

**SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS TO DEPOSIT CONSULTATION  
ON PROPOSED SPZ AT HEYWOOD DISTRIBUTION PARK**

<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Summary of Representations</b>	<b>Response</b>
<b>GMPTE</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports the requirement set out in Condition 15 that new development in addition to the existing floorspace should adhere to the Umbrella Travel Plan.</li> <li>- Concerns raised over the implementation of the Travel Plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted</li> <li>- Travel Plan to be implemented in conjunction with Site's managers and occupiers to address the concerns raised.</li> </ul>
<b>Highways Agency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- HA notes that the revised Travel Plan continues to fit well with Policy and the Rochdale UDP with good access for walking and cycling as well as a dedicated bus route extension.</li> <li>- Suggests further work to establish baseline trip data</li> <li>- HA note that the Travel Plan applies to new users only but seeks to encourage existing users to support the aims of the Travel Plan.</li> <li>- Seek to encourage monitoring of the Travel Plan in order to affect changes to it.</li> <li>- Suggest steering group to allow monitoring and development of the Travel Plan.</li> <li>- The lorry park on the Park should be protected for its current use as a lack of HGV parking in the area could lead to wider problems on the network.</li> <li>- There is, in principle, little reason to object to the designation of the SPZ provided that measures are defined specifically according to targets and against timescales in order to evaluate their success.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted</li> <li>- Agree that once SPZ is adopted this survey will need to be undertaken and that this will form part of the first monitoring report actions.</li> <li>- Existing users to be encouraged to join the target setting objectives in line with emerging practice.</li> <li>- Annual monitoring is proposed for existing users, with 6 monthly reviews for new occupiers is proposed.</li> <li>- Creation of a Steering Group is an agreed output for the new plan when adopted.</li> <li>- The lorry park is planned to have major investment in the future to improve services, however it is a Heywood Distribution Park facility and is for the site's owners to decide its longer term use. Heywood currently has a lorry overnight parking ban which is currently not as well enforced as it has been.</li> <li>- The HA's support is welcomed.</li> </ul>
<b>Mr Henry, Local Resident</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Raises a concern over the ownership of the Park.</li> <li>- Suggests that the SPZ could increase the amount of Class B8 development at the Park.</li> <li>- Raises concern over the potential for increase in the amount of HGVs accessing the Park as a result of the SPZ.</li> <li>- Suggests a junction improvement to the M66 (Pilsworth Road) Junction with Hareshill Road.</li> <li>- Questions the Umbrella Travel Plan</li> <li>- Raises doubts over the Flood Risk Assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Landownership is not a material planning consideration.</li> <li>- The current uses and extant planning permissions at the Park could enable 97% of the total floorspace to be used for Class B8 uses without the need for planning permission to be applied for. The inclusion of offices within the SPZ will actually decrease the total amount of Class B8 development that could occur at the Park.</li> <li>- The reduction in Class B8 development as a result of the inclusion of offices at the Park will reduce the total number of HGVs accessing the Park.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Condition 14 includes a requirement to upgrade this junction before the occupation of an additional 21,000 square metres of development at the Park.</li> <li>- The HA acknowledge that the Umbrella Travel Plan is acceptable in principle.</li> <li>- The Environment Agency have not objected to the findings of the FRA or the drainage strategy. Condition 27 requires details of drainage to be submitted and approved prior to commencement of development in order to control this issue.</li> </ul>
<b>Health and Safety Executive</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Suggest an informative to confirm that there are no major hazard developments in the designated area.</li> <li>- Clarify contact addresses for various queries.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Informative to be inserted to SPZ.</li> <li>- Address in Appendix 6 to be updated.</li> </ul>
<b>Mr Joseph, Local Resident</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Supports the SPZ as it has the potential to create jobs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted and welcomed.</li> </ul>
<b>Mrs P McNiece, Local Resident</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Objects to the height of the proposed units being 21 metres</li> <li>- Objects on traffic grounds.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Buildings of up to 21 metres are located to the centre of the site, to reduce their impact and to minimise any overlooking/amenity issues.</li> <li>- The SPZ has the potential to reduce the total number of vehicle movements due to the differing land uses proposed.</li> </ul>
<b>Network Rail</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No comments at this stage</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted</li> </ul>
<b>North West Development Agency</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support the principle of the SPZ, the proposed uses and suggested conditions.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Noted and welcomed.</li> </ul>
<b>4NW</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Object to the inclusion of 46,451 square metres of offices within the SPZ as consider that this is not a town centre location and as such is contrary to guidance in PPS6.</li> <li>- Accept that the other town centre uses proposed will be ancillary to the main use of the Park.</li> <li>- Support inclusion of the Travel Plan.</li> <li>- Support the Landscaping Guidance Note included as Appendix 5.</li> <li>- Support inclusion of BREEAM Condition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is an extant planning permission (D30843) at the Park for approximately 110,000 square metres of open Class B1, B2 and B8 floorspace. This is the fall back position that could occur at the park without the need for planning permission to be obtained.</li> <li>- The imposition of a cap on B1(a) floorspace at 46,451 square metres would represent an improvement to the situation that could currently occur.</li> <li>- No need for B1(a) office to be ancillary to the main use as extant planning permission does not currently require this.</li> <li>- Welcome support for town centre uses as being ancillary to the main use</li> </ul>

		<p>of the Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Welcome support for the Travel Plan, Landscaping Guidance Note and BREEAM Condition.</li> </ul>
<b>United Utilities</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Clarify contact details for United Utilities set out in Part 4.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- SPZ to be updated accordingly.</li> </ul>
<b>Wilton Estate</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Support creation of SPZ and suggest that the SPZ could be extended to include land to the south and east of HDP to include additional employment allocations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Beyond the scope of the SPZ process and is a matter for consideration through the preparation of the LDF.</li> </ul>