly)
- CD R3 Draft Regional Planning Guidance for the North West – Report of the Panel into Public Examination 13th February – 2nd March 2001 (Panel)
- CD R4 Review of Regional Planning Guidance for the North West – Public Examination Background Paper 1: Housing (North West Regional Assembly)
- CD R8 England’s North West – A Strategy Towards 2020 (North West Development Agency)
- CD R9 Action for Sustainability (North West Regional Assembly)
- CD R10 Statement for the Public Examination into the draft review of Regional Planning Guidance for the North West Matter Heading 5 Housing Provision S/5/360 (Government Office for the North West)
- CD R11 Draft Regional Planning Guidance for the North West (RPG13) – incorporating the Secretary of State’s proposed changes (Public Consultation) (Government Office for the North West)
- CD R12 Draft Regional Planning Guidance for the North West (RPG13) –Schedule of the Secretary of State’s Proposed Changes and Statement of Reasons for Changes (Government Office for the North West)

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

2. POSITION STATEMENTS AND DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED TO HOUSING ROUND TABLE SESSION, 22 and 23 JANUARY 2002

Document	Description	Submitted by:
RTS/1	Bolton Urban Capacity Study December 2001 commissioned by Westbury Homes; Persimmon Homes (formerly Beazer Strategic Land) and Wilcon Homes (formerly Wain Estates)	Bolton Emery Partnership, on behalf of WS Atkins
RTS/2	Position Statement by Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd & Wilcon Homes (NW) Ltd (formerly Wain Estates)	Bolton Emery Partnership
RTS/3	Position Statement by The Emerson Group	
RTS/4	Position Statement by The House Builders Federation	
RTS/5	Position Statement by Wilcon Homes (NW) Ltd (formerly Wain Estates)	Sedgwick Associates
RTS/6	Position Statement by Persimmon Homes / Harcourt Developments	GL Hearn Planning
RTS/7	Position Statement by Bellway Homes – Statement	Robert Turley Associates
RTS/8	Appendices to Position Statement by Bellway Homes	Robert Turley Associates
RTS/9	Position Statement by Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council	
RTS/10	Position Statement by Bolton and District Civic Trust	
RTS/11	Position Statement by Morris Homes	Business Environments Planning
RTS/12	Position Statement by Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	Michael Courcier and Partners
RTS/13	Supplementary Statement by Bellway Homes	Robert Turley Associates
RTS/14	Supplementary Statement by Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	Michael Courcier and Partners
RTS/15	Memorandum by DTLGR on Empty Homes (EMP 26)	Michael Courcier and Partners on behalf of Redrow Homes
RTS/16	Supplementary Letter by Bolton and District Civic Trust	
RTS/17	Wording for proposed additional housing Policy	Joint Statement all Participating Objectors
RTS/18	Additional Relevant Policy Guidance	Michael Courcier and Partners on behalf of Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Ltd
RTS/19	Criteria to be used in Assessing the Suitability of Sites for Housing Allocation	Bolton MBC and agreed by other participants, save for the additional matters raised by Michael Courcier & Partners on behalf of Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Ltd

3. POSITION STATEMENTS AND DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED TO THE HOUSING ROUND TABLE SESSION, 5 NOVEMBER 2002

Document	Description	Submitted by:
RTS/20	Position Statement by Morris Homes	Business Environments
RTS/21	Position Statement by Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council	
RTS/22	Position Statement by Bellway Homes	Robert Turley Associates
RTS/23	Position Statement by Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd and Wilson Connolly Group (formerly Wilcon Homes NW Ltd)	Emery Planning Partnership Ltd
RTS/24	Position Statement by Persimmon Homes / Harcourt Developments	G L Hearn Planning
RTS/25	Position Statement by Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	Michael Courcier & Partners
RTS/26	Position Statement on Clearance Rates by Bellway Estates	Robert Turley Associates

4. DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY BOLTON METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL DURING INQUIRY SESSIONS

Document	Objector(s)	Description
JAN25/BOL/01	Mrs M Riley, Mr J Kay & Mrs N Platt	Plan showing Green Belt Boundary at Bank Top, Astley Bridge.
JAN25/BOL/02	Mrs M Riley, Mr J Kay & Mrs N Platt	Map showing SBI at Eagley Brook Valley
JAN25/BOL/03	Mrs M Riley, Mr J Kay & Mrs N Platt	Extract from Definitive Footpath Map
FEB12/BOL/01	Mr & Mrs A W Knight	Area subject of Objections 1153 and 1155 as agreed at site visit by Objectors and Council.
MAR07/BOL/01	Mr A Partington	Proposed waste disposal site at Gibb Farm, Horwich
MAR12/BOL/01	Arrowcroft North West Ltd	Housing sites in Blackrod and Horwich Wards as listed in Tables 1 & 2, Proof BOL/1748/01

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

MAR12/BOL/02

Arrowcroft North West Ltd.

Housing Land Availability in Parliamentary Constituencies

5. DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY OBJECTORS DURING INQUIRY SESSIONS

Document	Objector(s)	Description
NOV29/OBJ/01	SWAN	Map of Westhoughton and surrounding area
NOV29/OBJ/01	Bolton Cycling Forum	Additional supporting text to policy A17
NOV29/OBJ/02	Bolton Cycling Forum	Addition of word "visual" to policy TC9
JAN24/OBJ/01	Bellway Estates	WS Atkins Report – Core Zone Plan
JAN24/OBJ/02	Bellway Estates	Urban Design Concept, Bowlands Hey, Westhoughton
FEB05/OBJ/01	Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd & Wilcon Homes (NW) Ltd	Map: Existing Gas Mains at Ditchers Farm, Westhoughton
FEB21/OBJ/01	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited.	Map: Ward Boundaries, Bolton
FEB21/OBJ/02	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	Map: Connection of Bus Routes to Employment areas
FEB21/OBJ/03	Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	Table: Jobs to Population Ratio for Wards in Bolton
MAR12/OBJ/01	Arrowcroft North West Ltd	Appendix 8 to Ecology Proof O/1748/05
MAR12/OBJ/02	Arrowcroft North West Ltd	Appeal Decision 21 June 1996 relating to an appeal by Orbit Investments (Properties) Ltd. and Bolton Wanderers Football Club Ltd. for proposals at Bolton Sports Village; DTLR reference APP/N4205/A/95/249250

6. RESPONSES TO THE REVISED DOCUMENT "DRAFT REGIONAL PLANNING GUIDANCE: PROPOSED CHANGES BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE" ISSUED JUNE 2002

Document	Description	Submitted by
O/RPG/1	Response by Government Office for the North West	
O/RPG/2	Response by Westhoughton Town Council	
O/RPG/3	Response by Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd and Wilson Connolly Ltd (Formerly Wilcon Homes North West Ltd)	Bolton Emery Partnership
O/RPG/4	Response by Bellway Homes	Robert Turley Associates
O/RPG/5	Response by Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	Michael Courcier & Partners Ltd.
O/RPG/6	Response by Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	Michael Courcier & Partners Ltd.
B/RPG/1	Response by Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council	

7. EVIDENCE AND WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS.

In the list below, documents submitted by the Council are listed in the left hand column and are prefixed with a "B". Documents submitted by objectors appear in the second column and are prefixed with an "O". Agreed Statements appear in the third column and are prefixed with a "AS". Additional supporting statements appear in the right hand column and are prefixed with an "S".

Some objectors relied on their original objections. These, and letters of negotiation between the Council and objectors, have not been given document numbers.

Chapter 1: INTRODUCTION

GENERAL	
Paragraph 1.05	B/0586/01
Paragraph 1.06	B/2225/01
Paragraph 1.14	B/1789/01 B/1851/01 B/1904/01
Paragraph 1.16	B/1852/01

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

B/1891/01
B/2393/01
B/2438/01

Chapter 2: PART 1 POLICIES

GENERAL

Paragraph 2.01 B/1121/01

Paragraph 2.10 B/1892/01

Chapter 3: COUNTRYSIDE AND THE RURAL ECONOMY

POLICY R1

Paragraph 3.01 B/1585/01 S/1441/01V
B/1696/01
B/1905/01
B/1969/01

POLICY R2

Paragraph 3.06 B/0081/01 O/0533/01
B/0533/01 O/1154/01
B/0543/01 O/1533/01
B/1098/01 O/1533/02
B/1154/01 O/1533/03
B/1184/01 O/1533/04
B/1209/01 O/1541/01
B/1303/01 O/1541/02
B/1535/01 O/1541/03
B/1541/01 O/1541/04
B/1541/02 O/1546/01
B/1549/01 O/1546/02
B/1556/01 O/1546/03
B/1596/01 O/1546/04
B/1600/01 O/1546/05
B/1623/01 O/1546/06
B/1748/01 O/1748/01
B/1788/01 O/1748/02
B/1854/01 O/1748/03
B/1900/01 O/1748/04
B/1970/01 O/1748/05
B/1992/01 O/2016/01
B/2016/01 O/2016/02
B/2079/01 O/2016/03
O/2016/04
O/2016/05
O/2016/06
O/2016/07

POLICY R3

Paragraph 3.09 B/0587/01
B/1855/01
B/1893/01

POLICY R4

Paragraph 3.13 B/1971/01

POLICY R5

Paragraph 3.16 B/0064/01
B/1714/01
B/1856/01
B/1972/01

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

Chapter 4: GREEN BELT

POLICY G1			
Paragraph 4.01	B/0007/01	O/0533/01	
	B/0257/01	O/0564/01	
	B/0260/01	O/1301/01	
	B/0262/01	O/1791/01	
	B/0264/01	O/1791/02	
	B/0534/01	O/1791/03	
	B/0564/01	O/1791/04	
	B/1102/01		
	B/1104/01		
	B/1106/01		
	B/1176/01		
	B/1301/01		
	B/1552/01		
	B/1581/01		
	B/1590/01		
	B/1593/01		
	B/1597/01		
	B/1601/01		
	B/1857/01		
POLICY G2			
Paragraph 4.06	B/0535/01	O/0533/01	
	B/0574/01	O/1460/01	
	B/0589/01		
	B/1590/01		
	B/1973/01		
POLICY G3			
Paragraph 4.09	B/0536/01	O/0533/01	
	B/1893/01		
Paragraph 4.10	B/2226/01		
POLICY G4			
Paragraph 4.12	B/0005/01	O/1152/01	
	B/1152/01		
	B/1592/01		
	B/1993/01		
POLICY G5			
Paragraph 4.14	B/0261/01	O/1560/01	AS/1583/01
	B/0262/01		AS/1583/02
	B/1065/01		
	B/1583/01		
	B/1584/01		
	B/1742/01		
	B/2241/01		
	B/2363/01		
	B/2368/01		
POLICY G6			
Paragraph 4.16	B/2242/01		

Chapter 5: NATURE CONSERVATION

POLICY N1			
Paragraph 5.01	B/1697/01		
	B/2326/01		
	B/2348/01		
POLICY N2			
Paragraph 5.04	B/0591/01	O/2191/01	S/1124/01
	B/1125/01		

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

	B/1975/01 B/2191/01	
POLICY N3 Paragraph 5.06	B/0592/01 B/1976/01	S/1109/01
POLICY N4 Paragraph 5.09	B/0537/01 B/0593/01 B/1296/01 B/1302/01 B/1537/01 B/1901/01 B/1977/01 B/2081/01 B/2228/01 B/2376/01	O/0533/01 O/1294/01 O/1533/01 O/1533/02 O/1533/03 O/1533/04
Paragraph 5.10	B/1311/01	
POLICY N5 Paragraph 5.15	B/0064/01 B/0594/01 B/1172/01 B/1172/02 B/1560/01 B/1698/01 B/1832/01 B/2039/01	O/1560/01 O/2333/01
POLICY N6 Paragraph 5.19	B/1131/01 B/1434/01 B/1999/01 B/2019/01 B/2397/01	O/1434/01 O/2016/01 O/2016/02 O/2016/03 O/2016/04 O/2016/05 O/2016/06 O/2016/07 O/2016/01 O/2016/02 O/2016/03 O/2016/04 O/2016/05 O/2016/06 O/2016/07
POLICY N7 Paragraph 5.22	B/0595/01 B/1172/01 B/1172/02 B/1858/01	
Paragraph 5.25	B/2377/01 B/2398/01	
POLICY N8 Paragraph 5.28	B/0578/01 B/1172/01 B/1172/02 B/1561/01 B/2356/01	O/1560/01 O/1560/01
POLICY N9 Paragraph 5.30	B/1037/01 B/1562/01	O/1560/01

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

Chapter 6: ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

POLICY EM1 Paragraph 6.01	B/1718/01	
POLICY EM3 Paragraph 6.07	B/1978/01 B/2000/01	
POLICY EM4 Paragraph 6.10	B/0579/01 B/1133/01 B/1134/01 B/1719/01 B/2001/01 B/2399/01	O/0579/01
POLICY EM5 Paragraph 6.13	B/1563/01 B/1979/01	
POLICY EM6 Paragraph 6.15	B/1564/01 B/2365/01	O/1560/01 O/1560/01
POLICY EM8 Paragraph 6.20	B/0069/01 B/1720/01 B/1859/01	O/1859/01
POLICY EM9 Paragraph 6.22	B/1721/01	
POLICY EM10 Paragraph 6.24	B/1212/01	
POLICY EM11 Paragraph 6.27	B/1213/01 B/2002/01	
POLICY EM12 Paragraph 6.30	B/2229/01	
Paragraph 6.31	B/2378/01	
POLICY EM13 Paragraph 6.32	B/2249/01	
Paragraph 6.33	B/2230/01	

Chapter 7: DESIGN AND THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT

POLICY D1 Paragraph 7.01	B/1214/01 B/1565/01 B/1980/01 B/2075/01 B/2076/01	O/1560/01
POLICY D2 Paragraph 7.05	B/1371/01 B/1860/01 B/1996/01 B/2084/01 B/2041/01	O/1859/01

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

POLICY D3 Paragraph 7.08	B/0604/01 B/1861/01 B/2243/01	O/1859/01
Paragraph 7.09	B/1138/01	
Paragraph 7.11	B/1372/01	
POLICY D5 Paragraph 7.14	B/0605/01 B/1216/01 B/1566/01 B/1699/01 B/2043/01	O/1560/01
POLICY D6 Paragraph 7.16	B/0051/01 B/0606/01 B/1343/01 B/1344/01 B/1655/01 B/1722/01 B/1828/01 B/2044/01	O/1655/01 O/1655/02
POLICY D7 Paragraph 7.21	B/1068/01 B/1097/01 B/1567/01 B/1656/01 B/2045/01 B/2244/01 B/2357/01	O/1560/01
POLICY D8 Paragraph 7.24	B/1658/01	
POLICY D10 Paragraph 7.29	B/0607/01 B/1373/01 B/1568/01 B/2047/01	O/1560/01
Paragraph 7.31	B/1657/01	
POLICY D12 Paragraph 7.35	B/0073/01 B/1374/01	
POLICY D13 Paragraph 7.36	B/2049/01	
POLICY D14 Paragraph 7.38	B/1981/01	
POLICY D15 Paragraph 7.40	B/1700/01	

Chapter 8: OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION

POLICY O1 Paragraph 8.01	B/1066/01 B/1472/01 B/1701/01	O/1066/01
-----------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

Paragraph 9.04	B/2217/01	O/2217/01
POLICY DELETED Paragraph 9.07	B/1769/01	
POLICY A2 Paragraph 9.09	B/1705/01 B/1723/01	
Paragraph 9.10	B/1055/01	
POLICY A3 Paragraph 9.16	B/1056/01	
POLICY A4 Paragraph 9.17	B/1571/01	O/1560/01
Paragraph 9.18	B/1219/01	
POLICY A5 Paragraph 9.21	B/1572/01 B/2379/01	O/1560/01
POLICY A6 Paragraph 9.25	B/0617/01 B/1158/01 B/2380/01 B/2420/01	
Paragraph 9.28	B/1663/01	
POLICY A8 Paragraph 9.31	B/0619/01 B/2247/01 B/2381/01	
POLICY A10 Paragraph 9.37	B/1057/01	
Paragraph 9.38	B/1664/01	O/1662/01 O/1655/02
POLICY DELETED Paragraph 9.40	B/1716/01 B/1766/01	
POLICY A11 Paragraph 9.43	B/0035/01 B/1767/01 B/2218/01 B/2299/01	O/2218/01
POLICY A12 Paragraph 9.45	B/0622/01 B/1706/01	
Paragraph 9.46	B/1058/01	
POLICY A13 Paragraph 9.48	B/0623/01 B/1436/01 B/1690/01 B/1806/01	O/1436/01 O/1436/02 O/1686/01 O/1806/01 O/1806/02

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

POLICY A14 Paragraph 9.52	B/0624/01 B/1707/01	
POLICY A16 Paragraph 9.56	B/0626/01	
Paragraph 9.58	B/1665/01	O/1662/01 O/1655/02
POLICY A17 Paragraph 9.63	B/2259/01	
POLICY A19 Paragraph 9.72	B/1573/01 B/1708/01	O/1560/01
POLICY A20 Paragraph 9.76	B/0037/01 B/0629/01	O/1686/01
Paragraph 9.77	B/0629/01	
POLICY A22 Paragraph 9.80	B/1667/01	O/1662/01 O/1655/02

Chapter 10: HOUSING

POLICY H1 Paragraph 10.01	B/0630/01 B/1532/01 B/1907/01 B/2236/01	O/1985/01 O/1533/01 O/1533/02 O/1533/03 O/1533/04
Paragraph 10.06	B/0048/01 B/0253/01 B/0258/01 B/0630/01 B/1103/01 B/1105/01 B/1107/01 B/1153/01 B/1594/01 B/1598/01 B/1602/01	O/0253/01 O/0253/02 O/1153/01
Paragraph 10.08	B/1079/01	
POLICY H2 Paragraph 10.11	B/0635/01 B/1533/01 B/1546/01 B/1830/01 B/2236/01 B/2349/01	O/1675/01 O/1533/01 O/1533/02 O/1533/03 O/1533/04 O/1546/01 O/1546/02 O/1546/03 O/1546/04 O/1546/05 O/1546/06 O/1985/01
Paragraph 10.12	B/0635/01	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

Paragraph 10.20	B/0048/01	O/0253/01
	B/0253/01	O/0253/02
	B/0258/01	O/0564/01
	B/0544/01	O/1153/01
	B/0565/01	O/1533/01
	B/0631/01	O/1533/02
	B/0635/01	O/1533/03
	B/1153/01	O/1533/04
	B/1175/01	O/1533/05
	B/1533/01	O/1541/01
	B/1541/01	O/1541/02
	B/1541/02	O/1541/03
	B/1546/01	O/1541/04
	B/1551/01	O/1546/01
	B/1555/01	O/1546/02
	B/1575/01	O/1546/03
	B/1594/01	O/1546/04
	B/1598/01	O/1546/05
	B/1602/01	O/1546/06
	B/1633/01	O/1575/01
	B/1668/01	O/1575/02
	B/1672/01	O/1575/03
	B/1674/01	O/1633/01
	B/1743/01	O/1674/01
	B/1748/01	O/1743/01
	B/1830/01	O/1743/02
	B/1903/01	O/1748/01
		O/1748/02
		O/1748/03
		O/1748/04
		O/1985/01

Paragraph 10.22 B/0635/01

POLICY H3

Paragraph 10.26	B/1534/01	O/1533/01
	B/1578/01	O/1533/02
	B/2008/01	O/1533/03
	B/2238/01	O/1533/04
	B/2384/01	O/1560/01
	B/2396/01	O/1546/01
	B/2402/01	O/1546/02
	B/2449/01	O/1546/03
		O/1546/04
		O/1546/05
		O/1546/06

Paragraph 10.32	B/1049/01	O/1533/01
	B/1534/01	O/1533/02
	B/1578/01	O/1533/03
	B/1695/01	O/1533/04
	B/1709/01	O/1560/01
	B/1774/01	O/1695/01
	B/1994/01	

Paragraph 10.33 B/1049/01

POLICY H4

Paragraph 10.38	B/0632/01	O/1560/01
	B/1579/01	O/1533/01
	B/2306/01	O/1533/02
	B/2385/01	O/1533/03
		O/1533/04

Paragraph 10.42	B/0632/01	O/1080/01
	B/1080/01	O/1560/01

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

	B/1540/01	O/1866/01	
	B/1579/01		
	B/1635/01		
	B/1866/01		
	B/2385/01		
POLICY H5			
Paragraph 10.51	B/2439/01		
POLICY H6			
Paragraph 10.58	B/1081/01		S/1090/01
Paragraph 10.59	B/0634/01		
POLICY H7			
Paragraph 10.60	B/1580/01	O/1560/01	
	B/1669/01	O/1669/01	
		O/1655/02	
Paragraph 10.62	B/1082/01	O/1080/01	

Chapter 11: COMMUNITY PROVISION

POLICY CP1			
Paragraph 11.01	B/0545/01	O/1546/01	
	B/1550/01	O/1546/02	
	B/1867/01	O/1546/03	
	B/1908/01	O/1546/04	
		O/1546/05	
		O/1546/06	
Paragraph 11.02	B/1670/01	O/1662/01	
		O/1655/02	
POLICY CP2			
Paragraph 11.05	B/1985/01	O/1985/01	
		O/1985/02	
		O/1985/03	

POLICY CP3			
Paragraph 11.08	B/1909/01		

Chapter 12: EMPLOYMENT AND THE ECONOMY

POLICY E1			
Paragraph 12.01	B/1724/01		
	B/1868/01		
	B/1910/01		
	B/2024/01		
POLICY E2			
Paragraph 12.03	B/0057/01	O/1628/01	
	B/0546/01	O/1638/01	
	B/0548/01		
	B/1118/01		
	B/1310/01		
	B/1638/01		
	B/1768/01		
POLICY E3			
Paragraph 12.07	B/1710/01		
	B/1983/01		
POLICY E4			
Paragraph 12.10	B/1711/01		
	B/1984/01		

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

POLICY E5
Paragraph 12.13
B/0050/01
B/0549/01
B/1160/01
B/1223/01
B/2239/01

POLICY E6
Paragraph 12.15
B/1725/01
B/1746/01

POLICY E7
Paragraph 12.17
B/0268/01
B/1911/01

POLICY E8
Paragraph 12.19
B/1884/01
B/1890/01
B/1898/01
B/1912/01

Chapter 13: RETAIL AND LEISURE

POLICY S1
Paragraph 13.01
B/1642/01
B/1712/01
B/1745/01
B/1756/01
B/1764/01
B/1765/01
B/1782/01
B/1870/01
B/1913/01
O/1764/02
O/1765/02

POLICY S2
Paragraph 13.05
B/0542/01
B/0642/01
B/1182/01
B/1643/01
B/1671/01
B/1757/01
B/1988/01
O/1643/01
O/1988/01

Paragraph 13.07
B/2414/01
O/1669/01
O/1655/02

POLICY S3
Paragraph 13.08
B/0059/01
B/1183/01
B/1295/01
B/1297/01
B/1644/01
B/1694/01
B/1717/01
B/1758/01
B/1989/01
O/1294/01
O/1294/01
O/1644/01
O/1644/02
O/1988/01

POLICY S4
Paragraph 13.13
B/1726/01
B/1759/01
B/1785/01
B/1885/01
B/1990/01
B/2415/01
B/2417/01
O/1990/01

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

POLICY S6
Paragraph 13.20 B/1645/01 O/1644/01
 B/1760/01 O/1644/02
 B/2220/01

POLICY S7
Paragraph 13.24 B/1159/01

Chapter 14: TOWN CENTRES

POLICY TC1
Paragraph 14.01 B/1156/01
 B/1713/01
 B/1747/01
 B/1899/01
 B/1914/01

POLICY TC4
Paragraph 14.07 B/1157/01 O/1962/01
 B/2082/01

POLICY TC5
Paragraph 14.11 B/1761/01

POLICY TC6
Paragraph 14.12 B/1224/01

POLICY DELETED
Paragraph 14.14 B/1762/01

POLICY TC7
Paragraph 14.16 B/2183/01 O/2183/01

POLICY TC8
Paragraph 14.18 B/1763/01 O/1686/01

Paragraph 14.19 B/1687/01

POLICY TC9
Paragraph 14.20 B/0538/01 O/0538/01
 B/1688/01 O/1686/01

Chapter 15: MINERALS

POLICY M1
Paragraph 15.01 B/0252/01 O/0252/01
 B/1727/01 O/2016/01
 B/2020/01 O/2016/02
 O/2016/03
 O/2016/04
 O/2016/05
 O/2016/06
 O/2016/07

Paragraph 15.02 B/2233/01

POLICY M2
Paragraph 15.04 B/0079/01 O/1315/01
 B/0553/01 O/1315/02
 B/0647/01 O/1315/03
 B/1315/01 O/1320/01
 B/1320/01
 B/1508/01
 B/1871/01
 B/1888/01

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

	B/2234/01
POLICY M3 Paragraph 15.11	B/1886/01 B/2254/01
POLICY M4 Paragraph 15.13	B/0648/01 B/2255/01 B/2260/01

Chapter 16: WASTE

POLICY W1 Paragraph 16.01	B/0583/01 B/1728/01 B/2021/01	O/2016/01 O/2016/02 O/2016/03 O/2016/04 O/2016/05 O/2016/06 O/2016/07
Paragraph 16.02	B/0583/01 B/2256/01	O/1083/01
POLICY W2 Paragraph 16.03	B/0584/01 B/0653/01 B/1872/01 B/1887/01 B/2235/01	
Paragraph 16.04	B/2262/01	

Chapter 17: MONITORING AND REVIEW

GENERAL Paragraph 17.01	B/1225/01
Paragraph 17.02	B/1917/01

APPENDIX 4 – HOUSING SITES

Paragraph 21.01	B/0631/01 B/0635/01 B/1181/01 B/1345/01 B/1675/01 B/2258/01 B/2264/01	O/2307/01 O/1422/01 O/1675/01 O/1675/02
Paragraph 21.04	B/1298/01 B/1299/01 B/1347/01 B/2005/01	O/1294/01 O/1294/01

APPENDIX 5 – INDUSTRIAL SITES

Paragraph 22.01	B/0080/01 B/1982/01	O/1982/01
Paragraph 22.03	B/0080/01 B/1164/01 B/1889/01 B/2006/01	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

APPENDIX 6 – PROPOSED RETAIL ALLOCATIONS

Paragraph 23.01	B/2007/01
Paragraph 23.03	B/2182/01
Paragraph 23.05	B/2022/01

APPENDIX 3: LIST OF APPEARANCES

FOR BOLTON METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

Mr D Manley, of Counsel

Instructed by Mr P N Wilson
Director of Central Services

Evidence by:

Mr P Goodman

MPhil BA Dip TP
MRTPI

Head of Policy and Transport Planning

Mr A Chalmers

BA MA(TP) MRTPI

Group Planning Officer

Mrs M Serjeant

MA Dip TP MRTPI DMS

Principal Planning Officer

Mrs C Mullin

BSc(Hons)

Planning Officer

FOR THE OBJECTORS

BELLWAY ESTATES and MR M BIRCHALL

Mr I Dove, of Counsel

Instructed by Robert Turley Associates

Evidence

submitted by:

Mrs S Ryan

BA(Hons) MRTPI

Associate Director, Robert Turley Associates

Mr P L Stanton

BA CEng MICE DipTP

Director, Mayer Brown Ltd

Mr J Cooper

BSc(Hons) Dip LD FLI

Managing Director, Cooper Partnership Ltd

MRS M RILEY and MR J KAY / MRS N PLATT

Mr A W Atkinson MRICS FAAV

Rural Practice Chartered Surveyor, ADAS

He gave evidence, with evidence also by:

Mrs M Riley

PERSIMMON HOMES LTD and HARCOURT DEVELOPMENTS

Miss F Patterson QC

Instructed by G L Hearn

Evidence

submitted by:

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

Mr D Beardmore	MSc FRTPI MLI FRICS	Managing Director, GL Hearn
Mr M J Leigh	BSc(Hons) MSc MCIT	Regional Director, Savell Bird & Axon
Mr M G Baker	BA MRICS MRTPI	Director, G L Hearn
Mr F B Hesketh	BSc(Hons) MLI MICFor MIEEM	Partner, TEP – The Environment Partnership

WESTBURY HOMES (HOLDINGS) LTD and WILCON HOMES (NORTH WEST) LTD

Mr V Fraser QC Instructed by Bolton Emery Partnership.

Evidence submitted
by:

Mrs D R Emery	BA(Hons) MRTPI	Partner, Bolton Emery Partnership
---------------	----------------	-----------------------------------

REDROW HOMES (LANCASHIRE) LIMITED

Mr J Hoggett QC Instructed by Michael Courcier and Partners

Evidence submitted
by:

Mr M R Courcier	BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI	Director, Michael Courcier & Partners
-----------------	----------------------	---------------------------------------

THE HULTON ESTATE

Mr R Lancaster Solicitor, Halliwell Landau Instructed by Dunlop Heywood Lorenz Ltd

Evidence submitted
by:

Mr R Moffat	BSc(Hons) MRICS	Associate Director, Dunlop Heywood Lorenz
-------------	-----------------	---

MORRIS HOMES LTD

Mr R. Lancaster Solicitor, Halliwell Landau Instructed by Business Environments Group

Evidence submitted
by:

Mr J Chambers	BA Dip TP MRTPI	Business Environments
---------------	-----------------	-----------------------

MR A PARTINGTON and RAILTRACK PLC

Mr R Lancaster	Solicitor, Halliwell Landau	Instructed by Higham & Co
Evidence submitted by:		
Mrs E J Worsey	BSc(Hons) MRICS MRTPI	Partner, Higham & Company
Mr F B Hesketh	BSc(Hons) MIEEM MICFor MLI	Partner, TEP – The Environment Partnership
Mr I Cameron	BEng CEng MICE FIHT	Director, JMP Consultants Ltd.
Mr N Roberts	BA(Hons) MLI	Director, AXIS
Mr A Rivero	BSc(Hons) MRTPI	Senior Town Planner, Railtrack Plc

ARROWCROFT NORTH WEST

Mr S J Sauvain QC		Instructed by Insignia Richard Ellis
Evidence submitted by:		
Mr J R Blakey	BA(Hons) MRTPI	Director, Insignia Richard Ellis
Mr P R Corbett	BEng CEng MICE FIHT	Associate, JMP Consultants Ltd
Ms K Atkins	BA(Hons)	Principal Consultant, Casella Stanger

ORGANISATIONS THAT REPRESENTED THEMSELVES

SAVE WESTHOUGHTON ACT NOW (SWAN)

Mrs R Duckworth BA(Hons) PGCE
Cllr D Chadwick

BOLTON CYCLING FORUM

Mr N Taylor	BA MSc	Vice-Chair, Bolton Cycling Forum
-------------	--------	----------------------------------

BOLTON AND DISTRICT CIVIC TRUST

Mr R Shirres	MSc BSc CEng MICE MIHT	Bolton & District Civic Trust
--------------	------------------------	-------------------------------

MR J E BOOTH ALSO REPRESENTING THE OVER HULTON ANTI-OPENCAST GROUP

Mr J E Booth BSc AMCST FTI

***OBJECTORS PARTICIPATING IN THE HOUSING ROUND TABLE SESSION
22 / 23 January 2002***

OBJECTOR	REPRESENTED BY:		
Persimmon Homes Ltd. & Harcourt Developments	Mr M G Baker	BA MRTPI MRICS	Planning Director, GL Hearn
Morris Homes Ltd.	Mrs S Baron	BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI	Associate Director, Business Environments
The Emerson Group	Mr G Bee	BSc(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI	Senior Planner
The House Builders Federation	Mr P Bloomfield	Dip TP MRTPI	Regional Planner
Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	Mr M Courcier	BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI	Director, Michael Courcier & Partners
Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd & Wilcon Homes (NW) Ltd (formerly Wain Estates Ltd)	Mrs D R Emery	BA(Hons) MRTPI	Partner, Bolton Emery Partnership
Bellway Estates	Mrs S A Ryan	BA(Hons) MRTPI	Associate Director, Robert Turley Associates
Consortium of Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd & Wilcon Homes (NW) Ltd, Persimmon Homes Ltd & Harcourt Developments	Mr K L Manning	BSc BTP MRTPI	Head of North of England Division, WS Atkins Planning Consultants

OBJECTORS PARTICIPATING IN THE RESUMED HOUSING ROUND TABLE SESSION 5 November 2002

OBJECTOR	REPRESENTED BY:		
Persimmon Homes Ltd & Harcourt Developments	Mr S Edgeller	BA Dip TP MRTPI	Associate Director, GL Hearn

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

Morris Homes Ltd	Mrs S Baron	BA(Hons) MSc MRTPI	Associate Director, Business Environments
Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	Mr M Courcier	BA(Hons) Dip TP MRTPI	Director, Michael Courcier & Partners
Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd & Wilson Connolly (formerly Wilcon Homes (NW) Ltd)	Mr S Goodwin	BA(Hons) MCD MRTPI	Associate Director, Emery Planning
Bellway Estates	Mrs S A Ryan	BA(Hons) MRTPI	Associate Director, Robert Turley Associates

APPENDIX 4: INQUIRY PROGRAMME

Type: INF = Hearing, FOR = Formal Inquiry, ASV = Accompanied Site Visit

Date	Type	Objector	Subject	Policy
27/11/01			Inquiry Opening	
29/11/01	INF	Save Westhoughton Act Now (SWAN)	Bowlands Hey/ Ditcher's Farm/ Lee G1 Hall	
29/11/01	INF	SWAN	Dobb Brow Railway Station	A13
30/11/01	INF	Bolton Cycling Forum	Policy Omission	
5/12/01	INF	Bolton & District Civic Trust	Viability of facilities and accessibility / housing densities	D6 A1 A10 A13 A19
6/12/01	INF	Mr J E Booth	Minerals exploration and workings	M2
22/01/02 - 23/01/02	RTS	Bolton MBC	Housing Round Table Session	
		Persimmon Homes Ltd / Harcourt Developments The Emerson Group Bellway Estates Morris Homes Ltd Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd & Wilcon Homes (NW) Ltd The House Builders Federation Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited		
24/01/02	FOR	Bellway Estates Mr M Birchall Agency: Robert Turley Associates	Bowlands Hey, Westhoughton	H2 R2
25/01/02	INF	Mrs M Riley / Mr J Kay & Mrs N Platt Agency: ADAS	Land at Bank Top, Astley Bridge	H2 G1
30/01/02	FOR	Persimmon Homes Ltd./ Harcourt Developments Agency: G L Hearn Planning	Lee Hall, Westhoughton	H2 H3 R2
5/02/02	FOR	Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd & Wilcon Homes (NW) Ltd Agency: Bolton Emery Partnership	Ditcher's Farm, Westhoughton	H2 H3 H4 R2 N4
12//02/02	ASV	Mr and Mrs A Knight	Land to rear of Hart Common Public House	H1
			Land south-west of Bowlands Hey	H2 R2
13/02/02	ASV	SWAN	Dobb Brow Railway Station	
14/02/02	ASV	Bellway Homes	Bowlands Hey	
14/02/02	ASV	Persimmon Homes Ltd/ Harcourt	Lee Hall, Westhoughton	

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

		Developments	
14/02/02	ASV	Mrs M Riley / Mr J Kay & Mrs N Bank Top, Astley Bridge Platt Redrow Homes	H2 G1
21/02/02	FOR	(Lancashire)Limited The Hollins, Plodder Lane Agency: Michael Courcier & Partners	H2
04/03/02	FOR	Hulton Estate Roscoe's Farm Agency: Dunlop Heywood Lorenz	H1 H2
06/03/02	FOR	Morris Homes Ltd Church St/Manchester Rd, Westhoughton	H2
07/03/02	FOR	Agency: Business Environments Planning Mr A Partington Gibb Farm, Horwich Agency: Higham & Co.	CP2 R2 N3 N4 N6 M1 W1
12/03/02	FOR	Railtrack Plc Arrowcroft North West Ltd Lever Park Avenue, Horwich Agency: Insignia Richard Ellis	A13 R2 H2
12/04/02	ASV	SWAN Dobb Brow Railway Station	
12/04/02	ASV	Mr A Partington / Railtrack Plc Gibb Farm, Horwich	
27/06/02	ASV	Westhoughton Cricket Club Westhoughton Cricket Club	O2
27/06/02	ASV	Charles Topham & Sons Limited Deakins Business Park	G5
8/07/02	ASV	North West Water Ltd Westhoughton Kearsley Lostock	G5
5/11/02	RTS	Bolton MBC Housing Round Table Session Persimmon Homes Ltd / Harcourt Developments Bellway Estates Morris Homes Ltd Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd & Wilcon Homes (NW) Ltd Redrow Homes (Lancashire) Limited	
5/12/02		Outstanding matters	
19/12/02		Close of Inquiry	

APPENDIX 5: PRE-INQUIRY MEETING

NOTE OF PRE-INQUIRY MEETING 4 SEPTEMBER 2001

1. The Inspector - Mr Peter F Davies, a Chartered Town Planner, had been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport, Local Government and the Regions to hold an Inquiry into Objections to the Bolton Unitary Development Plan (UDP). He welcomed everyone present.
2. The Inquiry would open on Tuesday, 27 November 2001 in the Town Hall. The Inspector explained that the purpose of the PIM was to provide Council and Objectors with an opportunity to explain and discuss administrative procedures relating to the Inquiry. The PIM did not form part of the Inquiry and it was not possible at the PIM to hear any representations or comments on the merits, or otherwise, of Objections that would be before the Inspector at the Inquiry.
3. The Inquiry would, provisionally, be in 2 blocks:
Tuesday 27 November 2001 to Friday 7 December 2001 (2 weeks)
Tuesday 22 January 2002 to Friday 8 February 2002 (3 weeks)
4. If the Inquiry is not closed by the end of the second block, or if the Council has not completed its responses to all the written Objections, a further block will be arranged.
5. The Inspector explained for the benefit of members of the public who, understandably, were not conversant with it, the general Development Plan process. All local planning authorities are required to prepare a Development Plan – in Bolton's case a UDP. The procedure to be followed had evolved over the years but the principle remains the same – Objectors to the Plan should be given the opportunity to record their concerns. If the Objections are not resolved before the Inquiry, Objectors have the right for their concern to be placed before an independent person.
6. In considering Objections to the UDP, the Inspector's role is different to that at an appeal against a refusal of planning permission. In that case, he/she would determine the appeal. In a Development Plan Inquiry, however, the Inspector submits a Report to the Council with a recommendation to it, on each Objection, of the action to be taken. They may include changes to the Plan. The Council is required to consider the Report and publish a Statement of its decision - with reasons - on each of the recommendations.

PROGRAMME OFFICER

7. Ms Eryl Prytherch has been appointed as the Programme Officer (PO). The Planning Inspectorate proceeds on the principles of "fairness, openness and impartiality". For the avoidance of doubt, Ms Prytherch has been appointed by Bolton after completing a Local Plan Inquiry in another planning authority. She has, therefore, had no involvement in the preparation of the UDP. Her office is not located in the Planning Department of the Council. It is in the Chief Executive's department. Her location, telephone and FAX numbers are as set out in the covering letter to this note.

8. She is an Officer of the Inquiry. She will make every endeavour to assist everyone at the Inquiry, Objectors as well as Council. Her principal functions – under the Inspector’s direction – are to organize the Inquiry programme, to ensure that all Inquiry documents are recorded and distributed, as well as to maintain the Inquiry library. Every effort will be made to keep to the programme. Objectors **need at all times** to keep in contact with her so that, if they appear at the Inquiry, the case can be presented when required. There will be **no guarantee** that Objectors will be allocated a specific Inquiry slot, albeit that she will attempt to accommodate their requirements.
9. Any Objector or Council concerns/queries/clarifications required to be before the Inspector should be directed to the PO. She will respond on my behalf. During the Inquiry, therefore, the Inspector will not be able to speak **individually** to the Council or Objectors.

APPEARANCES

10. Mr David Manley, of Counsel, will be the Council’s advocate. During the Inquiry, he will call 4 witnesses :-
 - (a) Mr P Goodman M Phil BA Dip TP MRTPI: Head of Policy and Transport Planning
 - (b) Mr A Chalmers BA MA(TP) MRTPI: Group Planning Officer
 - (c) Mrs M Serjeant MA Dip TP MRTPI DMS: Principal Planning Officer
 - (d) Mrs C Mullin BSc(Hons): Planning Officer
11. The above list would be placed on the Inquiry notice board. The appearances of other participants would be taken when they present their cases and details should be given to the PO one week before. Attendance lists will be circulated at each session and the Press should inform the PO of their presence.

THE OBJECTIONS

12. The Inspector’s role is to consider Objections to the Plan. On the basis of the information available to the Programme Officer before the PIM, some 739 Objections were made to the Deposit version of the UDP. The Council has not asked the Inspector to consider any late Objections. In the intervening period, 182 Objections have been withdrawn, either unconditionally or conditionally. The Council is reminded that withdrawals **must** be confirmed in writing by the Objector.
13. Following consideration of the Objections, the Council published a Second Deposit version resulting in 127 Objections, and 1 late support before me. 10 Objections have been withdrawn. The Council advised the Inspector that it did not intend to publish any further changes - albeit some may arise during the Inquiry.
14. No further action would be taken on Objections that have already been withdrawn. They will not be considered at the Inquiry or in the Inspector’s Report.
15. On support for the Plan, around 1500 at both Deposit stages, the UDP Inquiry is into **Objections**. While the supporting representations would be carefully considered, they would not be heard at the Inquiry or dealt with in detail in the Report. Supporters at First Deposit who Object to changes at Second Deposit would be heard.

PROCEDURE AND PROGRAMME FOR THE INQUIRY

16. The Inspector told the PIM that Objections would be considered at the Inquiry in broadly one of 2 ways :-
 Firstly, by written representations without the need to appear at the Inquiry, or
 Secondly, by appearing at the Inquiry, at either a formal or informal session.
Objectors who wish to rely - solely - on their Objection form can do so.

Written Representations

17. Even if an Objector has already indicated on the Objection form a wish to appear, he/she/it can still use the written procedure. The Council has to respond to all of them, including those Objectors who rely solely on their Objection form.
18. The Inspector stressed that written representations would be given the same consideration as those that are the subject of Inquiry sessions. **THEY ARE NOT LESS IMPORTANT OBJECTIONS.**
Objectors relying on this procedure are required to send their submissions to the PO by the start of the Inquiry and the Council will respond. The Objector must be allowed to see and comment on what the Council says.
19. The Council agreed to prepare a programme of work for its consideration of written representations. The Inquiry cannot close until this procedure has been completed. The Inspector would be requesting progress reports.
20. Objectors using this method **MUST** make clear in their submission the nature of the difference between them and the Council and the change to the plan that the Objector wishes the Inspector to recommend.

Appearing at the Inquiry

21. Those Objectors not at the PIM may wish to ask the PO for a copy of the booklet explaining procedures. There are 3 possibilities:
 Formal sessions,
 Informal sessions, commonly known as Hearings, and
 Round table sessions (RTS)
22. Turning first to formal sessions, there would usually be advocates representing Objectors and the Council, both supported by professional witnesses who have prepared written evidence before the session.
23. On procedure, the Objector makes a brief opening Statement and introduces the evidence. The Council will cross-examine witnesses and the Inspector may have questions. The procedure is then reversed with the Council presenting its case, followed by Objector questions to witnesses, and then the Inspector's. The Council would then make a closing Statement followed by that of the Objector. The Inquiry will then move to the next Objection.
24. Then, to informal sessions. There will not usually be advocates representing the Objectors or the Council. The cases are put by a professional or by Objectors. The Inspector would

Bolton Unitary Development Plan - Inspector's Report

start by summarizing the cases, followed by an informal discussion of the issues - with each side summing up at the end, the Objector last. Through the Inspector, the PO will discuss with Council and Objectors those Objections appropriate for a Hearing.

25. Finally, round table sessions, participation at which is by invitation. They address a strategic topic relating to matters of general Objection. They are not site specific and are inappropriate for advocates. The session involves a discussion of the issues, following prior circulation of the Inspector's Discussion Paper and a response by each participant.

PROGRAMMING

26. A draft programme would be circulated shortly. In this respect, 4 weeks before the PIM the PO wrote to Objectors requesting information on their intentions, including appearing, or otherwise, at the Inquiry – including written representations. The response had been limited. Anyone present who had not replied, was asked to do so immediately or see the PO at the end of the PIM.
27. The Inquiry would proceed in general plan order, though that may change. Site specific Objections on housing and employment would be heard in the second block. Any RTS on housing would also be likely to be in the second block.
28. Normally, all Objectors to a particular policy or allocation would appear at the same Inquiry session. Objectors with similar Objections would be expected to combine to present joint cases. Ongoing repetition would be an inappropriate use of Inquiry time. The PO would explore this with Objectors.
29. Objector's Proofs of Evidence as well as Hearing Statements, together with supporting documents, are to be deposited with the PO not later than 6 weeks before the Objection is to be heard. The response of the Council will be available within a further 2 weeks. A summary should accompany each Proof of Evidence as only summaries would be read at the Inquiry. Failure to comply with this timescale would place the programme at risk. Those who fail to comply may need to return later.
30. The requirements for the format of Proofs and Statements is enclosed.
31. On housekeeping matters, the Inquiry would normally sit between 1000 hours and 1700 hours, Tuesdays to Thursdays, and 1000 hours to around 1530 hours, Fridays. There will be a one hour lunch adjournment at about 1300 hours.
32. Telephone, photocopy and FAX facilities will be available for which a small charge would be made. The PO would NOT be able to undertake large amounts of photocopying.

OPENING OF THE INQUIRY

33. At the start of the Inquiry, after the Inspector's opening remarks, the Council will be asked to confirm that all statutory procedures have been complied with, otherwise the Inquiry may be delayed. It will then make a brief opening Statement outlining the context of the plan and changes made in response to Objections – drawing attention to those withdrawn or conditionally withdrawn. The Council's background documentation will be introduced. All

that would take no more than 30 minutes. The Inquiry will then proceed to hear outstanding Objections.

SITE INSPECTIONS

34. The Inspector will be making a series of unaccompanied site inspections at various times before, during and after the Inquiry. He will not be able to speak to anyone at them. If he cannot see a site properly without going onto private land, an accompanied visit in the presence of the Council and Objector(s) will take place. The merits, or otherwise, of Objections will not be able to be discussed at it. The programme for these will be displayed on the Inquiry notice board.

ASSISTANCE WITH THE REPORT

35. The Council had not requested, and the Inspectorate is not suggesting, an Assistant Inspector at the Inquiry. The Planning Inspectorate employs a number of professional Planning Assistants to help Inspectors at Inquiries. One MAY be assigned to this Inquiry. If so, he/she will assist the Inspector with routine professional tasks, including statistical analyses of Objections and preparation for any RTS. The Assistant would always be working under the control of the Inspector and would not be taking any Decisions on recommendations. Also standard practice at this type of Inquiry would be the assistance of the Council in the preparation of what has come to be known as a "Skeleton Report". Through the PO, the Inspector has already asked the Council for assistance in this respect. It is on a computer disk, containing basis factual information of chapter and policy headings, Objector names and references. In other words, the framework of the Report. Experience has shown that it speeds up the submission of the Report to the Council - not least as it reduces the amount of repetitive typing. No information will be supplied which will influence the Inspector's consideration of the Objections.

AVAILABILITY OF INFORMATION

36. An Inquiry Library would be established and located at the PO's office. Access to it will be via the Programme Officer. It will contain all the Objections, Proofs of Evidence, Statements and the Core Documents (CDs) on which the Council will rely. Part of the CDs will include Topic Papers (TPs), prepared by the Council as general responses to Objections. The Council submitted a list of CDs to the PIM, the TP on Green Belt to include Policy R2. That, and the TP on Housing, would be available on 18 September 2001, that on employment land shortly afterwards. Copies of CDs would be placed in the Inquiry library as soon as possible.

DISABLED ACCESS

37. Facilities would be available for those with mobility difficulties to reach the Inquiry rooms. Should anyone require assistance in this respect, contact the PO. Similarly, anyone with another form of disability should contact Ms Prytherch who will make every effort to help you.
38. After indicating that a note of the PIM would be circulated shortly, the Inspector thanked everyone for attending and looked forward to meeting those present during the course of the Inquiry. He then closed the PIM.

GENERAL DISCUSSION AT THE PIM

1. The Council acknowledged that the absence of numbering on any paragraphs of the supporting text to the policies of the Deposit documents would create problems for Objectors, Council and Inspector during the Inquiry. He would have further difficulties at Reporting stage. The Council, through the PO, would discuss with the Inspector the appropriate means of addressing this.
2. The PO would consider how Core Documents (CDs) could be made available to the public outside normal office hours. The Council has subsequently confirmed that copies of CDs will be placed in the Reference Library, adjacent to the Town Hall.
3. The Inspector confirmed that it was both essential, and good practice, for Objectors to continue to discuss their Objections with the Council with a view to a resolution of disagreement. The Council confirmed it was willing to discuss with Objectors the basis of their concern.
4. Duly made Objections relating to the linkages between policies would be considered at the Inquiry.
5. There were differing views at the PIM on the need for Round Table Sessions [RTS(s)]. The debate focussed on a housing RTS. Here, the Inspector had before him the written view of the Council, opposing, as well as those by 3 Objectors - generally supporting. Other Objectors supported a RTS on housing. In summary, the Council - while acknowledging that the decision was for the Inspector - did not support an RTS, not least as Draft Regional Planning Guidance had recently been issued and the UDP reflected its housing provisions. The intention of PPG 11 was that it was not necessary to reopen that housing debate. It doubted the merits of the RTS procedure and whether it would save Inquiry time. The Council would prefer to agree housing data before the Inquiry. In summary, Objectors argued that RPG was in draft form and may well change. There were substantial doubts on the merits of the housing provision, including whether the general pattern of the housing allocations was acceptable. While they were grateful for the Council's offer to discuss relevant housing data, it was unlikely that any substantial agreement would be able to be reached. The Council had not prepared an Urban Capacity Study. There would be a saving of Inquiry time. The Inspector told the PIM that he would consider all the representations in this respect and would inform Council and Objectors of his decision shortly.
6. In so doing, he was able to confirm that participation at any RTS need not be limited to "professionals".
7. The draft 2 block Inquiry programme would straddle Christmas and the New Year. While the Council and an Objector drew the attention of the Inspector to possible holiday commitments, his expectation was that programming requirements would need to be met. Any exceptional difficulties should be referred to the Programme Officer.
8. Providing that it formed part of an Objection, the environmental impact of housing proposals would be able to be discussed at the Inquiry.

FORMAT OF PROOFS, STATEMENTS AND WRITTEN REPRESENTATIONS

1. It is not the wish of the Inspector to be unduly prescriptive in this respect. Nonetheless, the following principles would be helpful to him.
2. All Proofs of Evidence should include a summary.
3. The cover to all Council Proofs, Supporting Documents and Statements should be the same colour, this to be at the discretion of the Council.
4. Similarly, the cover to Objector Proofs and Statements – with accompanying Documents – should be of the same colour.
5. Supporting documents should be bound separately to Proofs and Statements but all should have a hole punched in the top left corner to allow the insertion of a “treasury tag”.
6. The covers to Proofs and Statements should contain the following information:

**BOLTON METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL
UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN INQUIRY**

COUNCIL PROOF OF EVIDENCE

(or)

PERFECT HOMES PROOF OF EVIDENCE

Objector:	Perfect Homes
Objector Reference(s):	1286, 1497
Topic:	Green Belt
Location:	Railway Cuttings, East Cheam
Policy No:	GB1

7. The above 5 headings should be repeated at the top of the first page of the Proof/Statement. This should be followed by: -
 - Relevant Deposit text
 - Summary of Objection
 - Change Sought by the Objector
 - Any Relevant Change to the Deposit version
 - Related Representations
 - Relevant Core Documents, including Topic Papers
 - Relevant National Planning Guidance
 - Strategic Considerations (eg RPG)
 - Local Considerations -
 - Description of the Objection Site
 - Any policy status relevant to the site
 - Any relevant planning history
 - Response (Council or Objector)
 - Conclusion
8. On a site Objection, an Ordnance Survey plan at an appropriate scale should be included that clearly shows the site boundaries.