

Ashton-under-Lyne Town Centre Strategy

Supplementary Planning Document

Consultation Statement

This statement has been prepared in order to comply with the requirements of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, for the adoption of Supplementary Planning Documents by Local Planning Authorities.

Published by

**Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
Planning and Building Control**

November 2009

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 local authorities are required to prepare and publish a Consultation Statement for a range of planning policy documents, including Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's). This is a reflection of Government's desire to "strengthen community and stakeholder involvement in the development of local communities"²⁶. The Council formally adopted a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) on 11th July 2006, which sets out how the public will be consulted on new planning policy and significant planning applications. As the Statement of Community Involvement is now adopted, all such planning documents will be required to conform to its provisions.
- 1.2 This Consultation Statement has been prepared following the adoption of the Statement of Community Involvement, and aims to reflect the intentions of Government planning guidance for reporting on community involvement in the plan making process. It describes the involvement of stakeholders, the community, voluntary organisations and statutory consultees in the preparation of the Ashton-under-Lyne Town Centre Strategy Planning Document Scoping Report, which was the forerunner to the Supplementary Planning Document. The Scoping report was made available during a period of formal public consultation in July 2006 for five weeks, and was also made available to view alongside the Supplementary Planning Document and the Sustainability Appraisal Report, in accordance with the appropriate regulations²⁷ during the 4 week period of public consultation.

2.0 Scoping Report Consultation

- 2.1 Work on the preparation of the Scoping Report began in July 2006 when it became clear there was a need to provide guidance to aid and steer development within Ashton Town Centre. The Supplementary Planning Document aims to enhance relevant policies within the Tameside UDP with more detailed development principles.
- 2.2 A Scoping Report was circulated round internal departments of the Council for comment during July 2006 and an amended version was produced for targeted public consultation on 26th July 2006, after consultation with the Cabinet Deputy of Technical Services.
- 2.3 Consultation on the Scoping Report began on the 31st July 2006 and lasted for five weeks until 4th September 2006. A list of consultees and their comments is included in appendix 1.

²⁶ "Planning Policy Statement 12: Local Development Frameworks", Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, 2004, paragraph 1.3 (iii).

²⁷ "Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004", ODPM 2003

3.0 Officer and Member Consultation

- 3.1 Prior to the public consultation stage internal consultation of the draft SPD was undertaken with Council Officers and key members of the Council to ensure a robust and accurate draft document has been produced.
- 3.2 An Officers workshop event was held on 19th May 2006 to draw down potential issues and opportunities the Ashton Town Centre Strategy may acknowledge and address through its eventual adoption and implementation. This was followed by the consultation of a first draft document on 19th October 2006. Details of these are in appendix 3.
- 3.3 Following Officer consultation a series of consultations were carried out with key Members of the Council. Initial consultation was with Councillor Quinn, (Cabinet Deputy for Economic Services), Councillor Whitehead (Cabinet Deputy for Technical Services) and the Leader of the Council, Councillor Oldham, followed by presentations to the Ashton Ward Members. Those Members unable to attend the presentations were emailed a copy of the document, enabling them to comment on it. Responses received from these Member exercises were positive.
- 3.4 The draft Supplementary Planning Document was finalised during July and August 2009 taking full account of the consultation responses from the Scoping report, and the consultation workshops with Officers and Members of the Council.

4.0 Consultation of draft Supplementary Planning Document

- 4.1 The draft Supplementary Planning Document was the subject of a 4 week formal public consultation from Monday 21st September until Monday 19th October 2009. The SPD together with its accompanying documents were placed on the Council's website, with reference copies were made available at Customer Services Centres and libraries in Ashton, Denton, Droylsden, Hattersley, Hyde, Stalybridge, Longdendale and Mossley; libraries in Ashton, Haughton Green, Hurst, Newton and West End; and in the Planning and Building Control Department at the Council Offices in Ashton.
- 4.2 In order to inform the public, groups, businesses and organisations the consultation was taking place a public notice was placed in the Tameside Report (appendix 6) and a presentation was given to the Ashton District Assembly meeting on 22nd September. Allied with this an email or letter was sent to individuals or organisations on the Local Development Framework mailing list, informing them of where they could view the SPD documents and how to submit comments. Details of consultees are given in appendix 2 (Member), 4 & 5.
- 4.3 Consultees were informed that any comments they wished to make had to be submitted in writing or email to the Council by Tuesday 20th October at 9.00 a.m. By this deadline period the Council had received 9 responses and 4 responses were received within a day of the consultation ending. Due to the

relevance of the late comments received, the Council has decided to consider these with the other 9 responses; resulting in a total of 13 consultation responses.

- 4.4 On completion of the consultation period, all the responses were gathered, read and assessed and a précis of the main points produced during October and November 2009, which is presented in appendix 7, together with any changes made to the final SPD as a result of the comments received, following agreement by key Council Officers and Councillors.

Appendix 1 - Scoping Report Distribution List - Statutory Consultees

To fulfil the requirements of Stage A5 in the Sustainability Appraisal process the Scoping Report was sent to the following consultation bodies:

List of Consultees	Email (E), Letter (L), Document (D)
English Nature	L,D
Countryside Agency	L,D
Environment Agency	L,D
English Heritage	L,D
Government Office for the North West	L,D
North West Regional Assembly	L,D
North West Regional Development Agency	L,D
Manchester City Council	L,D
Stockport Council	L,D
High Peak Borough Council	L,D
Oldham Council	L,D

Scoping Report Consultation responses

Four responses were received during the consultation period of the scoping report.

- The Environment Agency felt the overall objectives and criteria outlined in A, B & C appear to address their environmental concerns.
- The Government Office for the North West made no comments at this stage.
- The North West Regional Development Agency had no comments at this stage.
- English Nature made the following comments related to the SA of the LDF Core Strategy and Hattersley AAP Draft Scoping Report, rather than the Ashton SPD Scoping Report.

Paragraph 12 – four points, a – d address biodiversity but there is ambiguity in some of the terms used. The term ‘endangered’ for example is not clearly defined. There is some repetition of the concept and the term ‘wildlife’ can be ambiguous.

Appendix 2 - List of Member Consultees for Draft Supplementary Planning Document

Councillor Consultee List - (E- Email, L-Letter, D-Document)

AMBLER, Richard	E
BAINES, Derek	E
BEELEY, Basil	E
BELL, John S	E
BOWDEN, Helen	E
BRAY, Warren	E
BRAZIL, Jean	E
BRELSFORD, Wendy	E
BUCKLEY, David	E
CARTER, Valerie	E
CARTWRIGHT, Dorothy	E
COONEY, Gerald P	E
DAVIS, Jack	E
DICKINSON, Doreen	E
DOUBLEDAY, Andrew	E
DOWNS, Margaret E	E
DOWNS, Walter	E
ETCHELLS, Ann	E
ETCHELLS, Roy	E
FITZPATRICK, James M	E
FITZPATRICK, Philip M	E
GWYNNE, Allison	E
HARRISON, William	E
HIGHTON, Andrew	E
HOLLAND, Ann J	E
HOLLAND, Barrie	E
KELLY, John	E
KITCHEN, Joseph A.P.	E
LANE, Dawson	E
LANE, Jackie	E
MIDDLETON, James	E
OLDHAM, S Roy	E
PARKER-PERRY, Sean	E
PATRICK, Clive	E
PIDDINGTON, Catherine M	E
QUINN, Kieran	E
QUINN, Susan	E
REYNOLDS, Jonathan	E
RICCI, Vincent	E
ROBERTS, George	E
ROBINSON, Peter J	E
SHORROCK, Eileen	E
SIDEBOTTOM, Margaret C	E
SMITH, Michael	E

SMITH, Stephen	E
SULLIVAN, John	E
SWEETON, David	E
TAYLOR, John C	E
TRAVIS, Lynn	E
WAREING, Martin	E
WARRINGTON, Brenda	E
WELSH, Kevin	E
WELSH, Ruth	E
WHITE, Colin	E
WHITEHEAD, J Alan	E
WHITLEY, Michael	E
WILD, Brian	E

Appendix 3 – Officer Consultation

Internal Consultation on the draft Supplementary Planning Document

The draft Supplementary Planning Document was circulated internally (via email) for comments on 19th October 2007 for a period of twelve working days to the following departments within the Council:

- Corporate Services
- Education & Cultural Services
- Housing
- Highways & Engineers
- Economic Development
- Planning & Building Control
- Development & technical Directorate
- Sport & Cultural Services
- Town Centre Marketing
- Head of Service – Development & Technical
- Town Centre Management
- Legal Services
- Assistant Executive Director – Development & Technical
- Estates & Valuation

Comments were received from the Property Services Department and Ashton Regeneration. Unfortunately Ashton Regeneration comments were received past the comment deadline. As such, they will be considered during this wider consultation stage. Property Services comments were fed into the draft document.

Topics & outcomes from the Officer workshop

In order to help focus discussion at this initial stage, broad topic groups were used. The outcomes of which are as follows:

Culture, Heritage & Leisure

Issues

- Ashton needs to be successfully adopted as the capital of Tameside with a town centre mirroring this – creation of identity & ‘place’
- Investment perceptions of Ashton need to be improved to encourage new & different uses into the town centre – cafes / restaurants / venues
- Key strategies need to link to deliver shared goals – cultural & night-time / evening economy

Opportunities

- Develop identity and improve perceptions of the town – engage people through culture
- Develop and maximise key buildings and spaces to create identity
 - Market & market square
 - Cultural quarter – linked to St Petersfield and Hugh Mason House
 - Old Town
 - Portland Basin & Canal
- Create a focus for young people

- Monopolise existing assets

Environment & Public Realm

Issues

- Inconsistent materials palette applied through town
- Poor maintenance / durability of landscape systems
- A defined high quality materials palette is required to create identity
- Poor quality gateways into the town centre, particularly from the north and east
- Barriers to effective permeability & vistas – southern bypass, inappropriate developments, dominance of roads
- On-street parking in Old Town requires policing
- The evening economy of the town needs greater promotion
- High levels of street clutter

Opportunities

- Creation of boulevard encouraging pedestrian movement between Ikea area and town centre
- Development of high quality sequence of public spaces & routes
- Linking the canal & Portland Basin to town centre via St Petersfield and Old Town
- Creation of new market square – impetus for public realm improvements
- Reduction in street cluttering through effective, considered public realm palette & strategy
- Promotion of evening economy allied with development of town centre residential
- Effective / direct pedestrian links across primary road routes

Transport

Issues

- On street parking and high price of public car parks
- Poor distribution of car parks – greater provision is required within the south and east
- Severing effect of primary roads – Park Parade, Wellington Rd, Cavendish Rd Oldham Rd
- Concentration of public transport within north east of town centre
- Old town lacks public transport and footfall drawn from its presence

Opportunities

- Creation of car parks to help feed the old town
- Creation of multi-modal transport routes, with effective pedestrian movement at its core
- Utilising the proposed transport interchange and rail station and its proximity to the town centre
- Aiding the vitality of Old Town through selective siting of new public car park/s
- Metro link – aiding investment

Land-use and Development

Issues

- Need for increased retail & town centre uses in the core town centre
- Residential decline in the surrounding areas

- Delamere is a visually run-down area creating a barrier between the town centre and its residential neighbours
- Concentration of vehicular movement – congestion, north/south traffic, barriers
- Old town is failing to maximise its historic character
- Wellington Road Council offices are utilising a key town centre site

Opportunities

- Encourage redevelopment of 'Delamere' area as a mixed use transition between residential, office and town centre uses
- Promotion of a mixed-use town centre with increased residential aiding the viability of the evening economy, particularly within the Old Town area
- Creating an improved relationship between vehicular and non vehicular transport, with effective pedestrian permeability at its core
- Relocation of Council offices releasing a key town centre development site
- Maximise on the key developments under way or proposed to ensure further investment in the town centre
- Quality of the historic environment; opportunity to create a unique town centre district
- Increased waterside development – merging of St Petersfield and Portland Basin
- Gateway improvements through application of high quality design creating landmark buildings and structures.

Appendix 4 - Specific Consultation Bodies Consulted on the Draft SPD

The following list of consultation bodies are those identified in Appendix G of the adopted Tameside Statement of Community Involvement.

- The Regional Planning Body – The North West Regional Assembly
- A relevant authority any part of whose area is in or adjoins the area of the local planning authority:
 - Derbyshire County Council;
 - Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council;
 - Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council;
 - Peak District National Park Authority;
 - High Peak Borough Council;
 - Manchester City Council;
 - Mossley Town Council;
 - Saddleworth Parish Council;
 - Tintwistle Parish Council;
 - Charlesworth Parish Council; and
 - Chisworth Parish Council.
- The Countryside Agency²⁸
- The Environment Agency
- The Highways Agency
- The Historic Buildings and Monuments Commission for England (English Heritage)
- English Nature²⁹
- Network Rail
- A Regional Development Agency whose area is in or adjoins the area of the local planning authority – North West Development Agency, East Midlands Development Agency
- Any person to whom the electronic communications code applies by virtue of a direction given under Section 106 (3)(a) of the Communications Act 2003: British Telecommunications
- Any person who owns or controls electronic communications apparatus situated in any part of the area of the local planning authority: Mobile Operators Association, Vodafone Ltd, One2One Personal Communications Ltd, O2 (UK) Ltd, Orange Personal Communications Services Ltd
- Any of the bodies from the following list who are exercising functions in any part of the area of the local planning authority:
 - I. Strategic Health Authority – Greater Manchester Strategic Health Authority
 - II. Person to whom a license has been granted under sec 7(2) of the Gas Act 1986 – Transco North West
 - III. Sewage undertaker United Utilities Properties Limited and United Utilities – Service delivery
 - IV. Water undertaker: United Utilities Properties Limited and United Utilities – Service delivery

²⁸ The Countryside Agency merged with English Nature in October 2006 to form Natural England which is now a statutory consultee.

²⁹ English Nature merged with the Countryside Agency in October 2006 to form Natural England which is now a statutory consultee.

- Government Departments:
 - Department for Constitutional Affairs;
 - Department of Culture, Media and Sport;
 - Government Office for the North West (GONW);
 - Defence Estate Organisation (Ministry of Defence);
 - Department for Work and Pensions;
 - Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs;
 - The Home Office;
 - Office of Government Commerce;
 - Department for Education and Skills (through GONW);
 - Department of Transport (through GONW);
 - Department for Health (through the regional public health group);
 - Department for Trade and Industry³⁰

³⁰ The Department for Trade and Industry was replaced by the Department for Business Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR) in 2007

Appendix 5 - General and Other Consultees

General consultation bodies are those identified in Appendix G of the adopted Tameside Statement of Community Involvement:

- Voluntary bodies, some or all of whose activities benefit any part of the authority's area;
- Bodies which represent the interests of different racial, ethnic or national groups in the authority's area;
- Bodies which represent the interests of different religious groups in the authority's area;
- Bodies which represent the interests of disabled persons in the authority's area; and
- Bodies which represent the interests of persons carrying on business in the authority's area.

Other consultees are those identified in Appendix G of the adopted Tameside Statement of Community Involvement:

- | | |
|---|---|
| (a) Age Concern; | (s) Environmental groups at national, regional and local level, including: Campaign to Protect of Rural England ³¹ ; |
| (b) Airport operators: Manchester Airport; | i. Friends of the Earth; |
| (c) British Chemical Distributors Association; | ii. Royal Society for the Protection of Birds; and |
| (d) British Geological Survey; | iii. Wildlife Trusts. |
| (e) British Waterways, canal owners and navigation authorities; | (t) Equal Opportunities Commission |
| (f) Centre for Ecology and Hydrology; | (u) Fire and Rescue Services |
| (g) Chambers of Commerce, Local CBI and local branches of the Institute of Directors; | (v) Forestry Commission |
| (h) Church Commissioners; | (w) Freight Transport Association |
| (i) Civil Aviation Authority; | (x) Gypsy Council |
| (j) Coal Authority; | (y) Health and Safety Executive |
| (k) Commission of Architecture and the Built Environment; | (z) Help the Aged |
| (l) Commission for New Towns and English Partnerships; | (aa) Housing Corporation |
| (m) Commission for Racial Equality; | (bb) Learning and Skills Council |
| (n) Crown Estate Office; | (cc) Local Agenda 21 bodies including: |
| (o) Diocesan Board of Finance; | i. Civic Societies; |
| (p) Disability Rights Commission; | ii. Community Groups; |
| (q) Disabled Persons Transport Advisory Committee; | iii. Local Transport Authorities; |
| (r) Electricity, Gas and Telecommunications undertakers, and the National Grid Company; | iv. Local Transport Operators; and |
| | v. Local Race Equality Councils and other local equality groups. |

³¹ Formerly The Council for the Protection of Rural England

- (dd) National Playing Fields Association
- (ee) Network Rail
- (ff) Passenger Transport Authorities: Greater Manchester Passenger Transport Executive
- (gg) Passenger Transport Executives
- (hh) Police Architectural Liaison Officers/Crime Prevention Design Advisors
- (ii) Port Operators
- (jj) Post Office Property Holdings
- (kk) Rail Companies and Rail Freight Group
- (ll) Regional Development Agencies
- (mm) Regional Housing Boards
- (nn) Regional Sports Boards
- (oo) Road Haulage Association
- (pp) Sport England
- (qq) The House Builders Federation
- (rr) Transport for London
- (ss) Traveller Law Reform Coalition
- (tt) Water Companies
- (uu) Women's National Commission
- (vv) Council for British Archaeology
- (ww) Greater Manchester Archaeological Unit

Appendix 6 - Public Notice

Public notice from the Tameside Reporter 17th September 2009.

3 1910 Editorial Glossop: 01457 852669 www.tamesidereporter.com

Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
Draft Ashton Town Centre Strategy Supplementary Planning Document
Public Notice Inviting Representations
Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004
Planning and Building Control

Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council gives notice that it has published the above draft supplementary planning document for public consultation

The Draft Ashton Town Centre Strategy SPD covers the central part of Ashton-under-Lyne and provides specific planning guidance for Ashton town centre to aid developers submitting planning applications and support the economic growth of the town centre.

The main aims and objectives of the document are as follows:

- Create clear and detailed planning policy guidance to promote and guide the continued regeneration of Ashton Town Centre.
- Encourage the creation of a high quality urban environment.
- Promote the positive development of under utilised / vacant properties and land.
- Guide developers on the use mixes likely to be encouraged or permitted within the town centre of Ashton.
- Aid the regeneration of Old Town.
- Provide land-use guidance for potential developers, with specific reference to urban design principles, desired uses, public realm, transport and parking.

The draft SPD is subject to a period of public consultation from Monday 21st September to Monday 19th October during which period we will receive representations. **The consultation period will end at 9:00 a.m. on Tuesday 20th October 2009. We cannot accept late representations.**

Representations should be in writing and sent by post to The Strategic Planning Office, Rm 1.41, Tameside Council Offices, Ashton-Under-Lyne, Tameside, OL6 6DL or FAX to 0161 342 2837 or by email to Planpolicy@tameside.gov.uk. Any submitted representations will be available for public inspection at the Council Offices on closure of the consultation period.

If you wish to be notified of the adoption of the Supplementary Planning Document then please let us know and provide an address to which representations may be sent.

The draft Ashton Town Centre Strategy SPD and supporting documents (including the consultation statement) will be available for inspection from Monday 21st September on the Council's website at <http://www.tameside.gov.uk/planning> and at:

- **Tameside Council Offices, Planning and Building Control, Council Offices, Wellington Road, Ashton-under-Lyne, Tameside, OL6 6DL.**

Opening times: Monday to Wednesday - 9.00 a.m. to 5.00 p.m.
 Thursday - 9.00 a.m. to 4.30 p.m. Friday - 9.00 a.m. to 4.00 p.m.

The draft SPD is also available for inspection at:

- **Tameside Customer Service Centres**
- **Libraries in Tameside MBC**

Details of locations and opening times can be obtained:

- on the Council website www.tameside.gov.uk
- by telephoning the Customer Service Centre (Tel: 0161 342 8355)
- by emailing customer.services@tameside.gov.uk

905305

rust
ling
oth
at

alth
ore
will
ality

with
eer
hts
ital
a
ing

our
as

ind
or
ad

gs
)

D

een
ABC
aps,

And
een
ide

blic
the
ind
ted
tto:
k/
ip.
not
ray
on
ter
the
in

A
r
A

f
a

a
A
O

N
n
a
o
w
/
D
A
h
in
sc
St
C
As

Ur

An
re
ap
to
Me
Ec
Co
Ro
OL
ph
qu
nu
Btl

Ro

Rei

On

Da

Appendix 7 - Summary of Consultation comments on the consultation draft SPD

The following section summarises the main comments received during the four week statutory consultation period during September and October 2009.

The summary is presented in tabular form for ease of understanding – amendments to the SPD text are shown in red and deleted text is shown in red strikethrough.

If required you may see the original consultation comments – please contact the Strategic Planning team to arrange on Tel: 0161 342 2750.

Comment	Response	Amendment to SPD
<p>ASPDR-01 - UK Association of Gypsy Women I have quickly looked over some of the SPD but, can you tell me if the council have any plans for Gypsy Sites in the area? I would appreciate any info you could furnish me with.</p>	<p>Tameside have taken part in the Greater Manchester Assessment of the needs of Gypsies and Travellers/Show people which has shown a potential requirement for additional pitches for show people and some provision of pitches for Gypsies and Travellers. Tameside accepts the findings of the assessment and will consider in partnership with other Greater Manchester Authorities how we meet the assessed needs. Our Core Strategies and our new Housing Strategy will reflect these needs and how we progress the matter. The possible locations of sites and how they could be provided are issues the Council has not yet considered; therefore it is not covered by the SPD.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>ASPDR-02 - Shire Consulting on behalf of Barclays Bank At paragraph 2.1 the draft SPD accepts that “In order for this document to successfully aid the regeneration of Ashton Town Centre it must acknowledge the issues facing the town centre and focus on trying to remedy or overcome them.” The bank believes that one of the critical issues that must be addressed is the outmoded and out-of-date approach towards A2 uses in ‘shopping frontages’ in policy S4 of the UDP and its supporting paragraphs. The Council’s restrictive</p>	<p>The Tameside Core Strategy, once produced will replace the Tameside UDP and its policies including S4. As such, it’s recommended this issue be raised during the consultation of this primary document. An SPD can only build on existing policies, not revise or propose new ones.</p> <p>Ashton’s primary shopping area contains at least 6 banks and the Council acknowledges the importance banks play in providing a diverse town centre.</p> <p>The ‘Old Town’ section of the SPD highlights the ‘presence of high street banks’ as a key asset.</p>	<p>The following revision will be inserted into the SPD:</p> <p>2.2 Retail</p> <p>2.5 Allied with the town’s existing retail provision, the Council acknowledges the role its high street banks play in contributing to the town’s use mix, creating active frontage and aiding footfall, especially those located in Old Town.</p>

<p>approach to anything other than A1 uses is not really explained or properly justified but appears to be based on the erroneous assumption that anything other than A1 is likely to reduce vitality and viability. This fails to reflect the reality of the important role played by financial services retailers such as the bank in promoting vitality, underpinning town centres and assisting in regeneration.</p>		
<p>ASPDR-03 - Collier CRE on behalf of Bollinwater Estates LLP Comments have been received on a number of the sections within 'Portland Basin':</p>		
<p><u>Development Aspirations</u> "We support the aspirations put forward by the Council."</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p><u>Desired Uses</u> 1. "the Council need to be more explicit with regard to the area being referred to (for commercial uses) in the draft SPD. In our opinion the land between Victoria Street / Hill Street and Park Parade is the logical area for commercial uses." 2. "The existing buildings to south of Park Parade are not attractive and make no contribution to the quality of the built environment. This must be addressed if the strategy for the town is to be successful." 3. "The Council should encourage uses such as offices, retail and hotels in the area between Victoria Str / Hill Str & Park Parade. However, development here needs to be complemented with a new link</p>	<p>1. SPD's cannot designate specific land uses to plots or areas of land. It can only suggest land uses as the SPD has done, with commercial being suggested as an appropriate use for plots adjacent to Park Parade (referring to the land / plots between Park Parade & Victoria Street & Hill Street). 2. The Council agrees with this comment and hopes that through appropriate redevelopment (aided by the SPD) this area will improve. 3. The SPD currently suggests residential (excluding the northern area), commercial with ancillary leisure, retail and tourism uses for the area as a whole. The Council would support an appropriate hotel as part of the leisure element. The Council would view offices as the primary element in its commercial uses. Section 5.8 details the need for a pedestrian link to St Petersfield across Park Parade as part of a public realm guidance for the 'quarter'.</p>	<p>1. No change 2. No change 3. The following amendments will be made: Development Aspirations 5.2 Portland Basin should become a high quality water side 'quarter', linking to the Markets Quarter via St Petersfield, with high quality developments that maximises its water space assets with high quality development, encompassing with a range of appropriate uses (including residential moorings) and activity. Desired Uses 5.3 The Council wishes to encourage mixed use development encompassing residential and commercial with ancillary leisure, retail, hotel and tourism facilities for this area. 4. No change</p>

for pedestrian & cyclist use between St Petersfield & Portland Basin.” 4. “north of the canal the emphasis should be on maximising the use of cultural heritage assets, complementary retail, leisure and community facilities & allowing further residential development. In our view the area has the potential to mirror the success achieved by Manchester’s Castlefields albeit on a smaller scale.”	4. The SPD already outlines that it would encourage mixed use developments encompassing residential and commercial with ancillary leisure, retail & tourism facilities (section 5.3) and seeks to maximise the waterside assets which is where the heritage assets are located.	
<u>Architectural Styles / Design</u> “We welcome the Council not being prescriptive over design issues.”	No comment	No change
<u>Scale & Mass</u> “The Council must be careful in its application of density requirements in relation to residential development. The emphasis should be on creating a mixed and balanced community to include both high & lower density.”	As an urban environment, the Council does not feel low density housing development is appropriate in the part of Portland Basin to the north of the canal. The creation of a mixed and balanced community requires a range of dwelling sizes and tenures. Densities do not necessarily deliver the same. Despite this, section 5.10 referred to, states “should be avoided”, which enables some flexibility. We agree that some lower density housing may be appropriate to the south of the river.	5.10 The mass and scale of developments should reflect the urban nature of the area emphasising its urban grain and complementing its historic structures. While elements of low density housing have previously been developed, further developments of this scale these are not considered appropriate and should be avoided by future developments will be resisted. Exceptions may be considered on plots south of the canal and river, and in part, on plots neighbouring the residential uses west of Portland Basin.
<u>Gateways & Views</u> “Identification of client’s site as having potential to create a landmark is welcomed.”	No comments	No change
<u>Potential Development Site</u> “We welcome the identification of our client’s land as a potential development site.”	No comments	No change
ASPDR – 04 - The Coal Authority We suggest the following addition to Section 2: Town Centre-wide Issues: 1. “There are coal resources at shallow depth present across Ashton Town Centre. In undertaking	1. The Council does not feel that the extraction of coal is an appropriate activity for one of the main shopping and business centres of Tameside. 2. The Council recommends all developers undertake appropriate land and building surveys	No change

<p>redevelopment proposals identified in this SPD consideration should be given to extraction of those resources prior to development taking place. This not only prevents sterilisation of a valuable mineral resource, but can also remove any potential land stability issues.”</p> <p>2. “The eastern part of the Ashton Town Centre SPD area may be affected by former coal mining activities. The SPD therefore seeks to ensure that any redevelopment opportunity sites are investigated for mining legacy problems which, if necessary, are then appropriately treated to ensure that future developments are safe and stable.”</p>	<p>to ensure they're aware of any problems associated with past mining activity.</p>	
<p>ASPDR – 05 - Ashton-under-Lyne Civic Society Overall the Ashton Civic Society support the document, with the following comments submitted:</p>		
<p>Para. 2.27 possible MSCP sites are incorrectly lettered.</p>	<p>Council acknowledges this error</p>	<p>The plan at 2.27 will be revised to align with the associated table</p>
<p>Para. 2.16 – 2.19 A distinct lack of cultural facilities in the town centre, which would attract successful evening uses.</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>The following revision will be made:</p> <p>2.45 2.17 Leisure & Cultural Facilities 2.46 2.18 A key element in creating a sustainable mixed-use town centre is the presence of a vibrant cultural and leisure sector. A significant proportion of this could be achieved with a successful evening economy, installing activity beyond 9 to 5 trading hours, complementing the growth of town centre residents and adding further diversity to the town’s employment offer. In promoting this the Council will encourage uses such as cafes, restaurants, cultural facilities and health & fitness facilities, together with increased use of the town’s swimming pool, library, museums and art gallery.</p>
<p>Para. 2.28 These sites are eminently suitable for development as MSCP.</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>No change</p>

Para. 2.33 – 2.37 That the document emphasises the Town Centre Conservation Area as being of prime importance is to be applauded.	No comment	No change
Para. 2.29 – 2.32 Piecemeal development is to be avoided, especially by the introduction of more street clutter.	No comment	No change
Para. 4.5 – 4.7 MSCP is only appropriate on the perimeter of the area, that bounding Park Parade.	Council agrees with this comment. It will cross reference section 2.28 with sections 4.5 to 4.7.	The following revisions will be inserted into the SPD: Car Parking 4.7 A multi-storey car park(s) would provide the most appropriate parking solution for Old Town by providing increased provision within a confined footprint. Such a development must be of the highest quality ensuring it does not scar the historic character of the area. As detailed in Town Centre-wide Issues (2.30), existing surface car parks adjacent to Park Parade provide ideal locations for such developments.
Para. 4.8 completion of former Legends bar would be a pre-requisite to improving Old Square. St Michael's Square could be developed into a green space with car parking removed.	The Council supports the completion of the former Legends bar. The future of St Michael's Square could be considered by a Public Realm Strategy / Guide for the town centre.	No change
Para 4.10 – 4.11 4 storey buildings would only be appropriate where there are no light access problems.	Para. 4.11 details the need to acknowledge the scale & mass of neighbouring buildings. If residential uses are proposed, minimum privacy distances must be met.	No change
Para. 4.13 – 4.15 An opportunity to remove facades which bear no relation to surrounding buildings & distract from an aesthetic view point.	Para 4.9 and 4.10 emphasise the need for high quality design in this area.	No change
Para. 4.16 – 4.17 Strong view along Stamford Str from Old Sq to St Petersfield must be re-enforced. Car parking spaces along a primary frontage is a problem & site M presents a problem to achieving high quality landmark.	Agree strong view along Stamford Str must be retained. Although on street car parking can clutter streets the Council feels that appropriately controlled and design parking can add to street activity. In its current use site M does not represent a high quality landmark. But in the future this could change. It is felt that these comments reflect the current wording of the draft SPD.	No change

Para. 4.18 Crown buildings at site B is disproportionately high within the context of Old Town	Council agrees with this comment, and this is one reason why this is highlighted as a potential development site.	No change
Para. 5.8 A pedestrian link to St Petersfield across Park Parade could result in an underpass and associated problems.	The Council recognises the potential user safety problems with underpasses and would want any such crossing created to be at grade.	The following amendment will be made: 5.8 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pedestrian link to St Petersfield across Park Parade. A wide at-grade / surface pedestrian crossing to St Petersfield across Park Parade
Para. 6.9 The need for pedestrianisation in this area is at the core of the potential development.	Issues such as pedestrianisation could be considered by a public realm strategy / guide for the town centre. Applying such measures must not hinder appropriate development.	No change
Para. 6.14 – 6.18 A necessary & forward looking appraisal of the needs of that area.	No comment	No change
Para. 7.5 Car parking from primary routes should be retained.	The Council would agree that any new car parking needs to be accessible.	No change
Para. 7.6 – 7.7 Opportunity to sensitively develop the market square.	No comment	No change
Para. 7.8 Is not inconceivable that contemporary architectural styles cannot be incorporated adjacent to existing listed buildings, provided new builds complement them with good design.	It is considered that this observation supports the wording of the draft SPD.	No change
Para. 8.1 – 8.3 continued development of St Petersfield is a natural progression. Hugh Mason House may be problematic.	No comment	No change
Para. 9.6 Safer & more welcoming pedestrian link to Old Town is paramount in developing a town centre park.	No comment	No change
Para. 10.3 – 10.6 Pedestrian access to rail station is a priority when northern bypass is constructed. Car parking facilities are essential for traffic entering from the east. Pedestrian access to markets from	Council agrees with the comments. The SPD acknowledges the need to improve access to the rail gateway.	The following amendment will be made to the fifth point in 10.6: Environmental improvements around the medical area and improved links between the medical area and the market square.

the medical centres is necessary.		
-----------------------------------	--	--

<p>ASPDR-06 - Tameside Archaeological Society Limited</p> <p>The TAS supports the strategy proposed but would encourage the utilisation of archaeological processes in guidance given to developers or provide a desk based assessment to prevent unnecessary delays to development and enable the heritage of Ashton to be recorded.</p>	<p>The Council has a 'local list' of documents and assessment that must accompany planning applications. Archaeological assessments are within this list, as follows:</p> <p>In the case of a major development proposal or significant infrastructure works, the applicant may need to commission an assessment of existing archaeological information and submit the results as part of the Heritage Statement.</p> <p>Threshold</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any developments specified in pre-application advice <p>Further guidance is provided in Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 : Planning and the Historic Environment (September 1994) and Planning Policy Guidance Note 16 : Archaeology and Planning (November 1990) . See also 'A Charter for English Heritage Advisory Services' produced by English Heritage.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Utilise the green space on the south side of the bypass with integrated car parking and storage for recreation activities.</p>	<p>Additional ancillary car parking could be provided in this area as ancillary to the recreation uses, but its primary role should be as a town centre park, which would be predominantly accessed on foot.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>ASPDR-07 - Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners on behalf of Apollo Ashton LLP</p> <p>The respondent's comments support a number of issues detailed within the SPD, but objects or partially objections to the following:</p>		
<p>Para. 7.5 respondent considers it appropriate for car parking to also be</p>	<p>Accept comment</p>	<p>The following amendments will be made to the SPD:</p>

<p>provided in this sub-area as MSCP in addition to basement or roof top facilities.</p>		<p>Car Parking 7.5 The pedestrianised nature of the area does not allow free vehicle movement, therefore any new car parking provision can only be placed within basement or roof top facilities accessed off Wellington Street and Katherine Street areas.</p> <p>7.4 Due to the pedestrianised nature of the area and its well established built form, the quarter has limited opportunities for new car parking and access to it. As such car parking within 'the Markets' will only be accepted in basement, rooftop or multi storey facilities.</p>
<p><u>Para. 7.5</u> unnecessarily restrictive to require all new car parking provision in this quarter to be accessed from only Wellington Str & Katherine Str.</p>	<p>The Council accepts this comment.</p>	<p>See previous revisions. These incorporate this objection.</p>
<p><u>Para. 6.5</u> Part of the approved transport interchange lies within Delamere. As such, the respondent requests that "A transport interchange would also be an acceptable use in this quarter."</p>	<p>The Council accepts that outlining planning permission has been given for the transport interchange and the Metrolink to Ashton has been confirmed. The Council fully supports both Metrolink and the proposed transport interchange.</p>	<p>The following revisions will be applied:</p> <p>Desired Uses Following 6.5, creating third paragraph:</p> <p>6.6 Allied with these town centre uses, the northern edge of Delamere will contain the Ashton Metrolink line and elements of the proposed transport interchange. Once developed it's hoped this transport asset will aid development in Delamere.</p>
<p><u>Para. 6.12</u> "In certain circumstances development of less than 3 storeys will be appropriate in Delamere. For example, the public transport interchange."</p>	<p>While the proposed transport interchange is below the 3 storey requirement, the Council views this as part of the Arcades extension which will be well over this requirement.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p><u>Para. 6.19</u> "request that the north east corner of Delamere is identified as a potential development site."</p>	<p>Council accepts this comment</p>	<p>The north east area of Delamere will be highlighted as a potential development site at 6.19.</p>
<p><u>Primary Frontages</u> The primary shopping area defined by the Tameside UDP is mainly focused on 'the Markets'. However, plans are provided within the draft SPD which identify wide spread opportunities across the town centre to extend Ashton town centre's</p>	<p>The Frontage sections within all 'quarters' do not refer to the primary retail frontages as detailed by the respondent. It refers to applying urban design principles related to active street frontages and not allowing blank facades to be installed along the highlighted streets. Uses such as office, education, residential, leisure & civic can provide this activity. It does not have to be a retail</p>	<p>'Frontage' sections within all Quarters will be renamed:</p> <p>Street Frontage Frontage</p>

<p>primary frontage in quarters including Penny Meadow, St Petersfield & Southside. Respondent refers to Table 2 Annex A of PPS6, which states that “primary frontages are likely to include a high proportion of retail uses and that the primary shopping area is the defined area where retail development is concentrated.” The respondent objects to the proposed extension of the primary shopping area.</p>	<p>frontage.</p>	
<p>ASPDR-08 - Natural England Draft SPD We suggest linkages be made to local Biodiversity Action Plans, which acknowledge the potential of relatively urban environments to contribute to biodiversity.</p>	<p>The SPD suggests that a public realm document be created for the whole town centre. Within this, proposals should align with the Greater Manchester Biodiversity Action Plan and ensure proposals contribute to the Borough’s green infrastructure.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p><u>Green Infrastructure</u> We suggest it would be useful for the SPD to consider the proposed green spaces as they relate to wider green infrastructure.</p>	<p>The Council will be producing a Green Infrastructure Framework as part of the evidence base for the LDF. ‘Southside’ details the creation of a town centre park which will contribute to Tameside’s green infrastructure.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p><u>Sustainability Appraisal</u> 1. We think the omission of biodiversity considerations at the scoping stage of the appraisal would not be endorsed now. 2. Would also question omission of sustainability criteria, such as air quality and water conservation issues, which have assumed greater importance with the increased recognition of the effects of climate change.</p>	<p>1. This was endorsed by Natural England at the time it was produced. 2. The Council recognises that greater emphasis has now been placed on sustainable developments. However, it is felt that requirements through the planning application process will ensure that all developments align and response to this changing agenda.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Habitats Regulations Assessment The screening report would benefit</p>	<p>Appendix 3 of the Habitats Regulation Assessment contains a plan showing the</p>	<p>No change</p>

from a map showing the proposed development sites in relation to the European designated sites.	European designated site & the whole of Tameside, including Ashton.	
<p>ASPDR-09 - Lancashire County Council</p> <p>The overall aim of regenerating & strengthening Ashton Town Centre is supported.</p>	No comment	No change
<p>'Potential development sites' could accommodate considerable amounts of floorspace. The need for this potential scale of development and the impact of it should be given due consideration in the planning process. It is not clear whether these sites are needed to satisfy an identified quantitative need. In addition, the impact of proposals may need to be tested through the planning application process.</p>	<p>The Council's rationale for including 'potential development sites' within the SPD is to highlight to potential developers the sites it views as having development opportunity & potential for aiding the regeneration of the town centre, not to meet an identified quantitative need. This does not mean other sites will not be considered, or that the highlighted sites must be developed. It merely highlights that the Council is open to appropriate development across the town centre.</p>	No change
<p>ASPDR-10 - Government Office North West</p> <p>1. As set out in PPS12 (para. 6.1) SPDs may provide further detail on policies out in development plans, but they should not themselves contain new policy material which should be examined through the DPD preparation process. SPDs cannot therefore allocate sites and it appears that the document may be straying over that line by identifying sites for development in various parts of the town centre</p>	See comment above.	No change
<p>2. We note that the document indicates that retail development</p>	<p>The Council accepts this comment and will amend the SPD accordingly.</p>	<p>The following revisions to the SPD will be made:</p>

<p>may be acceptable in various parts of the town centre. The document should make it clear that any proposals for retail development will need to satisfy the sequential test set out in PPS6 (para 2.44 and table 2, annex A). For retail development it is the primary shopping area which constitutes the town centre in this context, rather than the whole of the wider town centre. Sites which are not within the primary shopping area are therefore considered to be edge-of-centre or out-of-centre so far as retail development is concerned</p>		<p>Plan at page 6 will highlight Ashton's primary shopping area, as illustrated in the Tameside UDP.</p> <p>Town Centre Uses – page 11 2.2 Retail 2.6 Any proposals for retail development will need to satisfy the sequential test as set out in PPS6 (para. 2.44 & table 2 annex A). For retail developments it is the primary shopping area which constitutes the town centre, rather than the whole of the wider town centre. Sites which are not within the primary shopping area are therefore considered to be edge-of-centre or out-of-centre.</p>
<p>ASPDR-11 - Greater Manchester Public Transport Executive Page 8 – Bullet 5 states 'Metrolink to Ashton requires funding. This is by far the most pressing infrastructure priority'. This requires updating, as GMPTE is currently in, what it believe to be, the final stages of contract negotiations & will be seeking full approval from the Department of Transport.</p>	<p>Bullet 5 of page 8 refers to the Greater Manchester Town Centres Study; as such the Council cannot alter its content. However, the Council recognises that the current position of Metrolink needs to be highlighted within the SPD.</p>	<p>No change to bullet 5, page 8. But the following revisions will be made to Transport Section page 12:</p> <p>2.24 2.23 The town centre benefits from a number of transport assets. Centrally located, the rail station provides Ashton with a cross Pennine service to Manchester and Huddersfield, but its gateway and pedestrian link to the town centre is poor and must be improved. In addition to the rail service, it is proposed Ashton will receive the metro line during the second phase of extension.</p> <p>2.24 Allied with its existing public transport provision, Ashton is due to receive Metrolink. The Metrolink Ashton-under-Lyne extension is one of the Department of Transport's Accelerated Funding Package schemes within the list of prioritised schemes to be funded by the Greater Manchester Transport Fund. Under the provisional programme trams would be in service to Ashton Town Centre by mid to late 2013.</p> <p>2.22 2.25 The town's bus station is centrally located next to the Arcades shopping centre with routes serving the Borough and wider region. There are proposals to create a new transport interchange combining the bus station and new metro station, linked to the proposed Arcades extension. Outline planning permission has been granted for the Arcades shopping centre to develop the existing bus station site and create a new transport interchange housing a new bus station and the town's Metrolink station fronting Wellington Road.</p>

<p><u>Page 12</u> – As stated above, the section on Transport requires updating to reflect the metrolink extension proposals.</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges that references to the Metrolink require updating across the document.</p>	<p>See above amendments</p>
<p><u>Page 28</u> – Section 6 ‘Delamere’ makes no reference to the transport interchange or the outline planning approval for it. Would be useful to cross reference with Section 7 ‘Markets’ as the development lies in both quarters.</p>	<p>The Council acknowledges that references to the Metrolink require updating across the document.</p>	<p>The following amendments will be made:</p> <p>Delamere</p> <p>Key Assets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proximity to retail core & St Petersfield - Well defined urban grain - Supply of potential development sites - Cultural assets – Art Gallery & Library - Proposed Metrolink & transport interchange <p>6.19 Potential Development Sites</p> <p>The site of the transport interchange / Metrolink station will be highlighted as a potential development site.</p> <p>The Markets</p> <p>Key Assets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Arcades & Ladysmith Shopping Centres - Markets & Market Square - Historic buildings - Proximity to bus & train stations - Proposed Metrolink & transport interchange
<p>ASPDR-12 - Theatres Trust We support the aim to ‘promote as a centre for employment, culture, retail & town centre living’ and the aim to ‘aid the regeneration of Old Town’.</p> <p>Note that the Tameside Hippodrome has not been included within the Old Town boundary despite it having been listed.</p>	<p>The Council sees no benefits to the Hippodrome being placed in Old Town rather than Delamere. The building is now listed, as such protected against inappropriate development.</p> <p>While areas have been divided into ‘quarters’ the Council does not see these as isolated areas.</p>	<p>No change</p>

<p>APSDR-13 - Ashton District Assembly Objection relates to Architectural Styles / Design sections throughout document 'The Council will not dictate architectural styles or design to be applied.'</p> <p>Respondents feel this phrase "gives developers carte blanche to propose buildings which do not fit in with the character of Ashton. The general opinion is that there should be very clear development briefs regarding materials and character of build for each of the areas.</p>	<p>One of the key drivers behind this document is to promote and encourage the development of high quality buildings across Ashton Town Centre and not give developers a carte blanche to development as they wish.</p> <p>Architectural Styles / Design sections aim to relate to the styles of architecture applied to a building such as, modernist, art deco, arts & crafts, Victorian, Georgian, classical, baroque, neo-classical, etc. To stipulate the exact architectural style that should be applied to a site or area would be seen as restricting to development in terms of hindering innovation and modern building technologies.</p> <p>However, not dictating architectural styles does not mean the Council will not scrutinise the design of any development proposal for the town centre. Sections such as scale & mass, urban grain, frontage and gateways & views aim to help this scrutiny.</p> <p>The Council acknowledges that clearer emphasis should be placed on ensuring new developments acknowledge the distinct character present across parts of the town centre.</p>	<p>In order to prevent confusion the section 'Architectural Styles / Design' within all 'quarters' will become:</p> <p>Architectural Styles /Design</p> <p>In order to increase the emphasis on acknowledging local character the following will be added:</p> <p>Old Town Architectural Styles 4.9 The Council will not dictate architectural styles to be applied in Old Town the Town Centre. However all new developments must apply a high quality design that acknowledges the character of this historic area. This alignment should be evident through elements such as the primary materials, alignment & size of windows, detailing and the vertical or horizontal emphasis of the building's fenestration.</p> <p>However in Old Town development must 4.10 Developments in Old Town must also align with Conservation Area policy outlined in UDP policies C2, C3, C4, C5 (for Listed Buildings) and C6 (setting of Listed Buildings). and acknowledge the historic surroundings in which development is taking place.</p> <p>Portland Basin Architectural Styles 5.9 The Council will not dictate specific architectural styles that should be applied to Portland Basin. The only conditions are that development must be of a high quality innovative design that respects the historic structures and conservation area policies of the area. Development proposals lying adjacent to historic buildings and structures should acknowledge this respect / alignment through elements such as the primary materials, scale & mass of development, alignment & size of windows, detailing and the vertical or horizontal emphasis of the building's fenestration.</p> <p>Delamere Architectural Styles 6.10 6.11 The Council will not dictate specific architectural styles to be applied across Delamere. But all development proposed must be of a high quality design. The quarter as a whole has limited buildings of architectural quality for new development to take reference from. As</p>
--	--	--

such the Council suggests those of quality, such as the New Charter offices, are acknowledged where relevant, and as new developments are created these are used as a precedent where appropriate. Exceptions to this apply where development sites lies adjacent to neighbouring quarters or historic buildings such as the Listed Library or T.A. centre. On such sites development must respect their surroundings through elements such as materials, scale & mass, the vertical or horizontal emphasis of the building's fenestration and its detailing.

~~6.11 Exceptions apply where a development lies adjacent to an historic building such as the Listed Library or TA building, where development must respect the historic character.~~

The Markets

Architectural Styles

7.8 The Council will not dictate architectural styles to be applied in The Markets. However any future development proposals must be of the highest quality, acknowledging and complementing the three listed buildings (Market Hall, Town Hall and Cheshire Building Society) and aligning with Conservation Area policy where appropriate, **through their choice of primary materials and detailing, scale & mass and the vertical or horizontal emphasis of the building's fenestration.**

St Petersfield

Architectural Styles

~~8.6~~ 8.8 If any further development in the area takes place it should acknowledge the modern and where appropriate complement the historic **with architectural styles and materials that sit appropriately within the modern development created.**

Penny Meadow

Architectural Styles

10.7 The Council will not dictate architectural styles that should be applied to Penny Meadow. Development must be of the highest quality, reflecting the quarter's prominent gateway location. Innovative modern design will be welcome particularly at landmark sites. Poor quality design will not be accepted. **Sites that lie within or adjacent to the Town Centre Conservation Area must align with Conservation Area policy acknowledging the historic character in their scale, mass, materials and vertical or horizontal emphasis of the fenestration.**

		<p>Holy Trinity Architectural Styles 12.8 The Council will not dictate an architectural style to be applied in Holy Trinity. All future developments must represent high quality innovative design and acknowledge the existing housing stock where appropriate. is the only prerequisites that should be adopted by future development proposals. This is of particular importance on sites 12.9. The only exception to this being development adjacent to the cluster of listed buildings, (Holy Trinity Church, Vicarage and Primary School). In such cases development proposals should apply a design that does where development must not affect the setting of these historic buildings.</p>
--	--	--

List of Stakeholder who responded

- ASPDR-01 UK Association of Gypsy Women
- ASPDR-02 Shire Consulting on behalf of Barclays Bank
- ASPDR-03 Collier CRE on behalf of Bollinwater Estates LLP
- ASPDR-04 The Coal Authority
- ASPDR-05 Ashton-under-Lyne Civic Society
- ASPDR-06 Tameside Archaeological Society Limited
- ASPDR-07 Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners on behalf of Apollo Ashton LLP
- ASPDR-08 Natural England
- ASPDR-09 Lancashire County Council
- ASPDR-10 Government Office North West
- ASPDR-11 Greater Manchester Public Transport Executive

ASPDR-12 Theatres Trust

ASPDR-13 Ashton District Assembly

The Council received 9 responses within the allocated consultation period. 4 responses were received after the four week period had elapsed, but have been considered by the Council.

The comments received are summarised in the previous section and amendments, additions or deletions are also indicated in the summary table.