

GB2 - SAFEGUARDED LAND

Objections to Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref.
040	O	001	GB	2	Mr & Mrs A Clark		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
041	O	001	GB	2	Mr R Causey		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
046	O	001	GB	2	Ron Buckley		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
047	O	001	GB	2	Irene and Ron Buckley		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
052	O	001	GB	2	Peter J McLachlan		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
054	O	001	GB	2	Philip J Swift		WMBC 054 GB2
056	O	001	GB	2	Mrs M Sheila Craggs		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
059	O	001	GB	2	Ian Clemon		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
078	O	001	GB	2	Paul Derbyshire		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
079	O	001	GB	2	Mrs A P Hilditch and E W Hilditch		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
096	O	005	GB	2	Fiona Whistlecroft – Lane Head South Residents Group		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
107	O	001	GB	2	Mrs Margaret Ridsdale		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
119	O	001	GB	2	R. Wittaker		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
121	O	001	GB	2	Mr Arthur Ridsdale		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
123	O	001	GB	2	Mrs Dorothy Partington		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
124	O	001	GB	2	Mr David John Pritchard		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
125	O	001	GB	2	Mrs Gillian Pritchard		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
141	O	001	GB	2	Joseph Oliver Partington		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
142	O	001	GB	2	Patricia Shippam		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
143	O	001	GB	2	Vincent Gerard Sarsfield	Tonebase Ltd	WMBC 143 GB2
147	O	001	GB	2	Anne & Terry Ring		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
148	O	001	GB	2	Alan Stephenson		WMBC 148 GB2
149	O	001	GB	2	Mrs J Emmett		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
204	O	001	GB	2	D. E. Goodman		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
205	O	001	GB	2	Clifford Gaskell		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
207	O	001	GB	2	Marjorie Hall		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
211	O	001	GB	2	Carol Blomley		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
220	O	008	GB	2	Mrs E Ainscough	Emery Planning	WMBC 220
266	O	001	GB	2	Alan Fletcher		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
267	O	001	GB	2	Persimmon Homes	Dunlop Heywood Lorenz	WMBC 267
270	O	001	GB	2	Malcolm Chapman		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
272	O	001	GB	2	Anne Robinson		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
273	O	001	GB	2	Mr J Holme		WMBC 273/626 GB2
274	O	001	GB	2	Mr and Mrs Mather		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
278	O	001	GB	2	Joseph Eckersley		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
281	O	001	GB	2	Shelia Marston		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
282	O	001	GB	2	F J Dearden		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
285	O	001	GB	2	D. Doran		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
287	O	001	GB	2	Mr Max Atkins		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
288	O	001	GB	2	Darren Sparks		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
289	O	001	GB	2	D M Shaw		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM

381	O	005	GB	2	Mrs A J Smith - County Bird		WMBC 381
410	O	001	GB	2	Jane Lewis & Jason Sproston		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
463	O	001	GB	2	W. Davies, G. Moxham, O. Calland	Hightide Properties Ltd	WMBC 463 GB2
467	O	004	GB	2	Wilson Connolly	Barton Willmore Planning Partnership	WMBC 467
472	O	001	GB	2	John Whittaker		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
477	O	001	GB	2	Phil Taylor		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
498	O	001	GB	2	June Bate		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
503	O	001	GB	2	Vincent Balmer		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
513	O	001	GB	2	Mr Lee Webb		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
514	O	001	GB	2	David Bibby		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
524	O	001	GB	2	Catherine Deters – Estate of James Ball		WIGAN MBC 524/A
538	O	006	GB	2	Mr D R Taylor and Mrs J A Taylor	The Graham Bolton Planning Partnership Ltd	WMBC 538/A
543	O	001	GB	2	David Gaskell		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
551	O	001	GB	2	Mrs J Hodgkinson		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
571	O	001	GB	2	CLLR Lynne Liptrot		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
572	O	010	GB	2	Peter Sargeant FRTPI		WIGAN MBC 572/A
572	O	042	GB	2	Peter Sargeant FRTPI		WIGAN MBC 572/A
572	O	043	GB	2	Peter Sargeant FRTPI		WIGAN MBC 572/A
572	O	045	GB	2	Peter Sargeant FRTPI		WIGAN MBC 572/A
572	O	046	GB	2	Peter Sargeant FRTPI		WIGAN MBC 572/A
582	O	002	GB	2	Taylor Woodrow Developments Ltd	Michael Courcier and Partners Ltd	WMBC 582/A
583	O	004	GB	2	Peel Investment North Ltd	Halliwell Landau	WMBC 583 WR
583	O	005	GB	2	Peel Investment North Ltd	Halliwell Landau	WMBC 583 WR
587	O	001	GB	2	Mrs C. A. Freeman		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
593	O	005	GB	2	Hallam Land Management Ltd		WMBC 593
607	O	001	GB	2	Mr S McRae		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
610	O	001	GB	2	Bryan Savage		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
614	O	001	GB	2	B A Wright		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
618	O	001	GB	2	Mr and Mrs Hurst		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
619	O	001	GB	2	Carol Quinn		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
620	O	001	GB	2	R F Scott		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
621	O	001	GB	2	Jill Young		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
623	O	001	GB	2	Eileen Marsh		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
626	O	001	GB	2	G R Bullock		WMBC 273/626 GB2
630	O	001	GB	2	Mrs Patricia Sanderson		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
631	O	001	GB	2	Richard Parkinson		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
635	O	001	GB	2	Ernest Williams		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
636	O	001	GB	2	Irene Kelly		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
637	O	001	GB	2	Alan Critchley		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
638	O	001	GB	2	Andrew Marsh		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
639	O	001	GB	2	Chris Pennington		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
640	O	001	GB	2	Brian Rowlandson		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM

646	O	001	GB	2	John Fitton and Susan Newby		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
648	O	001	GB	2	Mr and Mrs A J Corcoran		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
649	O	001	GB	2	Mr and Mrs Watson		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
652	O	001	GB	2	A W Cowell		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
653	O	001	GB	2	Shaune Moran		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
654	O	001	GB	2	Mrs M Lee		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
655	O	001	GB	2	Mr and Mrs D Watmough		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
656	O	001	GB	2	Mr and Mrs T Gibbons		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
658	O	001	GB	2	Athur Jackson		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
659	O	001	GB	2	Ian Prescott		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
660	O	001	GB	2	Mr Robert Small		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
661	O	001	GB	2	Phillip Gibson		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
669	O	001	GB	2	Mrs kershaw		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
671	O	001	GB	2	Mr P S Kavarana		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
672	O	001	GB	2	Mr and Mrs Masser		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
673	O	001	GB	2	Mr K Boardman		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
674	O	001	GB	2	Roy Gaskell		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
675	O	001	GB	2	Mr M W Henshall		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
676	O	001	GB	2	Mrs C A Henshall		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
678	O	001	GB	2	Mr and Mrs Belcher		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
685	O	005	GB	2	Wainhomes North West Ltd		WIGAN MBC 685/A
							WMBC 685/C
688	O	001	GB	2	Paul Kelly		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
689	O	001	GB	2	Mrs Edna Bell		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
691	O	001	GB	2	Denise Finch		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
693	O	001	GB	2	Carl Gaskell		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
695	O	001	GB	2	Holden		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
698	O	001	GB	2	The Trustees of Leigh Estate	Matthews and Goodman	WIGAN MBC 698/A
715	O	001	GB	2	Terrence Wilson		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
721	O	002	GB	2	Milnes Gaskell Estate	How Planning	WMBC 721
722	O	001	GB	2	Bellway Homes (Manchester		WMBC 722/A
726	O	012	GB	2	United Utilities Facilities and Property Services		WMBC 726/A

Draft Deposit Objections Unconditionally Withdrawn

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref
424	O	006	GB	2	Government Office for the North West		

Objections to Revised Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref
096	O	012	GB	2	Fiona Whistlecroft – Lane Head South Residents Group		WMBC 096 Lane Head South
122	O	002	GB	2	D Glover		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
146	O	002	GB	2	Fran and Les Capper		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
221	O	007	GB	2	Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd	Broadway Malyan	WIGAN MBC 221/A

538	O	011	GB	2	D R Taylor & Ms J A Taylor	The Graham Bolton Planning Partnership	WMBC 538/A
572	O	085	GB	2	Peter Sargeant FRTPI		WIGAN MBC 572/A
582	O	016	GB	2	Taylor Woodrow Developments Limited	Michael Courcier and Partners Limited	WMBC 582/A
583	O	035	GB	2	Peel Investments North Ltd	Halliwell Landau	WMBC 583 WR
672	O	002	GB	2	Yasmin Masser		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
675	O	002	GB	2	Michael Henshall		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
676	O	002	GB	2	Chris Henshall		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM
872	O	001	GB	2	M Glover		WMBC/STIRRUPS FARM

Supporters of Draft Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref
018	S	002	GB	2	Mrs Lynda Hunt		
035	S	001	GB	2	Mark Orrell		
036	S	001	GB	2	Barbara Cocks		
037	S	001	GB	2	Helen Blay		
038	S	001	GB	2	Mr Dennis Blay		
042	S	001	GB	2	Simon Ellison		
044	S	001	GB	2	Alan J McLeod		
057	S	001	GB	2	Harry Cocks		
062	S	001	GB	2	Carl and Gillian Messenger		
072	S	001	GB	2	Mr and Mrs Bradshaw		
073	S	001	GB	2	Mrs J Stringer		
074	S	001	GB	2	J W Stringer		
075	S	001	GB	2	Mrs L Bailey		
076	S	001	GB	2	Charles A Bailey		
077	S	001	GB	2	J Oldknow		
104	S	001	GB	2	Gwyneth Lilian Fox		
105	S	001	GB	2	Barbara McLachlan		
108	S	001	GB	2	Mrs J. Mee		
109	S	001	GB	2	Mrs F.M Deakin		
122	S	001	GB	2	Mr David Glover		
126	S	001	GB	2	Mr J. Malley		
127	S	001	GB	2	Mrs M. Glover		
128	S	001	GB	2	Mrs Ruddy		
129	S	001	GB	2	Mrs I. Wilson		
132	S	001	GB	2	Joseph Healen		
140	S	002	GB	2	Nick Trotter		
146	S	001	GB	2	Les Capper		
199	S	001	GB	2	Geoffrey Molyneux		
200	S	001	GB	2	Edith French		
201	S	001	GB	2	John French		
202	S	001	GB	2	Ronald Ashton & Marion Ashton		
203	S	001	GB	2	Mrs S Banton		
206	S	001	GB	2	Graham Hall		
208	S	001	GB	2	Darren Keeling		
209	S	001	GB	2	Christine Keeling		
210	S	001	GB	2	Wendi Keeling		

221	S	005	GB	2	Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd		
221	S	006	GB	2	Westbury Homes and Morris Homes Ltd	Broadway Malyan	
264	S	001	GB	2	Jennifer Wallbank		
269	S	001	GB	2	John Eccles		
271	S	001	GB	2	Mr and Mrs Pugh		
275	S	001	GB	2	Michael Orr		
276	S	001	GB	2	Josephine Ishwewood		
277	S	001	GB	2	Brian Prescott		
279	S	001	GB	2	Mr C O'Neil Bell		
280	S	001	GB	2	James Moncur		
283	S	001	GB	2	I Hamnette		
284	S	001	GB	2	J D Shallcross		
286	S	001	GB	2	Rachael Axon		
290	S	001	GB	2	Mr and Mrs Wilkinson		
345	S	002	GB	2	Mr and Mrs Morgan		
346	S	001	GB	2	Colin Forster		
386	S	001	GB	2	Mr and Mrs Deer		
387	S	001	GB	2	Ian and Carol Worth		
388	S	001	GB	2	Mr and Mrs Lyons		
389	S	001	GB	2	Harry Farrand Buntin		
392	S	001	GB	2	Mr S Burns		
393	S	001	GB	2	Mr L Tierney		
397	S	001	GB	2	Mrs Christine Stocker		
399	S	001	GB	2	B Clifton		
404	S	001	GB	2	Eric		
406	S	001	GB	2	Roy and Elizabeth Collier		
413	S	001	GB	2	Trevor Court		
423	S	004	GB	2	Jo Burris – Woodland Trust		
425	S	001	GB	2	David Cooper		
437	S	006	GB	2	Steve Fowler – NWTB	Paul Butler Associates	
444	S	001	GB	2	Alison Thornborough		
448	S	001	GB	2	Michael Walch		
449	S	002	GB	2	Timothy Eastham		
451	S	001	GB	2	Michael Hooper		
459	S	001	GB	2	Ellis Walker		
470	S	001	GB	2	Mr K B Bagshaw		
471	S	001	GB	2	Mr Kevin Macleay		
473	S	001	GB	2	Miss D L Bodie		
476	S	001	GB	2	Mr R W Peter		
479	S	001	GB	2	Joanne Platt		
480	S	001	GB	2	Margaret Elizabeth Douglas		
486	S	001	GB	2	L & J Butterworth		
487	S	001	GB	2	Mr B Tracey		
497	S	001	GB	2	John Bate		
511	S	001	GB	2	Carole Retford		
512	S	001	GB	2	Mr and Mrs Lindley		
516	S	001	GB	2	Eustace and Susan Collier		
517	S	001	GB	2	Anthony and Maureen Warren		
534	S	001	GB	2	Mr G C Jones		

544	S	001	GB	2	Keith Eric Hanrahan		
597	S	001	GB	2	CLLR Kevin Anderson		
603	S	001	GB	2	Brian Wilson		
604	S	001	GB	2	Alan Stephanson		
606	S	001	GB	2	John McKay		
608	S	001	GB	2	Mrs Alice Turner		
609	S	001	GB	2	Francis Noon		
611	S	001	GB	2	Tracy Ryan		
612	S	001	GB	2	Jonathon Karl Boyes		
613	S	001	GB	2	Dorothy Maud McArdle		
615	S	001	GB	2	Mrs Gaynor Brooks		
616	S	001	GB	2	M Keane		
617	S	001	GB	2	Bennett		
622	S	001	GB	2	Caroline Jane Travis		
624	S	001	GB	2	Mrs Sandra Travis		
625	S	001	GB	2	Mr Peter Travis		
627	S	001	GB	2	Mrs M Barker		
628	S	001	GB	2	Mr Edward Chadwick		
629	S	001	GB	2	Elizabeth Cayton		
632	S	001	GB	2	D H Ashall		
633	S	001	GB	2	Mr and Mrs G Barr		
634	S	001	GB	2	Richard Mercer		
641	S	001	GB	2	Mrs B. Yarwood		
642	S	001	GB	2	Mr and Mrs Logan		
643	S	001	GB	2	Adele Rowlandson		
644	S	001	GB	2	John Talbot & Elizabeth Audrey Talbot		
645	S	001	GB	2	Muriel Fowler		
647	S	001	GB	2	Mr A R Doyle		
650	S	001	GB	2	Mrs Ellen Eckersley		
651	S	001	GB	2	K Cowell		
657	S	001	GB	2	Dawn Thornborough		
662	S	001	GB	2	Mary Barrow		
663	S	001	GB	2	Mark Barrow		
664	S	001	GB	2	Bernard Barrow		
665	S	001	GB	2	George Lee		
666	S	001	GB	2	Julie O'Rourke		
667	S	001	GB	2	Claire Hodgkinson		
668	S	001	GB	2	Mr Noel Kershaw		
670	S	001	GB	2	Mr Richard Edward Simm		
677	S	001	GB	2	Paul John Dean		
687	S	001	GB	2	Lynne Ann Holcroft		
690	S	001	GB	2	Raymond Furnival		
692	S	001	GB	2	Mr B Munro		
694	S	001	GB	2	Mr T Whelan		
696	S	001	GB	2	Mr and Mrs Gray		
705	S	003	GB	2	Mrs Gail Patricia Robb		
731	S	001	GB	2	Stephan Retford		

Supporters of Revised Deposit

Ref No	a	b	c	d	Name	Agent	Response Ref
221	S	012	GB	2	Westbury Homes (Holdings) Ltd,		

Note

The matters raised by objection 698/001 are dealt with in the section of this report which relates to policy R1A.

The matters raised by objections 221/007, 538/011 and 685/005 are dealt with in the section of this report which relates to policy R1B.

The matters raised by objections 572/046 and 220/008 are dealt with in the section of this report which relates to policy GB1.

Main Issues

Whether this policy is appropriate, having regard to:

- the role of safeguarded land;
- the relationship of policies GB1A, GB1B and GB1C to policies GB1 and GB2;
- the possible need, in exceptional circumstances, for the development of safeguarded land during the plan period;
- action preparatory to the grant of planning permission on safeguarded land;
- the need to make specific provision for waste management facilities;
- the merits of removing land at Pocket Nook Farm, Lowton, from designation as safeguarded land;
- the merits of removing land at Maple Avenue, Hindley Green, from designation as safeguarded land;
- the merits of removing land between 112 and 72 Heath Lane, Lowton, from designation as safeguarded land;
- the merits of removing land at Thames Avenue, Pennington, from designation as safeguarded land;
- the merits of removing land at Cat i th Window Farm, Standish, from designation as safeguarded land;
- the merits of removing land at Hooten Lane, Leigh, from designation as safeguarded land;
- the merits of removing land at Old Pepper Lane, Standish, from designation as safeguarded land;
- the merits of removing land at Leigh Waste Water Treatment Works from designation as safeguarded land;
- the merits of removing land to the east of Chestnut Drive South, Leigh, from designation as safeguarded land;
- the merits of removing land at Stirrups Farm, Lowton, from designation as safeguarded land;

- the merits of removing land at Rothwell's Farm, Golbourne, from designation as safeguarded land;
- the merits of removing land at Coxes Farm, Atherton, from designation as safeguarded land;
- the merits of designating land at Heath House Farm, Golbourne, as safeguarded land;
- the merits of designating land at Wash End as safeguarded land;
- the merits of designating land at Winchester Avenue, Woodedge/Edgerley Place and Rigby Street, Ashton-in-Makerfield, as safeguarded land.

Inspector's Considerations and Conclusions

The role of safeguarded land

6.142 Policy GB2 provides that, in safeguarded land, approval will not be given except in very special circumstances for the construction of new buildings for purposes other than agriculture and forestry, essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation, cemeteries and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of safeguarded land. Other forms of development, including changes in the use of land, will not be approved unless they maintain openness. Proposals will not be allowed, within or conspicuous from safeguarded land, where they would injure the visual amenities of safeguarded land which, although they would not injure its main purpose, might be visually detrimental by reason of their siting, material or design. Objectors argue that policy GB2 does not reflect the advice of PPG2. They contend that the policy should be reworded to conform to that advice.

6.143 PPG2 (paragraph 2.12 and annex B) advises that, when LPAs prepare development plans, they should satisfy themselves that green belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period. This will, in some cases, mean safeguarding land between the urban area and the green belt which may be required to meet longer term development needs. Safeguarded land comprises areas and sites which may be required to serve development needs in the longer term, i.e. well beyond the plan period. It should be genuinely capable of development when needed. It should be located where future development would be an efficient use of land, i.e. it should be well integrated with existing development and well related to public transport and other infrastructure so that it promotes sustainable development.

6.144 Regard should be had to environmental and landscape quality when identifying safeguarded land, but only so far as this is consistent with PPG2 (paragraph 1.7). This confirms that the quality of landscape is not relevant to the inclusion of land within the green belt. On that basis that factor is not relevant to the identification of land as safeguarded land. Development plans should state that safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time and keep it free to fulfil its purpose of meeting possible longer term development needs. No development which would prejudice later comprehensive development should be permitted, although temporary developments may assist by ensuring that the land is properly looked after. Development plan policies

should provide that planning permission for permanent development of safeguarded land should be granted only following a review of the UDP which proposes the development of particular areas of safeguarded land.

6.145 Policy GB2 departs from this advice in a number of ways. It introduces the test of ‘very special circumstances’. This stringent approach is applied by PPG2 only to land which is in an adopted green belt. It is a test to be satisfied if inappropriate development is to be permitted in such areas. Very special circumstances are intended to be demonstrated by the outcome of a balancing exercise in which the harm to the green belt, by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations. It is wrong to apply such a test to land outside the green belt because, in such places, there is no harm by reason of inappropriateness.

6.146 Policy GB2 seeks to maintain the openness of safeguarded land. This is a concept specific to the green belt. The application of such a criterion to other land is not supported by the Government’s planning policy guidance. The policy also seeks to protect the visual amenities of safeguarded land. This matter is dealt with in policy EV3A. The introduction to the plan indicates that it is to be read as a whole. There is no need to repeat such provisions in policy GB2.

6.147 Policy GB2 does not reflect the primary purpose of safeguarded land i.e. to clarify that the designated areas are not allocated for development at the present time and are being kept free of permanent development so that they may be available to meet possible longer term development needs well beyond the plan period. Although development which would prejudice later comprehensive development should not be permitted, temporary development may be allowed if this would ensure that the land is properly looked after. The policy omits a vital aspect which is specifically referred to in PPG2 (annex B, paragraph B6), i.e. that a development plan should provide that planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should be granted only after a review of the UDP, which proposes the development of particular areas of safeguarded land. Because this factor relates to the determination of applications for planning permission it should be incorporated within the policy, rather than be referred to in the reasoned justification.

6.148 The LPA argues that PPG2 seeks to protect safeguarded land from development for the period of the UDP, and that this is achieved by policy GB2. It notes that the reasoned justification, at RDD stage, makes reference to the need for a review of the development plan to precede the grant of planning permission. This wording does not make the distinction between permanent and temporary development, however, and is prescribed in the reasoned justification rather than in the policy wording as PPG2 (paragraph B6) requires. The LPA notes that this policy is carried forward from the adopted UDP. Because that plan was adopted after a statutory inquiry the LPA argues that it is entitled to regard it as conforming to the Government’s planning policy guidance. In my view, however, a plain reading of policy GB2 indicates that it is not in conformity with the advice of PPG2, both as to the general purposes of safeguarded land and the detailed terms of expression.

6.149 Objectors argue that the reference to planning permission being granted only following a plan review which proposes the development of particular areas of safeguarded land, dilutes the principle of that designation. It is, however, an essential aspect of policy for safeguarded land, as confirmed by PPG2 (Annex B, paragraph B6).

6.150 For these reasons I conclude that policy GB2 and its related reasoned justification should be deleted in their entirety and replaced with a policy and supporting text which reflect the advice of PPG2.

The relationship of policies GB1A, GB1B and GB1C to policies GB1 and GB2

6.151 The reasoned justification to policy GB2 informs that its wording is identical to that of GB1. An objector refers to individual words that differ between the policies. The LPA concurs that it is more accurate to say that the wording of the two policies is virtually identical. This concern is however, subsumed within the more fundamental appraisal of policy GB2 which I present in the preceding subsection.

6.152 Policy GB1 relates to the green belt. Policy GB2 relates to safeguarded land. Policies GB1A, GB1B and GB1C relate, respectively, to the re-use of buildings, extensions to existing dwellings and replacement dwellings. In each of these latter three cases the policy is intended to apply both in the green belt and on safeguarded land. They are, in the interests of brevity, listed as sub-policies to GB1 (green belts) although they contain elements related to policy GB2 (safeguarded land). An objector argues that this structure is not appropriate given the different policy frameworks that relate to green belt and safeguarded land. For the reasons I give in relation to these individual policies, I concur that a degree of restructuring is needed. This is set out in my recommendations to policies GB1A, GB1B and GB1C.

The possible need, in exceptional circumstances, for the development of safeguarded land during the plan period

6.153 The third paragraph of the reasoned justification to policy GB2 informs that planning permission for the development of safeguarded land will be granted only following a plan review which proposes the development of particular areas of safeguarded land. Objectors argue that development of such land may be needed prior to a plan review. That policy provision is, however, consistent with the advice of PPG2 (paragraph B6).

6.154 In the section of this report which relates to policy R1A, I have concluded that sufficient housing land is available from sites with planning permission, the allocation of mixed-use sites and the reasonable expectation of windfall sites coming forward on previously developed land within the defined urban area, to meet housing development needs in the plan period. In the section of this report which deals with policy R1B I deal with the scope of the plan to cope with uncertainty in relation to housing development. That proposed policy deals, among other things, with the exceptional circumstances in

which residential development may be allowed on green-field sites. The wording of that policy limits these to green-field sites within the urban area as defined on the proposals map.

6.155 In the section of this report which relates to policy R1B I consider the scope for the UDP to cope with a future oversupply or undersupply of housing land. In respect of an undersupply I conclude that a remedy could not be found from within a housing land resource composed mainly of sites with planning permission and assumptions about future windfall capacity on previously developed land within the defined urban area. The former would come forward for development at the discretion of developers, not the LPA. The latter are, by definition, unidentified and not subject to LPA influence. Such an undersupply, if it occurred, could be remedied only by the grant of planning permission, on an exceptional basis, for the development of green-field land. This is recognised by the final element of policy R1B.

6.156 An objector argues that it is necessary for policy GB2 to explicitly recognise that a review of safeguarded land might be necessary to secure a continuity of housing land supplies. For the reasons I give in the section of this report which relates to policy R1B, I recommend that the related reasoned justification be modified to confirm that, if an undersupply of housing land emerges which cannot be satisfied other than by the development of safeguarded land, the LPA will initiate a review of the plan to identify housing allocations from within areas which are subject to that designation. For the reasons I give in the section of this report that relates to policy R1A, I have concluded that there is no justification for a review of safeguarded land to identify additional housing development sites at the present stage of plan preparation.

6.157 In my view the reference made to this matter in the reasoned justification to policy R1B (subject to my recommendation on this) is sufficient to secure the necessary action if an undersupply of housing land emerges. There is, therefore, no need to modify policy GB2 to make reference to such an eventuality.

6.158 My conclusion and recommendation in relation to the employment land resource (policy EM1) requires the allocation of additional land for that purpose prior to the adoption of the UDP. That, in turn, will require a reconsideration of the designation of areas identified as safeguarded land in the RDD. Once that exercise is carried out, and the plan is adopted, however, there can, in conformity with the advice of PPG2, be no justification for the grant of planning permission for permanent development on the safeguarded land that remains, prior to a review of the development plan.

Action preparatory to the grant of planning permission on safeguarded land

6.159 At RDD stage the LPA has inserted additional text in the reasoned justification to policy GB2 to inform that planning permission for the development of safeguarded land will be granted only following a plan review which proposes the development of particular areas of safeguarded land. Objectors seek the deletion of this new text or suggest alternative wording. However, the RDD wording is closely modelled on the

advice of PPG2 (annex B, paragraph B6) and should, therefore, be preferred to that of the objectors. There are, however, important differences between the advice of PPG2 and the approach taken by the LPA. PPG2 advises that this aspect should be presented in development plan policies, not the reasoned justification. It also makes the distinction between permanent development and other development. The preceding paragraph makes clear that temporary development may be acceptable in certain circumstances. I deal with this matter in a preceding subsection of this chapter.

The need to make specific provision for waste management facilities

6.160 An objector argues that waste management facilities may be required on safeguarded land during the plan period. He contends that policy GB2 should recognise this. Most waste management facilities are suitably located within designated employment areas and can be accommodated without the need to use safeguarded land. The UDP makes provision for the determination of planning applications for waste management facilities in policies WM1 and WM1A. The plan is to be read as a whole and there is no need for elements of these to be repeated in policy GB2.

6.161 It is often the case that, at the end of the waste stream, resort must be had to some extent to landfill. Part 1 policy WM1(D) recognises this. Such a requirement during the period of the replacement UDP need not be inconsistent with the safeguarded status of land provided that, in accordance with the advice of PPG2 (paragraph B5), the particular scheme of landfill was designed and implemented in such a way that it did not prejudice later comprehensive development of the land. I recommend that this aspect of advice be incorporated into a revised version of policy GB2. If this recommendation is accepted, there would be no need for a specific reference to waste management facilities within that policy.

The merits of removing land at Pocket Nook Farm, Lowton, from designation as safeguarded land

6.162 An objector argues that an area of land at Pocket Nook Farm, Lowton, should be removed from designation as safeguarded land with a view to its development for housing and roadside development. For the reasons I give in the section of this report which relates to policy R1A, I conclude that there is sufficient land available from sites with planning permission, the residential element of proposed mixed use allocations and the reasonable expectation of windfall sites coming forward on previously developed land within the defined urban area to meet housing development needs in the plan period. There is, therefore, having regard to the advice of PPG3 on the sequence of land allocation and development, no justification at this stage for the release of green-field land for housing development, including that at Pocket Nook Farm, Lowton, for this purpose. No evidence was presented to substantiate an argument that any roadside uses which are needed in the locality could not be accommodated on previously developed land within the built up area. For these reasons, I conclude that the removal of this area from designation as safeguarded land is not justified by the need for housing and roadside development.

6.163 A further objector seeks the removal of this land from the designation as safeguarded land with a view to its inclusion within the green belt. PPG2 advises that detailed green belt boundaries, defined in adopted development plans, should be altered only exceptionally. The objector presents no reasoned arguments which could form the basis for the conclusion that such an exceptional circumstance exists.

The merits of removing land at Maple Avenue, Hindley Green, from designation as safeguarded land

6.164 An objector argues that an area of land at Maple Avenue, Hindley Green, should be removed from designation as safeguarded land with a view to its development as a mixed use site. For the reasons I give in the section of this report which relates to policy R1A, I conclude that there is sufficient land available from sites with planning permission, the residential element of proposed mixed use allocations and the reasonable expectation of windfall sites coming forward on previously developed land within the defined built up area to meet housing development needs in the plan period. There is, therefore, having regard to the advice of PPG3 on the sequence of land allocation and development, no justification at this stage for the release of green-field land for housing development, including that at Maple Avenue, Hindley Green, for this purpose. No evidence was presented to substantiate an argument that any other uses which might form part of a mixed use development could not be accommodated on previously developed land within the built up area. To the extent that a mixed use development might include employment uses the considerations to which I refer in relation to the land at Stirrups Farm, Lowton, also apply to this site. For these reasons I conclude that the removal of this area from designation as safeguarded land is not justified by the need for mixed use development.

The merits of removing land between 112 and 72 Heath Lane, Lowton, from designation as safeguarded land

6.165 An objector argues that an area of land between 112 and 72 Heath Lane, Lowton, should be removed from designation as safeguarded land with a view to its development for housing. He argues that this will consolidate and ‘round off’ the adjacent urban area. For the reasons I give in the section of this report which relates to policy R1A, I conclude that there is sufficient land available from sites with planning permission, the residential element of proposed mixed use allocations and the reasonable expectation of windfall sites coming forward on previously developed land within the defined urban area to meet housing development needs in the plan period. There is, therefore, having regard to the advice of PPG3 on the sequence of land allocation and development, no justification at this stage for the release of green-field land for housing development, including that between 112 and 72 Heath Lane, Lowton, for this purpose. For this reason I conclude that the removal of this area from designation as safeguarded land is not justified by the need for housing development.

The merits of removing land at Thames Avenue, Pennington, from designation as safeguarded land

6.166 An objector argues that an area of land at Thames Avenue, Pennington, should be removed from designation as safeguarded land with a view to its development for housing. For the reasons I give in the section of this report which relates to policy R1A, I conclude that there is sufficient land available from sites with planning permission, the residential element of proposed mixed use allocations and the reasonable expectation of windfall sites coming forward on previously developed land within the defined urban area to meet housing development needs in the plan period. There is, therefore, having regard to the advice of PPG3 on the sequence of land allocation and development, no justification at this stage for the release of green-field land for housing development, including that at Thames Avenue, Pennington, for this purpose. For this reason I conclude that the removal of this area from designation as safeguarded land is not justified by the need for housing development. The objector argues that this site is in a sustainable location. PPG2 (annex B, paragraph B3) advises that this is a necessary aspect of a safeguarded land designation. It is not, therefore, a factor which indicates that an area of land should be released for development during the plan period.

The merits of removing land at Cat ith Window Farm, Standish, from designation as safeguarded land

6.167 An objector argues that an area of land at Cat ith Window Farm, Standish, should be removed from designation as safeguarded land and be identified as a site that could be brought forward for housing development within the present plan period if a need is demonstrated. For the reasons I give in the section of this report which relates to policy R1A, I conclude that there is sufficient land available from sites with planning permission, the residential element of proposed mixed use allocations and the reasonable expectation of windfall sites coming forward on previously developed land within the defined urban area to meet housing development needs in the plan period. There is, therefore, no justification at this stage for the release of green-field land for housing development, including that at Cat ith Window Farm, Standish, for this purpose. For these reasons I conclude that the removal of this area from designation as safeguarded land is not justified by the need for housing development.

The merits of removing land at Hooten Lane, Leigh, from designation as safeguarded land

6.168 An objector argues that an area of land at Hooten Lane, Leigh, should be removed from designation as safeguarded land with a view to its development for housing. For the reasons I give in the section of this report which relates to policy R1A, I conclude that there is sufficient land available from sites with planning permission, the residential element of proposed mixed use allocations and the reasonable expectation of windfall sites coming forward on previously developed land within the defined urban area to meet housing development needs in the plan period. There is, therefore, having regard to the advice of PPG3 on the sequence of land allocation and development, no justification at

this stage for the release of green-field land for residential development, including that at Hooten Lane, Leigh, for this purpose. For these reasons I conclude that the removal of this area from designation as safeguarded land is not justified by the need for housing development. I note the argument of the objector that this site is in a sustainable location. PPG2 (Annex B, paragraph B3) advises that this is a necessary characteristic of safeguarded land.

The merits of removing land at Old Pepper Lane, Standish, from designation as safeguarded land

6.169 An objector refers to an area of grassland which forms part of the open countryside at the eastern edge of the small settlement of Shevington Moor, to the east of Standish. This is a green-field site which is proposed to be designated as safeguarded land. The objector refers to its proximity to established residential development to the north and south. He regards it as a suitable housing infill site and seeks its removal from this designation with a view to its allocation for residential development.

6.170 For the reasons I give in the section of this report which relates to policy R1A, I conclude that there is sufficient land available from sites with planning permission, the residential element of proposed mixed use allocations and the reasonable expectation of windfall sites coming forward on previously developed land within the defined urban area to meet housing development needs in the plan period. There is, therefore, having regard to the advice of PPG3 on the sequence of land allocation and development, no justification at this stage for the release of green-field land for housing development, including that at Old Pepper Lane, Standish, for this purpose. I conclude that the removal of this area from designation as safeguarded land is not justified by the need for housing development.

The merits of removing land at Leigh Waste Water Treatment Works from designation as safeguarded land

6.171 An objector argues that land at the Leigh Waste Water Treatment Works should be removed from the designation of safeguarded land. Most of that designation on this site is also shown on the proposals map as a Site of Biological Importance (SBI), subject to policy EV2B. That policy provides that the LPA will not permit development on such sites or close enough to adversely affect them.

6.172 PPG2 (annex B) advises that land should be identified as safeguarded land if it may be required to serve development needs in the longer term. It should be genuinely capable of development when needed. It should be located where future development would be an efficient use of land. Because the LPA has identified the majority of safeguarded land at Leigh Waste Water Treatment Works as being of a sort where development will not be permitted, it is inconsistent for it to be identified as safeguarded land. For this reason the safeguarded land designation should be removed from the area of the identified Site of Biological Importance.

6.173 A part of the safeguarded land at Leigh Waste Water Treatment Works lies outside the SBI. The objector has not identified any particular need for development that would be unmet during the plan period by the RDD proposals. He simply seeks that the safeguarded land should be included within the urban area. Although the objector refers to the possibility that the site may be contaminated and that some built development may be needed to secure reclamation, this is not expressed with any degree of certainty. The presence of contamination is not supported by the designation of the adjacent land as an SBI. On the basis of the arguments put to me there is no basis for removing the remaining area from the category of safeguarded land.

The merits of removing land to the east of Chestnut Drive South, Leigh, from designation as safeguarded land

6.174 An objector argues that a narrow belt of land to the west of Pennington Brook, and the east of the rear gardens of dwellings fronting Chestnut Drive South (to the north of the footbridge) has been wrongly designated as safeguarded land. This is an area of mostly overgrown land which is isolated by dwelling curtilages and a substantial water course from the possibility of road access.

6.175 The LPA argues that this area should be retained as safeguarded land as part the wider designation for this purpose which extends to the east of Pennington Brook. For the reasons I have given in the subsection of this chapter which relates to land at Leigh Waste Water Treatment Works, I have concluded that the designation of safeguarded land should be removed from the land to the east of Pennington Brook. Its removal would negate the LPA's reason for so designating the land to the east of dwellings at Chestnut Drive South.

6.176 At the inquiry session which related to this objection the LPA conceded that the proposals map had, inadvertently, included in the safeguarded land designation the rear garden of a dwelling on the north side of the eastern-most end of Thames Avenue, Leigh. This is clearly part of the urban area and should be removed from the safeguarded land.

The merits of removing land at Stirrups Farm, Lowton, from designation as safeguarded land

6.177 Objectors argue that some 26ha of land at Stirrups Farm, Lowton, bounded by Stone Cross Lane, Church Lane and the A580 road should be removed from designation as safeguarded land and, instead, included within the green belt. PPG2 advises that detailed green belt boundaries defined in adopted development plans should be altered only exceptionally.

6.178 The objectors refer to the land as a haven for wildlife. The majority of it is cropped farm land and, therefore, green-field land which does not provide a beneficial wildlife habitat. The area not actively farmed has been inspected by an ecologist from the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit. It was found to have some wildlife value but not

sufficient to warrant the status of Site of Biological Importance (SBI). In any case, the protection of wildlife is not among the purposes of green belt policy.

6.179 The objectors value the area for its landscape value. PPG2 advises that the quality of the landscape is not relevant to the inclusion of land within a green belt. They argue that the land should be returned to its former green belt status, but the objection site has never been subject to such a designation. I conclude that exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated which would justify the alteration of the green belt to include this land.

6.180 Other objectors seek the removal of the land at Stirrups Farm from its safeguarded land designation and its allocation, in whole or in part, for housing or for a mixed use development which would include employment. For the reasons I give in the section of this report which relates to policy R1A, I conclude that there is sufficient land available from sites with planning permission, the residential element of proposed mixed use allocations and the reasonable expectation of windfall sites coming forward on previously developed land within the defined urban area to meet housing development needs in the plan period. There is, therefore, having regard to the advice of PPG3 on the sequence of land allocation and development, no justification at this stage for the release of green-field land for housing development, including that at Stirrups Farm, for this purpose, either in its own right or as part of a mixed use development.

6.181 My appraisal, in the section of this report which relates to policy EM1, of the relationship between the requirement for and likely effective supply of land for employment, has led me to conclude that the LPA should identify additional opportunities for this. The objector proposes employment development on this site only as part of a mixed-use scheme. In the absence of a complementary element of residential development it is not clear what scale of employment uses would comprise a viable development. To the extent that employment uses may form a component part of a mixed use scheme it would be necessary to justify an allocation via the application of the sequential approach presented in RPG13 (policy DP1).

6.182 That policy provides that previously undeveloped land should be developed only when existing buildings and previously developed land has been considered and found to be not available. For the reasons I give in the sections of this report which relate to policies EM1 and EM1A I have concluded that this is the present situation in the Borough. The development of previously undeveloped land must avoid areas of important open space, be well located in relation to houses, jobs, other services and infrastructure and be (or be capable of being) accessible by public transport, walking or cycling. The objector argues that this site performs well in these terms. It is, however, necessary to consider the extent to which other areas meet these criteria.

6.183 For the reasons I give in the section of this report which relates to policy EM1 I have recommended that this search for the necessary additional employment land should be directed, in the first instance, to the areas proposed to be designated as safeguarded land. If my recommendation is accepted the merits of an employment land designation on

land at Stirrups Farm, Lowton, will be considered, and the outstanding uncertainties resolved, via that exercise.

The merits of removing land from the designation of safeguarded land at Rothwell's Farm, Golbourne

6.184 An objector argues that land at Rothwell's Farm, Golbourne, should be removed from designation as safeguarded land with a view to its inclusion within the green belt. PPG2 advises that detailed green belt boundaries defined in adopted development plans should be altered only exceptionally.

6.185 The objector notes the proximity of the land at Rothwell's Farm to a Site of Biological Importance (SBI) at Lightshaw Lime Bed. The protection of nature conservation interests is not one of the purposes of including land in green belts. It is identified as an objective of the green belt once this has been defined, but the extent to which the use of land fulfils such an objective is not, in itself, a material factor in the inclusion of land within a green belt.

6.186 Sites of Biological Importance are protected by policy EV2B. This provides that development will not be permitted if it is close enough to a SBI to adversely affect it. Whether it would have such an effect in a particular case depends on the nature of the use and its actual layout and design. There is no basis for proscribing future development before these factors are known. I conclude that no exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated for the inclusion of this land in the green belt. For these reasons I conclude that the land at Rothwell's Farm, Golbourne should not be deleted from safeguarded land.

The merits of removing land at Coxes Farm, Atherton, from designation as safeguarded land

6.187 An objector argues that land at Coxes Farm, Atherton, should be removed from designation as safeguarded land and allocated for housing and/or mixed use development. The latter option would include employment opportunities and amenity/leisure facilities. He claims that the area is previously developed land which has been used for clay extraction, commercial tipping, shallow mining and open-cast coal extraction. The site has the appearance of agricultural land. The remains of former activities have blended into the landscape. For this reason, having regard to the advice of PPG3 (annex C), I consider that it should not be regarded as previously developed land for the purposes of the sequential approach to development.

6.188 For the reasons I have given in the section of this report which relates to policy R1A, I conclude that there is sufficient land available from sites with planning permission, the residential element of proposed mixed-use allocations and the reasonable expectation of windfall sites coming forward on previously developed land within the defined urban area to meet housing development needs in the plan period. There is, therefore, having regard to the advice of PPG3 on the sequence of land allocation and development, no justification at this stage for the release of green-field land for

residential development, including that at Coxes Farm, Atherton, for this purpose. The objector has not demonstrated a need for any of the other elements of his proposed mixed-use scheme. To the extent that a mixed-use development might include employment uses the considerations to which I refer in relation to the land at Stirrups Farm, Lowton, also apply to this site. For these reasons I conclude that the removal of this area from designation as safeguarded land is not justified by the need for housing or mixed-use development.

The merits of designating land at Heath House Farm, Golbourne, as safeguarded land

6.189 A small area of land at Heath House Farm, Golbourne, is situated to the north of the A580 road between an hotel to the west, a Primary Employment Area (EM1A1) to the north and proposed safeguarded land to the east. The boundary of the adopted green belt follows the southern edge of the A580 road to the south. An objector argues that, if the safeguarded land to the east is included in the green belt, as he advocates, then the land at Heath House Farm should be included in this designation also. For the reasons I give in the section of this report which relates to policy GB1 I have concluded that the land to the east should remain as safeguarded land. In that event, the objector seeks the designation of the land at Heath House Farm as safeguarded land.

6.190 PPG2 (paragraph 2.12 and annex B) makes clear that the purpose of such a designation is to provide for longer term development needs, thereby ensuring that green belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period. The area referred to by the objector is very small, both in its own right and in comparison with the extensive areas of safeguarded land proposed in the RDD. There is no basis on which I can conclude that making such a marginal increase in the stock of safeguarded land would have a tangible influence upon future decisions to release green belt land for development, particularly having regard to the period of time which separates this inquiry from the end of the plan period in 2016. The designation of this land as safeguarded land could not, therefore, be justified as serving the objectives of that policy.

The merits of designating land at Wash End as safeguarded land

6.191 An objector argues that land at Wash End should be designated as safeguarded land in order to protect it from future development because he considers this to be inappropriate for highway safety reasons. Policy GB2 does not safeguard land from any possibility of development however. It safeguards it from development during the plan period so that it may be available to meet development needs if these arise after that time. In any case, this land has received a grant of planning permission for residential development. Its development within the plan period could not, therefore, be prevented.

The merits of designating land at Winchester Avenue, Woodedge/Edgerley Place and Rigby Street, Ashton-in-Makerfield as safeguarded land

6.192 An objector argues that an area of woodland in the vicinity of the above highways should be designated as safeguarded land to protect it from development. The area is

identified in the RDD as a Site of Biological Importance. PPG2 (annex B) clarifies that designation as safeguarded land does not protect land from any possibility of development. Instead it is intended to safeguard it from development during the plan period so that it may be available to meet development needs if these arise after that time. It is clear that the objector's long term aspirations for the land would not be served by such a designation.

Recommendation

I recommend:

(REC 6.16) that the RDD be modified by the deletion of policy GB2 and the replacement of the policy wording as follows. 'The safeguarded land, defined on the proposals map, may be required to serve development needs in the longer term, well beyond the plan period. It is identified for this purpose in order that the boundaries of the adopted green belt will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period in 2016. This land is not allocated for development at present. It will be kept free of permanent development so that it may fulfil its purpose of meeting possible longer term development needs. Although temporary development may be permitted if this would assist in ensuring that the land is properly looked after, no development which would prejudice later comprehensive development will be permitted. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land will be granted only following a review of the development plan which proposes this.'

(REC 6.17) that the RDD be modified by the deletion of the reasoned justification for policy GB2 and its replacement with text which supports and is consistent with the above approach.

(REC 6.18) that the RDD be modified by the deletion from the proposals map of that part of the safeguarded land designation between Chestnut Drive South, Leigh, and Leigh Commerce Park which lies within the identified Site of Biological Importance, together with the safeguarded land to the west of Pennington Brook (to the north of the footbridge) and the area which is within the rear garden of the dwelling at the eastern-most end of Thames Avenue.

(REC 6.19) that no other modification be made to the RDD in response to these objections.