

## A1G 2 WIGAN TO CHORLEY

### Supporters of Draft Deposit

| Ref No | a | b   | c | d  | Name                      | Agent | Response Ref. |
|--------|---|-----|---|----|---------------------------|-------|---------------|
| 728    | S | 002 | A | 1G | Lancashire County Council |       | A1G 2         |

## A1H LEIGH, ELLENBROOK, MANCHESTER PUBLIC TRANSPORT CORRIDOR

### Supporters of the Draft Deposit

| Ref No | a | b   | c | d  | Name  | Agent | Response Ref. |
|--------|---|-----|---|----|-------|-------|---------------|
| 418    | S | 015 | A | 1H | GMPTE |       |               |

## A1J RAIL INFRASTRUCTURE

### Objections to Draft Deposit

| Ref No | a | b   | c | d  | Name                 | Agent | Response Ref.   |
|--------|---|-----|---|----|----------------------|-------|-----------------|
| 150    | O | 002 | A | 1J | Graham Wilcock       |       | WMBC A1J        |
| 155    | O | 001 | A | 1J | Dr John Holden       |       | WMBC A1J        |
| 418    | O | 016 | A | 1J | GMPTE                |       | WMBC A1J        |
| 572    | O | 028 | A | 1J | Peter Sargeant FRTPI |       | WIGAN MBC 572/A |

### Supporters of Revised Deposit

| Ref No | a | b   | c | d  | Name                       | Agent | Response Ref. |
|--------|---|-----|---|----|----------------------------|-------|---------------|
| 747    | S | 005 | A | 1J | Wigan Borough Action Group |       |               |

### Main Issues

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to:

- the priority given to the integration of the Wigan North Western Station and the Wigan Wallgate Station;
- the emphasis given to rail development;
- the development of Golbourne Station;
- the powers available to the Local Planning Authority.

### Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

*The priority given to the integration of the Wigan North Western Station and the Wigan Wallgate Station*

10.36 Policy A1J provides that the development of new or improved services and facilities at existing rail stations will be sought. The construction of a new rail station at Golbourne will be pursued within the land shown on the proposals map. Policy A1K provides for the integration of the railway stations of Wigan North Western and Wigan Wallgate. An objector contends that this latter proposal is too ambitious and, instead, resources would be better used to secure the reopening of small outlying stations such as those at Standish and Gathurst and in providing park and ride facilities.

10.37 The integration of the two stations adjacent to Wigan town centre would provide enhanced interchange between rail services and also between these and other modes of public transport. It is, therefore, rightly regarded by the LPA as a major component of its transport strategy. These particular stations are accessible to the largest proportion of the local population. Wigan North Western is the national gateway to Wigan. Improvements to it would enhance access to the west coast mainline and provide an alternative to the motorway network for national and regional travel. Because it offers such a substantial contribution to the achievement of a sustainable pattern of settlement, I conclude that it should remain as a central component of the LPA's transport strategy and that resources should not be diverted from it to other schemes.

### *The emphasis given to rail development*

10.38 An objector argues that the UDP is weak in relation to rail development. He argues that the plan should aim to divert more passenger and freight movements to rail. He advocates the merits of a rail freight development at New Springs. For the reasons I give in the preceding sub-section I conclude that the integration of the two existing railway stations at Wigan has the potential to significantly increase the attractiveness of rail for passenger trips. There is no prospect of providing for rail freight at New Springs because this is remote from the rail network. The LPA speculates that the objector may have meant to refer to Spring View where there is an existing rail depot. There is no rail freight use there at present and, for it to be widely used for this purpose, improvements would be needed to the local highway network. I conclude that, in its overall approach to the location of development, emphasising the re-use of previously developed land within the existing built-up area, and via the up-grading of both rail and bus services, the LPA is going as far as it can in land use policy terms to achieve a sustainable pattern of settlement.

### *The development of Golbourne Station*

10.39 Objectors, at FDD stage, argue that the reasoned justification to policy A1J should better explain the complexities involved in the development of Golbourne Station. The LPA concurs and, at RDD stage, has changed the reasoned justification to refer not only to the infrastructure improvements which are required at many of the stations in the Borough, but also to the principal factor on which the proposed new station at Golbourne depends. I conclude that this satisfies the concerns of the objectors.

### *The powers available to the Local Planning Authority*

10.40 An objector argues that the wording of the policy is aspirational. It should, instead, be expressed in terms of the approach the LPA will take to determination of a planning application for the development of new or improved services and facilities at existing railway stations.

10.41 Development by railway operators on their operational land, required in connection with the movement of traffic by rail, is permitted development by virtue of Schedule 2, Part 17, Class A of the General Permitted Development Order 1995. The wording of the policy has been devised to take account of this. The objector expresses doubt as to whether sufficient land has been allocated for the development of a new railway station at Golbourne. No technical arguments have, however, been presented to support a view that the proposed site is too small. If a planning application is submitted for this scheme the provisions of policy G1A will form the basis for the consideration of the impact of the proposal on amenity. Policy A1 will secure that accessibility considerations are taken into account.

## **Recommendation**

**I recommend:**

**(REC 10.10) that no modification be made to the RDD in response to these objections.**

## A1K INTEGRATION OF WIGAN RAIL STATIONS

### Objections to Draft Deposit

| Ref No | a | b   | c | d  | Name                   | Agent                              | Response Ref. |
|--------|---|-----|---|----|------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------|
| 102    | O | 002 | A | 1K | Jill Stephenson        |                                    | WMBC A1K      |
| 385    | O | 001 | A | 1K | Manchester Airport Plc |                                    | WMBC A1K      |
| 419    | O | 003 | A | 1K | Mr David Delaney       |                                    | WMBC A1K      |
| 541    | O | 001 | A | 1K | Morston Archway        | Carpenter Planning Consultants Ltd | WMBC 541 A1K  |

### Supporters of Draft Deposit

| Ref No | a | b   | c | d  | Name   | Agent | Response Ref. |
|--------|---|-----|---|----|--|-------|---------------|
| 418    | S | 017 | A | 1K | GMPTE  |       |               |
| 724    | S | 002 | A | 1K | Merseyside Passenger Transport Authority and Executive |       |               |
| 728    | S | 003 | A | 1K | Lancashire County Council                              |       |               |

### Main Issues

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to:

- the scope for alternative development within the designated area;
- the role of Manchester Airport.

### Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

#### *The scope for alternative development within the designated area*

10.42 Policy A1K provides that, within the land shown on the proposals map, the integration of Wigan North Western and Wigan Wallgate Stations will be pursued. Objectors refer to premises within the identified area which are in use for commercial and retail purposes. They seek additional information to enable them to determine the extent to which particular premises will be affected by the scheme. They argue that the proposal to integrate the two stations must not prevent the development of this land for other purposes. The LPA confirms that, at the time of this inquiry, only limited progress has been made in implementing the proposal. It is committed to involving all affected land owners in the decision process. Only at the detailed design stage can the impact on particular properties be identified.

10.43 The proposal to secure integration of the two stations with each other, and with other modes of public transport, has the potential to achieve significant benefits for Wigan. It is a key element of the strategy to promote a sustainable pattern of settlement in the public interest. In advance of the formulation of detailed proposals to implement policy A1K, it would be wrong to give a commitment that particular sites within the policy designation should be excluded from its terms. Such an undertaking could,

possibly, render this desirable policy incapable of implementation. For this reason no prior undertaking should be given that particular sites will be excluded from the scheme.

10.44 It is certainly true however, as an objector argues, that the proposal to integrate the two stations has the potential to act as a catalyst, enhancing the vitality and viability of Wigan town centre. Much of the area to which policy A1K relates is within the area of the town centre as designated in policy S1B. Development for a range of uses, including leisure facilities, retail and housing is, therefore, appropriate in principle and could be integrated with the proposals for the railway stations. Desirable development could, however, be inhibited by lack of a planning framework for this part of the town centre. The situation proposed by the RDD, whereby the areas subject to policies A1K and S1B overlap, promotes uncertainty and may inhibit desirable development. That uncertainty could be reduced if a development brief for the area of overlap was prepared as a joint exercise between the LPA and relevant landowners. I conclude that the reasoned justification for policy A1K should express the commitment of the LA to producing this at the earliest opportunity.

#### *The role of Manchester Airport*

10.45 An objector refers to the importance of Manchester Airport in the modernisation of the local and regional economy. He seeks acknowledgement of the potential to access the airport from within a much wider catchment area via the Wigan railway stations. The scheme of integration will significantly enhance the role of public transport in accessing a wide range of destinations, of which Manchester Airport is only one. The UDP is a document intended to provide the framework for decisions on the development and use of land. It is not a promotional brochure. If it was to make reference to Manchester Airport it would, in equity, have to make reference to other prominent destinations and facilities, contrary to the advice of PPG12 that development plans should be succinct.

#### **Recommendation**

##### **I recommend:**

**(REC 10.11) that the RDD be modified by the insertion, within the reasoned justification for policy A1K, of a commitment by the LPA to work with relevant landowners to produce, at the earliest opportunity, a development brief for the area of land which is subject not only to that policy but also to policy S1B.**

**(REC 10.12) that no other modification be made to the RDD in response to these objections.**

## A1L TAXIS - NEW DEVELOPMENT

### Objections to Draft Deposit

| Ref No | a | b   | c | d  | Name              | Agent                                | Response Ref. |
|--------|---|-----|---|----|-------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| 702    | O | 009 | A | 1L | Tescos Stores Ltd | The Development Planning Partnership | WMBC 702 PART |
| 702    | O | 013 | A | 1L | 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 | 032 | A | 1L | Tescos Stores Ltd | The Development Planning Partnership | WMBC 702 PART |

### Main Issues

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to:

- the requirement for off-site provision;
- the quality of provision.

### Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

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

10.46 Policy A1L provides that adequate provision for taxis and private hire vehicles will be required in proposals for large retail and leisure developments and at rail and bus stations. Where off-site access for taxis and private hire vehicles 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.

10.47 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. This 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 A1L.

*The quality of provision*

10.48 Clause (c) of policy A1L provides that facilities for taxis and private hire vehicles should have seating and a shelter. An objector argues that this requirement is unduly onerous, unreasonable and unnecessary. Such provision need not be an unduly expensive element of a large scheme, however. It is essential if retail and leisure facilities are to be used by persons who do not have access to a private car or are prevented by age or infirmity from using the bus services. It is, in my view, an essential requirement if particular schemes of development are to contribute to a sustainable pattern of development which is socially inclusive.

**Recommendation**

**I recommend:**

**(REC 10.13) that no modification be made to the RDD in response to these objections.**

## **A1M FREIGHT - NEW DEVELOPMENT**

### **Objections to Draft Deposit**

| <b>Ref No</b> | <b>a</b> | <b>b</b> | <b>c</b> | <b>d</b> | <b>Name</b>          | <b>Agent</b> | <b>Response Ref.</b> |
|---------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| 572           | O        | 066      | A        | 1M       | Peter Sargeant FRTPI |              | WIGAN MBC 572/A      |

### **Supporters of Draft Deposit**

| <b>Ref No</b> | <b>a</b> | <b>b</b> | <b>c</b> | <b>d</b> | <b>Name</b>                     | <b>Agent</b> | <b>Response Ref.</b> |
|---------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| 096           | S        | 009      | A        | 1M       | Lane Head South Residents Group |              |                      |

### **Main Issue**

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to the impact of proposals on the safe and free flow of traffic and residential amenity.

### **Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions**

10.49 Policy A1M provides that proposals that will generate freight movement will be required to have appropriate access to the Strategic Route Network. Proposals for rail connections for freight will be permitted provided that there will be no undue impact on amenity, safety or congestion and any additional road traffic generated will have appropriate access to the Strategic Route Network.

10.50 An objector argues that freight traffic generated by new development must be safely and conveniently routed to the Strategic Route Network. The policy already makes provision for this. The plan should be read as a whole. Policy A1A requires a Transport Assessment for all development which would give rise to a material increase in the volume or other impact of road traffic. Policy G1A will secure that development will not be permitted where it would be detrimental to amenity.

10.51 A respondent classified by the LPA as a supporter of this policy does, in fact, seek its application to developments outside the Borough. The UDP is, however, constrained to provide a policy framework limited to the Wigan MBC area.

### **Recommendation**

**I recommend:**

**(REC 10.14) that no modification be made to the RDD in response to this objection.**

## A1N STRATEGIC ROUTE NETWORK

### Objections to Draft Deposit

| Ref No | a | b   | c | d  | Name                            | Agent | Response Ref.            |
|--------|---|-----|---|----|---------------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| 096    | O | 001 | A | 1N | Lane Head South Residents Group |       | WMBC 096 Lane Head South |
| 572    | O | 067 | A | 1N | Peter Sargeant FRTPI            |       | WIGAN MBC 572/A          |
| 572    | O | 068 | A | 1N | Peter Sargeant FRTPI            |       | WIGAN MBC 572/A          |
| 572    | O | 069 | A | 1N | Peter Sargeant FRTPI            |       | WIGAN MBC 572/A          |

### Objections to Revised Deposit

| Ref No | a | b   | c | d  | Name                            | Agent | Response Ref.            |
|--------|---|-----|---|----|---------------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| 096    | O | 023 | A | 1N | Lane Head South Residents Group |       | WMBC 096 Lane Head South |
| 572    | O | 119 | A | 1N | Peter Sargeant FRTPI            |       | WIGAN MBC 572/A          |

### Supporters of Draft Deposit

| Ref No | a | b   | c | d  | Name                            | Agent | Response Ref. |
|--------|---|-----|---|----|---------------------------------|-------|---------------|
| 096    | S | 011 | A | 1N | Lane Head South Residents Group |       |               |

### Note

This policy is subject to DINC6.

### Main Issues

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to:

- the position of the policy within the UDP;
- the effect of the Strategic Route Network on residential amenity;
- the need to refine the structure of the Strategic Route Network;
- the definition of the Strategic Route Network.

### Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

#### *The position of the policy within the UDP*

10.52 Policy A1N provides that the Council will safeguard, maintain and improve the strategic route network to accommodate main flows of general traffic in the Borough. An objector argues that the positions of policies A1N and A1M should be reversed. This would, however, separate policy on the Strategic Route Network from that on major highway schemes to the detriment of comprehensibility.

*The effect of the use of the Strategic Route Network on residential amenity*

10.53 An objector argues that policy A1N should be modified to take account of the effect of users of the Strategic Route Network on those who live near to it. The role of the UDP is to provide a consistent framework for decisions upon the development and use of land. To the extent that particular proposed actions in relation to the Strategic Route Network constitute development and require planning permission, policies A1 and G1A will secure the interests of residential amenity.

10.54 The same objector contends that the LPA should seek to influence the planning decisions of neighbouring LPAs to ensure that the road network within the Borough is not unreasonably burdened by additional traffic generated outside Wigan. Such influence can be applied via the normal processes of consultation upon planning applications. The UDP, itself, cannot contain policies relating to the development and use of land in other LPA areas.

*The need to refine the structure of the Strategic Route Network*

10.55 The reasoned justification for policy A1N informs that the Strategic Route Network comprises the main arterial roads carrying the highest volumes of traffic and linking the main settlements. It is shown on the UDP proposals map. The principal basis behind the classification of the Strategic Route Network is that all 'A' and 'B' roads are included. Its purpose is to ensure that main flows of traffic are directed to it in order to keep this away from unsuitable roads.

10.56 An objector argues that the Strategic Route Network should be refined to identify within it a category of main arterial routes such as the M6, A580 and A579 Lowton St Mary's Bypass/Atherleigh Way, thereby differentiating the main routes from others in the Strategic Route Network.

10.57 Such a structure already exists, however. The routes referred to by the objector form part of the Primary Route Network which is a sub-set of main routes within the Strategic Route Network. These are recognised as the key distributor roads for the movement of goods and people within the Borough. The distinction between the Primary Route Network and the remainder of the Strategic Route Network is of relevance to traffic management. By basing its policies on the wider concept of the Strategic Route Network, the UDP secures that the protection afforded by them applies to the widest possible definition of the main arterial roads.

*The definition of the Strategic Route Network*

10.58 Objectors seek the deletion from the Strategic Route Network of Kenyon Lane/Wilton Lane (B5207) from its junction with Newton Road to the administrative boundary of the Borough. The LPA agrees with the objectors that this section of highway does not fulfil an arterial function. It notes that traffic flows along it are very low and proposes, via DINC6, to delete this section from the Strategic Route Network. Because it

does not serve the intended function of designation I conclude that it should be deleted from the Strategic Route Network.

10.59 At FDD stage the section of Winwick Lane (A579) from its junction with Newton Road to the Borough boundary was, in error, omitted from depiction on the proposals map as part of the Strategic Route Network. At that stage representations of support were made in respect of this measure. At RDD stage this error was corrected by the insertion on the proposals map of the missing designation. An objector, who believed that the omission of this designation at FDD stage was a measure intended to reflect the downgrading of this route for freight use, opposes the insertion of the designation at RDD stage. A further objector opposes, in principle, the designation of this section of road as part of the Strategic Route Network.

10.60 This section of road forms a major link between the urban areas of the Borough and the all-ways junction 22 of the M6. No weight limits or overhead structures restrict its use. For that reason the road forms part of an abnormal load route. It is part of the Primary Route Network as well as being classified as part of the Strategic Route Network. Its designation as part of the Primary Route Network is continued across the Borough boundary into Warrington District. It is necessary to maintain commonality in road classification across local authority boundaries in the interests of the efficient movement of people and goods. For all these reasons I conclude that this section of road should continue to be shown on the UDP proposals map as part of the Strategic Route Network.

### **Recommendation**

#### **I recommend:**

**(REC 10.15) that the RDD be modified by the deletion of Kenyon Lane/Wilton Lane (B5207) from designation on the proposals map as part of the Strategic Route Network in accordance with DINC6.**

**(REC 10.16) that no other modification be made to the RDD in response to these objections.**

## A1P MAJOR HIGHWAY SCHEMES

### Objections to Draft Deposit

| Ref No | a | b   | c | d  | Name                            | Agent | Response Ref.            |
|--------|---|-----|---|----|---------------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| 096    | O | 002 | A | 1P | Lane Head South Residents Group |       | WMBC 096 Lane Head South |
| 239    | O | 001 | A | 1P | Roy Skitt                       |       | WMBC A5225 Lovers Lane   |
| 240    | O | 001 | A | 1P | Wendy Williamson                |       | WMBC A5225 Lovers Lane   |
| 291    | O | 004 | A | 1P | Lancashire Wildlife Trust       |       | WMBC 291                 |
| 421    | O | 005 | A | 1P | Mrs E M Stephenson              |       | WMBC 421/A               |
| 593    | O | 012 | A | 1P | Hallam Land Management Ltd      |       | WMBC 593                 |

### Draft Deposit Objections Unconditionally Withdrawn

| Ref No | a | b   | c | d  | Name         | Agent          | Response Ref. |
|--------|---|-----|---|----|--------------|----------------|---------------|
| 598    | O | 003 | A | 1P | KSS Richards | Neil Goldsmith |               |

### Objections to Revised Deposit

| Ref No | a | b   | c | d  | Name           | Agent | Response Ref.    |
|--------|---|-----|---|----|----------------|-------|------------------|
| 768    | O | 001 | A | 1P | Janette Thomas |       | WMBC 768 A1P (1) |
| 874    | O | 002 | A | 1P | David Marsh    |       | WMBC 874 A1P     |

### Supporters of Revised Deposit

| Ref No | a | b   | c | d  | Name                       | Agent | Response Ref. |
|--------|---|-----|---|----|----------------------------|-------|---------------|
| 747    | S | 003 | A | 1P | Wigan Borough Action Group |       |               |
| 747    | S | 004 | A | 1P | Wigan Borough Action Group |       |               |

### Note

Objections 768/001, 239/001, 240/001, 291/004, 421/005 and 874/002 relate to policy A1P(1) and are dealt with in that section of this report.

Objection 593/012 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 status of the proposed highways under the terms of the Road Traffic Regulations;
- the merits of a bypass for the Lane Head area of Lowton.

## **Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions**

### *The status of the proposed highways under the terms of the Road Traffic Regulations*

10.61 Policy A1P provides that the LPA will safeguard the land required for the A5225 Wigan and Hindley Bypass, the Westwood Park/Town Centre Link Road, the Wigan Inner Relief Road West and the Ashton-in-Makerfield Northern Bypass. It will not permit any development which might prejudice their construction.

10.62 An objector argues that, when completed, the A5225 Wigan and Hindley Bypass, the Westwood Park/Town Centre Link Road and the Wigan Inner Relief Road West should be classified as Freeways with minimum obstructions. The LPA concurs and will secure this via the necessary Road Traffic Regulations. This is not, therefore, a matter to be progressed via the UDP.

### *The merits of a bypass for the Lane Head area of Lowton*

10.63 An objector advocates the safeguarding of land for a bypass to the settlement of Lane Head. This would link the A580 road (at a point some 1km to the east of the junction of that road with the A572) with Winwick Road (the A579). The objector refers to the support for such a scheme expressed by the local MP. PPG12 (paragraph 6.24) advises that the provisions of development plans must be realistic and likely to be implemented during the period of the plan. The LPA considers that such a scheme would not provide sufficient benefits to rank as a priority in a road building programme. Without such status there is no basis on which I can conclude that resources sufficient to implement the scheme would be forthcoming to allow the start of construction before 2016. I conclude that, in order to ensure the avoidance of blight, land should not be safeguarded for such a scheme.

## **Recommendation**

### **I recommend:**

**(REC 10.17) that no modification be made to the RDD in response to these objections.**