

## CHAPTER 7 - EMPLOYMENT POLICIES

### EM INTRODUCTION

#### Objections to Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
702	O	001	EM		Tesco Stores Ltd	The Development Planning Partnership	WMBC 702 EM

#### Supporters of Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
545	S	001	EM		Wigan Chamber of Commerce		

#### Main Issue

Whether the introduction to the employment policies is appropriate, having regard to the role of retail development in employment generation.

#### Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

7.1 An objector argues that a specific reference should be made within the introduction to the employment policies to the role of retail development in job creation. PPS6 (paragraph 2.37) advises, in respect of retail development, that additional benefits in respect of regeneration and employment do not constitute indicators of need for additional floor space. However they may be material considerations in the site selection process. The weight to be given to such factors will depend upon the particular local circumstances. Employment generation is not, therefore, an indicator of need from which the locational policies for retail development follow, led by the sequential approach. To make specific reference to the economic, employment and regeneration benefits of retail at this point would place inappropriate weight on retail-generated employment, particularly since Chapter 7 does not present any retail policies.

#### Recommendation

**I recommend:**

**(REC 7.1) that no modification be made to the RDD in response to this objection.**

## EM1 LAND AND BUILDINGS FOR EMPLOYMENT USES

### Objections to Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref
150	O	001	EM	1	Graham Wilcock		WMBC EM1
253	O	001	EM	1	MSF Motor Group Limited	CgMs Ltd	WMBC EM1
567	O	001	EM	1	Eddisons	Indigo Planning	WMBC EM1
582	O	004	EM	1	Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Michael Courcier and Partners Limited	WMBC 582/A
583	O	007	EM	1	Peel Investments (North) Ltd	Halliwell Landau	WIGAN MBC 583/A
593	O	010	EM	1	Hallam Land Management Ltd		WMBC 593

### Draft Deposit Objections Conditionally Withdrawn

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref
433	O	002	EM	1	Chorley Borough Council		WMBC 433 EM/S

### Objections to Revised Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref
024	O	021	EM	1	Mrs M E Fairhurst		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
025	O	002	EM	1	Philip Fairhurst		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
033	O	004	EM	1	Miss Winifred Beesley		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
049	O	004	EM	1	Linda Hickey		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
050	O	004	EM	1	Robert Hickey		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
053	O	006	EM	1	Adrian Hurst		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
055	O	004	EM	1	Mrs M Iredale		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
060	O	003	EM	1	Anthony Connell		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
060	O	020	EM	1	Katherine Marsland		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
065	O	003	EM	1	Colin Greenhalgh		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
086	O	004	EM	1	Susan Melling		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
087	O	004	EM	1	B Hughes		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
089	O	004	EM	1	Ms Margaret Dean		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
090	O	005	EM	1	Karin & Keith Dagnall		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
091	O	011	EM	1	W Malcolm Cook		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
097	O	011	EM	1	Mrs K Lees		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
099	O	008	EM	1	Mr G E Forster		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
100	O	020	EM	1	Margaret Brooks		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
101	O	020	EM	1	William Brooks		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
114	O	010	EM	1	Joan Atherton		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
160	O	004	EM	1	Amelia Ellen Lavin		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
161	O	003	EM	1	T Brennan		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
166	O	004	EM	1	Mr Jack Delaney		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
172	O	004	EM	1	Gary Crossley		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
172	O	020	EM	1	Julie Crossley		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
174	O	003	EM	1	Miss B McKenna		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
184	O	004	EM	1	E M Chadwick		WIGAN MBC FOA/A

187	O	002	EM	1	Mrs M Smith		WMBC EM1
188	O	012	EM	1	Josephine Mary Fleming		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
189	O	004	EM	1	Miss M Topping		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
190	O	004	EM	1	Sarbari Mukherjee		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
194	O	015	EM	1	Lillian Corcoran		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
198	O	016	EM	1	Mrs Kay Pooke		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
219	O	016	EM	1	Mrs M P Anten		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
248	O	004	EM	1	John E Middleton		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
251	O	011	EM	1	Val Middleton		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
255	O	003	EM	1	J McLean		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
293	O	003	EM	1	A Hamilton		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
295	O	004	EM	1	P D Hamilton		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
297	O	007	EM	1	Raymond Sharples		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
301	O	002	EM	1	Mavis Helena Gale		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
303	O	009	EM	1	Christine A Jones		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
304	O	018	EM	1	J S Arkwright		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
308	O	006	EM	1	M Boardman		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
311	O	004	EM	1	Bernard Shaw		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
312	O	013	EM	1	Mary F Shaw		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
314	O	003	EM	1	Mrs M MacDonald		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
317	O	010	EM	1	J G Ellison		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
318	O	004	EM	1	Mr G Daniels		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
319	O	004	EM	1	Mrs M H Hughes		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
322	O	004	EM	1	Archibald Smith Tate		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
323	O	004	EM	1	Norman Edward Rusk		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
325	O	004	EM	1	Mr John Steele		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
326	O	004	EM	1	Mrs Janet Steele		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
327	O	004	EM	1	Neina Woodward		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
328	O	013	EM	1	Mr A Woodward		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
330	O	012	EM	1	William Glover		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
332	O	003	EM	1	David Catterall		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
333	O	003	EM	1	Geoffrey Powell		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
335	O	014	EM	1	J F Kearsley		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
339	O	003	EM	1	Kathryn Pennington		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
407	O	004	EM	1	Adele Wilkes		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
408	O	002	EM	1	Gary Wilkes		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
435	O	004	EM	1	Gordon Catterall		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
436	O	004	EM	1	Mrs E Johnson		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
446	O	004	EM	1	C Hilton-Carroll		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
450	O	004	EM	1	Andre Philip Richard Gorner		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
461	O	008	EM	1	Ethel Glover		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
493	O	005	EM	1	William Lovell Verinder		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
494	O	002	EM	1	Julie L Harrison		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
505	O	004	EM	1	Mrs C Daington		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
533	O	016	EM	1	Mrs E A Carter		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
548	O	012	EM	1	Mrs Sylvia Marion Stitt		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
550	O	003	EM	1	Belinda Croston		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
573	O	004	EM	1	Mr A Eaves		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
574	O	004	EM	1	John Murphy		WIGAN MBC FOA/A

582	O	019	EM	1	Taylor Woodrow Developments Limited	Michael Courcier and Partners Ltd	WMBC 582/A
583	O	037	EM	1	Peel Investments (North) Ltd	Halliwell Landau	WIGAN MBC 685/A
591	O	002	EM	1	Mr John Makin		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
747	O	037	EM	1	Wigan Borough Action Group		WIGAN MBC 747/A
747	O	071	EM	1	Wigan Borough Action Group		WIGAN MBC 747/A
810	O	001	EM	1	Mr A Sherman		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
828	O	005	EM	1	Dorothy Arkwright		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
830	O	003	EM	1	C Murnan		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
831	O	016	EM	1	Les Jones		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
833	O	002	EM	1	S Murphy		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
834	O	002	EM	1	C Murphy		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
835	O	002	EM	1	P Murphy		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
836	O	009	EM	1	Mr C L Pooke		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
837	O	018	EM	1	Mrs S Whitfield		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
838	O	005	EM	1	Rachel Webster		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
839	O	002	EM	1	Gary Oakes		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
840	O	002	EM	1	Mrs J Sherman		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
856	O	003	EM	1	Mr L Walkden		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
887	O	016	EM	1	Mr Charles Christopherson		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
888	O	004	EM	1	W A Sefton		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
889	O	005	EM	1	W Boardman		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
890	O	016	EM	1	Mrs Edith Sefton		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
891	O	005	EM	1	Mrs Speed		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
892	O	004	EM	1	Adrian Hughes		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
893	O	004	EM	1	Mrs M J Rusk		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
894	O	014	EM	1	Mr John Wilkieson		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
895	O	011	EM	1	Mrs T Quinn		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
896	O	003	EM	1	David Tinsley		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
897	O	003	EM	1	Janet Marjorie Tate		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
898	O	003	EM	1	Miss T Topping		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
899	O	007	EM	1	Betty Prescott		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
900	O	001	EM	1	Mrs J Lodge		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
901	O	015	EM	1	Alison Hurst		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
902	O	013	EM	1	S V Lang		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
903	O	009	EM	1	J A Harrison		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
904	O	011	EM	1	Dr A M Mukherjee		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
905	O	013	EM	1	Mrs H J Hughes		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
906	O	003	EM	1	Frank Stringfellow		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
907	O	003	EM	1	Ida Rylance		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
908	O	003	EM	1	William J Rylance		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
909	O	003	EM	1	J Butcher		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
910	O	003	EM	1	Mrs Kathleen F Brown		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
911	O	003	EM	1	D Ball		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
912	O	003	EM	1	Mr R Banks		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
913	O	003	EM	1	J Houghton		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
914	O	003	EM	1	C MacDonald		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
915	O	005	EM	1	Jacqueline Sheehan		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
916	O	002	EM	1	Maureen Smith		WIGAN MBC FOA/A

917	O	009	EM	1	Mrs P A Tushingham		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
918	O	004	EM	1	Gladys Wilkes		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
919	O	009	EM	1	P A Waldron		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
920	O	003	EM	1	Mr R G Bradshaw		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
921	O	016	EM	1	D Ellison		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
922	O	009	EM	1	Richard Andrew Corless		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
923	O	006	EM	1	Jeffrey Cook		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
924	O	010	EM	1	Maureen Corless		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
925	O	014	EM	1	I Cotham		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
926	O	002	EM	1	Margaret Catterall		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
927	O	004	EM	1	Vincent Corcoran		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
928	O	005	EM	1	Philip Holt		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
929	O	013	EM	1	A Horton		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
930	O	005	EM	1	Mr A J Horton		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
931	O	003	EM	1	C P Simpson		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
932	O	003	EM	1	G Brash		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
933	O	003	EM	1	Bernard H Shorrocks		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
934	O	003	EM	1	Brenda Ryan		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
935	O	003	EM	1	Mrs K Marsh		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
936	O	003	EM	1	Mrs A Cordell		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
937	O	003	EM	1	F Murtagh		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
938	O	003	EM	1	Mrs Vivien Rigby		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
939	O	008	EM	1	Doreen Sharples		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
940	O	002	EM	1	David Pennington		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
941	O	013	EM	1	Mrs J Tushingham		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
942	O	011	EM	1	Mr A Tushingham		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
943	O	007	EM	1	Marilyn Riding		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
944	O	003	EM	1	Edward Ryan		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
945	O	003	EM	1	Ann Gorner		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
946	O	003	EM	1	Ben Daniel Gorner		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
947	O	003	EM	1	Gabrielle Maria Gorner		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
948	O	003	EM	1	Sheila Jones		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
949	O	002	EM	1	Gary W Jones		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
950	O	015	EM	1	Allan Jones		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
951	O	004	EM	1	Mr Michael W Kelly		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
952	O	009	EM	1	Mrs V Kelly		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
953	O	015	EM	1	J A Pendlebury		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
954	O	003	EM	1	P J Pendlebury		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
955	O	012	EM	1	S Leonard		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
956	O	015	EM	1	Harry Millington		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
957	O	009	EM	1	Patricia A Donnelly		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
958	O	007	EM	1	Mary E Shorrocks		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
959	O	013	EM	1	Mrs Heather Williams		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
960	O	007	EM	1	Mrs P A Grimshaw		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
961	O	012	EM	1	Mrs Doreen Glover		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
962	O	003	EM	1	Teresa Garland		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
963	O	013	EM	1	Karen Gibson		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
964	O	003	EM	1	A Pennington		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
965	O	005	EM	1	F Heaton		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
966	O	005	EM	1	Eileen Critchley		WIGAN MBC FOA/A

967	O	011	EM	1	Mrs Eryl Cross		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
968	O	004	EM	1	Roger K Dandridge		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
969	O	013	EM	1	R J Brown		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
970	O	005	EM	1	Norah Bradshaw		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
971	O	004	EM	1	Mrs K Birkett		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
972	O	005	EM	1	Debbie Gaynor		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
973	O	002	EM	1	Margaret Cook		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
974	O	014	EM	1	Mrs P M Forster		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
975	O	015	EM	1	Mrs Edna Brown		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
976	O	012	EM	1	Mrs T Wood		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
977	O	005	EM	1	Anne Maliczewski		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
978	O	001	EM	1	Mr J W Fleming		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
979	O	010	EM	1	Mr Stanley L Brown		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
980	O	011	EM	1	Jean Haddock		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
981	O	009	EM	1	A M Catterall		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
982	O	013	EM	1	Mrs Kinsella		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
983	O	013	EM	1	Mrs Sheila Majakari		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
984	O	007	EM	1	D Glover		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
985	O	009	EM	1	W MacDonald		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
986	O	003	EM	1	Joan Quick		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
987	O	003	EM	1	Anthony Quick		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
988	O	003	EM	1	Miss A L Prescott		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
989	O	003	EM	1	Mrs B Prescott		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
990	O	003	EM	1	Barbara Parkinson		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
991	O	003	EM	1	Marian Ochwat		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
992	O	003	EM	1	Stefan Ochwat		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
993	O	004	EM	1	George Swindell		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
994	O	003	EM	1	Hazel Louise Gorner		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
995	O	003	EM	1	Andrew Gaynor		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
996	O	002	EM	1	Patricia M Shannon		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
997	O	003	EM	1	Dinah Middleton		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
998	O	003	EM	1	J Fairhurst		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
999	O	003	EM	1	T Doyle		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A01	O	003	EM	1	Anna Louise Calder		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A02	O	003	EM	1	Peter Cains Butchers		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A03	O	003	EM	1	Linda Croston		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A04	O	003	EM	1	Jane Moore		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A05	O	003	EM	1	Friends of Ashton		WIGAN MBC A05/A
A06	O	003	EM	1	Mrs Hilary Davies		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A07	O	003	EM	1	Paula Jayne Green		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A08	O	003	EM	1	Joseph Garland		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A09	O	003	EM	1	Mr James Crook		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A10	O	003	EM	1	Mr John Crook		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A11	O	003	EM	1	B Carney		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A12	O	003	EM	1	Frank Brown		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A13	O	003	EM	1	Mr J Bentham		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A14	O	003	EM	1	M Withington		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A15	O	003	EM	1	Helen Whalley		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A16	O	003	EM	1	William James Wilkes		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A17	O	003	EM	1	Joanne Young		WIGAN MBC FOA/A

A18	O	003	EM	1	John G Bradshaw		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A19	O	003	EM	1	G Sheedy		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A20	O	003	EM	1	Jayne Johnson		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A21	O	003	EM	1	Mrs I B Eaves		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A22	O	003	EM	1	Greta Kearsley		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A23	O	003	EM	1	Margaret Thompson		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A24	O	003	EM	1	Richard Prescott		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A25	O	003	EM	1	John Melling		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A26	O	003	EM	1	Yvonne Harrison		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A27	O	003	EM	1	I R Clarence		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A28	O	003	EM	1	Mr P Majakari		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A29	O	003	EM	1	Brenda Edwards		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A30	O	003	EM	1	Alan Edwards		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A31	O	003	EM	1	Mrs M McKechnie		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A32	O	003	EM	1	Alan Hurst		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A33	O	003	EM	1	Thomas Hughes		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A34	O	003	EM	1	K Hilton		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A35	O	003	EM	1	Albert Atherton		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A36	O	003	EM	1	Julia Allen		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A37	O	002	EM	1	B Potter		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A38	O	001	EM	1	Mrs K W Parker		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A39	O	005	EM	1	Barbara Hodgkinson		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A40	O	012	EM	1	F W Appleton		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A41	O	001	EM	1	Alastair Stitt		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A42	O	013	EM	1	Ian Campbell		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A43	O	003	EM	1	Allen James Johnson		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A44	O	005	EM	1	Mr A Simpson		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A45	O	008	EM	1	Mr Robert Richard Hughes		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A46	O	002	EM	1	Paul A Tushingham		WIGAN MBC A05/A
A47	O	013	EM	1	Mrs I Prescott		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A48	O	008	EM	1	Mrs Carol Spencer		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A49	O	007	EM	1	E J Clarence		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A50	O	008	EM	1	Michael David Iredale		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A51	O	003	EM	1	Warren Pennington		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A52	O	014	EM	1	Beryl Helsby		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A53	O	007	EM	1	Geoffrey MacDonald		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A54	O	016	EM	1	Andrea Hilton		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A55	O	009	EM	1	W Carney		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A56	O	006	EM	1	M Owen		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A57	O	002	EM	1	Matthew Tushingham		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A58	O	003	EM	1	W D Gibson		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A59	O	003	EM	1	Pauline Campbell		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A60	O	003	EM	1	R Huyton – Ashton Cycles		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A61	O	003	EM	1	Alan Dean		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A62	O	003	EM	1	D Cunliffe		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A63	O	003	EM	1	Paula Cunliffe		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A64	O	003	EM	1	Angela Catterall		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A65	O	003	EM	1	George Croston		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A66	O	003	EM	1	Cyril Catterall		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A67	O	003	EM	1	Steven Sheenan		WIGAN MBC FOA/A

A68	O	003	EM	1	Bernard Mattison		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A69	O	003	EM	1	A I Bullough		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A70	O	003	EM	1	Mrs Dawn Wilson		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A71	O	003	EM	1	Mrs K Maddocks		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A72	O	003	EM	1	R F Bullough		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A73	O	003	EM	1	Cissie Garston		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A74	O	003	EM	1	George McCathie		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A75	O	003	EM	1	Susan Holt		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A76	O	003	EM	1	David Thompson		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A77	O	003	EM	1	Natalie Gibson		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A78	O	003	EM	1	Mr S J Winstanley		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A79	O	003	EM	1	Mr P Redmond		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A80	O	003	EM	1	Mrs M Leyland		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A81	O	003	EM	1	Mrs H M Francis		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A82	O	003	EM	1	Mrs J Smith		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A83	O	003	EM	1	J Marsh		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A84	O	003	EM	1	Derek Woods		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A85	O	003	EM	1	Mrs Sheila Dandridge		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A86	O	003	EM	1	Mrs M Johnson		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A87	O	003	EM	1	Freda Woods		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A88	O	003	EM	1	Daniel Gibson		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A89	O	003	EM	1	Roy Calder		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A90	O	003	EM	1	Mrs M Crossley		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A91	O	003	EM	1	Valerie Middleton		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A92	O	003	EM	1	Mrs H Harris		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A93	O	003	EM	1	M W Doyle		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A94	O	010	EM	1	Mr L Prescott		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A95	O	003	EM	1	W A Payne		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A96	O	003	EM	1	P J Huyton – Ashton Cycles		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A97	O	003	EM	1	D A Payne		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
A98	O	003	EM	1	Mrs Hilda Payne		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
B01	O	002	EM	1	J McDougall		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
B02	O	002	EM	1	W J McDougall		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
B03	O	002	EM	1	D J Holden		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
B05	O	003	EM	1	E Brash		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
B06	O	003	EM	1	Barbara Conway		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
B07	O	001	EM	1	Janette Cunliffe		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
B30	O	009	EM	1	Mr Kinsella		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
B31	O	011	EM	1	William E Coyle		WIGAN MBC FOA/A
B32	O	003	EM	1	Kathleen Jones		WIGAN MBC FOA/A

**Note**

This policy is subject to DINC9.

Objection 593/010 is dealt with in the section of this report which relates to policy GB1.

## **Main Issues**

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to:

- the requirement for employment land allocations;
- the capacity of the land within the identified Primary Employment Areas to support continued economic development and growth throughout the plan period;
- the meaning of ‘other employment uses’;
- the need for a review of employment land;
- the need to make provision for small business parks and starter units.

## **Inspector’s Considerations and Conclusions**

### *The requirement for employment land allocations*

7.2 RDD policy EM1 provides that the Council will ensure an adequate supply of land and buildings for employment uses by safeguarding and making the best use of existing land and buildings in employment use, identifying some 259ha of land for employment uses and permitting employment uses on land or in buildings not currently in or allocated for employment use, provided that there will be no unacceptable impact.

7.3 Objectors argue that the change from 258ha at FDD stage to 259ha at RDD stage is not justified. It is, however, a reflection of updated survey information. Others argue that the 259ha of employment land identified is insufficient and, in any case, is not likely to be available or that it is an excessive provision. Objectors query the differences between the site areas shown in table 1 at FDD and RDD stages. These are the consequences of the changes to site boundaries shown on pages 16 to 23 of the report ‘Changes for Revised Deposit’.

7.4 PPS1 (paragraph 27 iv) advises that development plans should bring forward sufficient land of a suitable quality in appropriate locations to meet the expected needs for industrial development. PPG4 (paragraph 6) advises that, in allocating land for industry and commerce, LPAs should be realistic in their assessment of the needs of business. They should ensure that there is sufficient land available which is readily capable of development and well served by infrastructure. They should ensure that there is a variety of sites available to meet differing needs. A choice of suitable sites will facilitate competition between developers. This will benefit end users and stimulate economic activity.

7.5 PPG12 (paragraph 4.9) advises that, in preparing development plans, LPAs should take account of the need to revitalise and broaden the local economy, the need to stimulate employment opportunities and the importance of encouraging industrial and commercial development, particularly in the growing knowledge-driven sector. They should look to provide a range of suitable sites in their plans. RPG13 (policy EC1) provides that development plans should identify a range of suitable sites and premises for employment purposes. Policy EC2 provides that sites should meet the needs, not only of those seeking to expand or relocate, but also the needs of inward investors.

7.6 The RDD does not propose a target take-up figure for employment land either on the basis of an annual rate or for the plan period as a whole. It simply states, within policy EM1 (element B), that the identification of 259 ha of land for employment uses will be one of the means by which an adequate supply of land and buildings for employment will be secured. The land which comprises this 259ha is presented in RDD table 1. This table shows the situation as at the end of December 2001. In no single place within the RDD does the plan confirm the details of the plan period. The introduction to the RDD confirms that the plan covers the period to April 2016 and the supporting text to policy R1A, in the housing chapter, confirms that the plan is intended to cover a 14 year period. The plan period must, therefore, be taken to be from April 2002 to April 2016. This was confirmed by the LPA to be correct in answer to my question on this matter at the inquiry. In the interests of certainty this should be confirmed in the plan.

7.7 The content of table 1 can, therefore, be taken as presenting the capacity of the employment land within the identified Primary Employment Areas at a time approximating to the start of the plan period. During the years 2002 and 2003 some 18.6ha of the identified employment land was developed. Core Document 8 confirms that, at January 2004, the capacity of the sites identified in table 1 had been reduced to some 241ha.

7.8 The supporting text to policy EM1A informs that the 259ha identified at the end of December 2001 will enable past building rates to be maintained while offering choice for developers. Core Proof 10 (table 8) informs that, for the 15 year period between 1989 and 2003 (inclusive) an annual average of 15.4ha gross of employment land was developed. Paragraph 4.4.2 of that Core Proof confirms that this take up relates purely to allocated employment land. The take-up rates for individual years within the period vary from as little as 7.6ha to as much as 24.2ha. Objectors argue that, if particular 5 year periods are selected from this sequence, annual average take-up levels as high as 20ha pa or as low as 12ha pa can be identified. Because the information in CD10 (table 8) as a whole relates to a period which approximates to that of the RDD, it therefore presents a broad and robust basis from which a likely measure of annual average future take-up can be derived. I conclude that the UDP should make provision for the development of an annual average of some 15.4ha pa gross and that, in addition to this, an allowance should be made for choice and range of sites.

7.9 At the inquiry the witnesses for the LPA argued that the assumed future annual average figure of some 15.4ha pa of allocated employment land should be regarded as relating both to the likely actual take-up and to an additional allowance for range and choice of sites. On this basis the actual take-up would be about 12ha pa and the remaining 3.4ha would represent an additional factor for range and choice. This evidence, however, conflicts with the RDD itself. The supporting text (page 41) confirms that the 259ha in table 1 will enable past building rates to be maintained while offering choice for developers. Over a plan period of 14 years the annual average take-up of 15.4ha would amount to some 215.6ha. The 259ha identified in RDD table 1 must, therefore, be intended by the LPA to represent not only the expected take-up but also some 43ha (259

– 215.6ha) for choice and range of sites. This is logical since the past achievement of an annual average take-up of some 15.4ha can have been achieved only within a total of the same size or larger, not one which was smaller. This 43ha margin amounts to an allowance for choice and range of some 20%.

7.10 An objector argues that the allowance for choice and range implied by the comparison of the employment land resource in RDD table 1, and the 15.4ha pa past take-up is 25%. This is on the basis that the 259ha identified employment land resource, when divided by a 13 year plan period, would result in an annual average of 19.9ha developed per year. This 19.9ha would then be some 25% more than the past take-up of 15.4ha pa. However, the plan period is 14 years and the margin is, therefore, 20%.

7.11 Both national and regional guidance emphasise the need for a margin of land supply over requirement to provide choice and a range of sites. They do not, however, provide guidance on the extent of this. A balance has to be struck between allowing the scope for securing the necessary employment development (which would be promoted by a large flexibility allowance) and avoiding blight which could arise from unrealistically large allocations. In my view a margin of 20% is acceptable only so long as the whole of the identified employment land resource is of such a quality that it could accommodate demands for development, at the annual average rate anticipated, throughout the Borough and throughout the plan period. For this reason it will be necessary for me to undertake a rigorous appraisal of the land identified for development within the Primary Employment Areas.

7.12 The witnesses for the LPA sought to justify a smaller annual average take-up assumption on the grounds that future employment development would contain a higher proportion, than in the past, of knowledge-based employment which would make more efficient use of land and therefore require less of this. This argument may prove to have merit but the historic pattern of employment development in Wigan, which generated the annual average of 15.4ha pa, related to a period at the end of which, as the RDD itself acknowledges, (Chapter 7, Introduction) over one-third of people with jobs who are resident in the Borough now work outside it. Both national and regional policy guidance seek to promote patterns of development which minimise the need to travel. This is reflected in the strategy of the RDD itself, which seeks to promote the development of employment sites which are closely related to the places where potential employees live and which will be accessible to them via sustainable transport modes. Any decrease in land-take, due to the changing nature of employment, will in accordance with the LPAs strategy be likely to be counteracted by an increased demand for local employment as net out-commuting reduces. This factor tends to support, rather than erode, the retention of the 15.4ha pa figure as a basis for employment land policy in Wigan.

7.13 An LPA witness, at the inquiry, introduced the concept that if the plan was based on an objective to provide for the creation of 1,000 net new jobs in the Borough per year this would give rise to a need to provide land to accommodate some 13,000 jobs over the plan period. The evidence of this witness assumed, in various places, that the plan period is 13 years or 15 years, when the RDD itself indicates that it is 14 years. On the basis of a

series of assumptions the witness converted this job target to a land requirement of only some 184ha for the plan period. It was conceded, however, that this approach to the estimation of employment land allocations is not presented in the RDD itself. It has not been sanctioned by any resolution of the LPA and that body has not proposed a pre-inquiry change to reflect it, nor has the LPA proposed a during-inquiry change in this respect. The individual assumptions that were used to translate 13,000 net new jobs to 184ha of land are each capable of supporting a wide range of values, leaving the final land take-up figure as little more than an unsupported assertion.

7.14 A key assumption that no allowance should be made for the land needs of industry (and in particular the manufacturing sector), on the basis that it is of little importance and is declining, conflicts with RPG13 (policy EC2) that development plans should ensure the provision of sites which meet the changing needs of traditional manufacturing industry as well as new and emerging manufacturing activities. This consideration, alone, supports the view that the 184ha is too low a figure for the employment land allocations of the RDD. I can, therefore, give little weight to this particular approach and must base my conclusion on the merits of that presented in the RDD.

7.15 The witnesses for the LPA argued that the re-use of existing employment premises during the plan period would reduce the future need for new employment development below the annual rates experienced in the past. It is clear, however, that such re-use of existing premises was a feature of the local economy in the period from 1989 to 2003. The land take-up figures presented in table 8 of CD10, therefore, are in addition to this. This is confirmed by paragraph 4.4.2 of CD10.

7.16 An objector argues that the employment land market of Wigan is composed of two distinct elements. One covering the north and west of the Borough (based on Wigan, Ashton and Standish) and the other the south and east of the Borough (based on Leigh, Lowton, Atherton, Tyldersley and Hindley). This objector and the LPA disagreed not only in respect of whether this reflects the actual situation but also, if such a distinction exists, on what basis the sub-market areas could be defined and where the boundaries lie. It was also a subject of debate whether each of these separate areas extends beyond the Borough boundary and, if so, to what ultimate line. The definition of boundaries is relevant to the identification of the particular sites which would lie within them and, therefore to their theoretical land capacity.

7.17 Because Wigan is a densely developed Borough, and because proposed Primary Employment Areas are separated from each other by only a few kilometres, a very slight realignment of a proposed boundary can have a massive effect on the potential land supply within each proposed sub-market area. Because the evidence presented at the inquiry was based, predominantly, on anecdote and speculation as to motives of developers, rather than on statistical evidence, it does not provide me with the basis on which I can confidently reach conclusions, particularly since a minor movement of a boundary would have such far reaching consequences for the balance of requirement and supply.

7.18 It is apparent that, if such sub-market areas exist, they have different boundaries for different sectors of the employment land market. A decision maker for an incoming transport-based business is likely to give greatest weight to locations relative to the main highway network, particularly the M6 and A580. A decision maker for a relocating established local business would probably give weight to the location of an established workforce, suppliers and important customers. Most of the Primary Employment Areas listed in RDD table 1 are of sufficient size to accommodate a range of sizes and types of business. Indeed, several objectors actively promote the development of particular sites on the basis that they could accommodate a range of property types (offices, warehouses etc) for a wide range of customers. The application of a sub-market structure would, for this reason, require so many assumptions as to be of little value. It would lead to the definition of a series of different market areas for different employment sectors. In any case, the evidence presented at the inquiry, while presenting opinions about the extent of sub-market areas and on which parts of the potential land supply falls within them, provided no assistance in respect of the subdivision of a land requirement on a sub-market basis. It is likely, furthermore, that any sub-market definition adopted for the purpose of this report would be rendered obsolete by major changes during the lifetime of the plan.

7.19 I intend, therefore, to derive my spatial perspective from national and regional guidance which seeks to give priority to the reuse of previously developed land in the built-up areas, reduce the need to travel, especially by car and promote the use of sustainable transport modes. This implies a distribution of employment opportunities across the Borough in which sites are well related to residential areas and to public transport. My conclusions on this matter are supported by the findings of the Inspector who held the inquiry into the appeal against refusal of planning permission for the employment development of land at Chaddock Lane, Tyldersley (APP/V4250/A/03/1130535) that a north west/south east distinction did not reflect a reality in the market for local employment sites and that local businesses relocated freely between the two areas and, indeed, across nearby Borough boundaries. I consider that, for inward investors, such local market factors would be of even less relevance and matters of accessibility to the main road network would be principal locational considerations.

7.20 The employment chapter of the RDD is written in such a way that it is not immediately apparent what is the plan period to which the employment land proposals relate, what is the annual average employment take-up target to be met and how this relates to an allowance for choice and range of sites. In the interests of certainty, which PPS1 (paragraph 8) identifies as vital to the development plan system, I conclude that the RDD should be modified in such a way as to make these aspects clear.

*The capacity of the land within the identified Primary Employment Areas to support continued economic development and growth throughout the plan period*

7.21 In respect of the previous issue I concluded that the margin of 20% to provide for choice and range of site was acceptable only so long as the whole of the identified

employment land resource is of such a quality that it could accommodate demand for development, at the annual rate anticipated, throughout the Borough and throughout the plan period. In this part of the report I examine the employment sites identified within the Primary Employment Areas of the RDD and reach a view on the extent to which they will satisfy the identified requirement in the period from April 2002 to April 2016.

7.22 In the section of this report which relates to policy A1P(1) I have concluded that there is no realistic prospect that a start on the construction of the A5225 Wigan and Hindley Bypass could be achieved during the plan period. Therefore, although both the LPA and objectors expressed views at the inquiry on whether all or part of particular sites were likely to commence development before or after the LPAs anticipated start date for that road (2012), I will confine myself to expressing my view, in the context of my conclusion on policy A1P(1), on whether development is likely to commence on individual sites within the plan period as a whole.

#### Site EM1A1: Stone Cross Park, Golbourne

7.23 Both the LPA and objectors concur that this is a successful employment park which benefits from its location on the A580 dual carriageway only some 3km from the M6. At December 2001 some 6.4ha was available but by January 2004 this has been reduced, by development, to only 3.34ha. Because of its eminent accessibility and high visibility from a major element of the strategic route network I conclude that this remaining 3.34ha will be attractive to both local and inward investors. I concur with the LPA and objectors that it is capable of being developed within the plan period.

#### Site EM1A2: Golbourne Enterprise Park

7.24 Some 1.1ha was available at this site in December 2001 but by January 2004 this had been fully developed.

#### Site EM1A3: Bridge Street, Golbourne

7.25 Although identified as a Primary Employment Area, no land was available for development at either December 2001 or January 2004.

#### Site EM1A4: Newton Road, Lowton

7.26 Although identified as a Primary Employment Area, no land was available for development at either December 2001 or January 2004.

#### Site EM1A5: Moss Industrial Estate, Lowton

7.27 At December 2001 some 4.9ha was available within this established industrial estate. By January 2004 this had reduced to 4.37ha. Both the LPA and objectors concur that this remaining land is capable of being developed within the plan period. They differ as to its appeal to inward investors. Because the site as a whole gains its access to the

A580 dual carriageway via some 2km of single carriageway road, and because the vacant plots are visible only from the internal access road, I conclude that it will be attractive only to local investors.

Site EM1A6: Parsonage, Leigh

7.28 For the reasons I give in the section of this report which relates to policy EM1A6, I have concluded that the remaining 18.2ha of this allocation should remain part of the employment land resource. In view of the evidence given in relation to objections to that policy, I consider that there is reasonably direct access to the site via good quality highways and that part of the site has the potential to be visible from the frontage to a major road. For this reason, although I concur with the LPA and objectors that most of the site would, because of its back-land nature, be attractive only to local businesses, I consider that a small part on the frontage to Atherleigh Way could be attractive to an incoming business.

Site EM1A7: Bridgewater, Leigh

7.29 At December 2001 some 1.2ha of land remained undeveloped within this established industrial estate. By January 2004 this had been fully developed.

Site EM1A8: Hope Carr/Leigh Commerce Park, Leigh

7.30 At December 2001 some 11.0ha of land remained undeveloped within this established industrial estate. By January 2004 this had been reduced, by development, to some 7.9ha. Both the LPA and the objectors concur that this is a development opportunity which is attractive to both local and inward investors because of its proximity to the A580 dual carriageway. They agree that the remaining land is capable of being fully developed within the plan period.

Site EM1A9: Chaddock Lane, Astley

7.31 At December 2001 some 0.7ha of land remained undeveloped within this established industrial estate. By January 2004 this had increased to 0.93ha. Both the LPA and objectors agree that this is capable of being developed within the plan period but, because it is understood to be reserved for future expansion by established adjoining businesses, it is likely to meet a local market need rather than serve inward investment.

Site EM1A10: Parr Brow, Tyldesley

7.32 Although identified as a Primary Employment Area, no land was available for development at either December 2001 or January 2004.

Site EM1A11: Chanters Industrial Estate, Hindsford

7.33 Although identified as a Primary Employment Area, no land was available for development at either December 2001 or January 2004.

Site EM1A12: Gibfield, Atherton

7.34 The LPA contends that at both December 2001 and January 2004, some 16ha of land was available for employment development on this site. Part of this lies within the adopted green belt, however. Having regard to my considerations and conclusions which are presented in the section of this report which relates to policy EM1A12, this site should be regarded as having a capacity of only some 9.55ha of employment land. This is composed of the 6.8ha with planning permission for a business park and 2.75ha of employment land at Coal Pit Lane. The whole of this is capable of being developed within the plan period. Having regard to my conclusions in relation to policy A1P(1) that there is no realistic prospect that the A5225 road will commence construction during the plan period, the Gibfield Primary Employment Area will continue to be remote from a high quality highway network. For this reason it is likely to attract local rather than incoming investors.

Site EM1A13: East of Leigh Road, Hindley Green

7.35 Having regard to my conclusions in the section of this report which relates to policy EM1A13, I conclude that there is no realistic prospect that this site will yield any employment development during the plan period.

Site EM1A14: West of Leigh Road, Hindley Green

7.36 Having regard to my conclusions in the section of this report which relates to policy EM1A14, I conclude that there is no realistic prospect that any of the undeveloped land at Primary Employment Area EM1A14 will form an effective part of the employment land resource during the plan period.

Site EM1A15: Swan Lane, Hindley Green

7.37 At both December 2001 and January 2004, some 7.0ha of land was available within this established industrial estate. Both the LPA and objectors concur that this is capable of being developed within the plan period. Because of its remoteness from high capacity, multi-carriageway roads, I conclude that it is likely to be attractive to local rather than incoming investors.

Site EM1A16: Makerfield Way, Ince

7.38 At December 2001 some 11.9ha was available within this established industrial estate. By January 2004 this had been reduced by development to some 7.61ha. Both the LPA and objectors concur that this is capable of being developed within the plan period. I

conclude that, because of its remoteness from high capacity multi-carriageway roads, it is likely to be attractive to local rather than incoming investors.

Site EM1A17: Wigan Enterprise Park, Ince

7.39 At December 2001 and January 2004 some 1.8ha was available within this established industrial estate. Both the LPA and objectors concur that this is capable of being developed within the plan period. I conclude that, because of its remoteness from high capacity multi-carriageway roads, it is likely to be attractive to local rather than incoming investors.

Site EM1A18: Dobson Park Industrial Estate, Ince

7.40 At December 2001 some 2.1ha was available within this established industrial estate. By January 2004 this had been reduced, by development to 1.12ha. Both the LPA and objectors concur that this is capable of being developed within the plan period. Because of its remoteness from high capacity multi-carriageway roads it is likely to be attractive to local rather than incoming investors.

Site EM1A19: Rosebridge, Ince

7.41 At December 2001 some 1.2ha was available within this established industrial estate. By January 2004 this had been reduced by development to some 0.85ha. Both the LPA and objectors concur that this is capable of being developed within the plan period. Because of its remoteness from high capacity multi-carriageway roads it is likely to be attractive to local rather than incoming investors.

Site EM1A20: Westwood Park, Wigan

7.42 The proposed Primary Employment Area at Westwood Park has a total area of 33.9ha of which some 21.3ha was available as at December 2001 and 21.6ha was available at January 2004. The reasoned justification of the RDD informs that the full development potential of this site is dependent on the construction of the western section of the A5225 road to junction 26 of the M6. For the reasons I give in the section of this report which relates to policy A1P(1) I have recommended that land should not be safeguarded for that road scheme.

7.43 The site is to be served by the Westwood Link Road, construction of which is due to start in February 2005. In the absence of the A5225 to which it would have connected at its southern end, this new highway will be limited to linking the site to the existing road network to the south of Wigan town centre. Internal access roads are complete and the necessary new canal bridge is under construction. The whole site should be serviced and available for development to start in 2007.

7.44 The restriction on accessibility imposed by the likely future dependence of the allocation on the town centre circulation system is likely to restrict the attractiveness of

the site to local rather than incoming investors. For the reasons I give in relation to the Primary Employment Areas at East and West of Leigh Road and the South Lancashire Industrial Estate (policies EM1A13, 14 and 36 respectively), there is likely to be less employment land available than anticipated by the LPA. This could enhance the prospects for the development of the land at Westwood Park and outweigh the access factor to allow the entire 21.6ha to be taken up within the plan period, notwithstanding the absence of the A5225 road.

Site EM1A21: Wigan Pier Business Park/Riverside, Wigan

7.45 At December 2001 some 0.9ha was available in this office park area. By January 2004 this had been reduced by development to some 0.52ha. Both the LPA and objectors concur that this is capable of development within the plan period. The accessibility of this site will be enhanced by the construction of the Westwood Park/Town Centre Link Road which is due to commence construction in February 2005. The site would, however, have been attractive to inward investors only if the A5225 Wigan and Hindley Bypass was constructed and connected this link road to the national motorway network. It is likely that, in the absence of this connection, the site will be attractive to local rather than incoming investors. My view on this aspect coincides with that of the RDD that the A5225 is critical to the ability to achieve the full potential of this site.

Site EM1A22: Chapel Lane, Wigan

7.46 Although identified as a Primary Employment Area, no land was available for development within this established industrial estate at either December 2001 or January 2004.

Site EM1A23: Wallgate, Wigan

7.47 At December 2001 some 0.3ha of land was available within this established industrial estate. However, by January 2004 this had been completely developed.

Site EM1A24: Springfield and Miry Lane, Wigan

7.48 At December 2001 some 5.5ha was available within this established industrial estate. By January 2004 this had been reduced by development to some 3.9ha. Both the LPA and objectors concur that this is capable of development within the plan period. Because of its remoteness from high capacity multi-carriageway roads, I conclude that the land is likely to be attractive to local rather than incoming investors.

Site EM1A25: Martland Park and Heinz, Wigan

7.49 At December 2001 some 16.3ha of this 100.4ha Primary Employment Area was available for development. By January 2004 this had reduced by development to some 15.5ha. An objector argues that some 5.0ha of this area will be developed for non-employment uses (ie car sales) and, as a consequence, the available area for employment

should be reduced by this amount. The LPA has confirmed that the relevant area is some 3.0ha rather than 5.0ha.

7.50 RDD policy EM1E confirms that the development of premises for motor vehicle servicing, repairs, hire and sales will be permitted within Primary Employment Areas provided that the appearance of the use will not unduly dominate the area and that there will be no adverse impact on the amenity of nearby uses. Such uses can, therefore, be regarded as appropriate to Primary Employment Areas. The possible future take-up of land for these purposes should not reduce the area considered to be currently available for employment. I conclude that some 15.5ha of land should be regarded as available for this. Because the area is served by only minor roads it would prove attractive to local rather than incoming businesses.

#### Site EM1A26: Gidlow Lane, Beech Hill

7.51 For the reasons I give in the section of this report which relates to policy EM1A26, I conclude that this Primary Employment Area should be redefined to exclude the part of this which is within the adopted green belt. On that basis the Primary Employment Area would be reduced to some 6.6ha containing no vacant employment land.

#### Site EM1A27: Bradley Lane, Standish

7.52 At December 2001 and January 2004 some 3.3ha of land was available within this established industrial estate. Both the LPA and objectors concur that this is capable of being developed within the plan period. Because of its remoteness from high capacity multi-carriageway roads, it is likely to be attractive to local rather than incoming investors.

#### Site EM1A28: Richmond Hill Industrial Estate, Pemberton

7.53 At December 2001 and January 2004 some 0.45ha of land was available within this established industrial estate. Both the LPA and objectors concur that this is capable of being developed in the plan period. Because of its remoteness from high capacity multi-carriageway roads it is likely to be attractive to local rather than incoming investors.

#### Site EM1A29: Lamberhead Industrial Estate, Pemberton

7.54 Although identified as a Primary Employment Area, no land was available for development at either December 2001 or January 2004.

Site EM1A30: Pemberton Colliery

7.55 At December 2001 and January 2004 some 18.7ha of land was available for development within this Primary Employment Area. For the reasons I give in the section of this report which relates to policy EM1A30, it is likely that the whole of this amount will be developed during the plan period, although road access limitations may reduce somewhat the attractiveness of the site to incoming investment and emphasise its role in meeting local demand.

Site EM1A31: Warrington Road Industrial Estate, Wigan

7.56 Although identified as a Primary Employment Area, no land was available for development at either December 2001 or January 2004.

Site EM1A32: Warrington Road, Hawkley

7.57 At December 2001 and at January 2004 some 4.2ha was available adjacent to an established factory. Both the LPA and objectors concur that this is capable of being developed within the plan period. Because of its proximity to junction 25 of the M6, and the scope for the vacant land to have a frontage to the A49 road, I conclude that it would be attractive to both local and inward investors.

Site EM1A33: Wheatlea Industrial Estate, Wigan

7.58 At December 2001 and at January 2004 some 0.4ha was available within this established industrial estate. Both the LPA and objectors concur that this is capable of being developed within the plan period. Because the vacant land would be a small infill site with no frontage to the adjacent A49 road, it is likely to be attractive to local rather than incoming investors.

Site EM1A34: Haslemere and Land Gate, Bryn

7.59 Although identified as a Primary Employment Area, no land was available for development at either December 2001 or January 2004.

Site EM1A35: Park Brook, Wigan Road, Bryn

7.60 Although identified in the RDD as having 3.2ha of land available for employment development, the employment land availability update of January 2004 (CD8) confirms that this is an established industrial estate with no vacant land. Having regard to the age and layout of the buildings on the site this is likely to have been the situation at December 2001 also.

#### Site EM1A36: South Lancashire Industrial Estate, Ashton

7.61 This Primary Employment Area has a total area of some 91.0ha. Of this, some 39.2ha was available at December 2001. This had increased to 41.7ha at January 2004. For the reasons I give in the section of this report which relates to policy EM1A36, I have recommended that employment development in this Primary Employment Area must be limited to schemes which, due to their inherent nature or their integration with achievable off-site works, will not significantly increase the traffic flows through Ashton-in-Makerfield town centre.

7.62 Some development within these categories may be possible and the UDP should allow for this. However, no evidence presented to the inquiry leads me to conclude that it will be a significant amount. Because of the remoteness of the site from high quality transport infrastructure, development is likely to be for local rather than inward investors.

#### Site EM1A37: Kirkless Industrial Estate, Top Lock

7.63 Although identified as a Primary Employment Area no land was available for development at either December 2001 or January 2004.

#### Summary of Employment Land Capacity and Shortfall

7.64 The foregoing assessment indicates that there is a realistic prospect that, between January 2004 and April 2016, some 131.24ha of land will be available for development. To this should be added the 18.61ha that CD8 confirms was developed during 2002 and 2003 to give a total of some 150ha realistically available over the 14 year period from April 2002 to April 2016. This might, in practice, be increased slightly if development proposals come forward on the South Lancashire Industrial Estate of a sort which, due to their inherent nature or their integration with achievable off-site works, will not significantly increase traffic flows through Ashton-in-Makerfield town centre. This leaves a shortfall of about 109ha between the requirement of some 259ha and the supply of about 150ha.

7.65 From the foregoing assessment it is also apparent that, while most of the realistically available employment land supply is likely to be capable of meeting the needs for expansion and relocation of businesses which are already established within the Borough, only a small proportion is likely to meet the needs of inward investors. Having regard to the provisions of RPG13 (policy EC2), it is necessary to increase the capacity of the employment land resource to meet that particular element of demand.

7.66 I conclude that the RDD does not make sufficient provision for a continuous supply of employment land of adequate quality throughout the whole of the plan period. In particular it does not provide for the 259ha of employment land which RDD policy EM1 identifies as one of the measures necessary for this purpose. On the basis of an annual requirement of 15.4ha of land per year, with a 20% flexibility allowance (i.e. 18.5ha per year), the 150ha supply would last for some 8 years from the start of the plan

period in 2002 until about 2010. Provision must be made for a supply for the whole plan period to 2016. Prior to the adoption of the replacement UDP the LPA must identify additional employment land.

7.67 In the session of the inquiry which related to the merits of designating land as a Primary Employment Area at Chaddock Lane, Astley, (policy EM1A) the LPA confirmed what it had already agreed several months earlier in the Statement of Common Ground for a related s.78 planning appeal i.e. that the only alternative employment sites of significance in the Borough were those that had already been designated as Primary Employment Areas within the RDD. It was explicitly confirmed by the LPA that it did not believe that any outstanding employment land need could be accommodated in existing buildings or on previously developed sites that are not so designated. This directs the search for the necessary additional employment sites to green-field land. In accordance with the advice of PPG2 (paragraph 2.12) it is clear that safeguarded land is to be developed before green belt land.

7.68 PPG2 (Annex B, paragraph B3) confirms that, to be designated as safeguarded land, such areas must be located where development would be an efficient use of land, well integrated with existing development and well related to public transport and other existing and planned infrastructure, so promoting sustainable development. I can, therefore, assume that the areas proposed to be designated as safeguarded land are appropriate for development, the only factor being when this should be undertaken. There is, however, a significant difference in the pre-requisites for development for employment and for other purposes. In particular, employment development generally requires good road access to the main road network without passing through residential areas. The infrastructure of supporting services also has different characteristics. It is not, therefore, possible for me to conclude that all safeguarded land is suitable for employment development. For this reason it is necessary for the LPA to identify, from within the area proposed for designation as safeguarded land, sufficient new employment allocations to make up the shortfall in supply.

7.69 For the reasons I give in the section of this report which relates to policy EM1A, I have recommended that some 17.9ha of land at Chaddock Lane, Astley, be identified within the UDP as a Primary Employment Area. This reduces the shortfall to some 91ha. If my recommendation is accepted it would also increase the capacity of the Borough to meet the needs of inward investors. Having regard to this assessment there is, in my view, no justification for the reclassification of individual Primary Employment Areas as mixed-use developments (as is sought by several objectors) because this would reduce, still further, the effective capacity of the employment land resource. Objectors argue that additional areas of land should be allocated as mixed-use developments. Where specific sites are proposed, these are considered in this report.

*The meaning of 'other employment uses'*

7.70 An objector notes that, for the purposes of RDD Chapter 7, employment uses include uses within classes B1, B2 and B8 and other employment uses. He argues that

these other uses should be identified. This is done on page 38 of the RDD. The LPA contends that waste management proposals are often appropriately located in employment areas and, for that reason, should be considered against the employment policies of the UDP in addition to the waste management policies. It proposes, via DINC9, that the definition text in the reasoned justification to policy EM1 should clarify that waste transfer and recycling facilities are to be treated as employment uses. Because waste management schemes often have the characteristics of employment activities it is, in my view, necessary that they should comply with these additional policy requirements.

*The need for a review of employment land*

7.71 PPG3 (paragraph 42) advises that LPAs should review all their non-housing land allocations when reviewing their development plans and consider whether some of this land might better be used for housing or mixed-use developments. An objector notes that the RDD does not specifically confirm that this has been done and, if it has, how the findings have influenced policies and proposals. The LPA confirms that such a review has been undertaken. This is evidenced by the substantial differences between the employment land allocations in the adopted and replacement UDPs. The introduction to the employment policies confirms that a significant amount of employment land in the Borough has been redeveloped for housing. What remains is more suited to existing and future employment uses.

*The need to make provision for small business parks and starter units*

7.72 An objector argues that the UDP should make provision for small business parks and starter units in order to create employment opportunities close to where people live, and so reduce travel to work distances. Policy EM1 provides the scope for such sites to be identified by prospective developers. In clause 'C' it provides that employment uses on land or buildings not currently in or allocated for employment use, will be permitted provided that there is no unacceptable impact. This approach is carried forward in greater detail by policy EM1C. This objector postulates two locations for such small business parks and starter units. From the description he gives these sites are within the adopted green belt. No exceptional circumstances are presented which justify a modification of the green belt boundary at these points.

7.73 This objector seeks a relaxation of development control in the green belt to allow the development of land there for small business parks and starter units. Such development would, having regard to the advice of PPG2 (paragraph 3.4), be inappropriate development in the green belt. The LPA does not have the discretion to vary this policy framework.

7.74 The same objector seeks improved access to the Bradley Hall Industrial Estate, but does not indicate how this could be achieved. The LPA notes that the access is of poor quality but confirms that there is no reasonable prospect of it being improved during the plan period. This access, therefore, will continue to operate as a constraint to

development. Policy EM1A recognises that such cases will occur. This limitation will be taken into account in the consideration of development proposals at this location.

## **Recommendation**

**I recommend:**

**(REC 7.2) that the RDD be modified so that the reasoned justification to policy EM1 clearly states that the period to which its provisions relate is 14 years from April 2002 to April 2016.**

**(REC 7.3) that the RDD be modified so that the reasoned justification to policy EM1 provides that, during the plan period, provision will be made to allow the development of an annual average of at least 15.4ha gross of land for employment (216ha), together with a further 43ha gross to provide a flexibility allowance for choice and range of sites of 20%, a total provision of at least 259ha gross.**

**(REC 7.4) that the RDD be modified by the designation of sufficient land as Primary Employment Areas to make realistic provision for at least an additional 91ha gross of employment land over and above that already identified in that document and the additional Primary Employment Area at Chaddock Lane, Astley, which I recommend be designated. The search for this additional employment land should be directed, in the first instance, to the areas proposed to be designated as safeguarded land. A significant proportion of that land should be of such a nature that it is likely to be attractive to inward investors by reason, in particular, of its accessibility to the principal elements of the Borough's highway network.**

**(REC 7.5) that the RDD be modified by the incorporation, within the definition of employment uses in the reasoned justification to policy EM1, of additional text to clarify that waste transfer and recycling facilities will be treated as employment uses, in accordance with DINC9.**

**(REC 7.6) that no other modification be made to the RDD in response to these objections.**