Golborne and Lowton West Neighbourhood Plan

Representations submitted at the

Regulation 16 stage

December 2022

Submitted Representations

This paper sets out all the representations received during consultation on the final draft of the Golborne and Lowton West Neighbourhood Plan, which was consulted on for 6 weeks from 12 October to 22 November 2022.

A total of 9 representations were received, including 8 from statutory consultees, including Wigan Council, and 1 from Murphy Group, who are a landowner and employer in the Neighbourhood Area.

Contents:

Appendix 1: Representations submitted by Wigan Council

Appendix 2: Representations by Statutory Consultees

Appendix 3: Representation by WSP on behalf of Murphy Group

Appendix 1: Representations submitted by Wigan Council

Policy Reference	Comment
GLW-R5: Millingford Industrial Estate	The Council is aware that the following comment does not relate to whether the proposal plan fulfils basic conditions but considers it worthy of note as part of the examination: Millingford Industrial Estate is currently designated as a Primary Employment Area in Policy EM1A of the adopted Wigan Unitary Development Plan, within which employment uses (including B2 and B8 uses) are supported in principle. The site is currently subject to a planning application for employment development including B2, B8 and Class E employment uses with prior notification for demolition given in June 2022. It is anticipated that the proposal will be determined by the Council prior to the examination of the Neighbourhood Plan, and if approved would reduce the prospect of the plan's aspirations for the site being delivered.
GLW-D4: Coalescence	Whilst the Forum has amended the policy following consultation at the Regulation 14 stage, the Council still considers the policy to be unnecessary and a duplication of national Green Belt policy, as set out in NPPF. As a result, this policy is in breach of Basic Conditions as the NPPF at paragraph 16(f) states that plans should avoid unnecessary duplication of policies including those in the NPPF. Whilst the Forum considers the policy to address particular concerns raised by the community, the policy does not provide any additional safeguards to the Green Belt above that set out in the NPPF. Notwithstanding this, the policy wording does not make clear that the policy applies only to the areas identified in Plan 10. Plan 10 is also unclear and would work better if the 3 parcels of Green Belt were all coloured the same and identified on the key as 'Areas to be maintained as an open landscape gap' or similar, instead of Golborne and Lowton.
GLW-D1: Sustainable Design GLW-C1: Housing CLW-I1: Sustainable Travel	It is considered that some of the criteria in these policies are too rigid in terms of their strict requirements on development and do not allow sufficient flexibility to be applied where this may not be feasible or appropriate. For example, a number of criterion state that development 'must provide'. The inclusion of 'where appropriate' or 'where feasible' to such criteria, where relevant, would address this effectively, without inappropriately weakening the policy. If necessary, an explanation could be added to the supporting text to provide clarity on what would be considered to be inappropriate or unfeasible. Whilst supporting the principle of these policies, without this flexibility, there is a concern that the plan could place unnecessary burdens on development which could stifle the delivery of sustainable development, and consequently be in breach of basic conditions.

Appendix 2: Representations submitted by Statutory Consultees

Consultee	Comment
Canal and Rivers Trust	No comment
Coal Authority	No comment
Environment Agency	Part of Millingford Industrial Estate is in Flood Zone 2 and includes land within a River Bylaw. The National Planning Policy Framework requires any new proposed residential/employment allocations within flood zone 2 or 3 to be subject to the Flood Risk Sequential Test and, if applicable, the Exception Test. New proposed allocations should be directed towards Flood Zone 1 in the first instance. Only where sites are not available in Flood Zone 1 should consideration be made towards the allocation of sites in Flood Zone 2. Allocations in Flood Zone 3 should only be made if there are no reasonably available alternative sites in Flood Zone 2. Any site allocations in either Flood Zone 2 or 3 may need to be supported by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 require a permit or exemption to be obtained for any activities which will take place: - On or within 8 metres of a main river (16 metres if tidal) - On or within 8 metres of a flood defence structure or culverted main river (16 metres if tidal) - On or within 16 metres of a sea defence - Involving quarrying or excavation within 16 metres of any main river, flood defence (including a remote defence) or culvert - In a floodplain more than 8 metres from the river bank, culvert or flood defence (16 metres if it's a tidal main river) and you don't already have planning permission.
Historic England	No comment
National Grid	No comment
Natural England	No comment
Sport England	Additional demand for sporting facilities as a result of housing allocation must be considered.

Appendix 3: Representations submitted by WSP on behalf of Murphy Group

Policy Reference	Comment
General	Broadly support the Neighbourhood Plan and welcome the policies that seek good quality design and strong sustainability commitments.
Key Issues, Vision and Aims	In full support of visions and aims and agree that the vision would help to deliver shared ambitions for the Neighbourhood Plan, however, would welcome a more focused agenda on training, skills, biodiversity, and nature.
Policy GLW-C1	Welcome the policy.
Policy GLW-D4	The policy wording remains unchanged despite comments made during Regulation 14 consultation Two basic conditions are noted; (a) Having regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State it is appropriate to make the order (or neighbourhood plan); and (e) The making of the order (or neighbourhood plan) is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan for the area of the authority (or any part of that area). Whilst the intent is understood, Policy CP8 of the Wigan Local Plan Core Strategy reiterates the NPPF stance on Green Belt, as such the land in question is already protected from 'inappropriate development', the policy must have regard to basic condition (a) in this regard. The policy in its current form will be mistaken for seeking a blanket ban on development within this area which would conflict with Green Belt policy which allows for 'appropriate development' and in very special circumstances some 'inappropriate development'. Furthermore, there is no such policy within the Development Plan which refers to coalescence or any other form of strategic/green gap. Condition (e) is clear that Neighbourhood Plans must be in general conformity with the Development Plan. In the examination of Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan the Inspector noted that the plan sought to adopt a 'Strategic Gap' policy ahead of the Local Plan. The Inspector was concerned that policy was not in conformity with the adopted Development Plan but also that there was no substantive evidence to demonstrate that the 'strategic gap' was based on robust, detailed analysis. The Inspector recommended deleting the policy. In light of the above, the policy is not in general conformity with the adopted Development Plan and should be reworded/deleted. The land would remain within the Green Belt.