

## C1E GREENWAY NETWORK

### Objections to Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
004	O	002	C	1E	David McKendrick		WMBC C1E
132	O	003	C	1E	Joseph Healen		WMBC C1E
176	O	005	C	1E	Wigan and District Ramblers Association		WMBC C1E
291	O	005	C	1E	Lancashire Wildlife Trust		WMBC C1E
583	O	032	C	1E	Peel Investment (North) Ltd	Halliwell Landau	WMBC C1E
697	O	008	C	1E	Viridor Waste Management Ltd		WMBC 697
728	O	008	C	1E	Lancashire County Council		WMBC C1E

### Draft Deposit Objections Unconditionally Withdrawn

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
532	O	004	C	1E	Waterside Property Investments LLP	M L Ralph	

### Objections to Revised Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
176	O	007	C	1E	Wigan and District Ramblers Association		WMBC C1E

### Supporters of Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
176	S	006	C	1E	Wigan and District Ramblers Association		
442	S	006	C	1E	Sport England		
590	S	003	C	1E	Wildlife and Social Preservation		

### Main Issues

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to:

- the scope to extend and modify the network;
- the effect of network development on nature conservation;
- the integration of schemes across local authority boundaries;
- the relationship between policy C1E and policy C1F.

### Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

*The scope to extend and modify the network*

12.36 Policy C1E provides that the LPA will continue to develop the Greenway Network for walkers and, wherever practicable, disabled people, cyclists and horse riders. The network will be protected from development and extensions to it will be identified

when opportunities arise. Objectors argue that the network should be extended or its alignment modified in various specified ways.

12.37 PPG12 (paragraph 6.24) advises that the provisions of development plans should be realistic and likely to be achieved during the plan period. The extension and modification of the Greenway Network is dependent on the acquisition of rights over land and of financial resources for the provision of infrastructure. The network, as defined on the proposals map, represents the view of the LPA as to an appropriate balance between opportunities for network enhancement and the practical scope for implementation. While the network enhancements proposed by objectors may be desirable, no convincing evidence is presented to demonstrate that the LPA's appraisal is not soundly based.

*The effect of network development on nature conservation*

12.38 An objector argues that policy C1E should make specific provision for nature conservation interests to be protected and enhanced via the development of the Greenway Network. The UDP is to be read as a whole, however, in conformity with the advice of PPG12 that development plans should be succinct. Nature conservation interests are protected and promoted by policies EV1, EV2 and EV2A to EV2E.

*The integration of schemes across local authority boundaries*

12.39 An objector, at FDD stage, expresses the need for a reference to be made to the linkage of the Greenway Network with other similar initiatives by neighbouring authorities. The LPA concurs and, at RDD stage, inserted within the reasoned justification to policy C1E a reference to its intention that Greenways will link with such proposals of neighbouring authorities including long distance footpaths and cycle routes.

*The relationship between policy C1E and policy C1F*

12.40 An objector emphasises the need for development near to the Greenway Network to have regard to its presence. The second sentence of policy C1E provides that the Greenway Network will be protected from development. Another objector argues that this is unduly restrictive and is inconsistent with the provisions of policy C1F. He fears that this unqualified provision may inhibit desirable and necessary development, including works to maintain the long term stability and integrity of the Bridgewater Canal between Leigh and Worsley. Policy C1F is expressed in positive terms. It provides that proposals to enhance the use of the River Douglas, the Leeds and Liverpool Canal and the Bridgewater Canal for leisure and recreation purposes will be permitted provided that there will be no detrimental impact on specified interests. Several of these water features form part of the Greenway Network. As written, the second sentence of policy C1E could prevent development which would enhance the use of the water features for leisure and recreational purposes.

12.41 The UDP is to be read as a whole and, therefore, both policies will be referred to by decision makers in relation to proposals which affect the parts of the Greenway Network which follow a water feature. Consistency between the two policies can, in my view, be secured by amplifying the second sentence of policy C1E to provide that the Greenway Network will be protected from development which would negate its purpose. This would allow development which, as a further objector seeks, maintains or enhances the network and its recreational function or which provides suitable mitigation.

### **Recommendation**

#### **I recommend:**

**(REC 12.7) that the RDD be modified by the re-wording of the second sentence of policy C1E as follows. ‘The network will be protected from development which would negate its purpose’.**

**(REC 12.8) that no other modification be made to the RDD in response to these objections.**

## C1F THE RIVER DOUGLAS, CANAL NETWORK AND OTHER WATER FEATURES

### Objections to Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
106	O	001	C	1F	Fred Cooper		WMBC C1F
133	O	001	C	1F	Eileen Rybka		WIGAN MBC 133/A
144	O	001	C	1F	Lancashire Fisheries Consultative Association		WIGAN MBC 144/A
583	O	033	C	1F	Peel Investments (North) Ltd	Halliwell Landau	WMBC C1F

### Draft Deposit Objections Unconditionally Withdrawn

Ref No	a	B	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
532	O	005	C	1F	Waterside Property Investments LLP	M L Ralph	

### Supporters of Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	B	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
442	S	007	C	1F	Sport England		

### Note

Objection 583/033 is dealt with in the section of this report which relates to policy C1E.

### Main Issues

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to:

- the role of the UDP in relation to water features;
- whether the UDP should incorporate the provisions of the Douglas Valley Plan.

### Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

#### *The role of the UDP in relation to water features*

12.42 Proposed RDD policy C1F provides that proposals to enhance the use of the River Douglas, the Leeds and Liverpool Canal, the Bridgewater Canal and other significant water features for leisure and recreational purposes will be permitted provided that there is no detrimental impact on the safety and amenity of existing users and nearby uses, the value of the location as a habitat for wild life, the industrial or architectural heritage of the location and priorities for management of the water environment including pollution and flooding.

12.43 Objectors emphasise the importance to the population of the Borough of the opportunities for recreational fishing provided by the various water features within the area of the UDP. One objector argues that the UDP should address the decline in fish stocks for recreational angling. Another refers to various management plans and

programmes which have been prepared, or are in course of preparation, to promote this. He expresses the view that the detailed provisions of these should be incorporated within the RDD. This latter document is not, however, a management plan for a particular recreational activity. It has the role of providing the basis for consistent decisions in relation to the development and use of land over the whole range of interests of acknowledged importance, of which recreation is only one.

12.44 The intentions of the objectors for the promotion of fishing as a leisure pursuit would be supported by policy C1F which seeks to enhance the use of water features for leisure and recreational purposes, while securing that there is no harm to other interests. If the management programmes referred to by the objectors generate proposals for the development of land which require planning permission, this policy would provide the framework against which they would be considered. The modification of policy C1F to one devoted almost exclusively to the promotion of the interests of recreational fishing, as the objectors seek, would prevent it from performing its essential task of balancing the interests of all the other leisure pursuits which depend on the water features of the Borough. For these reasons I conclude that the policy should not be modified to give greater emphasis to that particular aspect.

*Whether the UDP should incorporate the provisions of the Douglas Valley Plan*

12.45 An objector refers to the Douglas Valley Plan. This is one of a series of River Valley Plans prepared by the former Greater Manchester Council. It was adopted in 1989 and carried forward, in its entirety, into the adopted Wigan UDP. It is, however, omitted from the RDD. It is, effectively, a subject plan which presents detailed proposals for recreational and environmental improvements, including those to a number of proposed bridleways and footpaths. The objector argues that the plan should be reinstated within the RDD to give greater emphasis to its content.

12.46 The proposed routes were, however, no more than aspirations without detailed consideration as to how they could be implemented and funded. Since the plan was prepared crucial matters such as grant regimes, land ownership and route priorities have changed. The detailed proposals of that plan do not reflect the current priorities of the Borough Council. They are, therefore, unlikely to be achieved in the form proposed in that document. Having regard to the advice of PPG12 (paragraph 6.24) it would be wrong to make reference in the UDP to proposals which have no realistic prospect of implementation. For these reasons I conclude that the provisions of the Douglas Valley Plan should not be incorporated within the UDP.

**Recommendation**

**I recommend:**

**(REC 12.9) that no modification be made to the RDD in response to these objections.**

## C1G REGIONAL PARK

### Objections to Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
004	O	004	C	1G	David McKendrick		WMBC C1G
222	O	003	C	1G	Jupiter Investments Ltd		WMBC C1G
422	O	009	C	1G	Lancashire CPRE		WMBC C1G
453	O	001	C	1G	Kathleen Clarke		WIGAN MBC 453/A
455	O	002	C	1G	Leigh Ornithological Society		WMBC C1G
568	O	005	C	1G	Northwest Development Agency		WMBC C1G
569	O	001	C	1G	Persimmon Homes		WMBC C1G
572	O	037	C	1G	Peter Sargeant FRTPi		WIGAN MBC 572/A
584	O	002	C	1G	Miss H and Mr C Charles	Sedgwick Associates	WIGAN MBC 584/A
682	O	019	C	1G	English Nature		WMBC 682/A
697	O	009	C	1G	Viridor Waste Management Ltd		WMBC 697
698	O	006	C	1G	The Trustees of Leigh Estate	Matthews and Goodman	WIGAN MBC 698/A
726	O	004	C	1G	United Utilities Facilities and Property Services		WMBC 726/A
726	O	011	C	1G	United Utilities Facilities and Property Services		WMBC 726/A
726	O	015	C	1G	United Utilities Facilities and Property Services		WMBC 726/A
726	O	020	C	1G	United Utilities Facilities and Property Services		WMBC 726/A
727	O	023	C	1G	Greater Manchester Ecology Unit		WMBC C1G

### Draft Deposit Objections Conditionally Withdrawn

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
726	O	002	C	1G	United Utilities Facilities and Property Services		WMBC 726/A

### Draft Deposit Objections Unconditionally Withdrawn

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
002	O	004	C	1G	Nigel Blandford		
456	O	002	C	1G	Salford City Council		

### Objections to Revised Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
442	O	009	C	1G	Sport England		WMBC C1G
568	O	007	C	1G	North West Development Agency		WMBC C1G
572	O	111	C	1G	Peter Sargeant FRTPi		WIGAN MBC 572/A
682	O	038	C	1G	English Nature		WMBC 682/A
747	O	042	C	1G	Wigan Borough Action Group		WIGAN MBC 747/A
747	O	056	C	1G	Wigan Borough Action Group		WIGAN MBC 747/A

747	O	057	C	1G	Wigan Borough Action Group		WIGAN MBC 747/A
747	O	058	C	1G	Wigan Borough Action Group		WIGAN MBC 747/A
747	O	059	C	1G	Wigan Borough Action Group		WIGAN MBC 747/A
747	O	060	C	1G	Wigan Borough Action Group		WIGAN MBC 747/A
747	O	078	C	1G	Wigan Borough Action Group		WIGAN MBC 747/A
815	O	001	C	1G	Brian Acton		WIGAN MBC 815/A
817	O	002	C	1G	Mr James Ellis		WIGAN MBC 817/A
825	O	002	C	1G	Mr M Smalley		WMBC C1G

### Supporters of Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
423	S	003	C	1G	Woodland Trust		
442	S	008	C	1G	Sport England		

### Main Issues

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to:

- the title of the policy;
- the stated purposes of the regional park;
- the boundaries of the policy designation;
- the control of development within the regional park;
- the reference to areas outside the Borough;
- the need for public involvement;
- the merits of including particular areas of land within the regional park;
- the merits of including within the policy land at Rayner Park, Hindley;
- grammatical aspects.

### Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

#### *The title of the policy*

12.47 At the FDD stage policy C1G was entitled 'Red Rose Regional Park'. This was changed to 'Regional Park' in the RDD. Objectors have interpreted this as being a change from 'Red Rose Forest' to 'Regional Park'. They seek the reinstatement of what they consider to be a reference to the 'Red Rose Forest' in the title of the policy. The confusion arises because both the proposed forest and regional park, which are completely separate initiatives, had the words 'Red Rose' in their titles. To avoid this confusion the LPA has changed the title of policy C1G by removing the 'Red Rose' wording. I conclude that a reversion to the wording used in the FDD version of this policy would perpetuate the misunderstanding of its intentions, as evidenced by the objections made to it.

#### *The stated purposes of the regional park*

12.48 Objectors argue that the regional park should aim to maintain landscape character and biodiversity. These are both specifically referred to in clause (b) of policy C1G. The

reference to biodiversity, in my view, also satisfies the concern of an objector that the reference to extensive woodland planting within clause (b) could generate too narrow a range of habitat types. It would also satisfy the objector who seeks achievement of the targets of the Greater Manchester Biodiversity Action Plan. Proposals in the regional park will also need to be considered against other policies including EV2, and EV2A to EV2E which all promote nature conservation interests.

#### *The boundaries of the policy designation*

12.49 The FDD version of policy C1G provided for the designation of an area known as the 'Red Rose Regional Park'. The area of this was shown on the proposals map at that stage. Objectors argued, at that time, that due to the early stage reached in the inter-authority liaison needed to define the area of the regional park as a whole, it was premature to define boundaries within which policy C1G would apply. Such a designation had not, furthermore, been made on the proposals map of the adjacent Salford UDP. The LPA agreed and, at RDD stage, has deleted the designated area of this policy from the proposals map. It also changed the title of the policy to simply 'Regional Park'. At RDD stage, also, the text of the policy was changed to confirm that, within the Borough, a regional park will be developed aimed at the enhancement and improvement of specified matters.

12.50 Objectors argue that the regional park boundaries should be reinstated on the proposals map. I consider that the LPA's approach is the correct one because the submitted draft of the Partial Review of Regional Planning Guidance for the North West (March 2004) simply identifies a broad area of search for such a regional park. Much work is needed to refine this into a definite proposal. It is, therefore, premature to indicate specific boundaries.

#### *The control of development within the regional park*

12.51 An objector argues that policy C1G should specify the types of development which will be considered appropriate within the regional park. A further objector argues that policy C1G should be changed to allow for built development on land at Chorley Road and at the sites of the waste water treatment works at Tyldesley, Ince-in-Makerfield, Leigh and Hindley, which lie within the designated area of the regional park as it was defined on the proposals map at FDD stage.

12.52 The UDP is to be read as a whole in conformity with the advice of PPG12 that development plans should be succinct. Policy C1G is aimed specifically at enhancing certain factors. The other policies of the UDP will apply to proposed development within the regional park when it is eventually defined. At RDD stage there is no certainty that any of the specified sites will be within that area.

*The reference to areas outside the Borough*

12.53 At FDD stage the second paragraph of the reasoned justification referred to the characteristics of the regional park within the area of Salford. An objector contended that it was inappropriate for the UDP to do this because its provisions are intended to apply only within the area of Wigan Borough. The LPA concurs and, at RDD stage, deleted this paragraph of the reasoned justification. A further objector seeks the reinstatement of this reference. In my view this would be inappropriate because the provisions of this UDP are intended to guide decisions on the development and use of land only within the area of Wigan.

*The need for public involvement*

12.54 An objector emphasises the need for public consultation and involvement in the implementation of the regional park. The LPA concurs and, in the penultimate paragraph of the reasoned justification for policy C1G, it confirms that the involvement of local people will be sought in the implementation of the policy.

*The merits of including particular areas of land within the regional park*

12.55 Objectors argued, at FDD stage, that the following areas of land should not be included within the designated area of the regional park.

Land at the southern edge of Abram;

Land at Lowton (to the east of Edgerton Road);

Land to the south of Mottram Drive, Wigan;

Land to the north and south of the proposed alignment of the A5225 road to the south west of Hindley;

Land at Walmsley Farm, Higher Folds, Leigh;

Land at Astley Green;

Land at Tyldesley Waste Water Treatment Works;

Land at Ince-in-Makerfield Waste Water Treatment Works;

Land at Leigh Waste Water Treatment Works;

Land at Hindley Waste Water Treatment Works;

Land at Chorley Road Waste Water Pumping Station, Standish.

Others argued that land at Three Sisters, near Ashton-in-Makerfield, should be included.

12.56 The effect of the RDD has been to remove the designation of the policy area from the proposals map. The area to which policy C1G is to apply is not, therefore, certain. Objections that the policy should or should not apply to particular areas of land have therefore been overtaken by events. I conclude that there is no certainty that the RDD proposes that policy C1G is intended to apply to any of the areas of land referred to by objectors.

*The merits of including within the policy land at Rayner Park, Hindley*

12.57 At FDD stage the proposals map included land at Rayner Park, Hindley, within the designation of the Red Rose Regional Park (at RDD stage changed to ‘Regional Park’). An objector argues that this area is a historic park which should, instead, be subject to the provisions of policy EV4D. The related reasoned justification informs that this latter policy is intended to be applied to historic parks, gardens and cemeteries where a landscape of particular historic interest remains and where special protection is needed to secure its survival.

12.58 The removal of the site from the regional park designation (C1G) is secured by the RDD. I have studied the maps and old photographs of Rayner Park provided by the objector and note its original character as an early 20<sup>th</sup> century formal civic amenity. Hardly any trace of this now remains, however. The park lacks clearly defined boundaries, entrance features, a planned layout of paths and a range of recreational facilities. Instead the area is currently composed of informal wooded areas and grassland. The original formal framework of paths and water features is no longer evident. I conclude that it is not the sort of recreational resource to which policy EV4D is intended to apply. Its continued contribution to the amenity of local residents would, however, be adequately secured under the terms of RDD policy C1C.

12.59 The objector contends that designation of the area as safeguarded land under policy GB2 would help secure its long term future as a park. That policy is intended to safeguard land for possible long term development, however, not from it.

*Grammatical aspects*

12.60 An objector refers to the word ‘It’ within the final sentence of the first paragraph of the FDD version of the policy. He argues that its meaning is obscure when read together with the following text. The LPA concurs and, at RDD stage, has re-structured the policy to eliminate this. The replacement wording at RDD stage does, however, contain a surplus word ‘will’. This should be deleted in the interests of clarity.

**Recommendation**

**I recommend:**

**(REC 12.10) that the RDD be modified by the deletion of the word ‘will’ from between ‘aimed’ and ‘at’ within the initial wording of policy C1G.**

**(REC 12.11) that no other modification be made to the RDD in response to these objections.**

## COMMUNITY FACILITIES, SPORT AND RECREATION POLICY OMISSION

### Objections to Draft Deposit

### Draft Deposit Objections Unconditionally Withdrawn

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
071	O	001	OM		Mr Ian Winstanley		
536	O	001	OM		HM Prison Service		
577	O	001	OM		Lower Ince Community Development Group		