

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Family Name</b>	Heavey
<b>Given Name</b>	Dorothy
<b>Person ID</b>	1286609
<b>Title</b>	Stakeholder Submission
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Family Name</b>	Heavey
<b>Given Name</b>	Dorothy
<b>Person ID</b>	1286609
<b>Title</b>	JPA 6: West of Wingates / M61 Junction 6
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	NA
<b>Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.</b>	<p>The process of community involvement has been nowhere near good enough. I try to keep abreast of what is going on locally and within the Borough but heard nothing of being able to put forward views or engage in any way with the drawing up of the plan. The platform for local people to shape their surroundings was, as far as many people were concerned, unknown. It was, apparently, available to view on the Council's website and in the One Stop Shop in Bolton town centre. People will only consult these places if they know what is going on in the first place. Some press releases were made available to the local people, but many people do not buy this paper. There should have been local public meetings, notices on the Westhoughton Town Hall notice board situated on the main street, notices on lamp posts as happens with planning applications, or, for 100% coverage, a postal notification for such an important item. We had no local neighbourhood consultation and only now, at this late stage, Westhoughton is starting on its own neighbourhood plan. We have had no say in what will be a major challenge for this area and that is against the principles contained within the framework.</p> <p>Westhoughton is struggling with health, education and social issues and there are no plans to address these issues. (Para 93b) We are in dire need of a health centre which was talked about years ago but with no result. We need a new high school and a new primary school especially as house building is continuing at an alarming rate with hundreds of new houses being built and Peel's plans just going in for over a thousand houses. There is no dedicated leisure centre and people have had to make do with part-time use of the school's sports centre after school hours. Older people will not use the pool during the dark winter months and their levels of fitness and wellbeing will be diminished. (Para 20c &amp; 93a)</p> <p>No consideration has been given to the loss of greenbelt with regard to industrial development at Wingates and its consequential effects on our</p>

already overburdened roads and the effect of road pollution on the inhabitants, any concerns raised by local councillors having been swept aside. Rather than the land absorbing carbon, the building of factories and warehouses would increase greenhouse gas emissions. (Para 104a & 154b) We are set to lose all of our greenbelt to the west side of Westhoughton down to the Wigan boundary and this is land which separates our town from those of Aspull and Blackrod. Even the greenbelt land at Brinsop Hall, which adjoins this area, has been bought by Harworth/Peel for more industry and will result in a huge swathe of industry in what was predominantly a rural setting and also merge Westhoughton into Blackrod with a continuing sprawl of industry. There is currently a well defined boundary of mature trees along the length of the western edge of the present industrial estate and this really should not be breached. It is contrary to the government's policy on preventing urban sprawl. (Para 137 & 138b,c,e)

This greenbelt is our green lung and it is easily accessed from many different points along its length. (Para 120b & 145) It is criss-crossed with 10 public rights of way and is well used by walkers, cyclists, runners and horse riders. It would mean diverting not just one footpath but the whole network of paths and as a lot of greenbelt does not automatically have any rights of way through it, this network of paths makes it far more valuable. (Para 100) It is where we go to get away from pollution and breathe in fresh air. It is vital for our mental health and wellbeing and has far reaching views to the Welsh hills to the south and to the Pennines to the north. If this is taken from us we shall have nowhere peaceful to walk. (Para 99b) This is why this area is so important to local people. During the Covid crisis we were told to keep safe and to stay local. We were able to do this because we have this extensive network of footpaths. Allocations Plan Policy P8AP states that the Council will permit development proposals "provided the integrity of the rights of way is retained" and that "the provision of an equally convenient and pleasant route will usually be required". Compared to what we have now a pleasant route between massive industrial units is a huge leap of the imagination. Here there is a wide variety of countryside with areas of mature trees set amongst agricultural fields growing wheat, barley and oil seed rape. Sheep, cattle and horses graze the nearby fields and it is important for biological connectivity between species groups and there are many quiet ponds supporting newts, toads and other wildlife. It connects up directly to the fields around the nearby Borsdane Wood - semi natural ancient woodland (1600AD) and LNR. (Para 98) There are red and amber listed farmland birds which have bred on this land for decades along with deer, foxes, stoats, hares, hedgehogs and other wildlife and these are now under threat of habitat loss. (Para 179a & b) At the phase 1 application the TEP ecologists for the developers said that in the case of brown hares the development would cause displacement due to loss of foraging, breeding and refuge habitats and no additional mitigation was available. It would therefore cause significant long term adverse effect at local level. Due to the massive amount of housing development over the last 20 years the wildlife has been pushed out to the edges of the town and now the little that is left might soon be gone. (Para 174d) This area is also a good place to see the stars as there is little light pollution. It has always been a tranquil place and helped many people to remain grounded in mind and body during the covid nightmare. (185c) The calmness of these acres and the benefits to us cannot be weighed or measured. (Para 174b) At the planning meeting to discuss Phase I of this development, now granted, the planning officer said that "no sites within Bolton have been designated for their tranquillity value per se, however it is clear from visiting this site, that some parts of the site do have value as a tranquil setting. There are aspects of the proposal which would not comply with the need to protect tranquil areas". (NPPF 185b) Within the Framework it states "a LPA should regard the construction of new buildings as inappropriate in the Green Belt". The exceptions listed certainly do not include

huge warehouses and factories which would utterly destroy the openness of the greenbelt. (Para 149)

As all of this area is on a slope it will mean that huge warehouses will be visible from a great distance. We can see the cooling towers at Fiddlers Ferry which is a good many miles from Wingates. Also being on a slope there is more risk of flooding further down especially on the Aspull boundary which floods frequently. This was also brought up at the Planning Meeting by a local councillor who expressed great concern about it. Bridge House on Dicconson Lane often has sandbags in front of it. (Para 167) We do not have vast areas of countryside as in the north of Bolton where the moors give miles of good walking. You only have to look at the Bolton District Overview Map to see how Bolton has huge areas of greenbelt which it is protecting, while designating our few hundred acres to industry. It is unfair that so much industry should be put in one area of the Borough because it happens have a motorway running through it. North east of Bolton has the A666 running through it which links up directly to the M61. It is not justifiable that so much industry is centred in one place within the Borough

The developers for Phase 1 have put forward mitigation works for the junctions along the A6 but for the junction of Church Street (B5236) with the A6 at Manchester Road they have admitted that no mitigation at all is possible. Therefore, traffic which is already backing up right the way down Church Street and also along the A6 would be far worse. (Para 110d) More traffic generating from a further industrial estate would be a total nightmare.

**Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.**

There is a very large area of old and semi-derelict mills to the north east of Bolton behind St. Helens Road on the outskirts of the town centre and on into Great Lever. This is historically an industrial area and would provide a lot of jobs if this land was re-used for modern industrial units. (Para 141a) Landscaped, it would greatly improve this deprived area and would provide many much needed jobs there. It is totally wrong that old industrial sites are being used for housing, or left as they are, and instead using greenbelt land for industry. It goes against the Framework and to say that there are no other suitable areas within Bolton is completely wrong and therefore unsound. At the Wingates Industrial Estate extension, 1st phase planning meeting, several councillors from the North and East side of Bolton said they did not believe any more jobs were needed on the west side of Bolton and it was the north and east side that really needed the jobs. Job vacancies have been difficult to fill on the Wingates Industrial Estate because of the problems travelling there. At the time of the 1st phase application the deputy mayor of Westhoughton had been told there were 132 vacancies on the estate. There has never been a good bus service to Wingates, the 715 running hourly buses from Bolton to Wigan. An alternative bus service was forced to stop buses going from Bolton to Wigan as they could not provide a turn around service in under 2 hours, so the service turned back at Westhoughton. This shows the problems we are having on our roads. (Para 110a & 112a) This development plan also seeks to draw in workers from all over the borough as well as Wigan and Salford. So, unless jobs are filled locally, it entails the use of many more cars which runs contrary to sustainable development. (Para 113)

Another alternative site is to the rear of Logistics North at the far eastern edge of Westhoughton near the Salford boundary at Little Hulton. There is still a good sized area of green fields to the rear of Newbrook Road which leads on to the brownfield site. This is a vast tract of land degraded by the spoil from this industrial development. As a condition of development, the developers, Harworth/Peel, gave the spare land over to Bolton and it was named a country park but is, in effect, brownfield land. It is a rather miserable, depressing area and would have been better suited as a continuation to the existing industrial estate. The location, right onto the motorway roundabout, means that no heavy traffic is travelling through domestic housing unlike

access to the motorway from J5 and J6 where traffic has to travel right along the A6 which has housing on both sides of the road, with people being subjected to higher levels of pollution. To protect this area, and at the same time to completely and utterly despoil 500 acres of greenbelt land for industry, is sheer madness. If the current Peel plan gets the go-ahead for its golf course development at Hulton Park there will be many rights of way through the parkland for the people of Over Hulton to access. If Wingates industrial extension gets the go-ahead there will be nowhere for local people to walk. No thought seems to have gone into this at all and it contravenes the Framework - conserving and enhancing the natural environment). (NPPF Para 94b) - existing open space should not be built on unless the loss would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location. There is no equivalent in this area which has all the qualities of this land. Even within Policy CG6AP - Other Protected Open Land - it states that 'development should generally be small scale to maintain the open character of these areas. Category 3 development would include commercial developments which requires a non-urban location but where the scale of buildings would make it unacceptable in Green Belt'. And yet this is the very thing that we are being asked to accept, that somehow it is acceptable in this area of Green Belt. According to the Dept. of Communities and Local Government 'only in exceptional circumstances may councils alter greenbelt boundaries, after consulting local people and submitting the revised local plan for examination'. Local people were never consulted about the green belt change and there was no revised plan until this one. (Para 49a & b) Presumption in favour of industrial development was premature and based on the redesignation of the land in the GMSF plans which should have carried no weight as they were proposals only and not ratified. Therefore the land should never have been taken out of green belt in the first instance.

<b>Family Name</b>	Heavey
<b>Given Name</b>	Dorothy
<b>Person ID</b>	1286609
<b>Title</b>	Other Comments
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	NA
<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	NA
<b>Family Name</b>	Heavey
<b>Given Name</b>	Dorothy
<b>Person ID</b>	1286609
<b>Title</b>	Other Comments
<b>Type</b>	Web
<b>Soundness - Positively prepared?</b>	NA

Places for Everyone Representation 2021

<b>Soundness - Justified?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Consistent with national policy?</b>	Unsound
<b>Soundness - Effective?</b>	Unsound
<b>Compliance - Legally compliant?</b>	NA
<b>Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?</b>	NA