

## CHAPTER 10 - ACCESSIBILITY POLICIES

### A INTRODUCTION

#### Objections to Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
572	O	026	A		Peter Sargeant FRTPI		WIGAN MBC 572/A
140	O	003	A		Nick Trotter		WMBC 140 A/C

#### Draft Deposit Objections Unconditionally Withdrawn

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
133	O	002	A		Eileen Rybka		

#### Supporters of Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
176	S	004	A		Wigan and District Ramblers Association		

#### Supporters of Revised Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
176	S	008	A		Wigan and District Ramblers Association		

### Main Issues

Whether the introduction to this chapter is appropriate, having regard to:

- the mode of expression;
- the recognition that horse-riders are vulnerable road users

### Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

#### *The mode of expression*

10.1 An objector argues that the first paragraph of the introduction is weakly and tritely expressed. In my view it is a useful initial statement of the general relationship between increased mobility and the current state of the economy.

*The recognition that horse-riders are vulnerable road users*

10.2 An objector, at FDD stage, argues that the introduction to Chapter 10 should recognise that horse-riders are vulnerable road users. The LPA concurs and, at RDD stage, has made the necessary reference to this in policy A1 and its reasoned justification.

**Recommendation**

**I recommend:**

**(REC 10.1) that no modification be made to the RDD in response to these objections.**

## A1 ACCESSIBILITY

### Objections to Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Responses Ref.
572	O	065	A	1	Peter Sargeant FRTPI		WIGAN MBC 572/A

### Objections to Revised Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Responses Ref.
572	O	099	A	1	Peter Sargeant FRTPI		WIGAN MBC 572/A

### Supporters of Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Responses Ref.
418	S	008	A	1	GMPTE		
437	S	015	A	1	NWTB	Paul Butler Associates	

### Supporters of Revised Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Responses Ref.
747	S	008	A	1	Wigan Borough Action Group		

## Main Issues

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to:

- the overall objective of the policy;
- the hierarchy of accessibility.

## Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

### *The overall objective of the policy*

10.3 Policy A1 seeks to achieve a more sustainable and integrated transport system via its provisions for the location and design of development. The first paragraph of the policy provides that the LPA will seek to achieve this in order to meet the needs of residents, assist in the economic and social regeneration of the Borough and reduce the environmental impact of development. An objector seeks the inclusion of references to safety and amenity in addition to that to environmental impact. These factors are, however, already given specific recognition in the final paragraph of the policy. The reference to these at the end of the policy should not be read as downgrading their importance. The plan is to be read as a whole. It is clear that safety and amenity considerations are to be given due regard when considering the access needs of all areas.

### *The hierarchy of accessibility*

10.4 The third element of the policy presents a hierarchy of accessibility to be applied in the design and layout of new development and highway works. An objector argues that people with disabilities should be classified together with pedestrians to reflect the Council's walking strategy. In my view the interests of people with disabilities should be recognised as distinct from pedestrians generally and come before them in the hierarchy, because such people give rise to accessibility issues relating to all modes of transport, including public transport and private cars. In any case, if an environment is designed to meet the needs of people with disabilities then it will also be easier for other people to use.

10.5 The same objector argues that the reference to 'commercial traffic for local access' should be replaced with one to 'local access traffic'. The position of commercial traffic in the hierarchy is a reflection of its importance to the well-being of town and local centres and the implications of this for employment and prosperity.

10.6 The final paragraph of the reasoned justification, which was inserted at RDD stage, informs that horse-riders are included in the hierarchy of accessibility alongside cyclists, not because of their potential to contribute to the achievement of a more sustainable transport system but because they are vulnerable road users. An objector argues that horse-riding should be recognised as a form of transport. Horse-riding is, however, overwhelmingly a form of leisure activity. It does not have a transport function comparable to the other forms referred to in the policy.

### **Recommendation**

**I recommend:**

**(REC 10.2) that no modification be made to the RDD in response to these objections.**

## A1A TRANSPORT ASSESSMENTS

### Objections to Draft Deposit

#### Draft Deposit Objections Unconditionally Withdrawn

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
457	O	006	A	1A	Highways Agency		

### Objections to Revised Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
177	O	012	A	1A	Mr D Foster		WMBC 177 A1A

### Supporters of Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
418	S	009	A	1A	GMPTE		

### Supporters of Revised Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
572	S	100	A	1A	Peter Sargeant FRTPI		WIGAN MBC 572/A
747	S	007	A	1A	Wigan Borough Action Group		

## Main Issue

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to the coverage of a Transport Assessment.

## Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

10.7 Policy A1A provides that a Transport Assessment will be required for all proposed development that would give rise to a material increase in the volume or other impact of road traffic. The reasoned justification informs that the coverage and detail of a Transport Assessment should reflect the scale and likely transport impacts of the development proposed, including any implications for the trunk road network.

10.8 An objector argues that the reasoned justification should confirm that the assessment will have regard to the effect of additional traffic on road congestion, air pollution, quality of life and environmental factors. The wording of policy A1A, itself, confirms that a Transport Assessment would be required for development which gives rise to both a material increase in the volume of traffic or other impacts of road traffic. This wording is wide enough to encompass the effects referred to by the objector. The UDP is, in any case, to be read as a whole. Policy EV1B provides that development will not be permitted if it would result in unacceptable levels of pollution. Policy G1A provides that development will be permitted only where it would not be detrimental, via various specified factors, to amenity. For these reasons I conclude that policy A1A should not be modified in response to this objection.

**Recommendation**

**I recommend:**

**(REC 10.3) that no modification be made to the RDD in response to this objection.**

## A1B TRAVEL PLANS

### Objections to Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
702	O	010	A	1B	Tescos Stores Ltd	The Development Planning Partnership	702 PART

### Supporters of Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
418	S	010	A	1B	GMPTE		

### Main Issue

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to the Government's planning policy guidance.

### Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

10.9 Policy A1B provides that a Travel Plan will be required alongside planning applications for new development or change of use in certain specified situations. An objector argues that, instead of being submitted alongside a planning application, a Travel Plan could be required by a condition to a planning application and be submitted later.

10.10 The information presented in a Travel Plan is an important element of the assessment which underlies the decision whether planning permission should be granted or not. It would be wrong to grant planning permission only to find out later that it could not be implemented. The LPA's approach acknowledges this. It is consistent with the advice of PPG13 (paragraph 89) that the Government considers that Travel Plans should be submitted alongside planning applications which are likely to have significant implications. The clauses of policy A1B all relate to situations of that sort. For these reasons I conclude that policy A1B should not be modified in the way sought by the objector.

### Recommendation

#### I recommend:

**(REC 10.4) that no modification be made to the RDD in response to this objection.**

## A1C ACCESS FOR ALL

### Objections to Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
132	O	002	A	1C	Joseph Healen		WMBC 132 A1C
391	O	001	A	1C	Wigan Access for the Disabled Committee		WMBC 132 A1C
702	O	005	A	1C	Tesco Stores Ltd	The Development Planning Partnership	702 PART

### Objections to Revised Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
572	O	101	A	1C	Peter Sargeant FRTPI		WIGAN MBC 572/A
702	O	028	A	1C	Tescos Stores Ltd	The Development Planning Partnership	WMBC 702 PART

### Supporters of Revised Deposit

Ref No	a	B	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
747	S	006	A	1C	Wigan Borough Action Group		

## Main Issues

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to:

- the quality of design layouts;
- the requirement for off-site provision;
- the scope of the policy.

## Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

### *The quality of design layouts*

10.11 Policy A1C provides that new development and transport proposals will be required to make provision for safe, clearly defined and convenient access for all potential users regardless of disability, age and gender to ensure the highest standards of accessibility and inclusion in all development proposals.

10.12 An objector argues that the reasoned justification to policy A1C should secure that layouts include the provision of tactile pavement surfaces. The quality of scheme layout is secured by the wording of the policy itself, which requires provision to be made for safe, clearly defined and convenient access for all. Tactile pavement surfaces are a useful component of a design. They can be used, where appropriate, to help users navigate and manoeuvre within and adjacent to a development scheme. There may well be other appropriate techniques which should be used as an alternative to these, or in conjunction with them, depending on the particular situation. For this reason I conclude that the reference in the reasoned justification to routes being safe, well-defined, easy to

negotiate and appropriately signed is suitable because it gives necessary flexibility to a designer to maximise accessibility on a particular site.

*The requirement for off-site provision*

10.13 Policy A1C provides that, where off-site provision for people with disabilities is inadequate, a legal agreement will be sought to secure the developer's contribution to the works needed to improve accessibility. This will be relative to the scale and type of the development and the relevant characteristics of the local environment.

10.14 An objector argues that off-site provision, and therefore such an agreement, may not be needed in every case. Any planning obligation that is concluded must conform to the advice of the now superseded Circular 1/97 (now Circular 05/2005). He advocates that reference to this should be incorporated within the policy. The UDP is intended to be read as a whole, however, in conformity with the advice of PPG12 that it should be succinct. Policy G1B deals with planning obligations. This confirms that these will be sought only where the need for them arises directly from the development. This is reinforced in the final paragraph of the reasoned justification to that policy which informs that it will always be necessary to ensure that the extent of what is required is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. It must also meet the other tests laid down in the now superseded Circular 1/97 (now Circular 05/2005). There is, therefore, no need to repeat this aspect in policy A1C.

*The scope of the policy*

10.15 An objector argues that policy A1C should be extended in scope to secure high quality provision in developments for public use, including public toilets, and should recognise the special needs of babies and children. The policy does refer to age as a relevant factor. As regards to public toilets and other facilities, policy G1B(d) refers to the provision of appropriate community facilities where the need for these arises directly from the development or its impact. Having regard to the advice of PPG12 that development plans should be succinct, it is not appropriate to duplicate references to this matter in policy A1C which has, as its primary concern, the provision of access.

**Recommendation**

**I recommend:**

**(REC 10.5) that no modification be made to the RDD in response to these objections.**

## A1D WALKING

### Objections to Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
702	O	006	A	1D	Tesco Stores Limited	The Development Planning Partnership	WMBC 702 PART

### Draft Deposit Objections Unconditionally Withdrawn

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
003	O	003	A	1D	George Seaward		

### Objections to Revised Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
702	O	029	A	1D	Tescos Stores Limited	The Development Planning Partnership	WMBC 702 PART
747	O	114	A	1D	Wigan Borough Action Group		WIGAN MBC 747/A

### Supporters of Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	B	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
176	S	003	A	1D	Wigan and District Ramblers Association		
418	S	011	A	1D	GMPTE		

### Supporters of Revised Deposit

Ref No	a	B	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
176	S	009	A	1D	Wigan and District Ramblers Association		

## Main Issues

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to:

- the requirement for off-site provision;
- the lighting of walkways.

## Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

### *The requirement for off-site provision*

10.16 RDD policy A1D presents measures designed to make the walking environment more accessible, attractive, convenient and safe. It provides that, where off-site access for pedestrians is inadequate, a legal agreement will be sought to secure the developer's contribution to the works needed to improve accessibility. This will be relative to the scale and type of the development and the relevant characteristics of the local highway network.

10.17 An objector argues that off-site provision, and therefore such an agreement, may not be needed in every case. Any planning obligation that is concluded must conform to the advice of the now superseded Circular 1/97 (now Circular 05/2005). He advocates that reference to this should be incorporated within the policy. The UDP is intended to be read as a whole, however, in conformity with the advice of PPG12 that it should be succinct. Policy G1B deals with planning obligations. This confirms that these will be sought only where the need arises directly from the development. This is reinforced in the final paragraph of the reasoned justification to that policy which informs that it will always be necessary to ensure that the extent of what is required is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. It must meet the other tests laid down in the now superseded Circular 1/97 (now Circular 05/2005). There is, therefore, no need to repeat this aspect in policy A1D.

*The lighting of walkways*

10.18 The reasoned justification for policy A1D, at RDD stage, informs that, to improve security, attention will be given to providing adequate lighting and ensuring footways are visible from surrounding areas. An objector argues that the reference should be not simply to 'lighting' but to 'street lighting'. The RDD wording is, in my view, to be preferred because it encompasses lighting in locations other than the streets, including footpaths which follow other alignments.

**Recommendation**

**I recommend:**

**(REC 10.6) that no modification be made to the RDD in response to these objections.**

## A1E CYCLING

### Objections to Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
096	O	003	A	1E	Lane Head South Residents Group		WMBC 096 Lane Head South
437	O	014	A	1E	NWTB	Paul Butler Associates	WMBC 437
702	O	007	A	1E	Tescos Stores Ltd	The Development Planning Partnership	WMBC 702 PART
702	O	011	A	1E	Tescos Stores Ltd	The Development Planning Partnership	WMBC 702 PART

### Objections to Revised Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
702	O	030	A	1E	Tescos Stores Ltd	The Development Planning Partnership	WMBC 702 PART
747	O	113	A	1E	Wigan Borough Action Group		WIGAN MBC 747/A

### Supporters of Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
096	S	010	A	1E	Lane Head South Residents Group		

## Main Issues

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to:

- the mode of expression of the purposes of the policy;
- the requirement for off-site provision;
- the nature of Cycle Audits;
- the safety of dedicated cycle-ways;
- the role of cycling in the promotion of recreation and tourism.

## Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

*The mode of expression of the purposes of the policy*

10.19 RDD policy A1E provides that the LPA will implement measures to improve accessibility for cyclists, including the development of a more attractive, convenient and safe cycling network. Development will be required to make provision for safe and convenient access for cyclists.

10.20 The reasoned justification for the policy, at FDD stage, refers to Cycle Audits which are to be carried out by the LPA to determine, among other things, that cycle routes are not severed by developments and that adequate provision is made for cycling

within them. At RDD stage this intention is expressed slightly differently. Cycle Audits are to be carried out to determine the required infrastructure improvements and to ensure that development does not adversely affect the existing and proposed cycle network. An objector argues that the FDD wording should be reinstated. However, in my view, the RDD wording more eloquently expresses the purpose of Cycle Audits. In doing this it does not neglect any of the meaning of the FDD text.

#### *The requirement for off-site provision*

10.21 Policy A1E provides that, where off-site access for cycling is inadequate, a legal agreement will be sought to secure the developer's contribution to the works needed to improve accessibility. This will be relative to the scale and type of the development and the relevant characteristics of the local highway network.

10.22 An objector argues that off-site provision, and therefore such an agreement, may not be needed in every case. Any planning obligation that is concluded must conform to the advice of the now superseded Circular 1/97 (now Circular 05/2005). He advocates that reference to this should be incorporated within the policy. The UDP is intended to be read as a whole, however, in conformity with the advice of PPG12 that it should be succinct. Policy G1B deals with planning obligations. This confirms that these will be sought only where the need for them arises directly from the development. This is reinforced in the final paragraph of the reasoned justification to that policy which informs that it will always be necessary to ensure that the extent of what is required is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. It must also meet the other tests laid down in the now superseded Circular 1/97 (now Circular 05/2005). There is, therefore, no need to repeat this aspect in policy A1E.

#### *The nature of Cycle Audits*

10.23 The reasoned justification to policy A1E, at FDD stage, informed that Cycle Audits will be required to ensure that existing and future routes are not severed and that adequate provision is made for cycling within developments. An objector at FDD stage argued that the UDP should present clearer guidance on what these Audits involve and who would prepare and monitor them. The LPA concurs and, at RDD stage, has changed the reasoned justification to clarify that Cycle Audits will be carried out by the LPA to determine the required infrastructure improvements and to ensure that the development does not adversely affect the existing and proposed cycle network. I conclude that this satisfies the concerns of the objector.

#### *The safety of dedicated cycle-ways*

10.24 An objector doubts that cycle-ways can operate in a safe manner. Policy A1E is expressed in terms which provide only for the development of cycle-ways which are, among other things, safe. Unsafe facilities would not, therefore, be provided.

*The role of cycling in the promotion of recreation and tourism*

10.25 An objector argues that policy A1E should be extended to emphasise the role of cycling as a recreational activity and as an aspect of tourism. The UDP is to be read as a whole. Tourism is dealt with in policies EM2 and EM2A. Recreational cycling is, whenever practicable, to be provided for by the development of the Greenway Network under policy C1E. Policy A1E is optimised to deal with cycling as an aspect of accessibility, but the same physical infrastructure can serve a recreation role also. There is, therefore, no need to make an additional reference to this role in this policy.

**Recommendation**

**I recommend:**

**(REC 10.7) that no modification be made to the RDD in response to these objections.**

## A1F BUS PROVISION - NEW DEVELOPMENT

### Objections to Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	B	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
572	O	027	A	1F	Peter Sargeant FRTPI		WIGAN MBC 572/A
702	O	008	A	1F	Tescos Stores Ltd	The Development Planning Partnership	WMBC 702 PART
702	O	012	A	1F	Tescos Stores Ltd	The Development Planning Partnership	WMBC 702 PART

### Objections to Revised Deposit

Ref No	a	B	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
702	O	031	A	1F	Tescos Stores Ltd	The Development Planning Partnership	WMBC 702 PART

### Supporters of Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	B	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
418	S	012	A	1F	GMPTE		

### Main Issues

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to:

- the circumstances in which the policy will be applied;
- the requirement for off-site provision;
- the detailed routing of bus services.

### Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

*The circumstances in which the policy will be applied*

10.26 Policy A1F provides that, in all appropriate new developments, provision for access by buses will be required. An objector argues that the UDP should clarify what constitutes 'appropriate new development'. This is done within the first paragraph of the reasoned justification. This informs that the need to meet the requirements of the policy will depend on the size, location and type of development. It is likely to be particularly appropriate in larger housing, retail and leisure developments.

10.27 The objector contends that new or increased bus provision should be required only where it is necessary and that every case should be judged on its merits. The reasoned justification deals with this aspect also by providing that a Transport Assessment will help determine the need for improved access and the type of measures required.

*The requirement for off-site provision*

10.28 Policy A1F provides that, where off-site access for bus services is inadequate to allow for an appropriate level of service provision, a legal agreement will be sought to secure the developer's contribution to the works needed to improve accessibility. This will be relative to the scale and type of the development and the relevant characteristics of the local highway network.

10.29 An objector argues that off-site provision, and therefore such an agreement, may not be needed in every case. Any planning obligation that is concluded must conform to the advice of the now superseded Circular 1/97 (now Circular 05/2005). He advocates that reference to this should be incorporated within the policy. The UDP is intended to be read as a whole, in conformity with the advice of PPG12 that it should be succinct. Policy G1B deals with planning obligations. This confirms that these will be sought only where the need for them arises directly from the development. This is reinforced in the final paragraph of the reasoned justification to that policy which informs that it will always be necessary to ensure that the extent of what is required is fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development. It must also meet the other tests laid down in the now superseded Circular 1/97 (now Circular 05/2005). There is, therefore, no need to repeat this aspect in policy A1F.

*The detailed routing of bus services*

10.30 An objector argues that bus routes should be planned on a through-running basis, minimising the need for turning areas. The LPA has, however, limited involvement with the planning of bus routes. Responsibility for this lies primarily with the Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive and the bus operator. Policy A1 provides for the needs of public transport to be reflected in the design and layout of new development and highway works.

**Recommendation**

**I recommend:**

**(REC 10.8) that no modification be made to the RDD in response to these objections.**

## A1G PHYSICAL IMPROVEMENTS TO BUS NETWORK

### Objections to Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	B	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
418	O	014	A	1G	GMPTE		WMBC A1G
457	O	007	A	1G	Highways Agency		WMBC A1G
568	O	003	A	1G	North West Development Agency		WMBC A1G
583	O	020	A	1G	Peel Investment (North) Ltd	Halliwell Landau	WMBC A1G

### Supporters of Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	B	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
418	S	013	A	1G	GMPTE		
724	S	001	A	1G	Merseyside Passenger Transport Authority and Exec.		

### Main Issues

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to:

- the potential effect of Quality Bus Corridors on the trunk road network;
- the merits of identifying the Leigh to Bolton Quality Bus Corridor;
- the scope for a Quality Bus Corridor between Wigan and Warrington;
- the scope for a Quality Bus Corridor between Leigh and Salford via Astley.

### Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

#### *The potential effect of Quality Bus Corridors on the trunk road network*

10.31 Policy A1G identifies five routes which are being developed as Quality Bus Corridors. Developments close to these, that require a Transport Assessment, should contribute towards the implementation of Quality Bus Corridor measures as far as they are material to the proposed development. An objector argues that a number of the proposed corridors may have an impact on the trunk road network, but the policy makes no reference to the role of the Highways Agency as highway authority for that network.

10.32 None of the Quality Bus Corridors depend on a motorway or any other trunk road for part of their route, however. There is, therefore, no need for a specific reference to the Highways Agency. The Quality Bus Corridor initiative is being progressed via the Local Transport Plan process. In Greater Manchester the Highways Agency is represented on the Greater Manchester LTP Steering Group. It is, by this mechanism, that the Highways Agency would be informed of any proposals that could impact on the trunk road network.

#### *The merits of identifying the Leigh to Bolton Quality Bus Corridor*

10.33 An objector notes that the Leigh to Bolton Quality Bus Corridor is complete except for the introduction of real-time passenger information. This is not, however, a

reason to delete the reference to it. Policy A1G has a role in the control of development which lies close to such a corridor. The objector argues that the policy should be amended to refer to real-time passenger information and how this could be installed on other routes. The reasoned justification, which relates to all the identified Quality Bus Corridors, expresses the common objective for these which is, among other things, to provide high quality waiting environments and passenger information.

*The scope for a Quality Bus Corridor between Wigan and Warrington*

10.34 An objector contends that a Quality Bus Corridor should be designated between Wigan and Warrington, or that reference could be made within the reasoned justification to such a scheme meriting investigation in the longer term. PPG12 (paragraph 6.24) advises that the provisions of development plans must be realistic and likely to be implemented during the plan period. No such initiative has been proposed by the relevant authorities and no resources have been allocated to support it. There is, therefore, no basis on which such an initiative could be identified within the UDP.

*The scope for a quality bus corridor between Leigh and Salford via Astley*

10.35 An objector contends that a Quality Bus Corridor should be designated between Leigh and Salford via Astley. PPG12 (paragraph 6.24) advises that the provisions of development plans must be realistic and likely to be implemented during the plan period. No such initiative has been proposed by the relevant authorities and no resources have been allocated to support it. The prospect that such resources will be forthcoming is reduced by the proximity of the Leigh Guided Bus-way and by the consideration that the route proposed by the objector is likely to be regarded as a duplication of investment. There is, therefore, no basis on which such an initiative could be identified within the UDP.

**Recommendation**

**I recommend:**

**(REC 10.9) that no modification be made to the RDD in response to these objections.**