

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/

IN27 Action Points from week 7 hearing sessions: site allocations

Introduction

Further to the discussions at the hearing sessions in week 7 relating to some of the site allocations, the following actions are required by GMCA. We consider these to be necessary at this stage of the examination to inform our consideration of whether the Plan is sound and/or how it could be made sound by main modifications.

Our ultimate conclusions on whether each of the allocations in the Plan is justified will depend on our consideration of a range of matters including those relating to the amount of development needed, the spatial strategy and Green Belt, as well as site specific issues. We may, therefore, decide in due course that other or different main modifications are required, including to the parts of the Plan that we refer to below. Reasons for any modifications that we do ultimately decide are necessary will be set out in our final report.

We have described each of the modifications in relation to the wording set out in the submitted Plan¹. Some may supersede, or require alterations to, modifications proposed earlier in the examination. We have sought to make this clear where appropriate. Consequential modifications may also be required to other parts of the Plan. We will advise later in the examination when these should be identified comprehensively by GMCA.

These action points seek to reflect the general approach to modifying the allocation policies set out in our note published on 23 January 2023², and take account of the suggested changes proposed by GMCA³ and the discussions at the relevant hearing sessions. If GMCA consider it essential to make changes to parts of the policy that we have not referred to these can be included in the response for our consideration.

¹ SD1.

² IN23.

³ PMM3, GMCA33 and GMCA44 to GMCA8.

Where changes are required to various parts of an allocation policy, they should be as a single main modification. This should include the whole policy as set out in the submitted Plan with the changes identified in the usual way using strikethrough and underlining. Consequential modifications will also be required to the reasoned justification and these should be set out as (a) separate main modification(s) (unless they are considered to be minor additional modifications).

Where appropriate, GMCA may wish to liaise with relevant representor(s) if they consider this would help to inform their response to a particular action point, for example Historic England about potential modifications to policies relating to the historic environment.

The GMCA responses to the action points in this note should be submitted to the Programme Officer by **midday on Friday 24 February 2023** unless otherwise indicated.

JPA19 Bamford and Norden

AP113. GMCA to draft a modification to policy JPA19 to include:

- Reference to affordable homes in part 1 (based on GMCA44).
- Clarification in part 2 that the residential development will be required to provide contributions towards the improvement of existing sport and recreation facilities on the site (based on GMCA44), and that existing public rights of way along with new routes for active travel should be incorporated into a high quality integrated green infrastructure network that links to existing public rights of way in the countryside to the west and north west of the site (and consequential deletion of part 12 and the reference in part 9 to links/routes to the wider countryside).
- Retention of part 5 to clarify that vehicular access is to be provided from Norden Road.
- Deletion of parts 6, 7 and 8 and replacement with reference to making provision for other new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure having regard to the indicative transport interventions set out in Appendix D in accordance with policy JP-C7.
- Consideration of whether part 9 should refer to the need to reflect and respond to the special qualities and sensitivities of the key characteristics of the relevant landscape character area in accordance with policy JP-G1, in addition to taking account of visual impacts from Ashworth Valley.
- An additional requirement relating to the provision of compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt in the vicinity of the site in accordance with policy JP-G2 (based on GMCA44).
- Consideration of whether part 10 relating to the setting of the listed Bamford Reform Church and the Historic Environment Assessment is justified and consistent with other policies in the Plan and national policy relating to heritage assets⁴.

⁴ Subject to liaison with Historic England.

- Clarification of the requirement in part 11 relating to school places (based on GMCA44).
- Inclusion of an additional requirement relating to minerals safeguarding areas (based on GMCA44).

JPA20 Castleton Sidings

AP114. GMCA to draft a modification to policy JPA20 to include:

- Reference to affordable homes in part 1 (based on GMCA45).
- Combination of parts 2 (based on GMCA45) and part 11 to set out all of the requirements relating to landscaping on the site including the creation of a new Green Belt boundary to the west of the residential development that will comprise physical features that are readily recognizable and likely to be permanent; provision of multi-functional green and blue infrastructure including accessible open space on the part of the site to be retained in the Green Belt; and mitigation of the visual and noise impacts of the nearby railway(s).
- An additional requirement relating to the provision of compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt within and/or in the vicinity of the site in accordance with policy JP-G2 (based on GMCA45).
- Clarification of the requirement in part 3 relating to the provision of land within the site to facilitate the extension of the East Lancashire Railway and provision of tram-train infrastructure (based on GMCA45).
- Deletion of part 5 relating to access by Network Rail and ELR (GMCA45).
- Reference in part 7 to making provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure having regard to the indicative transport interventions set out in Appendix D in accordance with policy JP-C7 (based on GMCA45).
- Consideration of whether the requirement in part 7 relating to providing good quality pedestrian and cycling routes through the site should clarify that they would need to link to Heywood Road / Manchester Road to the north east of the site, and to the existing footpaths on the adjoining golf course (in order to facilitate safe and convenient access to the centre of Castleton, Castleton station, bus stops and employment locations around Heywood).
- Deletion of parts 8 and 9 relating to electric vehicle charging infrastructure and financial contributions to mitigate impacts on the highway network.
- Clarification in part 10 that the requirement for a project specific Habitat Regulations Assessment relates to the Rochdale Canal Special Area of Conservation (based on GMCA45).
- Clarification of the requirement in part 12 relating to school places (based on GMCA45).
- An additional requirement relating to minerals safeguarding areas (based on GMCA45).

AP115. GMCA to consider whether the requirement in paragraph 11.222 for development to preserve and enhance the settings of a number of specified “adjacent heritage assets” is justified and, if so, whether it should be included in policy JPA20 or, if not, whether it should be deleted from the reasoned justification.

JPA22 Smithy Bridge

AP116. GMCA to draft a modification to policy JPA22 to include:

- Reference to affordable homes in part 1 (based on GMCA46)
- Reference to a landscape-led development, incorporating high quality design and green and blue infrastructure, that reflects and responds to the special qualities and sensitivities of the key characteristics of the [specify relevant] landscape character area in accordance with policy JP-G1 and to the site's Pennine fringe setting and proximity to Hollingworth Lake Country Park (or similar) (part 3).
- Deletion of part 4 (GMCA46).
- Deletion of parts 5 and 7 (GMCA46).
- Reference in part 8 to making provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure having regard to the indicative transport interventions set out in Appendix D in accordance with policy JP-C7 including facilitating high quality, safe and convenient walking and cycling routes through the site to provide improved links to key local destinations including Littleborough town centre, Hollingworth Lake, Rochdale Canal and Littleborough and Smithy Bridge railway stations (based on GMCA46).
- An additional requirement relating to the provision of compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt in the vicinity of the site in accordance with policy JP-G2 (based on GMCA46).
- An additional requirement relating to mitigating recreational disturbance impacts on the South Pennine Moors SAC and SPAs in accordance with policy JP-G5 (based on GMCA46).
- Clarification of the requirement in part 10 relating to facilitating the delivery of a new primary school on the site and making financial contributions for secondary school provision (based on GMCA46).
- Consideration of whether part 11 should refer to the retention and enhancement of existing visitor car parking spaces on the site, or the provision of replacement visitor car parking in a suitable location nearby for any existing spaces lost.
- An additional requirement relating to minerals safeguarding areas (based on GMCA46).

JPA23 Newhey Quarry

AP117. GMCA to draft a modification to policy JPA23 to include:

- Reference to affordable homes in part 1 (based on GMCA47).
- Deletion of part 5 and inclusion in part 4 (based on GMCA47).
- An additional requirement relating to the creation of new Green Belt boundaries that will comprise physical features that are readily recognizable and likely to be permanent.
- An additional requirement relating to the provision of compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining

Green Belt within and/or in the vicinity of the site in accordance with policy JP-G2 (based on GMCA47).

- An additional requirement relating to mitigating recreational disturbance impacts on the South Pennine Moors SAC and SPAs in accordance with policy JP-G5 (based on GMCA47).
- Clarification of part 6 relating to the settings of the nearby listed buildings (based on GMCA47).
- Clarification of part 7 relating to provision of car parking on the site to serve the metrolink stop and local residents (based on GMCA47).
- Deletion of parts 8 and 9.
- Reference in part 10 to making provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure having regard to the indicative transport interventions set out in Appendix D in accordance with policy JP-C7 including retaining and enhancing existing rights of way and creating a network of safe and attractive walking and cycling routes linking the development to the centre of Newhey, the nearby metrolink stop and the existing walking and cycling network (based on GMCA47).
- Clarification that vehicular access to serve the proposed residential development and car park(s) will be via the existing access from Huddersfield Road.
- Clarification of the requirement in part 12 relating to financial contributions for primary and secondary school provision (based on GMCA47).
- Inclusion of an additional requirement relating to minerals safeguarding areas (based on GMCA47).

JPA15 Chew Brook Vale

Policy JPA15 proposes the development of around 90 homes and up to 6,000 sqm of commercial, leisure and retail facilities on this 5 hectare site close to Dove Stone Reservoir and the Peak District National Park. The site is the disused Greenfield Mill and comprises buildings of various ages, some of which the Council consider to be non-designated heritage assets that may be worthy of preservation and enhancement⁵. The evidence submitted in support of the Plan indicates that around half of the site is at risk of flooding⁶, and that the proposed development would not be viable mainly due to costs associated with site remediation and highways improvements⁷. That evidence also indicates that if 135 homes or more could be accommodated development may be viable.

Shortly before the relevant hearing session, additional evidence relating to flood risk was submitted by the site promoters indicating a way in which they consider that flood risk could be mitigated⁸. Further evidence relating to the existing buildings on the site and an indicative layout for 138 dwellings and some commercial floorspace was also submitted⁹.

⁵ Plan paragraph 11.180 and oral evidence at the hearing session on 9 February 2023.

⁶ Level 2 SFRA Addendum [10.05.19]

⁷ Strategic Viability Assessment stages 1 and 2 [03.01.01 to 03.01.04]

⁸ SD21 and SD21c [8 February 2023]

⁹ SD21a and SD21b [9 February 2023]

The response to the following Action Point should be submitted by GMCA as soon as possible following consultation with the Environment Agency and any other relevant bodies but no later than **midday on Friday 17 March 2023**¹⁰.

AP118. GMCA to consider the new evidence submitted by the site promoters referred to above in consultation with the Environment Agency and any other relevant parties, and then advise how policy JPA15 could be modified to propose an acceptable form of development that has a reasonable prospect of being viably developed in the plan period. This would need to include:

- Number of homes and amount of commercial, leisure and retail floorspace required to make the development viable (parts 2 and 3).
- Making provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure having regard to the indicative transport interventions set out in Appendix D in accordance with policy JP-C7 including improved access from the A669/A635 (parts 4 and 5, based on GMCA48).
- Clarification or deletion of part 6 relating to a visitor management plan.
- Clarification of the requirements relating to landscaping and provision of green and blue infrastructure on the site, including how this connects to pedestrian and cycling routes to Greenfield village, Dove Stone Reservoir and the surrounding countryside (parts 7 and 12).
- Clarification of part 8 such that it ensures development reflects and responds to the special qualities and sensitivities of the key characteristics of the [specify relevant] landscape character type in accordance with policy JP-G1 and the site's proximity to Dove Stone Reservoir and the Peak District National Park.
- Clarification of the requirements relating to biodiversity (parts 9, 10 and 13).
- Clarification of the requirement relating to mitigating recreational disturbance impacts on the South Pennine Moors SAC and SPAs in accordance with policy JP-G5 (part 11, based on GMCA48).
- Amendment to part 14 to require the creation of new Green Belt boundaries that will comprise physical features that are readily recognizable and likely to be permanent.
- Amendment to part 15 to require the provision of compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt in the vicinity of the site in accordance with policy JP-G2.
- Deletion of parts 16, 17 and 18 relating to open space, schools and community facilities (GMCA48).
- Clarification of which buildings on the site are considered to be non-designated heritage assets, and of whether they should be conserved and enhanced or can be demolished to facilitate the proposed development¹¹ (part 19 and paragraph 11.180).

¹⁰ GMCA should contact the Programme Officers if it becomes apparent that this deadline cannot be met due to circumstances beyond their control.

¹¹ If it is considered that the policy cannot provide clarity on whether non-designated heritage assets on the site should be preserved and enhanced or can be demolished to facilitate the proposed development, then consideration should be given to modifying the policy to set out the approach a decision maker should take with regard to that issue (for example by setting out criteria that would need to be met if a non designated heritage asset on the site is to be demolished to facilitate the development).

- Clarification of the requirements relating to designated heritage assets in close proximity to the site (part 19 and paragraph 11.180).
- Deletion of part 20 relating to design (GMCA48).
- Clarification of the requirements relating to flood risk having regard to all of the relevant available evidence and advice from the Environment Agency and other relevant parties (part 21).

William Fieldhouse Louise Gibbons Steven Lee

13 February 2023
