

**REPORT OF AN INQUIRY INTO
THE REVISED DRAFT REPLACEMENT
TAMESIDE UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

Date of Inquiry: 29th October - 8th November 2002

Inspector: Mrs D Burrows DipTP MRTPI

CONTENTS

Inspector's Letter to the Council

Chapter 1 Part One Policies

Chapter 2 Employment and the Local Economy

Chapter 3 Housing and Community Facilities

Chapter 4 Town Centres, Retailing and Leisure

Chapter 5 Countryside, Open Land, Sport and Recreation

Chapter 6 Transportation and Access

Chapter 7 Conservation and Enhancement of the Built Environment

Chapter 8 Nature Conservation, Trees and Woodland

Chapter 9 Mineral Working, Waste Management and Pollution Control

Chapter 10 Utilities and Energy

Chapter 11 Indicators and Proposals Map

Chapter 12 Non Policy Specific Objections

Appendix 1 Glossary of Abbreviations

Appendix 2 Objections in Alphabetical Order of Objectors

Appendix 3 Objections in Policy Order

Appendix 4 Appearances and Documents

Appendix 5 List of Statements (written and heard objections)

Appendix 6 Core Documents

Explanation of abbreviations used in appendices 2 and 3:

OBJ'R: The reference number given to each objector or supporter

OBJ NO: The reference number for each objection or representation of support

O or S: O for objection, S for representation of support, (rd) for revised draft

Y: Yes, withdrawn

C: Conditionally withdrawn on the basis of further proposed changes

Please Note: Objections withdrawn on the basis of the revised draft are not shown in the main report, but are included in Appendices 2 and 3

To The Chief Executive
Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
Council Offices
Wellington Road
ASHTON-UNDER-LYNE
Tameside
OL6 6DL

31 March 2003

Dear Sir

THE TAMESIDE UNITARY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

I was appointed by the First Secretary of State to hold a public inquiry into objections to the revised deposit draft of the replacement Tameside Unitary Development Plan. A pre-inquiry meeting was held on 9 July 2002 and the inquiry itself took place between 29 October and 8 November 2002. The inquiry closed on the 29 January 2003. I attach my report which contains my recommendations on the actions which the Council should take in respect of the objections.

The first deposit draft UDP was placed on deposit from between 18 June and 30 July 2001. Formal representations were received from 149 different organisations and individuals during this six week period, comprising 518 duly made objections along with 111 representations of support. Various revisions were made subsequently to the plan by the Council, partly in response to the representations received and partly to update information. A number of proposals were deleted from the plan. The revised deposit draft UDP was placed on deposit from 15 March to 26 April 2002. During this second six week objection period, 47 duly made objections were received to the changes, along with 36 representations of support. These came from 23 organisations and individuals.

The Council in the summer of 2002 also produced a series of unadvertised proposed changes which in most cases resulted in the conditional withdrawal of objections, although in a number of instances these and other proposed changes suggested by the Council in their various written statements and proofs of evidence, did attract counter-objections. These are identified in the body of my report.

Excluding the proposed changes, the total number of duly made objections from both deposit periods is 565 with 147 representations of support. By the close of the inquiry there were 274 outstanding duly made objections, 23 of which the objectors indicated they were prepared to withdraw their objection on condition that changes suggested by the Council were incorporated into the plan.

Format of the report

The report and recommendations relate to the revised deposit version of the plan. The report is arranged in chapters which reflect the composition of the plan. My recommendations relate to the policies which are the subject of objection and in general I have not made recommendations in respect of those policies which are not subject to objection, although on occasion I have drawn the Council's attention to what I consider to be an anomaly in the plan. Where objectors to the deposit draft local plan have withdrawn/conditionally withdrawn their objections on the basis of the alterations made in the revised deposit version of the plan, I have not made recommendations in respect of those objections on the grounds that they have been met. Neither do I make any

recommendations in respect of objections to policies which were deleted from the first deposit plan, but which were not formally withdrawn. Schedules of all duly made objections are to be found in appendices 2 and 3 of my report. Although not expressly referred to in the report, in making my recommendations I have had regard to all representations made in support of the plan.

The report is in the short form with the main points of the cases of the objectors and the Council incorporated into my conclusions. I do not specifically mention all the detailed points referred to by objectors, but I have nevertheless taken them into account in making my recommendations. For each objection, I set down the policy number, the objection reference number, the objector reference number, the name of the objector and a short description of the objection. This is followed by what I consider to be the main issue(s) raised by the objection(s), my conclusions and recommendations. Where objections raise similar issues they are considered jointly and a single recommendation made. Where there are both general and site specific issues in respect of a policy I set out in the text how these have been treated, adhering to the objection numbers allocated to them by the Council. I have given equal weight to the objections made in writing and to those made orally at the inquiry.

In the interest of brevity, throughout the report I refer to various documents and organisations by acronyms and these are set out in appendix 1 of the report.

Emerging Regional Planning Guidance

The preparation of the UDP has been concurrent with the emerging Regional Planning Guidance for the North West (RPG13) which I now understand is due to be published in its final version at the end of March 2003. In drafting my report I have had regard to the most up to date version of the plan available to me, that is the public consultation document incorporating the Secretary of State's proposed changes published in March 2002. The emerging RPG has attracted objections to a number of its proposed policies which are relevant to my consideration of objections to the UDP. Inevitably this has meant that my recommendations are tempered by the uncertainty of the content of the RPG policies in their final version. I acknowledge that this may entail a reconsideration by the Council of a number of their policies and/or my recommendations at the modification stage. However to have proceeded otherwise would have lead to a considerable delay in the production of this report.

Main issues

The majority of the objections relate to the detailed wording of policies, to site specific proposals, to the general sustainability of the plan and its policies, or seek the allocation of sites for housing/employment development and changes to the green belt and built up area boundaries. The majority of the modifications I recommend relate to the detailed wording of policies which I consider lack clarity or could be open to differing interpretations. These recommendations do not significantly alter the provisions of the plan.

Whilst I am generally satisfied that there is sufficient housing land to meet the requirement in emerging regional planning guidance, the matter of future housing clearance has not yet been addressed in detail by the Council. Consequently I consider there is a need for the situation to be reviewed at the modification stage.

The issues about employment land mainly relate to the strategic employment sites - Ashton Moss E1(1) and Waterside Park E1(2) and the compatibility of the proposals with national and emerging regional planning guidance. It is in this area that I recommend the only major deletion

from the plan – Waterside Park. However even without this allocation I am satisfied that, for the present, there is no need for any further major allocation of employment land.

There are 2 major road proposals in Longdendale, the Mottram to Tintwistle Bypass and the Glossop Spur road from Mottram Moor to Woolley Lane. Whilst I acknowledge that these schemes are at present subject to NATA appraisal, I am generally satisfied that it is appropriate for the plan to continue to protect the lines of these roads until further investigation indicates otherwise.

Documents

Schedules of all objections and those conditionally withdrawn; the register of attendance for the inquiry; and schedules of documents, core documents are held by the Council. In addition a full set of documents, proofs of evidence, written statements and the Council's responses to those statements are filed at the UDP inquiry library at the Council offices.

Finally I would like to record my appreciation for the helpful and courteous attitude of all the participants at the inquiry. In particular, I would like to thank the programme officer Paul Collins who performed his many tasks with willingness, great efficiency and good humour.

Yours faithfully

D L BURROWS

cc. The Office Of the Deputy Prime Minister, Eland House, London, SW1E 5DU;
Government Office for the North West, Sunley Tower, Manchester, M1 4BE