

Examination of Places for Everyone

Joint Development Plan Document

Inspectors: William Fieldhouse, Louise Gibbons and Steven Lee

Programme Officers: Yvonne Parker and Helen Wilson

Tel (Yvonne Parker): 07813334305

Tel (Helen Wilson): 07879443035

Email: info@programmeofficers.co.uk

Examination webpage: www.hwa.uk.com/projects/gmca/

IN10: Matters, Issues and Questions relating to allocations

This note sets out some of the Matters, Issues and Questions that will help us decide if the Plan is sound and legally compliant and, if not, how it could be modified to ensure that it is (**Annex 2**). Matters, Issues and Questions relating to other parts of the Plan are set out in separate Inspector Notes.

The GMCA should submit written statements that respond to all of our Matters, Issues and Questions on behalf of the nine local planning authorities¹.

Any representor may submit a written statement or statements. However, these should only be in response to questions that relate to their original representations made under regulation 20 in response to the consultation held between August and October 2021. Representors' statements should set out the key points from their original representation against the relevant questions, and not introduce new arguments or evidence.

Written statements must be prepared in accordance with the advice in **Annex 1**.

Written statements in response to the questions in this note must be emailed to the Programme Officers in PDF format by **midday on Thursday 6 October 2022**.

No written material will be accepted after the relevant deadline for statements (unless it has been specifically requested by us).

Written statements will be published on the examination website as soon as possible after the deadline so that they are available to all participants and anyone else who wishes to read them. Because they will be available in this way, they will not be

¹ All references to "the GMCA" in this document, and by us throughout the examination, should be taken to refer to the nine local planning authorities where relevant in accordance with the provisions of section 28(1) and other parts the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended).

circulated directly to participants. Anyone who is unable to access them on the website should contact the Programme Officers.

Where relevant, our Matters, Issues and Questions refer to the GMCA's proposed main modifications and other responses to our Preliminary Questions. We will take account of the GMCA's proposed main modifications, along with all of the published evidence, representations made in accordance with regulation 20, and written statements in coming to our conclusions at the end of the examination. However, we can only recommend main modifications if we decide that they are essential to make the Plan sound or legally compliant. We cannot recommend a modification because it would "improve" the Plan, irrespective of the wishes of the GMCA or anyone else.

Any queries about this note should be taken up with the Programme Officers.

William Fieldhouse Louise Gibbons Steven Lee

21 July 2022

Written statements

All written statements must be prepared in accordance with this advice.

Any representor may submit a written statement or statements. However, these should only be in response to questions that relate to the representations that you made under regulation 20 (ie during the consultation held from 9 August to 3 October 2021). Statements should set out the key points from your representation against the relevant questions, and not introduce new arguments.

Statements should be concise and focussed, and in any event must contain no more than **2,000 words for each allocation**.

A separate statement must be submitted for each Matter that contains a question or questions that you wish to respond to. Each statement must:

- Include your name and Matter number in the top right corner of each page.
- Answer each question that you wish to respond to separately with clear reference to the relevant question number.
- Include a word count at the bottom of the final page.
- Have no appendices attached.

Where appropriate, reference should be made to relevant parts of the National Planning Policy Framework 2021 (“NPPF”) (paragraph numbers) and associated Planning Practice Guidance (“PPG”) (eg ID:61-002-20190315) with an explanation of why you think the policy in question is consistent or inconsistent with it. Reference should also be made to specific parts of evidence in the examination library, including the GMCA submission and supporting documents and any documents submitted by representors with their regulation 20 representations. The document reference, title, page and paragraph number should be stated.

There is no need to quote extensive parts of the NPPF, PPG or evidence documents, although a brief extract or summary of key factual information from evidence in the examination library may be included if it is directly relevant to one of our questions.

Written statements are not the opportunity to introduce new evidence. If the GMCA or any representor considers that there is evidence that it is essential to refer to in order to answer one of our questions, but which is not in the examination library, please check with the Programme Officers before submitting it. If, exceptionally, we agree to accept additional evidence, for example because it has only become available since the Plan was submitted and it is essential for us to consider, it would be added to the examination library.

If your response to any of our questions concludes that the relevant part of the Plan is not sound, your statement should set out how you think it should be modified to ensure that it is. Where relevant, refer to any proposed modifications or changes to the Policies Map that have been proposed by the GMCA.

End of IN10 Annex 1

Matters, Issues and Questions relating to allocations

A total of 38 sites are allocated in the Plan: 23 for housing, 9 for employment, and 6 for a mix of housing and employment development. All but 4 of those allocations² involve the removal of land from the Green Belt. All of the allocations are listed in Table 11.1 in the Plan, and defined on the Policies Map. Each is subject to a policy in chapter 11 which defines the development proposed and sets out various requirements to be met.

Under previous matters we have considered strategic issues associated with changes to the Green Belt, the site selection methodology, viability, and the Plan's spatial strategy set out in policies JPA-Strat1 to JPA-Strat11. This matter is concerned with site specific issues relating to each allocation, including whether it is suitably located in the context of the Plan's spatial strategy³, the impact the proposal would have on the Green Belt in that particular location, and whether the proposal would contribute to achieving sustainable development.

Matter 14: Cross boundary allocations: North East Growth Corridor

Policy JP-Strat7 (which was considered under an earlier matter) states that the North-East Growth Corridor will deliver a nationally-significant area of economic activity and growth which will be supported by a significant increase in the residential offer. It refers to three allocations in the corridor: JPA1.1, JPA1.2 and JPA2.

Issue 14.1 Is policy JPA1.1 Heywood / Pilsworth (Northern Gateway) justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Allocations JPA1.1 and JPA1.2 are described as the Northern Gateway: an extensive area around M60 junction 18 that straddles the districts of Bury and Rochdale⁴. Policy JP-J1 part G(vii) refers to a massive expansion of the existing employment areas in the Northern Gateway.

Policy JPA1.1 relates to a site of 641 hectares, 636 of which are removed from the Green Belt. It is located immediately east of the M66 and north of the M60 between M60 junction 18 and M62 junction 19. Around 1.2 million sqm of industrial and warehousing floorspace (0.7 million sqm by 2037), 1,200 new homes and a primary school are proposed on the site.

² JPA16, JPA24, JPA25 and JPA36.

³ Having regard to the site selection methodology criteria: 1.well served by public transport and/or previously developed land; 2.take advantage of key assets; 3.maximise economic opportunity; 4.within 800m of a town centre; 5.deliver urban regeneration; 6.deliver transport investment; and 7.deliver local benefits.

⁴ Plan text above paragraph 11.13.

The eastern part of the allocation (south of Heywood) has planning permission for up to 1,000 homes, 135,000 sqm of employment floorspace, community facilities and a link road to M62 junction 19. The other 200 new homes are proposed on the western part of the site with access from Castle Road

Green Belt

The majority of the Heywood / Pilsworth allocation is in Green Belt parcel BU_BA2 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

The western part of the site is in Green Belt parcel BU33 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- moderate/strong role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- weak role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

The north eastern and eastern parts of the allocation are in Green Belt parcels RD58 and RD60 that serve the following Green Belt purposes:

- moderate role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- weak role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that development of the site would cause very high harm to Green Belt purposes.

Q14.1. How would the development proposed in policy JPA1.1 on the Heywood / Pilsworth allocation affect each of the five Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q14.2. Would policy JPA1.1 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Heywood / Pilsworth allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q14.3. Would policy JPA1.1 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the Heywood / Pilsworth allocation from the Green Belt?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Heywood / Pilsworth allocation meets 5 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 1 – the site includes existing built development.
- Criterion 3 – transformational change and/or boost the competitiveness and connectivity of Greater Manchester.
- Criterion 5 – significant jobs and housing in an area with significant pockets of deprivation, low skills and worklessness.
- Criterion 6 – improved public transport in the area including bus rapid transit and a Metrolink extension to Middleton, and a network of cycling and walking routes.

- Criterion 7 – significant amount of new employment land in Bury to address longstanding shortage of supply and deliverable housing sites in north Greater Manchester to diversify the housing market.

Q14.4. Is the Heywood / Pilsworth allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q14.5. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA1.1 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Heywood / Pilsworth allocation? In particular with regard to:

- a) Provision of plots for custom- and self-build housing on land in the west of the allocation off Castle Road (criterion 1(iii)).
- b) Improvements to M66 junction 3; improved links between M66 junction 3 and M62 junction 19⁵; and other off-site highway works necessary to ensure acceptable traffic movement including a contribution towards the mitigation proposed at Croft Lane, Hollins Lane/Hollins Brow (criterion 2).
- c) Bus Rapid Transit corridors through the site, and improved public transport infrastructure close to the allocation including potential tram-train on the East Lancashire rail line between Bury and Rochdale (criterion 3).
- d) Financial contributions for off-site primary and secondary school provision (criterion 6).
- e) Active travel links over the M62 to proposed development at Simister/Bowlee (criterion 8).
- f) A buffer between the development and the motorway/local road network to serve multiple functions including air quality, noise, visual mitigation and high quality landscaping (criterion 16).
- g) A project specific Habitat Regulations Assessment for planning applications of 1,000 sqm or 50 dwellings or more (criterion 15).
- h) Protection and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings (criterion 17).

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability assessment considered the parts of the allocation that do not have planning permission and found that the development expected to come forward by 2037 would have a negative residual value of around -£16.5 million when all infrastructure costs are included. The sensitivity test shows that if all of the proposed development is taken into account, it would be viable assuming that transport costs remain the same (which may not be realistic). Public funding will be sought, including direct from the Government, to help deliver the proposal.

Q14.6. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Heywood / Pilsworth allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

⁵ GMCA to clarify if this is intended to mean improvements along the relevant sections of the motorways, or road links across the site / other land between those two motorway junctions.

Issue 14.2 Is policy JPA1.2 Simister and Bowlee (Northern Gateway) justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Allocations JPA1.1 and JPA1.2 are described as the Northern Gateway: an extensive area around M60 junction 18 that straddles the districts of Bury and Rochdale⁶. Policy JP-J1 part G(vii) refers to a massive expansion of the existing employment areas in the Northern Gateway.

The proposed site JPA1.2 is located between the settlements of Prestwich and Middleton and covers a total area of 74 hectares. The majority of its western boundary borders on the M60, the southern boundary abuts the edge of the village of Rhodes, and the allocation's eastern boundary wraps around the western and northern edges of Middleton. The site currently comprises agricultural land and a number of residential, employment and agricultural properties.

Approximately 1,550 homes are proposed within the Simister/Bowlee allocation. Around 1,350 homes will be in Bury and a further 200 will be located in Rochdale.

The GMCA advises that development is expected to start in 2024/2025 and completed in 2037⁷.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Simister and Bowlee allocation is in Green Belt parcels BU_BA02, BU_SET12, RD69, and BU47 and that these serve the following Green Belt purposes:

- RD69 and BU47 strong roles in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- RD69 and BU47 weak roles and BU_BA02 strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- RD69 and BU_BA02 moderate role and BU47 strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that development of the site would cause high harm to Green Belt purposes.

Q14.7. How would the development proposed in policy JPA1.2 on the Simister and Bowlee allocation affect each of the five Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q14.8. Would policy JPA1.2 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Simister and Bowlee allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

⁶ Plan text above paragraph 11.13.

⁷ 10.01.55

Q14.9. Would policy JPA1.2 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the Simister and Bowlee allocation from the Green Belt?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Simister and Bowlee allocation meets 5 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 1 – Covers an extensive area that includes existing built development
- Criterion 3 – have the capacity to deliver development at a transformative scale and significantly change the economic growth potential of the wider area.
- Criterion 5 – Opportunity to deliver significant jobs and housing to boost the competitiveness of northern and eastern parts of Greater Manchester in what is currently an area with significant pockets of deprivation, low skills and worklessness.
- Criterion 6 – Delivery of improved public transport provision through the area (including Bus Rapid Transit corridors) and close to the area (including potential Bus Rapid Transit or Metrolink extension to Middleton) in order to serve the development as well as deliver a network of safe and convenient cycling and walking routes through the area.
- Criterion 7 – Would help to rebalance the Greater Manchester economy by significantly boosting the economic output from the north of the conurbation.
 - Generate a significant number of new job opportunities in an area that is accessible to some of Greater Manchester's most deprived communities.
 - Would bring forward a significant amount of new employment land in Bury which would address longstanding problems associated with an inadequate supply in this district.
 - Would provide deliverable sites for housing in the north of Greater Manchester where there is an opportunity to capitalise on an existing high end market housing area and/or provide an opportunity to diversity the housing market, contributing to the competitiveness of the north.

Q14.10. Is the Simister and Bowlee allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q14.11. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA1.2 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Simister and Bowlee? In particular with regard to:

- a) A comprehensive masterplan, phasing and infrastructure (first paragraph)
- b) The need for specialist forms of housing (criterion 1)
- c) Facilitate the required supporting infrastructure (points (i) to (iv) (criterion 2)
- d) Affordable housing provision (criterion 4)
- e) Provision for primary and secondary education (criteria 5 and 6)
- f) Minimising impacts on the Bradley Hall SBI (criterion 12)
- g) Flood risk (criterion 13)

- h) A project specific Habitat Regulations Assessment for planning applications of 1,000 sqm or 50 dwellings or more (criterion 16)
- i) Noise and air quality mitigation (criterion 17)
- j) Protection and enhancement of heritage assets and their settings (criterion 19).

Q14.12. Whether the policy criteria for JPA1.2 apply to all parts of the site, and if not, why not?

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability assessment considered the allocation would be viable including affordable housing, transport and other costs.

Q14.13. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Heywood / Pilsworth allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 14.3 Is policy JPA2 Stakehill justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA2 relates to a site of 202 hectares, 168 of which are removed from the Green Belt, located immediately south of the M62 and west of the A627(M). Most of the site is in Rochdale, but the southern part is in Oldham. The A627(M) spur road and Thornham Lane run east-west through the centre of the site, with the existing Stakehill Industrial Estate adjoining the part of the allocation to the south.

An area of Green Belt would be retained between Thornham Lane and the motorway spur separating the development proposed on the north and south parts of the allocation. Another area of Green Belt would be retained within the allocation along the southern boundary. Land to the west of Stakehill industrial estate is proposed to be added to the Green Belt (GBA19).

Around 1,680 new homes and 150,000 sqm of industrial and warehousing floorspace are proposed. Paragraph 11.45 states that the residential development will be focussed to the north of Thornham Lane and to the south of the A627(M) spur. The employment development will be located to the south and east of the existing industrial estate.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Stakehill allocation is in Green Belt parcels RD56, RD62 and RD67. These parcels serve the following Green Belt purposes:

- Moderate (RD62 and RD67) or moderate/strong (RD56) role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- Moderate (RD62 and RD67) or strong (RD56) role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- Moderate (RD62 and RD67) or strong (RD56) role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

- No contribution (RD56 and RD62) or moderate (RD67) role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that development of the 168 hectares that are currently in the Green Belt would cause high harm to Green Belt purposes, but would have a minor or no/negligible impact on adjacent Green Belt.

Q14.14. (a) How would the development proposed in policy JPA2 on the Stakehill allocation affect the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138? (b) Would adding land to the Green Belt to the west of Stakehill Industrial Estate as proposed in the Plan (GBA19) alter that affect?

Q14.15. (a) Is the inclusion of two areas of Green Belt (total around 34 hectares) within the allocation boundary justified and consistent with national policy? (b) Would it be effective in providing an unambiguous policy for assessing potential future development proposals in those two areas?

Q14.16. Would policy JPA2 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Stakehill allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q14.17. Would policy JPA2 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the Stakehill allocation from the Green Belt?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Stakehill allocation meets 2 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 3 – the site has an existing employment offer and is capable of delivering development at a transformative scale and significantly changing the economic growth potential of the wider area.
- Criterion 5 – the site provides a significant opportunity for both Oldham and Rochdale to contribute to future economic growth capitalising on its connectivity to the motorway and rail network and attracting additional investment and economic activity to the area.

Q14.18. (a) Is the Stakehill allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development? (b) How would the development proposed in policy JPA2 have a direct significant impact on delivering urban regeneration (site selection criterion 5)?

North and south parts of the allocation

Q14.19. (a) Is the inclusion of separate development areas, with the A627(M) spur road and Thornham Lane in between, as a single allocation justified and effective? (b) In what respects are the two areas of development on the north and south parts of the allocation related? (c) Could the northern area be developed irrespective of the southern area, and vice versa?

Development requirements

Q14.20. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA2 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Stakehill allocation? In particular with regard to:

- a) Focus on advanced manufacturing and other growth sectors (criterion 1).
- b) Approach to masterplanning and design codes for the whole site (criterion 3).
- c) Contribution to the proposed new railway station at Slattocks (criterion 9).
- d) Improve access arrangements in and around Stakehill Industrial Estate and make provision for lorry parking (criterion 13).
- e) Deliver social infrastructure to ensure the needs of new and existing communities are properly met (criteria 18 and 19).
- f) Noise and air quality mitigation taking account of the M62 and A627(M) (criterion 20).
- g) Biodiversity, including in relation to the Rochdale Canal Site of Special Scientific Interest and project specific habitat regulations assessment (criteria 16 and 17).

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the combined residual value of the development on the different parts of the site is expected to be sufficient to meet the identified strategic transport costs with a headroom of around £11 million meaning that the proposal is viable.

Q14.21. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Stakehill allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Matter 15: Cross boundary allocations: Manchester / Trafford

Issue 15.1 Is policy JPA3.1 Medipark justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA3.1 relates to a site of 21 hectares, all of which are removed from the Green Belt. The site is located in close proximity to the existing University Hospital South Manchester and Roundthorn Medipark Enterprise Zone.

Around 81,000 sqm of 'B1' focussed floorspace are proposed, along with a new spine road.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Medipark allocation is in the Green Belt parcel MA13. This parcel serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- Strong role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area;
- Strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- Strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- No contribution to preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that development of the 21 hectares of Green Belt would cause moderate harm to Green Belt purposes.

Q15.1. How would the development proposed in policy JPA3.1 affect the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q15.2. Would policy JPA3.1 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Medipark allocation are clearly defined, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q15.3. Would policy JPA3.1 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt to offset the impact of removing the Medipark allocation from the Green Belt?

Site Location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Medipark allocation meets 3 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 2 – land that is able to take advantage of the key assets and opportunities that genuinely distinguish Greater Manchester from its competitors.
- Criterion 5 - land which would have a direct significant impact on delivering urban regeneration.
- Criterion 6 - land where transport investment (by the developer) and the creation of significant new demand (through appropriate development densities), would support the delivery of long-term viable sustainable travel options and delivers significant wider community benefits.

Q15.4. Is the Medipark allocation suitably located having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development Requirements

On 21 July 2020, the Government published The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020. The changes came into force on 1 September 2020. In summary, parts of use classes A, B and D no longer exist, and have been replaced by a new class E (commercial, business and service).

Q15.5. Should criterion 1 of policy JPA3.1 be modified to reflect the most up-to-date Use Class Order?

Q15.6. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA3.1 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Medipark allocation? In particular, with regard to:

- a) Scale of development and focus on knowledge-based industries (paragraph 11.62).
- b) Delivering transport or other infrastructure necessary to mitigate the impact of development (criteria 2, 3, 4 and 5).
- c) Protection and enhancement of heritage assets, their settings (criteria 7 and 8) and archaeological remains.
- d) Protection of the playing fields (criterion 7).
- e) Flooding and drainage (criterion 9).
- f) The protection and/or enhancement of biodiversity assets and green infrastructure (criterion 9)

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Medipark and Timperley Wedge (JPA3.2) allocations were brought together as one cross boundary allocation for the viability assessment and that, under both the base and sensitivity tests, the sites are viable.

Q15.7. (a) When is it anticipated that development of the Medipark allocation will start and be completed? (b) Is there a reasonable prospect that the Medipark allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 15.2 Is policy JPA3.2 Timperley Wedge justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA3.2 relates to a site of 226 hectares, 100 hectares of which would be removed from the Green Belt. It comprises land west of Junction 5 of the M56, running north along the boundary with Manchester to the existing urban area of Timperley.

The allocation proposes 2,500 homes, 1,700 of which would be developed in the plan period, around 60,000 sqm of 'B1' office floorspace, of which 15,000 sqm would be in the plan period. The allocation also proposes a new local centre, incorporating in the region of 3,000 sqm of retail floorspace. As well as an area of Green Belt, the allocation also includes an area of safeguarded land.

The GMCA response to IN2 Statement of Common Ground for Allocations advises that development is expected to start on the site in 2024/25 and be completed in 2042/43.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Timperley Wedge allocation is in Green Belt parcels TF41, TF44, TF45, TF47, TF48 and TF49. These parcels serve the following Green Belt purposes:

- Weak/strong (TF41), moderate/strong (TF44, TF45) or strong (TF47, TF48, TF49) role in checking unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area;
- Moderate (TF49) or strong (TF41, TF44, TF45, TF47, TF48) role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging;
- Weak (TF41, TF49), moderate (TF44, TF45, TF48) or strong (TF47) role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- No contribution (TF41) or weak (TF44, TF45, TF47, TF48, TF49) role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.

Q15.8. How would the development proposed in JPA3.2 affect the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q15.9. (a) Is the inclusion of the area of retained Green Belt (total around 89 hectares) within the allocation boundary justified and consistent with national policy? (b) Would it be effective in providing an unambiguous policy for assessing potential future development proposals in this area?

Q15.10. Would policy JPA3.2 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Timperley Wedge allocation are clearly defined, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q15.11. Would policy JPA3.2 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt to offset the impact of removing the Timperley Wedge allocation from the Green Belt?

Safeguarded Land

Q15.12. (a) Is the identification of safeguarded land within the Timperley Wedge allocation boundary justified and consistent with national policy? (b) Would criteria 47-49 be effective in providing a clear and unambiguous policy for assessing potential future development proposals in the safeguarded area? (c) Is criterion 50 justified and consistent with national policy? In particular, is it justifiable for this policy to pre-judge the outcome of any future Plan review?

Site Location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Timperley Wedge allocation meets 4 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 2 – land that is able to take advantage of the key assets and opportunities that genuinely distinguish Greater Manchester from its competitors.
- Criterion 5 - land which would have a direct significant impact on delivering urban regeneration.

- Criterion 6 - land where transport investment (by the developer) and the creation of significant new demand (through appropriate development densities), would support the delivery of long-term viable sustainable travel options and delivers significant wider community benefits.
- Criterion 7 – land that would deliver significant local benefits by addressing a major local problem/issue.

Q15.13. Is the Timperley Wedge allocation suitably located having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development Requirements

On 21 July 2020, the Government published The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020. The changes came into force on 1 September 2020. In summary, parts of use classes A, B and D no longer exist, and have been replaced by a new class E (commercial, business and service).

Q15.14. Should criterion 8 of policy JPA3.2 be modified to reflect the most up-to-date Use Class Order?

Q15.15. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA3.2 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Timperley Wedge allocation? In particular, with regard to:

- a) Scale of housing (criterion 2) and employment development (criterion 8)
- b) Focus on office development (criterion 8)
- c) Approach to masterplanning or SPD (criterion 1)
- d) Housing densities across the site (criterion 5)
- e) Scale of affordable housing contributions across the site (criterion 7)
- f) Approach to self-build and custom-build plots (criterion 8)
- g) Delivery, phasing and the approach to the 'equalisation mechanism' (criteria 11 and 12)
- h) Delivering transport or other infrastructure necessary to mitigate the impact of development (criteria 13 – 17)
- i) Provision of local services and facilities. In particular, the scale and mix of uses in the proposed local centre (criterion 18) and the approach to education provision (criterion 19)
- j) Protection and/or provision of green infrastructure (criteria 23 – 27).
- k) Protection and enhancement of biodiversity assets (criteria 28-30)
- l) Protection and enhancement of heritage assets, their settings and archaeological remains (criteria 36 and 37).
- m) Approach to climate change, flooding and drainage (criteria 38 – 45)
- n) Noise and air quality mitigating, taking the M56 into account (criterion 46)

Paragraph 11.79 refers to the Bowdon Rugby Club and that it may be appropriate to relocate the facilities within the wider allocation subject to masterplanning.

Q15.16. Would policy JPA.3.2 be clear and unambiguous with regard to proposals affecting Bowden Rugby Club?

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Medipark and Timperley Wedge (JPA3.2) allocations were brought together as one cross boundary allocation for the viability assessment and that, under both the base and sensitivity tests, the sites are viable.

Q15.17. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Timperley Wedge allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Matter 16: Allocations in Bolton

There are three sites allocated for development in Bolton, all are currently wholly or partly in the Green Belt.

Issue 16.1 Is policy JPA4 Bewshill Farm justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA4 relates to a site of 5.6 hectares, all of which is in the Green Belt. The site is located in the south of Bolton, close to the border with Salford. It is within the M61 Corridor and is adjacent to Logistics North.

Will provide for around 21,000 sq m of industrial and warehousing floorspace to compliment the adjacent development at Logistics North, from which access will be taken. The site provides the opportunity for a modest extension to Logistics North.

The GMCA advises that development is expected to be completed prior to 2037⁸.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Bewshill Farm allocation is in Green Belt parcel BT57 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- moderate role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- weak role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response indicates that the proposed development would cause low harm to Green Belt purposes.

Q16.1. How would the development proposed in policy JPA4 on the Bewshill Farm allocation affect each of the five Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

⁸ GMCA1.2

Q16.2. Would policy JPA4 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Bewshill Farm allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q16.3. Would policy JPA4 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing 5.1 hectares from the Green Belt as part of the Bewshill Farm allocation?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Bewshill Farm allocation meets 2 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 3 – the site falls within the Wigan-Bolton Growth Corridor, which is one of the strategic areas identified under the criterion. There is potential for this site to contribute to the delivery of transformational change in this area;
- Criterion 5 – Development has the potential to have a regenerative impact on nearby deprived communities.

Q16.4. Is the Bewshill Farm allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q16.5. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA4 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Bewshill Farm allocation? In particular with regard to:
a) Contribution to the existing Logistics North Local link demand responsive transport service (criterion 3).

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability assessment found the site to be viable.

Q16.6. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Bewshill Farm allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 16.2 Is policy JPA5 Chequerbent North justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA5 relates to a site of 15.7 hectares, all of which is in the Green Belt. The site is within the boundaries of Bolton. It is comprised partly of previously developed land with greenfield land that is enclosed by hedgerows around most of the site.

There is an industrial development located at the centre of the site. Chequerbent North lies approximately 4.5km southwest of Bolton town centre

The site can accommodate around 25,000sqm of B2 and B8 uses and has access from the A6 with a potential additional access via Snydale Way and it has access to Junction 5 of the M61.

The GMCA advises that development is expected to be completed prior to 2037⁹.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Chequerbent North allocation is in Green Belt parcel BT48 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- moderate role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- no role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response indicates that the proposed development would cause high harm to Green Belt purposes (with a moderate rating for the southern part of the site).

Q16.7. How would the development proposed in policy JPA5 on the Chequerbent North allocation affect each of the five Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q16.8. Would policy JPA5 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Chequerbent North allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q16.9. Would policy JPA5 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing 15.7 hectares from the Green Belt as part of the Chequerbent North allocation?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Chequerbent North allocation meets 1 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 3 – the site falls within the Wigan-Bolton Growth Corridor, which is one of the strategic areas identified under the criterion. There is potential for this site to contribute to the delivery of transformational change in this area;

Q16.10. Is the Chequerbent North allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

⁹ GMCA1.2

Q16.11. Does the designation of the Scheduled Ancient Monument on the eastern border of the site mean that the Plan needs to be modified and, if so, how?

Q16.12. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA5 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Chequerbent North allocation? In particular with regard to:
a) Access from the A6 and potential access via Snydale Way (criterion 2).
b) Financial contributions to mitigate the impact on the Local Road Network including improvements to the Chequerbent roundabout (criterion 4).

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability assessment found the site to be viable.

Q16.13. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Chequerbent North allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 16.3 Is policy JPA6 West of Wingates/M61 Junction 6 justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA6 relates to a site of 184 hectares, all of which is in the Green Belt. The site is located in the west of Bolton and falls within both the M61 Corridor and the Wigan-Bolton Growth Corridor. It is immediately adjacent to the existing Wingates Industrial Estate and is close to the Borough of Wigan.

The site can accommodate around 25,000sqm of B2 and B8 uses and has access from the A6 with a potential additional access via Snydale Way and it has access to Junction 5 of the M61.

The GMCA advises that development is expected to be completed prior to 2037¹⁰.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the West of Wingates/M61 Junction 6 allocation is in Green Belt parcel BT40 and BT_BA03 and that these serve the following Green Belt purposes:

- BT40 moderate role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- BT40 weak role and BT_BA03 strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- BT40 and BT_BA03 moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- BT40 and BT_BA03 moderate role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

¹⁰ GMCA1.2

The GMCA response indicates that the proposed development would cause high harm to Green Belt purposes (sub area GM6-1) and moderate to high harm (sub area GM6-2).

Q16.14. How would the development proposed in policy JPA6 on the West of Wingates/M61 Junction 6 allocation affect each of the five Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q16.15. Would policy JPA6 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the West of Wingates/M61 Junction 6 allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q16.16. Would policy JPA6 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing 183 hectares from the Green Belt as part of the West of Wingates/M61 Junction 6?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the West of Wingates/M61 Junction 6 allocation meets 1 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 3 – the site falls within the Wigan-Bolton Growth Corridor, which is one of the strategic areas identified under the criterion. There is potential for this site to contribute to the delivery of transformational change in this area;

Q16.17. Is the West of Wingates/M61 Junction 6 allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q16.18. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA6 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the West of Wingates/M61 Junction 6 allocation? In particular with regard to:

- a) A comprehensive masterplan, phasing and areas which should or should not be developed (criterion 2).
- b) The access road and a link from the A6 to Westhoughton¹¹ (criterion 3).
- c) Take advantage of the site's location near Junction 6 of M61¹² (criterion 4)
- d) Impact on biodiversity including at Four Gates (criterion 7).

Viability

¹¹ GMCA to clarify how the link from the A6 to Westhoughton would be achieved

¹² GMCA to clarify what is meant by this.

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability assessment found the site to be viable.

Q16.19. Is there a reasonable prospect that the West of Wingates/M61 Junction 6 allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Matter 17: Allocations in Bury

There are three sites allocated for development in Bury, all are currently wholly or partly in the Green Belt.

Issue 17.1 Is policy JPA7 Elton Reservoir justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA7 relates to a site of 251.6 hectares, most of which is in the Green Belt. 124.9 hectares will remain in the Green Belt. The site is located in Bury. The site is bound by Radcliffe to the south and Bury to the north east and currently comprises agricultural land and a number of residential, employment and agricultural properties.

Will provide for around 3,500 homes. Key infrastructure includes a North-south spine road, link to Spring Lane, Radcliffe Town Centre works and structural upgrades to reservoir.

The GMCA advises that 1,900 dwellings are expected to be completed prior to 2037¹³.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Elton Reservoir allocation is in Green Belt parcels BU25, BU29 and BU31 that serve the following Green Belt purposes:

- BU25 and BU29 strong and BU31 weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- BU25 and BU29 strong and BU31 moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- BU25 and BU31 moderate and BU29 strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- BU25 and BU29 weak and BU31 no role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response indicates that the proposed development would cause high harm to Green Belt purposes (60.3 hectares) and moderate harm (10.3 hectares).

Q17.1. How would the development proposed in policy JPA7 on the Elton Reservoir allocation affect each of the five Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

¹³ GMCA1.3

Q17.2. Would policy JPA7 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Elton Reservoir allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q17.3. Would policy JPA7 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing 126.7 hectares from the Green Belt as part of the Elton Reservoir allocation?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Elton Reservoir allocation meets 2 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 6 – The Bury to Manchester Metrolink line runs along the eastern edge of this site and, in order to reduce reliance on the car, development within the allocation will be required to incorporate the provision of a new Metrolink stop and associated park and ride facilities in the Warth area. Direct walking and cycling connections to the Metrolink stop will also be necessary.
- Criterion 7 – The area of search and sites within it will provide a deliverable site for housing in the north of Greater Manchester where there is an opportunity to capitalise on an existing high end housing market area and/or provide an opportunity to diversify the housing market, contributing to the competitiveness of the north; and would deliver significant highway improvements through the provision of a strategic north-south spine road connecting Bury and Bolton Road (A58) to Bury Road, Radcliffe. The road will provide an essential alternative to Bury Bridge for traffic travelling south towards Manchester from the west Bury area. Furthermore, in order to improve linkages to and assist in the physical and social regeneration of inner Radcliffe, including the town centre, there is a need to provide a significant spur road connecting the allocation to Spring Lane via the former Coney Green High School site.

Q17.4. Is the Elton Reservoir allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q17.5. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA7 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Elton Reservoir allocation? In particular with regard to:

- a) A comprehensive masterplan, phasing and infrastructure (first paragraph).
- b) Key enabling infrastructure and limits to residential development dependent on this (criterion 2)
- c) Provision for major investment in public transport (criterion 3)
- d) Affordable housing (criterion 5)
- e) Secondary school provision (criterion 7)
- f) Provision of local centres and the range of community facilities (criterion 8)
- g) Effective integration with surrounding communities, including active travel links (criterion 10)

- h) Green infrastructure (green corridor within the Green Belt) and enhancement of existing assets (criterion 12)
- i) Minimising impact on and net gains for biodiversity (criterion 13)
- j) Flood risk (including the River Irwell and Elton and Withins Reservoir) (criteria 14 and 15)
- k) Protection and enhancements of heritage assets including the impact on Old Hall Farmhouse Grade II listed building (criterion 17).

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability assessment indicates a positive return but that an element of significant infrastructure, particularly the link road may need an element of forward funding.

Q17.6. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Elton Reservoir allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 17.2 Is policy JPA8 Seedfield justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA8 relates to a site of 5.15 hectares, all of which is in the Green Belt. The allocation is located in the Seedfield area of Bury and was formerly occupied by Seedfield High School before more recently being used as a training centre.

The site is well-connected to the existing urban area and is located less than 2 kilometres from Bury town centre. In total the site is 5.15 ha with an approximate developable area of 3.46 ha. Approximately 50% of the allocation is previously developed with the remainder of the allocation being used as playing fields.

The GMCA advises that 140 dwellings are expected to be completed prior to 2037¹⁴.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Seedfield allocation is in Green Belt parcel BU19 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- strong role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- weak role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response indicates that the proposed development would cause very low harm to Green Belt purposes.

Q17.7. How would the development proposed in policy JPA8 on the Seedfield allocation affect each of the five Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

¹⁴ GMCA1.3

Q17.8. Would policy JPA8 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Seedfield allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q17.9. Would policy JPA8 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing 5.15 hectares from the Green Belt as part of the Seedfield allocation?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Seedfield allocation meets 1 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 1 – Approximately 50% of the allocation is previously-developed with the remainder of the allocation being used as playing fields and the site is well-connected to the services and facilities in Bury town centre including Bury Interchange.

Q17.10. Is the Seedfield allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q17.11. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA8 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Seedfield allocation? In particular with regard to:

- a) Existing recreation facilities, including playing fields (criterion 6)
- b) Retention and enhancement of the wildlife corridor and to the west and south of the site (criterion 7)

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability assessment indicates that the site is viable.

Q17.12. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Seedfield allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 7.3 Is policy JPA9 Walshaw justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA9 relates to a site of 63 hectares, all of which is in the Green Belt within the Borough of Bury. The amount of Green Belt to be removed is 60.91 hectares. It lies to the west of the Borough, 1.6 km west of Bury town centre.

The land is bounded by the urban areas of Tottington to the north, Woolfold and Elton to the east, Lowercroft to the south and Walshaw to the west. The site is mainly agricultural in use and contains three reservoirs fed by Walshaw Brook. The River Irwell lies approximately 1.5 km to the east of the allocation.

The trajectory for the site indicates development for around 1,250 homes would start in 2025 and be completed by 2036/2037¹⁵.

The trajectory for the site indicates development for around 1,250 homes would start in 2025 and be completed by 2036/2037¹⁶.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Walshaw allocation is in Green Belt parcel BU22 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- moderate role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- moderate role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response indicates that the proposed development would cause moderate harm to Green Belt purposes.

Q17.13. How would the development proposed in policy JPA9 on the Walshaw allocation affect each of the five Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q17.14. Would policy JPA9 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Walshaw allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q17.15. Would policy JPA9 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing 60.91 hectares from the Green Belt as part of the Walshaw allocation?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Walshaw allocation meets 1 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 7 – The allocation will provide a deliverable site for housing in the north of Greater Manchester where there is an opportunity to capitalise on an existing high end market housing area and/or provide an opportunity to diversify the housing market, contributing to the competitiveness of the north; and development would deliver significant highway improvements which will help to resolve existing issues in the local area including a new link road

¹⁵ 10.03.45

¹⁶ 10.03.45

through the allocation that will provide an alternative and more direct route to the more difficult Church Street/Bank Street route.

Q17.16. Is the Walshaw allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q17.17. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA9 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Walshaw allocation? In particular with regard to:

- a) A comprehensive masterplan, phasing and infrastructure (first paragraph).
- b) Provision for significant new and improved highways infrastructure and major investment in public transport (criteria 2 and 3)
- c) Affordable housing (criterion 5)
- d) Primary education provision and secondary school contributions (criteria 6 and 7)
- e) Provision for new local centre (criterion 8)
- f) Integration with surrounding communities (criterion 10)
- g) Minimising impact on and net gains for biodiversity (criterion 12)
- h) Flood risk (criteria 13 and 14)

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability assessment indicates that the site is unviable with the strategic transport costs identified. A sensitivity test found that an 5% increase in assumed development value would make the site viable.

Q17.18. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Walshaw allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Matter 18: Allocations in Manchester

There is one allocation that is entirely within Manchester.

Issue 18.1 Is policy JPA10 Global Logistics Park justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA10 relates to 20 hectares, around 12 of which are in the Green Belt. The site is located south-west of Manchester Airport. The allocation proposes 25,000 sqm of B2/B8 employment land.

The GMCA response to IN2 Statement of Common Ground for Allocations advises that the development is expected to start on site in

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Global Logistics allocation is in Green Belt parcel MA13. This parcel serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- Strong role in checking unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area;
- Strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging;
- Strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- No contribution in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns.

Q18.1. How would the development proposed in JPA10 affect the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q18.2. Would policy JPA10 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Global Logistics allocation are clearly defined, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q18.3. Would policy JPA10 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt to offset the impact of removing the Timperley Wedge allocation from the Green Belt?

Site Location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Global Logistics allocation meets 1 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 2 – land that is able to take advantage of the key assets and opportunities that genuinely distinguish Greater Manchester from its competitors.

Q18.4. (a) Is the Global Logistics allocation suitably located having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development? (b) To what extent does the provision of around 25,000 sqm of industry or warehousing near to Manchester Airport distinguish Greater Manchester from its competitors?

Development Requirements

Q18.5. What is the purpose of criterion 1 in requiring development to support growth of the airport to 2030? Is the criterion clear and unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals?

The first sentence of criterion 2 refers to the delivery of 25,000 sqm of B2/B8 development. The second sentence states that '[s]uitable uses for the site will be cargo facilities but could also include airport operational facilities where it would have no greater adverse impact than would occur for cargo facilities'.

Q18.6. Is criterion 2 clear and unambiguous about the nature of uses that will be permitted on the Global Logistics site? In particular, is it clear in what circumstances B2 uses would be permitted?

Q18.7. Are the other development requirements set out in policy JPA10 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Timperley Wedge allocation? In particular, with regard to:
a) Protection of biodiversity, in particular (i) the policy's assessment of harm to biodiversity assets (ii) the effect of development on the adjacent Cotterill Clough SSSI and (iii) what is meant by 'existing landscape mitigation' and whether it is possible to appropriately re-provide this elsewhere (criterion 3)
b) Delivering transport or other infrastructure necessary to mitigate the impact of development (criteria 5-7)

Viability

The Strategic Viability Report – Stage 2 Allocated Sites Viability Report¹⁷ advises that delivery of the site would be considered marginal.

Q18.8. (a) When is it envisaged that development of the Global Logistics will begin and end? (b) Is there a reasonable prospect that the Global Logistics allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Matter 19: Allocations in Oldham

There are seven sites allocated for development in Oldham, all but one of which (JPA16 Cowlshaw) are currently wholly or partly in the Green Belt.

Issue 19.1 Is policy JPA12 Beal Valley justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA12 relates to a site of 51 hectares, 40 hectares of which are currently in the Green Belt with the northern part currently designated as Other Protected Open Land. It is located on the edge of Shaw, south of the town centre, and bounded by a Metrolink line to the east and Bullcote Lane to the south. The River Beal runs through the south east part of the site. Allocation JPA14 Broadbent Moss lies to the south of Bullcote Lane.

Around 480 new homes are proposed served by a spine road that would connect to allocation JPA14 Broadbent Moss to the south. Policy JPA12 safeguards a route through the northern part of the site to offer a potential link to Shaw town centre, and requires a contribution to a new Metrolink stop and park and ride facility as part of the adjoining JPA14 Broadbent Moss allocation.

¹⁷ 03.01.04

The GMCA advises that development is expected to start on the site in 2025/26 and be completed in 2031/32¹⁸.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Beal Valley allocation is in Green Belt parcel OH23 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- strong role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- moderate role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response indicates that the proposed development would cause high harm to Green Belt purposes.

Q19.1. How would the development proposed in policy JPA12 on the Beal Valley allocation affect each of the five Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q19.2. Would policy JPA12 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Beal Valley allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q19.3. Would policy JPA12 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing 40 hectares from the Green Belt as part of the Beal Valley allocation?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Beal Valley allocation meets 4 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 1 – northern part of the site is within 800m of Shaw and Crompton Metrolink stop.
- Criterion 5 – northern part of the site is within one of the 10% most deprived areas.
- Criterion 6 – contribute to the provision of a new Metrolink stop.
- Criterion 7 – provide a new ground for Heyside Cricket Club, and diversify the housing stock.

Q19.4. Is the Beal Valley allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Relationship between allocations JPA12 Beal Valley and JPA14 Broadbent Moss

¹⁸ GMCA1.5

Q19.5. Are allocations JPA12 Beal Valley and JPA14 Broadbent Moss interdependent, or could the former be developed irrespective of the latter?

Development requirements

Q19.6. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA12 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Beal Valley allocation? In particular with regard to:

- b) A comprehensive masterplan and design code (criterion 1).
- c) An internal spine road that will connect to the Broadbent Moss allocation to the south delivered as part of the comprehensive development of both sites (criterion 4).
- d) Safeguard a route from the proposed spine road through the northern part of the site to offer the potential to link to Shaw town centre (criterion 5)¹⁹.
- e) Contribute to the delivery of a new Metrolink stop and park and ride facility as part of the Broadbent Moss allocation (criterion 7).
- f) The protection of a large green wedge between the main development area and the Metrolink line to the east (criterion 11).
- g) Expansion of, and improvement to, existing facilities at Heyside Cricket Club (criterion 15).

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability assessment found the site to be unviable. A sensitivity test found that an 15% increase in assumed development value would make the site viable.

Q19.7. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Beal Valley allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 19.2 Is policy JPA14 Broadbent Moss justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA14 relates to a site of 82 hectares, 40 hectares of which are removed from the Green Belt. 25 hectares within the eastern part of the allocation are to be retained in the Green Belt.

The site is situated between Oldham and Shaw, immediately to the south and south east of allocation JPA12 Beal Valley. A Metrolink line runs north-south through the site, and the existing Higginshaw Business Park lies to the west. The River Beal crosses the central part of the site.

Part of the allocation, at Hebron Street, has planning permission for 77 dwellings. In total, policy JPA14 proposes 1,450 new homes (including the 77 with planning

¹⁹ GMCA to clarify how the proposed spine road and safeguarded route through the northern part of the site would be likely to affect heritage assets, woodland, and areas of biodiversity value, and how a potential link to Shaw town centre would be achieved.

permission), 500 of which are expected to be completed after 2037. 21,000 sqm of industrial and warehousing floorspace are also proposed, as an extension to the existing employment site. The west and east parts of the allocation would be connected by a new spine road crossing the Metrolink line, which would also connect to the Beal Valley site to the north. The development would be required to make a contribution to a new Metrolink stop and park and ride facility, and provide an adjacent local centre.

The GMCA response to IN2 Statement of Common Ground for Allocations²⁰ advises that housing development is expected to start on the site in 2022/23 and continue until 2045/46. The employment development is expected to start in 2023/24 and be completed in 2024/25.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Broadbent Moss allocation is in Green Belt parcel OH23 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- strong role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- moderate role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response indicates that the proposed development would cause moderate-high harm to Green Belt purposes.

Q19.8. How would the development proposed in policy JPA14 on the Broadbent Moss allocation affect each of the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q19.9. (a) Is the inclusion of two areas of Green Belt land (total around 25 hectares) within the allocation boundary justified and consistent with national policy? (b) Would it be effective in providing an unambiguous policy for assessing potential future development proposals in those two areas?

Q19.10. Would policy JPA14 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Broadbent Moss allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q19.11. Would policy JPA14 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing 40 hectares from the Green Belt as part of the Broadbent Moss allocation?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Broadbent Moss allocation meets ? of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 5 – the site is close to an area of deprivation in Sholver.

²⁰ GMCA1.5

- Criterion 6 - contribute to the provision of a new Metrolink stop.
- Criterion 7 – spine road and new Metrolink stop would address existing traffic congestion in the area and improve public transport.

Q19.12. Is the Broadbent Moss allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Relationship between allocations JPA12 Beal Valley and JPA14 Broadbent Moss

Q19.13. Are allocations JPA12 Beal Valley and JPA14 Broadbent Moss interdependent, or could the latter be developed irrespective of the former?

Flood risk

The GMCA response to PQ41 advises that around 9.5 hectares of the site (12%) is within flood zones 2 and 3, and that all of the 1,450 homes can be accommodated outside those areas.

Development requirements

Q19.14. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA14 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Broadbent Moss allocation? In particular with regard to:

- a) A comprehensive masterplan and design code (criterion 1).
- b) An internal spine road that will connect to the Beal Valley allocation to the north and to the housing development to the east of the Metrolink line via an appropriate crossing (criterion 5).
- c) Contribute to the delivery of a new Metrolink stop and park and ride facility (criterion 7).
- d) Make provision for a local centre adjacent to the proposed Metrolink stop and park and ride facility (criterion 8).
- e) The approach to flood risk (criteria 20 and 21).

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Broadbent Moss is marginally viable.

Q19.15. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Broadbent Moss allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 19.3 Is policy JPA16 Cowlshaw justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA16 relates to a site of 32 hectares on the south-west edge of Shaw that is currently designated as Other Protected Open Land in the Oldham Local Plan.

Around 460 new homes are proposed with access from Kings Road to the east, Cocker Mill Lane to the south, and Denbigh Drive to the north (the latter serving only a “small parcel”).

Outline planning permission was granted in September 2020 for the demolition of existing abattoir buildings and residential development of up to 250 dwellings on the south-east part of the site with access from Cocker Mill Lane²¹. Planning permission was recently granted (subject to legal agreement) for 42 dwellings on the north-west part of the site²².

The GMCA response to IN2 Statement of Common Ground for Allocations²³ advises that development is expected to start in 2023/24 and be completed in 2031/32.

Site location

As the Cowlshaw allocation is not within the existing Green Belt, the site selection criteria were not applied.

Q19.16. Is the Cowlshaw allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan’s spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q19.17. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA16 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Cowlshaw allocation?

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability assessment concluded that the development proposed on the Cowlshaw allocation would be unviable. A sensitivity test assuming a 10% increase in development value showed the site to be viable with a residual land value of around £6.9 million.

Q19.18. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Cowlshaw allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 19.4 Is policy JPA17 South of Coal Pit Lane justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA17 relates to a site of 20 hectares, 19 of which are removed from the Green Belt. It is located on the southern edge of Oldham to the west of Ashton Road

²¹ Paragraph 6.1 of JPA16 Cowlshaw Allocation Topic Paper [10.05.36]

²² GMCA1.5

²³ GMCA1.5

(A62). Around 175 new homes are proposed with potential access points from Ashton Road and Coal Pit Lane.

The GMCA response to IN2 Statement of Common Ground for Allocations²⁴ advises that development is expected to start in 2028/29 and be completed in 2032/33.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Coal Pit Lane allocation is in Green Belt parcel OH46 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- strong role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response indicates that development of the 19 hectares that would be removed from the Green Belt would cause high harm to Green Belt purposes.

Q19.19. How would the development proposed in policy JPA17 on the Coal Pit Lane allocation affect each of the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q19.20. Would policy JPA17 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Coal Pit Lane allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q19.21. Would policy JPA17 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing 19 hectares from the Green Belt?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Coal Pit Lane allocation meets site selection criterion 7 - diversify the existing housing stock and enhance the housing mix through adding to the type and range of housing available.

Q19.22. Is the Coal Pit Lane allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q19.23. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA17 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Coal Pit Lane allocation? In particular with regard to the requirement to safeguard a route from the north western edge of the site through to Coal Pit Lane (criterion 4).

²⁴ GMCA1.5

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability assessment concluded that the development proposed in policy JPA17 would be unviable. A sensitivity test assuming a 17.5% increase in development value showed the development to be viable with a positive residual value of £0.8 million after accounting for strategic transport costs.

Q19.24. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Coal Pit Lane allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 19.5 Is policy JPA18 South of Rosary Road justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA18 relates to a site of 3 hectares which is currently in the Green Belt. It is located on the southern edge of Oldham, east of Ashton Road (A62). Around 60 new homes are proposed.

The GMCA response to IN2 Statement of Common Ground for Allocations²⁵ advises that development is expected to start in 2025/26 and be completed in 2026/27.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Rosary Road allocation is in Green Belt parcel OH44 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- strong role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- moderate role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response to PQ20 indicates that development proposed in policy JPA18 would cause low-moderate harm to Green Belt purposes.

Q19.25. How would the development proposed in policy JPA18 on the Rosary Road allocation affect each of the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q19.26. Would policy JPA18 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Rosary Road allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q19.27. Would policy JPA18 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the Rosary Road allocation from the Green Belt?

Site location

²⁵ GMCA1.5

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Rosary Road allocation meets site selection criterion 5 as it is in one of the 10% most deprived areas of Greater Manchester and could deliver significant local benefits by addressing the lack of large family homes which are needed in Oldham.

Q19.28. (a) Is the Rosary Road allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development? (b) How would the development of around 60 homes, including high quality family housing, have a direct significant impact on delivering regeneration?

Development requirements

Q19.29. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA18 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Rosary Road allocation? In particular with regard to:

- a) providing the main access from the site currently under development to the north east of the allocation with secondary emergency access from St Cuthbert's Fold to the west (criterion 2).
- b) Impact on biodiversity (criteria 6 and 7).
- c) Impact on the setting of grade II listed Bank Top Farmhouse and other nearby heritage assets (criterion ?).

Viability

The GMCA responses to PQ20 and PQ41 advise that the initial viability assessment concluded that the allocation was unviable. A sensitivity test was carried out where sales values were increased by 15% which the Council considers reasonable in the context of other developments and environmental improvements proposed nearby. This revised assessment also concluded that the site was unviable (negative residual value of -£70,000).

Q19.30. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Rosary Road allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 19.6 Is policy JPA15 Chew Brook Vale justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA15 relates to a site of 5 hectares which is currently in the Green Belt. It comprises a derelict mill complex in a rural location in the eastern part of the Borough close to the Peak District National Park. Around 90 homes are proposed along with commercial, leisure and retail facilities of up to 6,000 sqm to support tourism close to Dove Stone Reservoir. Access from the A635/A669 needs to be improved, including the crossing over Chew Brook.

The GMCA response to IN2 Statement of Common Ground for Allocations²⁶ advises that development is expected to start in 2026/27, with the new homes to be provided by 2030/31 and the commercial development completed by 2037.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Chew Brook Vale allocation is in Green Belt parcel TS02 that performs a strong role in:

- checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response indicates that development proposed in policy JPA15 would cause low-moderate harm to Green Belt purposes. This seems to be because the site makes a relatively limited contribution to purpose 3, and its degree of separation from the urban edge, relative to its size, together with the extent of development on the site, meaning that it does not contribute to preventing the sprawl of the large built-up area of Greater Manchester.

Q19.31. How would the development proposed in policy JPA15 on the Chew Brook Vale allocation affect each of the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q19.32. Would policy JPA15 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Chew Brook Vale allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q19.33. Would policy JPA15 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the Chew Brook Vale allocation from the Green Belt?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Chew Brook Vale allocation meets 2 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 1 – previously developed land (mill complex).
- Criterion 7 – capitalise on high end housing market area and diversify housing stock.

Q19.34. Is the Chew Brook Vale allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Flood risk

The GMCA response to PQ41 advises that the level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment indicates that 0.6 hectares (11%) of the site would be affected by the

²⁶ GMCA1.5

equivalent of flood zone 2 and 2.02 hectares of the site (38%) by the equivalent of flood zone 3. All of the 90 homes can be accommodated on land outside those areas.

Development requirements

Q19.35. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA15 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Chew Brook Vale allocation? In particular with regard to:

- a) Improved access off the A669/A635, including the crossing over Chew Brook (criterion 4).
- b) Impact on the landscape, including the Peak District National Park and Dove Stone Reservoir (criterion 6, 7 and 8).
- c) Impact on heritage assets (criterion 19).
- d) Impact on biodiversity (criteria 9 to 13).
- e) Approach to flood risk (criterion 21).

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the development proposed in policy JPA15 would not be viable due to site remediation and transport infrastructure costs. If flood risk issues could be addressed and additional dwellings accommodated, a development of 135 homes would be marginal although 150 homes may be needed (residual value of £2.2 million).

Q19.36. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Chew Brook Vale allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 19.7 Is policy JPA13 Bottom Field Farm justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA13 relates to a site of 1 hectare which is currently in the Green Belt. It comprises farm buildings located just outside the village of Woodhouses between Failsworth and Ashton under Lyne. Policy JPA13 proposes around 30 new homes.

The GMCA response to IN2 Statement of Common Ground for Allocations²⁷ advises that development is expected to start in 2025/26 and be completed in 2026/27.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Bottom Field Farm allocation is in Green Belt parcel OH48 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- moderate/strong role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- moderate role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

²⁷ GMCA1.5

The GMCA response indicates that development proposed in policy JPA13 would cause moderate harm to Green Belt purposes and that this could be mitigated by strengthening the boundary around the allocation.

Q19.37. How would the development proposed in policy JPA13 on the Bottom Field Farm allocation affect each of the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q19.38. Would policy JPA13 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Bottom Field Farm allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q19.39. Would policy JPA13 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the Bottom Field Farm allocation from the Green Belt?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Bottom Field Farm allocation meets 3 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 1 – previously developed land
- Criterion 5 – sites within or directly adjacent to the 10% most deprived Lower Super Output Areas in the Index of Multiple Deprivation.
- Criterion 7 – help to diversify the existing housing stock and enhance the housing mix in the area.

Q19.40. (a) Is the Bottom Field Farm allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development? (b) Is the site previously developed land as defined in the NPPF (which excludes land occupied by agricultural buildings)? (c) How would a development of around 30 homes on a site on the edge of Woodhouses village have a direct significant impact on delivering urban regeneration?

Development requirements

Q19.41. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA13 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Bottom Field Farm allocation? In particular, with regard to the impact on the landscape and heritage assets, including the setting of Woodhouses Conservation Area (criteria 4, 5, 14 and 15).

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the initial viability assessment found the development to be slightly unviable with residual value of -£50,000 when incorporating strategic transport costs. However, the council consider that the site is in a strong housing market and has the potential to deliver a range of high-quality housing in an appealing location. The sensitivity test (+10% sales value) found the site to be viable with a residual value of £410,000.

Q19.42. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Bottom Field Farm allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Matter 20: Allocations in Rochdale

There are seven sites allocated for development in Rochdale, all but two of which (JPA24 Roch Valley and JPA25 Trows Farm) are currently in the Green Belt.

Issue 20.1 Is policy JPA19 Bamford / Norden justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA19 relates to a site of 36 hectares, all of which are removed from the Green Belt. It is located on the western edge of Rochdale and comprises mainly agricultural land but also playing fields, a cricket ground and tennis courts. Around 450 new homes along with improved facilities to create a high quality recreational and sports hub are proposed.

Development is expected to take place in two phases, each consisting of 30-40 completions per year²⁸.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Bamford / Norden allocation is in Green Belt parcel RD37 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- strong role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- weak role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- no role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response indicates that development proposed in policy JPA19 would cause moderate harm to Green Belt purposes and that Jowkin Lane runs around the western edge of the site forming a defensible and permanent boundary.

Q20.1. How would the development proposed in policy JPA19 on the Bamford / Norden allocation affect each of the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q20.2. Would policy JPA19 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Bamford / Norden allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q20.3. Would policy JPA19 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the Bamford / Norden allocation from the Green Belt?

²⁸ Allocation Topic Paper 10.06.35.

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Bamford / Norden allocation meets site selection criterion 7 as it provides the opportunity to capitalise on an existing high end housing market area to deliver a type of housing which is in short supply across the borough and the conurbation as a whole.

Q20.4. Is the Bamford / Norden allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q20.5. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA19 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Bamford / Norden allocation? In particular, with regard to:

- a) Creation of a high quality recreational and sports hub serving the local area and Borough as a whole (criterion 2).
- b) Approach to archaeology, including requirements for geophysics, field walking, trial trenching and preservation in situ (criterion 4).
- c) Provision of access from Norden Road (criterion 5).
- d) Contribution to the potential extension of the proposed bus rapid transit service between Heywood and Manchester (criterion 7).

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability evidence shows that the proposed development would produce a residual land value of £5.8m which is sufficient to meet anticipated strategic transport costs (around £1.8m) meaning that it is expected to be viable.

Q20.6. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Bamford / Norden allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 20.2 Is policy JPA20 Castleton Sidings justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA20 relates to a site of 12 hectares, 5 of which are removed from the Green Belt. The western part of the site is retained in the Green Belt, whereas the eastern part is within the existing urban area. It comprises former railway sidings and is located on the south west edge of Rochdale a short distance to the north of the M62. Part of the Rochdale Canal Special Area of Conservation is a short distance to the east of the site.

Around 125 new homes space are proposed on the "eastern half" of the site, with the western part provided as an open space or nature conservation area. The north eastern part of the site would accommodate a temporary rail halt and associated parking to facilitate the extension of the East Lancashire Railway from Heywood to

Castleton and potentially a tram-train trial project. Paragraph 11.221 states that the halt will only be required until the legal procedures to extend the line under the Manchester Road Bridge to provide a connection with the Calder Valley main line are in place. Once the halt is not required the land will revert to a residential allocation.

Development is expected to be completed over a four year period²⁹.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 indicates that the Castleton Sidings allocation is in Green Belt parcel RD52 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- weak role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- no contribution to safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- no contribution to preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response indicates that development proposed in policy JPA20 would cause moderate harm to Green Belt purposes.

Q20.7. How would the development proposed in policy JPA20 on the Castleton Sidings allocation affect each of the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q20.8. (a) Is the inclusion of an area of Green Belt within the allocation boundary justified and consistent with national policy? (b) Would it be effective in providing an unambiguous policy for assessing potential future development proposals on that part of the allocation?

Q20.9. Would policy JPA20 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Castleton Sidings allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q20.10. Would policy JPA20 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the Castleton Sidings allocation from the Green Belt?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Castleton Sidings allocation meets 2 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 1 – previously developed land in a sustainable location.
- Criterion 7 – proposal is important to facilitate the extension of the East Lancashire Railway from Heywood to Castleton which will provide a convenient link between a heritage line and mainline passenger services at Castleton Station.

²⁹ Allocation Topic Paper 10.06.36.

Q20.11. Is the Castleton Sidings allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q20.12. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA20 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Castleton Sidings allocation? In particular, with regard to:

- a) Limiting built development to the "eastern half" of the site and providing open space or a nature conservation area on the "western part" (criterion 2).
- b) Accommodating a temporary rail halt and associated parking on the north eastern part of the site to facilitate the extension of the East Lancashire Railway from Heywood to Castleton and potentially a tram-train trial project (criterion 3).
- c) Provision of appropriate access in the scheme to maintenance and improvements to the extended East Lancashire Railway (criterion 5).
- d) Sustainable drainage strategy and surface water flooding (criterion 6).
- e) Provision of pedestrian and cycle links to the centre of Castleton, Castleton Bee Network scheme, nearby railway station, and employment locations around Heywood (criterion 7).
- f) Project specific Habitat Regulations Assessment (criterion 10).
- g) Landscaping and acoustic attenuation to mitigate the visual and noise impact of the railway (criterion 11).

Viability

The GMCA responses to PQ20 and PQ41 advise that the viability assessment shows that the development proposed in policy JPA20 would have a negative residual value of -£5.1m. The proposal could be made marginally viable with reduced affordable housing provision and if higher sales values were to be achieved which the Council considers realistic given the location and accessibility of the site.

Q20.13. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Castleton Sidings allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 20.3 Is policy JPA21 Crimble Mill justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA21 relates to a site of 17 hectares on the northern edge of Heywood. Most of the allocation is immediately south of the River Roch. The proposal involves the removal of 14 hectares from the Green Belt, mostly within the allocation but also All Souls Church of England Primary School to the south. The allocation includes the grade II* listed buildings at Crimble Mill, on the north side of the river, which would be retained in the Green Belt. Around 250 new homes are proposed, including within the Crimble Mill buildings.

Development is expected to be completed over a 7 year period³⁰.

Green Belt

The Crimble Mill complex which is within the allocation is retained in the Green Belt. The part of the allocation to the south of the river is in Green Belt parcel RD43 which the GMCA response to PQ20 advises serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- Moderate/strong role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- Strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- Moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- No contribution to preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response indicates that development proposed in policy JPA21 would cause high harm to Green Belt purposes. The impact on adjacent Green Belt would be minor due to the existing residential area to the south and the River Roch forming a strong northern boundary.

Q20.14. How would the development proposed in policy JPA21 on the Crimble Mill allocation affect each of the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q20.15. Would policy JPA21 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Crimble Mill allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q20.16. Would policy JPA21 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the Crimble Mill allocation from the Green Belt?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Crimble Mill allocation meets 2 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 5 – capitalise on high end housing market area and deliver a type of housing that is in short supply in Heywood and across the Borough
- Criterion 7 – secure the long term future of the grade II* listed mill buildings which are at immediate risk of further rapid deterioration or loss of fabric

Q20.17. (a) Is the Crimble Mill allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development? (b) How would the provision of higher value homes on a largely greenfield site on the northern edge of Heywood have a direct significant impact on delivering urban regeneration?

Flood risk

The GMCA response to PQ41 advises that around 30% of the site, including the existing mill building, is in flood zones 2 and 3. Around 60 homes are expected to be

³⁰ Allocation Topic Paper 10.06.37.

provided in and around the mill building, and a flood risk mitigation strategy has been prepared. The remaining homes can be accommodated on land outside flood zones 2 and 3.

Development requirements

Q20.18. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA21 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Crimble Mill allocation? In particular with regard to:

- a) Securing the long term future of the grade II* listed buildings through conversion to residential use (criteria 1 and 2).
- b) Protecting the setting of the grade II* listed buildings and the character and appearance of the wider area including Queens Park and the river valley (criteria 4 and 5).
- c) Vehicular access to the part of the allocation south of the river (criteria 6 and 7).
- d) Vehicular access to the converted Crimble Mill (criterion 8).
- e) Flood risk (criterion 8).
- f) Contributions (land and financial) to education provision (criterion 11).

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability assessment shows the development proposed in policy JPA21 to be unviable (negative residual value of -£10 million). The scheme would be marginally viable if higher development value is assumed along with a reduced contribution to education.

Q20.19. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Crimble Mill allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 20.4 Is policy JPA22 Land north of Smithy Bridge justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA22 relates to a site of 20 hectares, 18 of which are in the Green Belt. It is located on the north east edge of Smithy Bridge a short distance south of Littleborough. Around 300 new homes and a primary school are proposed on the site.

Residential development is taking place on adjoining land to the north. Hollingworth Lake Country Park is to the south, and part of the site is used as a visitor car park. Part of the Rochdale Canal Special Area of Conservation adjoins the north west boundary of the site, and the South Pennine Moors protected sites are a few kilometres to the east.

Development is expected to be completed over a 6 year period (50 homes per year)³¹.

³¹ Allocation Topic Paper 10.06.38.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Smithy Bridge allocation is in Green Belt parcel RD20 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- moderate role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- strong role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response indicates that development proposed in policy JPA22 would cause low to moderate harm to Green Belt purposes as the allocation is defined by strong physical features.

Q20.20. How would the development proposed in policy JPA22 on the Smithy Bridge allocation affect each of the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q20.21. Would policy JPA22 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Smithy Bridge allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q20.22. Would policy JPA22 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the Smithy Bridge allocation from the Green Belt?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Smithy Bridge allocation meets 2 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 1 – Littleborough and Smithy Bridge railway stations are both within walking distance as are high frequency bus services from Littleborough town centre
- Criterion 7 – deliverable site within an area with larger, higher value homes and strong market demand. Also, opportunity to deliver a new primary school to meet additional needs from the development but also in wider area.

Q20.23. Is the Smithy Bridge allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q20.24. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA22 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Smithy Bridge allocation? In particular with regard to:

- a) Project specific habitat regulations assessments for planning applications of 50 or more dwellings (criterion 9).
- b) Facilitating the delivery of a new primary school on the site, and a contributing to additional primary and secondary school places to meet demand arising from the development (criterion 10).

c) Providing a replacement visitor car park (criterion 11).

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability assessment shows the site to be unviable (negative residual value of -£4.2 million). A 10% increase in development value would make the site viable.

Q20.25. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Smithy Bridge allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 20.5 Is policy JPA23 Newhey Quarry justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA23 relates to a site of 15 hectares. 11 hectares are removed from the Green Belt, and two areas within the allocation are retained in the Green Belt. It is located on the north east edge of Newhey a short distance south of the M62 beyond which is Milnrow. Around 250 new homes and a public car park to serve the Newhey Metrolink stop are proposed on the site.

Development is expected to be completed over a 5 year period (50 homes per year)³².

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Newhey allocation is in Green Belt parcel RD40 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- Moderate/strong role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- Moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- Strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- Weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response indicates that development proposed in policy JPA23 would cause moderate/high harm to Green Belt purposes.

Q20.26. How would the development proposed in policy JPA23 on the Newhey Quarry allocation affect each of the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q20.27. (a) Is the inclusion of two areas of Green Belt within the allocation boundary justified and consistent with national policy? (b) Would it be effective in providing an unambiguous policy for assessing potential future development proposals on those parts of the allocation?

³² Allocation Topic Paper 10.06.39.

Q29.28. Would policy JPA23 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Newhey Quarry allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q20.29. Would policy JPA23 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the Newhey Quarry allocation from the Green Belt?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Newhey allocation meets site selection criteria 1 as it is previously developed land in a location well served by public transport.

Q20.30. Is the Newhey Quarry allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q20.31. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA23 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Newhey Quarry allocation? In particular with regard to:

- a) Reprofilling and landscaping the quarry face, including the effect on biodiversity (criteria 4 and 5).
- b) The setting of St Thomas Church and Bradley Farmhouse (criterion 6).
- c) Provision of a public car park (criterion 7).

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability assessment found the site to be viable (residual value of £7.1 million).

Q20.32. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Newhey Quarry allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 20.6 Is policy JPA24 Roch Valley justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA24 relates to a site of 14 hectares all of which is currently designated as Protected Open Land. It is on the southern edge of Littleborough with the River Roch running along the southern boundary. Around 200 new homes are proposed, mainly on the northern part of the site adjoining existing residential areas. The southern part of the site would be safeguarded to deliver flood alleviation benefits for the River Roch between Littleborough and Rochdale town centre. The layout of development should be designed to deliver the eastern section of a relief road

between Smithy Bridge Road (which adjoins the eastern boundary) and Albert Royds Street to the west.

Development is expected to be completed over a 6 year period (40 homes per year)³³.

Site location

As the Roch Valley allocation is not within the existing Green Belt, the site selection criteria were not applied.

Q20.33. Is the Roch Valley allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Flood risk

The GMCA response to PQ41 advises that around 17% of the site is in flood zones 2 and 3 but all of the development can be accommodated outside those areas.

Development requirements

Q20.34. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA24 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Roch Valley allocation? In particular with regard to:

- a) Safeguarding the southern part of the site to deliver flood alleviation benefits (criterion 3).
- b) Providing primary access from Smithy Bridge Road and financial contributions to mitigate impacts on the highway network, delivering the eastern section of a relief road between Smithy Bridge Road and Albert Royds Street (criteria 1, 8 and 9).

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the site is subject to a full planning application which is supported by viability evidence.

Q20.35. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Roch Valley allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 20.7 Is policy JPA25 Trows Farm justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA25 relates to a site of 21 hectares none of which are in the Green Belt. It is on the southern edge of Rochdale, bordered by residential and commercial uses in Castleton to the west and north, the A627(M) to the east, and M62 to the south.

³³ Allocation Topic Paper 10.06.40.

Around 550 new homes are proposed with primary access from Cowm Top Lane to the north.

Development is expected to take place on two parts of the site concurrently, each delivering around 30 homes per year. It is therefore expected to be completed over a 10 year period³⁴.

Site location

As the Trows Farm allocation is not within the existing Green Belt, the site selection criteria were not applied.

Q20.36. Is the Trows Farm allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q20.37. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA25 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Trows Farm allocation? In particular in relation to:

- a) Provision of higher value family housing (criterion 1).
- b) Masterplanning and use of design codes (criterion 2).
- c) Provision of walking and cycling routes to Castleton local centre and railway station (criterion 4).
- d) Project specific habitat regulations assessment (criterion 7).
- e) Archaeological evaluation in the form of geophysics, field walking and trial trenching (criterion 8).
- f) Financial contributions to mitigate impacts on the highway network (criterion 10).
- g) Noise and air quality mitigation along the M62 and A627(M) (criterion 11).
- h) Contributions to facilitate the expansion of existing schools or the provision of new school facilities (criterion 12).

Viability

The GMCA responses to PQ20 and PQ41 advise that the viability assessment shows the site to be unviable (negative residual value of -£22 million). If higher development values are achieved, and affordable housing provision and developer profit reduced, the scheme would be marginal. An outline application has been submitted which does not raise any viability issues.

Q20.38. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Trows Farm allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Matter 21: Allocations in Salford

³⁴ ??? Topic Paper.

There are four allocations within Salford, all of which are either fully or partially within the Green Belt.

Issue 21.1 Is policy JPA26 Land at Hazelhurst Farm justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

JPA26 relates to a site of around 16 hectares, all of which is Green Belt. The allocation proposes around 400 dwellings, with land to be set aside for additional primary school provision in certain circumstances. The site is located to the immediate south of the A580 East Lancashire Road. An additional 1 hectare of land outside the allocation is identified as being removed from the Green Belt.

The GMCA response to IN2 Statement of Common Ground for Allocations³⁵ advises that development is expected to start in 2025/26 and be completed by 2032/33.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Land at Hazelhurst Farm allocation is in Green Belt parcel SA18. This parcel serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- Strong role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- Moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- Weak role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- Weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that development proposed in policy JPA26 would cause low-moderate harm to Green Belt purposes, with no/negligible impact on adjacent Green Belt.

Q21.1. How would the development proposed in policy JPA26 on the Land at Hazelhurst Farm allocation affect each of the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q21.2. Would policy JPA26 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Land at Hazelhurst Farm allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q21.3. Would policy JPA26 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the Land at Hazelhurst Farm allocation from the Green Belt?

Q21.4. Is the removal of 1 hectare of Green Belt from outside the allocation justified and consistent with NPPF 140?

Site Location

³⁵ GMCA1.7

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Land at Hazelhurst Farm allocation meets criterion 1 of the 7 site selection criteria, which relates to land which is well served by public transport.

Q21.5. Is the Land at Hazelhurst Farm allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development Requirements

Q21.6. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA26 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Land at Hazelhurst Farm allocation? In particular:

- a) Scale of development
- b) Approach to masterplanning or SPD (criterion 1)
- c) Scale and provision of affordable housing, including requirement that some be directed towards off-site provision (criterion 2). Is it sufficiently clear to decision makers, developers and the local community how this requirement would be implemented?
- d) Delivering transport or other infrastructure necessary to mitigate the impact of development (criteria 3 and 4).
- e) Protection or enhancement of biodiversity assets (criteria 8 – 10)
- f) Approach to noise and air pollution (criterion 13)
- g) Requirement for the provision of new allotment plots (criterion 14)
- h) Setting aside land for additional primary school provision (criterion 15)
- i) Approach to the assessment and protection of archaeological remains

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that development of the site would be 'clearly viable', taking into account local transport mitigation measures and other requirements of the policy.

Q21.7. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Land at Hazelhurst Farm allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 21.2 Is policy JPA27 East of Boothstown justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

JPA27 relates to a site of around 30 hectares, all of which is within the Green Belt. The allocation proposes around 300 dwellings, with a requirement for allotment plots and a primary access from Occupation Road. The site is located to the east of Boothstown and is adjacent to the Royal Horticultural Society's Garden Bridgewater site. An area of 0.5 hectares of Green Belt is also identified for removal outside the allocation.

The GMCA response to IN2 Statement of Common Ground for Allocations³⁶ advises that development is expected to start in 2025/26 and be completed by 2034/35.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Land East of Boothstown allocation is in Green Belt parcel SA23 and SA25. These parcels serve the following Green Belt purposes:

- Strong (SA23) or moderate/strong (SA25) role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- Strong (SA23) or moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- Strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- Moderate (SA23) role or no contribution (SA25) in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that development proposed in policy JPA27 would cause a moderate level of harm to Green Belt purposes overall , with no/negligible impact on adjacent Green Belt.

Q21.8. How would the development proposed in policy JPA27 on the East of Boothstown allocation affect each of the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q21.9. Would policy JPA27 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the East of Boothstown allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q21.10. Would policy JPA27 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the East of Boothstown allocation from the Green Belt?

Q21.11. Is the removal of 0.5 hectares of Green Belt from outside the allocation justified and consistent with NPPF 140?

Site Location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the East of Boothstown allocation meets criterion 7 of the 7 site selection criteria, which refers to delivering significant local benefits by addressing a major local problem or issue.

Q21.12. (a) What is the significant local problem or issue that the delivery of this site will help resolve? (b) Is the East of Boothstown allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Flood risk

³⁶ GMCA1.7

The GMCA response to PQ41 states that the Level 2 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment indicates that 5.9 hectares (20%) of the site would be affected by the equivalent of flood zone 2 and 10.2 hectares (34%) in the equivalent of flood zone 3.

Q21.13. Has the site been selected in accordance with NPPF 161-165 with regard to the sequential approach to the location of development? Are criteria 6 and 7 justified, and would they be effective in ensuring development would not result in unacceptable risk of flooding, either on the site itself or elsewhere?

Development Requirements

Q21.14. Are the other development requirements set out in policy JPA27 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the East of Boothstown allocation? In particular:

- a) Scale and density of development;
- b) Approach to masterplanning or SPD (criterion 1)
- c) Scale and provision of affordable housing, including requirement that some be directed towards off-site provision (criterion 2). Is it sufficiently clear to decision makers, developers and the local community how this requirement would be implemented?
- d) Protection or enhancement of biodiversity assets (criteria 3, 4, 5, 8, 9)
- e) Requirement for the provision of new green infrastructure, including footpaths and allotments (criteria 12, 13, 14)
- f) Approach to noise (criterion 17) and air pollution
- g) Delivering transport or other infrastructure necessary to mitigate the impact of development (criteria 10, 11, 16)).
- h) Protection of heritage assets (criteria 18 and 19)

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that development of the site would be 'clearly viable', taking into account local transport mitigation measures and other requirements of the policy.

Q21.15. Is there a reasonable prospect that the East of Boothstown allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 21.3 Is policy JPA28 North of Irlam Station justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

JPA28 relates to a site of around 30 hectares, 29 hectares of which are within the Green Belt. A further 7.7 hectares of land currently in Green Belt outside the allocation are also identified to be removed as a consequence of this allocation. The allocation proposes around 800 dwellings, with associated social and community uses.

The GMCA response to IN2 Statement of Common Ground for Allocations³⁷ advises that development is expected to start in 2026/27 and be completed by 2033/34.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the North of Irlam allocation is in Green Belt parcel SA33 and SA34 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- Strong (SA33) or moderate (SA34) role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- Moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- Moderate (SA33) or weak (SA34) role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- No contribution to the role of preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that development proposed in policy JPA28 would cause a moderate level of harm to Green Belt purposes overall , with a negligible impact on adjacent Green Belt.

Q21.16. How would the development proposed in policy JPA28 on the North of Irlam Station allocation affect each of the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q21.17. Would policy JPA28 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the North of Irlam Station allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q21.18. Would policy JPA28 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the North of Irlam Station allocation from the Green Belt?

Q21.19. Is the removal of 7.7 hectares of Green Belt from outside the allocation justified and consistent with NPPF 140?

Site Location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the North of Irlam Station allocation meets criterion 1 of the 7 site selection criteria, which refers to the site being well related to public transport.

Q21.20. Is the North of Irlam Station allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development Requirements

³⁷ GMCA1.7

Q21.21. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA28 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the North of Irlam Station allocation? In particular:

- a) Scale and density of development;
- b) Approach to masterplanning or SPD and delivery strategy (criteria 1 and 2)
- c) Scale and provision of affordable housing (criterion 4).
- d) Protection or enhancement of biodiversity assets (criteria 5, 10, 11, 12 and 15).
- e) Requiring Habitats Regulation Assessment for applications of over 50 dwellings (criterion 13)
- f) Requirement for the provision of new green infrastructure, including allotments (criteria 16 and 17)
- g) Setting aside land for additional primary school provision (criterion 19)
- h) Approach to noise (criterion 18) and air pollution.

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that development of the site would be viable, taking into account local transport mitigation measures, ground conditions and other requirements of the policy.

Q21.22. Is there a reasonable prospect that the North of Irlam Station allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 21.4 Is policy JPA29 Port Salford Extension justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

JPA29 relates to a site of around 109 hectares, all of which are within the Green Belt. A further 15.6 hectares of land are also identified to be removed from the Green Belt as a consequence of this allocation. The allocation proposes around 320,000 sqm of employment land, with a strong focus on logistics but also manufacturing. The site is located between the A57 Liverpool Road and M62 motorway.

The GMCA response to IN2 Statement of Common Ground for Allocations³⁸ advises that development is expected to start in 2030/31 and be completed by 2035/36.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Port Salford Extension allocation is in Green Belt parcel SA29, SA30 and SA32. These parcels serve the following Green Belt purposes:

- Strong/weak (SA29) or strong/moderate (SA30) or strong (SA32) role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- Moderate (SA30, SA32) or weak (SA29) role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging

³⁸ GMCA1.7

- Strong (SA30), moderate (SA32) or weak (SA29) role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- No contribution to the role of preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that development proposed in policy JPA29 would cause a moderate level of harm to Green Belt purposes overall , with no/ negligible impact on adjacent Green Belt.

Q21.23. How would the development proposed in policy JPA29 on the Port Salford allocation affect each of the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q21.24. Would policy JPA29 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Port Salford Extension allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q21.25. Would policy JPA29 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the Port Salford Extension allocation from the Green Belt?

Q21.26. Is the removal of 15.6 hectares of Green Belt from outside the allocation justified and consistent with NPPF 140?

Site Location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Port of Salford Extension allocation meets 3 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 2 – land that is able to take advantage of the key assets and opportunities that genuinely distinguish Greater Manchester from its competitors;
- Criterion 5 - land which would have a direct significant impact on delivering urban regeneration.
- Criterion 6 – land where transport investment (by the developer) and the creation of significant new demand (through appropriate development densities) would support the delivery of long-term viable sustainable travel options and delivers significant community benefits.

Q21.27. Is the Port of Salford Extension allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development Requirements

Policy JP-Strat4 states that the overall facility will provide around 500,000 sqm of employment floorspace. The GMCA response to PQ52 confirms that 150,000 sqm of floorspace are already committed. It also advises that there would be no need for the Salford Local Plan to allocate any additional land. JPA29 proposes around 320,000 sqm of employment floorspace. With commitments, this would provide around 470,000 sqm of employment floorspace.

Q21.28. Is the scale and type of development proposed by policy JPA29 justified and would policy JPA29 be effective in achieving the objectives of policy JP-Strat4?

Q21.29. Are the other development requirements set out in policy JPA29 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Port Salford Extension allocation? In particular:

- a) Approach to masterplanning or SPD and community liaison (criteria 1 and 2)
- b) Approach to phasing (criterion 3)
- c) Delivering transport or other infrastructure necessary to mitigate the transport impact of development (criteria 5-8)
- d) Conserving and where appropriate enhancing the significance of designated and undesignated heritage assets (criterion 10)
- e) Justifying and providing compensation for the loss of the golf course (criterion 11)
- f) Protection or enhancement of biodiversity assets (criteria 13 - 15).
- g) Requiring Habitats Regulation Assessment for applications of over 1000 sqm (criterion 16)

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ42 advises that the viability assessment resulted in a negative residual value of £132m and that development would not be viable without public subsidy.

Q21.30. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Port Salford Extension allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Matter 22: Allocations in Tameside

There are 3 allocations in Tameside, all of which are either fully or partially in the Green Belt.

Issue 22.1 Is policy JPA30 Ashton Moss West justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

JPA30 relates to a site of around 58 hectares, all of which are within the Green Belt. The allocation proposes around 160,000 sqm of employment land, primarily within the research and development, light industrial and general industrial uses.

The GMCA response to IN2 Statement of Common Ground for Allocations³⁹ advises that development is expected to be completed by 2037.

Green Belt

³⁹ GMCA1.8

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Ashton Moss West allocation is in Green Belt parcel TS30. This parcel serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- Moderate/strong role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- Strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- Weak role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- Weak contribution to the role of preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that development proposed in policy JPA30 would cause low-moderate to 21.8 hectares of the allocation moderate harm to the remainder.

Q22.1. How would the development proposed in policy JPA30 on the Ashton Moss West allocation affect each of the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q22.2. Would policy JPA30 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Ashton Moss West allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q22.3. Would policy JPA30 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the Ashton Moss West allocation from the Green Belt?

Site Location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Ashton Moss West allocation meets 2 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 1 – land which has been previously developed land and/or is well served by public transport;
- Criterion 4 – land within 800 metres of a main town centre boundary or 800 metres from the other town centres' centroids.

Q22.4. Is the Ashton Moss West allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development Requirements

Q22.5. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA30 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Ashton Moss West allocation? In particular:

- a) Scale and type of development (criterion 1)
- b) Approach to masterplanning (criterion 2)
- c) Delivering transport or other infrastructure necessary to mitigate the transport impact of development (criteria 8, 10, 11 and 13)
- d) The effect on heritage and archaeological asset (criteria 4 and 7)
- e) Protection and enhancement of ecological features (criterion 14)
- f) Setting aside land for public open spaces (criterion 18)

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability evidence shows development of the site would have a positive residual value of circa £13m. This would be sufficient to meet the strategic transport costs of circa £3m and thus the development would be viable.

Q22.6. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Ashton Moss West allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 22.2 Is policy JPA31 Godley Green Garden Village justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

JPA31 relates to a site of around 124 hectares, all of which are within the Green Belt. The allocation proposes around 2,350 dwellings in two connected villages, each with a local hub. Access to the site is intended to be from the A560 Mottram Old Road. The GMCA response to IN2 Statement of Common Ground for Allocations⁴⁰ advises that around 1,116 dwellings will be completed in the plan period.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Godley Green Garden Village allocation is in Green Belt parcel TS58. This parcel serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- Strong/moderate role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- Moderate role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- Strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- No contribution to the role of preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that harm from the release of the allocation from the Green Belt would be high in overall terms.

Q22.7. How would the development proposed in policy JPA31 on the Godley Green Garden Village allocation affect each of the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q22.8. Would policy JPA31 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the Godley Green Garden Village allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

⁴⁰ GMCA1.8

Q22.9. Would policy JPA31 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the Godley Green Garden Village allocation from the Green Belt?

Site Location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the Godley Green Garden Village allocation meets 3 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 1 – land which has been previously developed land and/or is well served by public transport;
- Criterion 5 – land which would have a direct impact on delivering urban regeneration
- Criterion 6 - land where transport investment (by the developer) and the creation of significant new demand (through appropriated development densities) would support the delivery of long-term viable sustainable travel options and delivers significant wider community benefits

Q22.10. Is the Godley Green Garden Village allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development Requirements

Paragraph 11.287 states that older persons housing and plots for custom and self-build will feature as important elements of the housing mix and that some of these should be affordable to those on lower and middle incomes seeking this type of opportunity. Criterion 2 of policy JPA31 requires the delivery of homes across a range of types and tenures in accordance with the Council's most up-to-date Housing Needs Assessment.

Q22.11. Are the requirements of paragraph 11.287 justified? Is policy JPA31 clear and unambiguous with regard to the number of new homes that should be provided for older persons, plots for custom and self-build or the proportion of these that should be affordable to those on lower and middle incomes? Is the policy effective in this regard?

Q22.12. Are the other development requirements set out in policy JPA31 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Godley Green Garden Village allocation? In particular:

- a) Scale and density of development (criteria 1 and 10)
- b) Delivering homes across a range of types and tenures in accordance with the most up-to-date Housing Needs Assessment (criterion 2)
- c) Enshrining Garden City Principles (criterion 3)
- d) Approach to masterplanning (criterion 4)
- e) Establishment of local hubs, including scale and mix of uses (criterion 9)
- f) Delivering transport or other infrastructure necessary to mitigate the transport impact of development (criteria 11 and 14)
- g) Financial contributions toward education, health and other infrastructure (criterion 11)

- h) Setting aside land for additional primary school provision (criterion 13)
- i) Protection of biodiversity assets, including the Werneth Brook and Brookfold Wood Sites of Biological Importance (criteria 21 and 22)
- j) Setting aside land for public open spaces (criterion 24)

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability evidence shows development of the site would have a positive residual value of circa £10m once development costs have been taken into account. Accordingly, it advises that the site would be viable.

Q22.13. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Godley Green Garden Village allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 22.3 Is policy JPA32 South of Hyde justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

JPA31 relates to a site of around 33 hectares, 32 of which are within the Green Belt. The allocation proposes around 440 dwellings. The allocation also requires the delivery of the restoration and long-term future use of the Grade II* listed Apethorn Farmhouse and complex within an early phase of development. The allocation is made up of two separate parcels of land, with access to each intended to be taken from A560 Stockport Road.

The GMCA response to IN2 Statement of Common Ground for Allocations⁴¹ advises that all 440 dwellings will be completed in the plan period.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the South of Hyde allocation is in Green Belt parcel SP09. This parcel serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- Strong role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- Strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- Strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- Weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that harm to the Green Belt would be moderate-high (9.4 hectares), moderate (17.3 hectares), low-moderate (3.7 hectares) and very low (2 hectares).

Q22.14. How would the development proposed in policy JPA32 on the South of Hyde allocation affect each of the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

⁴¹ GMCA1.8

Q22.15. Would policy JPA32 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the South of Hyde allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q22.16. Would policy JPA32 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the South of Hyde allocation from the Green Belt?

Site Location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the South of Hyde allocation meets 1 of the 7 site selection criteria, namely criterion 7. This relates to land which delivers significant local benefits by addressing a major local problem/issue. In this case, the development would allow for the re-use and enhancement of at-risk heritage assets.

Q22.17. (a) Is the South of Hyde allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development? (b) What are the specific practical or viability issues relating to the restoration and re-use of the Grade II* Apethorn farmhouse and complex which justify the release of land in the Green Belt?

Development Requirements

Paragraph 11.306 states that older persons housing and plots for custom and self-build will feature as important elements of the housing mix and that some of these should be affordable to those on lower and middle incomes seeking this type of opportunity. Criterion 2 of policy JPA32 requires the delivery of homes across a range of types and tenures in accordance with the Council's most up-to-date Housing Needs Assessment.

Q22.18. Are the requirements of paragraph 11.306 justified? Is policy JPA32 clear and unambiguous with regard to the number of new homes that should be provided for older persons, plots for custom and self-build or the proportion of these that should be affordable to those on lower and middle incomes? Is the policy effective in this regard?

Q22.19. Are the other development requirements set out in policy JPA31 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the South of Hyde allocation? In particular:

- a) Scale and density of development (criteria 1 and 9)
- b) Delivering homes across a range of types and tenures in accordance with the most up-to-date Housing Needs Assessment (criterion 2)
- c) Enshrining Garden City Principles (criterion 3)
- d) Approach to masterplanning (criterion 4)
- e) Sustaining, enhancing and restoring heritage assets (criteria 10, 11 and 12)
- f) Delivering transport or other infrastructure necessary to mitigate the transport impact of development (criteria 13 and 15)
- g) Financial contributions toward education, health and other infrastructure (criterion 13)

- h) Protection of biodiversity assets, including the Pole Bank Site of Biological Importance (criteria 20 and 21)
- i) Setting aside land for public open spaces (criterion 23)

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability evidence shows development of the site would have a positive residual value of circa £25.5m once development costs have been taken into account. Accordingly, it advises that the development would be viable.

Q22.20. Is there a reasonable prospect that the South of Hyde allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Matter 23: Allocations in Trafford

There is one allocation wholly within Trafford. It includes land that is currently within the Green Belt.

Issue 23.1 Is policy JPA33 New Carrington justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

JPA33 relates to a site of around 1,154 hectares, 564 of which are within the Green Belt. The allocation would result in the release of 169 hectares of Green Belt, with a further 395 hectares retained within the allocation. The allocation proposes around 5,000 dwellings, 350,000 sqm of employment floorspace and 2,500 sqm of community facilities. The allocation requires a minimum of 15% affordable housing and contributions toward transport and other infrastructure to serve the development.

The GMCA response to IN2 Statement of Common Ground for Allocations⁴² advises that development will be expected to start in 2020/21 with overall completion in 2040/41. 4,300 of the 5,000 dwellings and all of the employment land is expected to be delivered in the plan period.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that parts of the New Carrington allocation are in Green Belt parcels TF26, TF29, TF33, TF34, TF35. These parcels serve the following Green Belt purposes:

- Strong role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- Moderate (TF33, TF34, TF35) or weak (TF26, TF29) role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- Moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

⁴² GMCA1.9

- No contribution to the role of preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that development would result in very high (30 hectares), high (30.7 hectares), moderate-high (90.9 hectares) or moderate (17.9 hectare) harm to the Green Belt.

Q23.1. How would the development proposed in policy JPA33 on the New Carrington allocation affect the Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q23.2. (a) Is the inclusion of two areas of Green Belt (total around 395 hectares) within the allocation boundary justified and consistent with national policy? (b) Would it be effective in providing an unambiguous policy for assessing potential future development proposals in those two areas?

Q23.3. Would policy JPA33 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the New Carrington allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q23.4. Would policy JPA33 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing the New Carrington allocation from the Green Belt?

Site Location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the New Carrington allocation meets 6 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 1 – land which has been previously developed land and/or is well served by public transport. In this case, the site includes a former industrial area which is previously developed.
- Criterion 2 – land that is able to take advantage of the key assets and opportunities that genuinely distinguish Greater Manchester from its competitors. In this case, the allocation is close to Port Salford
- Criterion 3 – land that can maximise existing economic opportunities which have significant capacity to deliver transformational change and/or boost competitiveness and connectivity of Greater Manchester and genuinely deliver inclusive growth. In this case, Carrington is identified as a strategically important location which has the capacity to deliver transformational change.
- Criterion 5 – land which would have a direct impact on delivering urban regeneration. In this case, the development has the potential to deliver socio-economic benefits to Carrington, Partington and Sale West.
- Criterion 6 - land where transport investment (by the developer) and the creation of significant new demand (through appropriated development densities) would support the delivery of long-term viable sustainable travel options and delivers significant wider community benefits. In this case, the scale of development has the potential to bring new transport links and improve viability of community services and facilities.

- Criterion 7 - land which delivers significant local benefits by addressing a major local problem/issue. In this case, the allocation offers an opportunity to deliver a site of substantial scale for housing and employment.

Q23.5. Is the New Carrington allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development Requirements

Q23.6. What is the purpose of the area identified as 'Local Plan' on Picture 11.48? Is the policy clear and unambiguous as to what is expected in this area?

Criterion 4 states that development must demonstrate how the constraints on land to the west of Warburton Lane be accommodated and how the site will meet the requirements of criteria i. and ii. It goes on to state that proposals which do not address these constraints will not be accepted. Paragraph 11.324 states that some areas of the site have particularly high sensitivity and will require additional work to be undertaken in advance of any planning application to ensure impacts can be satisfactorily addressed.

Q23.7. (a) How have the effects of development on heritage assets on land to the west of Warburton Road been considered as part of the site allocation process? Is the allocation justified on this basis? (b) Is criterion 4 consistent with national policy on proposals affecting heritage assets and will it be effective in ensuring development does not have an unacceptable impact?

Criterion 7 states that development will provide a minimum of 15% affordable housing. It goes on to state that the New Carrington Masterplan/SPD and the Trafford Local Plan will provide additional guidance on appropriate affordable housing contributions for each of the Character Areas?

Q23.8. What is the purpose of the final sentence of criterion 7 and the New Carrington/Masterplan/SPD and Trafford Local Plan providing additional guidance on appropriate housing contributions for each Character Area? Is it intended that these could depart from the 15% minimum set out in the policy? Is the criterion clear and unambiguous about what level and type of affordable housing will be sought from the development?

Q23.9. Are the other development requirements set out in policy JPA33 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the New Carrington allocation? In particular:

- a) Scale and density of development (criteria 2, 6, 9 and 21)
- b) Approach to masterplanning and/or SPD (criterion 1)
- c) Delivery of different house types (criterion 5)
- d) Approach to phasing (criterion 12)
- e) Financial contributions to infrastructure delivery, including operation of the 'equalisation mechanism' (criterion 13)

- f) Delivering transport or other infrastructure necessary to mitigate the transport impact of development (criteria 14 - 20)
- g) Provision of local and neighbourhood centre, including scale and mix of uses (criteria 21 and 22)
- h) Provision and contribution to provision of additional primary and secondary school places and health facilities (criteria 23 and 24)
- i) Protection and enhancement of green infrastructure, including the areas at Sale West that are identified as being protected (criteria 28-31). What is the justification for protecting these areas?
- j) Protection of biodiversity assets, including the Brookheys Covert Site of Special Scientific Interest and local Sites of Biological Importance and project specific habitat regulations assessment (criteria 32-36).
- k) Landscape character and design, including the conserving and enhancing the setting of the Dunham Massey estate and Warburton Deer Park and the provision of substantial landscape buffers and (criteria 37-39)
- l) Conserving and enhancing the historic environment and positively conserving archaeological features (criteria 43 and 44)

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability evidence demonstrated the site is viable with a 15% affordable housing contribution and a 15% uplift in market values.

Q23.10. Is there a reasonable prospect that the New Carrington allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Matter 24: Allocations in Wigan

There are four sites allocated for development in Wigan, three are in the Green Belt.

Issue 24.1 Is policy JPA34 M6 Junction 25 justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA34 relates to a site of 64.51 hectares, all of which is in the Green Belt but with 1.97 hectares to be retained as such. Located to the north of the M6 spur road at Junction 25 and west of A49 Warrington Road. The main access into the site will be from an additional arm on the existing A49/M6 roundabout (Bryn interchange).

The site was previously mined but has been reclaimed and is predominantly arable farmland. There are two existing vehicular accesses to the site - Brocstedes Road to the south, which extends northwards into the site; and a private agricultural road (High Brooks) located to the north of the A49 Warrington Road roundabout (Bryn Interchange) to the east of the site. This road extends to the west across the northern boundary of the site towards the Cranberry Lea Farm complex. A number of Public Rights of Way are located on the site, mostly within the northern and western areas, and there are fishing ponds to the south adjoining the M6 spur road.

The site has hybrid planning permission in June 2021 for 133,966 sqm of storage and distribution floorspace on most of the site, comprising 27,871 sqm with full planning permission, and up to 106,095 sq. m with outline planning permission.

The GMCA advises that development is expected to start in 2022 and be completed 2028/2029⁴³.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the M6 Junction 25 allocation is in Green Belt parcel WG_BA05 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- moderate role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- weak role in preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response indicates that the proposed development would cause very high harm to Green Belt purposes.

Q24.1. How would the development proposed in policy JPA34 on the M6 Junction 25 allocation affect each of the five Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q24.2. Would policy JPA34 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the M6 Junction 25 allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q24.3. Would policy JPA34 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing 62.54 hectares from the Green Belt as part of the M6 Junction 25 allocation?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the M6 Junction 25 allocation meets 2 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 3 – the site is large, relatively unconstrained and directly accessible to the M6, where there is a high demand for logistics and manufacturing activity, which should make the site attractive to the market.

Q24.4. Is the M6 Junction 25 allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q24.5. Does the location of part of the site within a designated Air Quality Management Area mean that the Plan needs to be modified and, if so, how?

⁴³ GMCA1.10

Q24.6. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA34 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the M6 Junction 25 allocation? In particular with regard to:

- a) A comprehensive masterplan, phasing and infrastructure (criterion 1).
- b) The allocation of B2 and B8 floorspace (criterion 2)
- c) Access from the M6 and A49, and provision of an all-ways junction at M6 Junction 25 (criteria 3 and 9)⁴⁴
- d) Provision of an internal road connection with Wheatlea Industrial Estate (criterion 7)

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability assessment found the site to be viable.

Q24.7. Is there a reasonable prospect that the M6 Junction 25 allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 24.2 Is policy JPA35 North of Mosely Common justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA35 relates to a site of 61.26 hectares, all of which is in the Green Belt. It is predominantly greenfield in nature. The busway runs through the site splitting it into northern and southern areas. The majority of the site is not identified as best and most versatile agricultural land, but there are two small, isolated areas of Grade 3a agricultural land in the northern area.

The GMCA advises that development is expected to start in 2024 and be completed 2037⁴⁵.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the North of Mosely Common allocation is in Green Belt parcel WG080 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- Strong role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- Strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- Strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- Strong role in contributing to preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response indicates that the 19.4 hectares of the proposed development would cause high harm to Green Belt purposes, 26.5 hectares high-moderate harm and 15.2 hectares moderate-low harm.

⁴⁴ GMCA to clarify what this is intended to mean.

⁴⁵ GMCA1.10

Q24.8. How would the development proposed in policy JPA35 on the North of Mosely Common allocation affect each of the five Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q24.9. Would policy JPA35 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the North of Mosely Common allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q24.10. Would policy JPA35 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing 61.26 hectares from the Green Belt as part of the North of Mosely Common allocation?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the North of Mosely Common allocation meets 2 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 1 – This site is well served by public transport because the Guided Busway runs through the site providing direct and fast public transport access to employment, leisure and retail services in Manchester City Centre and local services in Leigh.
- Criterion 6 – There is potential to provide an additional stop on the Busway to serve the site and for contributions to be made towards increasing the busway capacity at peak times, which will help to support viable sustainable travel.

Q24.11. Is the North of Mosely Common allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q24.12. Does the presence of some areas of higher value habitats within the site mean that the Plan needs to be modified and, if so, how?

Q24.13. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA35 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the North of Mosely Common allocation? In particular with regard to:

- a) A comprehensive masterplan, phasing and infrastructure (criterion 1).
- b) Provision of bus stops on the Guided Busways and the role of Transport for Greater Manchester (criteria 3 and 4)
- c) Road accesses to the site including the requirement for a choice of access points in the north and south of the site (criterion 4)
- d) Highway capacity improvements (criterion 5)
- e) Provision of primary education facilities (criterion 8)
- f) Flood risk and the protection and enhancement of Honksford Brook (criterion 9)
- g) Landscaping (criterion 10)

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability assessment found the site including all necessary mitigation, is viable.

Q24.14. Is there a reasonable prospect that the North of Mosely Common allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 24.3 Is policy JPA36 Pocket Nook justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA36 relates to a site of 44.78 hectares, none of which is in the Green Belt. It is a greenfield site in an urban fringe location and predominantly consists of farmland, farmsteads and ponds. In September 2013, the site was designated as part of a broad location for new development in Golborne and Lowton for approximately 1,000 new homes in Policy SP4 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy. As at July 2021, around 1,300 homes have been approved elsewhere within the broad location, outside of the proposed site allocation.

The GMCA advises that development of 600 homes and 15,000 sqm of employment floorspace is expected to start in 2026 and be completed 2035⁴⁶.

Site location

As the Pocket Nook allocation is not within the existing Green Belt, the site selection criteria were not applied.

Q24.15. Is the Pocket Nook allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q24.16. Does the presence of Flood Zones 2 and 3 in the northern part of the site mean that the Plan needs to be modified and, if so, how?

Q24.17. Does the location of the site adjacent to the A580 Air Quality Management Area mean that the Plan needs to be modified and, if so, how?

Q24.18. Does the location of the eastern part of site within the Class E Zone of the Glazebury Notifiable Installation mean that the Plan needs to be modified and, if so, how?

Q24.19. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA36 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the Pocket Nook allocation? In particular with regard to:

⁴⁶ GMCA1.10

- a) A comprehensive masterplan, phasing and infrastructure (criterion 1).
- b) Safeguarding of the land for HS2 and a new through road including a new bridge over HS2 (criteria 2 and 5)
- c) Provision of access for pedestrians and cyclists including to Lowton (criterion 6)
- d) Protection and enhancement of Carr Brook (criterion 7)
- e) Retention and enhancement of heritage setting for Fair House Farmhouse Grade II listed building (criterion 9).

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the sensitivity test produces a viable scheme at Pocket Nook, but when strategic transport costs are included, the scheme is shown to be marginal and that the HS2 proposals will inevitably influence the delivery of the western part of the site.

Q24.20. Is there a reasonable prospect that the Pocket Nook allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

Issue 24.4 Is policy JPA37 West of Gibfield justified and consistent with national policy, and would it be effective in achieving sustainable development?

Policy JPA37 relates to a site of 45.46 hectares and 3.6 hectares outside of the boundary, all of which is in the Green Belt. 25.36 hectares would remain in the Green Belt as a country park.

The site is to the west of Atherton adjacent to the established Gibfield Park employment area on the edge of the borough boundary with Bolton. The main access to the site is along Gibfield Park Way which runs north-south through the allocation connecting into the A577 Wigan Road and A579 Atherleigh Way to the south and into Gibfield Park Drive to the east. The urban area of Westhoughton in Bolton lies to the west separated from the allocation by Green Belt. The Atherton rail line runs east-west to the north of the allocation. The GMSF Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessment identifies the site as reclaimed land / wetlands reflecting the historic use of this area for mineral extraction.

The GMCA advises that development of 500 homes and 45,500 sqm of employment floorspace is expected to start in 2026 and be completed 2034⁴⁷.

Green Belt

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the West of Gibfield allocation is in Green Belt parcel BT65 that serves the following Green Belt purposes:

- Strong role in checking the unrestricted sprawl of the large built-up area
- Strong role in preventing neighbouring towns from merging
- Strong role in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment

⁴⁷ GMCA1.10

- Strong role in contributing to preserving the setting and special character of historic towns

The GMCA response indicates that the 10 hectares of the proposed development would cause very high harm to Green Belt purposes, 5.4 hectares high-moderate harm and 30.1 hectares moderate harm.

Q24.21. How would the development proposed in policy JPA37 on the West of Gibfield allocation affect each of the five Green Belt purposes set out in NPPF 138?

Q24.22. Would policy JPA37 be effective in ensuring that the proposed Green Belt boundaries around the West of Gibfield allocation are clearly defined using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent?

Q24.23. Would policy JPA37 be effective in securing compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land to offset the impact of removing 61.26 hectares from the Green Belt as part of the West of Gibfield allocation?

Q24.24. Is the removal of 3.6 hectares of Green Belt from outside the allocation justified and consistent with NPPF 140?

Site location

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the West of Gibfield allocation meets 3 of the 7 site selection criteria:

- Criterion 3 – this site forms a key component of the Wigan-Bolton Growth Corridor, as set out in Policy GM-Strat 8, as it will deliver high quality residential and economic development, and green infrastructure.
- Criterion 6 - whilst the site, in isolation, will not generate additional significant transport investment or the creation of sufficient demand to justify additional transport services, it would contribute cumulatively to the case for such improvements, such as the conversion of the rail line to tram-train use, as identified as an aspiration in TfGM's 2040 Delivery Plan.
- Criterion 7 - the delivery of a high-quality housing offer in this relatively deprived part of the sub-region would deliver significant local benefits by diversifying the local housing market, contributing to the competitiveness of the north.

Q24.25. Is the West of Gibfield allocation suitably located, having regard to the Plan's spatial strategy and the national policy aim of promoting a sustainable pattern of development?

Development requirements

Q24.26. Notwithstanding criterion 9 of JPA37, does the presence of some areas of high value habitats including the SBI within the site mean that the Plan needs to be modified and, if so, how?

Q24.27. Are the development requirements set out in policy JPA37 consistent with national policy and justified, and would they be effective in securing sustainable development on the West of Gibfield allocation? In particular with regard to:

- a) A comprehensive masterplan, phasing and infrastructure (criterion 1).
- b) The location of employment development within the site (criterion 3)
- c) Safeguarding land for a continuation of Gibfield Park Way including the GMCA's proposed Main Modification (criterion 4)
- d) Proposed highway improvement measures (criterion 5)
- e) Provision of a green infrastructure corridor and country park (criterion 6)
- f) The effect on Great Crested Newts (criterion 9)

Viability

The GMCA response to PQ20 advises that the viability assessment found the site to be marginally viable and should be monitored.

Q24.28. Is there a reasonable prospect that the West of Gibfield allocation could be viably developed at the point envisaged?

End of IN10 Annex 2