

ROCHDALE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK

**MILKSTONE, DEEPLISH AND NEWBOLD
SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**

STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION

September 2010



**ROCHDALE
METROPOLITAN BOROUGH
COUNCIL**

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Participation and consultation	1
Details of public consultation	2
Response to consultation	3
Advice and assistance	4
Appendix 1 – Location where documents could be viewed	5
Appendix 2 – Schedule of comments and proposed changes	7

MILKSTONE, DEEPLISH AND NEWBOLD SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

STATEMENT OF CONSULTATION

1. INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 The Supplementary Planning Document has been produced by the Council to guide development within this area. In order to ensure that appropriate public consultation takes place, Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) are required to be accompanied by a statement setting out how the Local Planning Authority will comply with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Consequently this document details the public consultation that will take place in order to meet the requirements of the SCI.
- 1.2 The new planning system introduced during 2004 includes new requirements (e.g. community involvement and the need to undertake a sustainability appraisal) governing the preparation of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) which replaces the old style Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). As a result, whilst not having 'development Plan' status, SPD's will be afforded greater weight in the development control process than SPG's.
- 1.3 This document sets out the public participation procedures to be undertaken by the Council, which are associated with the draft SPD. It accords with regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Local development) (England regulations 2004).
- 1.4 Using the guidelines of the new government regulations and PPS 12 the public consultation draft SPD proposals have been prepared through a process of consultation.

2. PARTICIPATION AND CONSULTATION

- 2.1 The process of producing the supplementary planning document consisted of the following stages:

Stage 1: Early consultation work with the public

Stage 2: The Sustainability Appraisal

Stage 3: Testing the guidance

2.2 Stage One: Early consultation work with the public

As part of the early preparation, some of the issues set out in the Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD were looked at as part of the Regeneration Investment Strategy Consultation in 2008. This consultation was coordinated by Rochdale Development Agency (RDA) and covered the core area of the wider SPD boundary. The consultation included discussion at the Area Forum, drop-in events and workshop sessions with youth elders and women's group. This consultation culminated in the production of the Inner Rochdale Consultation Report in June 2008. The key findings of this and other local consultation (e.g. as part of the Neighbourhood Action Plans) form an important starting point in understanding the issues to be addressed within the area.

2.3 **Stage two: The SA Process**

The first part of the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) process was to collect information on Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold. The Scoping report also looked at other plans and programmes to identify how they influenced and impacted upon the SPD. The key aim of the scoping report was to identify the key sustainability issues for the SPD area.

This was consulted on, through the sending out of paper copies of the Scoping Report, for a period of 5 weeks from early in 2010. The Government has stated that the four consultation bodies (as required by the Strategic Environmental Assessment Directive) should be consulted at this stage. These bodies are the Countryside Agency and English Nature (which have been combined into Natural England), English Heritage and the Environment Agency.

The second part of the process was to prepare SA framework against which a plan or programme can be assessed. The SA framework incorporates a range of objectives and questions adapted from national, regional, sub-regional and local sources to fit the key sustainability issues and aspirations of Rochdale Borough.

The appraisals have been undertaken using an iterative process so that the SA has informed the development of the SPD. This has ensured that the SPD has already met many of the sustainability objectives within the Councils framework. The Draft SA is also subject to public consultation.

2.4 **Stage 3: Testing the guidance**

In compiling the draft SPD, the detailed proposals of the draft SPD were worked up in consultation with statutory bodies and key stakeholders. The council have made a number of changes to the documents prior to statutory consultation to ensure that the feedback from key stakeholders had been taken on board as far as was possible.

2.5 Approval for public consultation by Rochdale Township was made on 10th March 2010.

3. **DETAILS OF PUBLIC CONSULTATION (JUNE/JULY 2010)**

3.1 In accordance with the councils Statement of Community Involvement, the consultation process included direct notification to consultees, key local stakeholders and other interested parties and publicity through the local press.

3.2 On publication of the Draft Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD, a public consultation exercise was undertaken to raise awareness and interest. In accordance with regulation 17 a public notice was published in a local newspaper which clearly stated the duration of the public participation period and the place and times at which the SPD can be inspected.

3.3 Public consultation commenced on the 7th June 2010 for six weeks and the closing date for responses will be 19th July 2010. Consultation and participation involved the following:

- As set out in the Consultation Statement the Consultation Draft SPD documents and consultation documents were available on the Council's website www.rochdale.gov.uk/yourviews (with the ability to comment on-line). Hard copies of

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

the document will be made available at the all the council offices, Borough Libraries and community centres (See Appendix 1)

- Emails and letters were sent to all parties Rochdale Council considers having an interest in the SPD (including statutory consultees, general consultees, local businesses and any other interested parties). The email / letter will detail the role of the SPD, the consultation opportunity and the times and locations the SPD, the Sustainability Appraisal, Habitats Regulation Assessment, Equalities Impact Assessment and this conformity statement could be viewed.
- A public notice was placed in the Rochdale Observer and a press release will be sent out to the local newspaper prior to the Public Consultation. The advertisement will explain the role of the SPD and where and where a copy of the SPD and its supporting documents can be viewed ahead of the Public Consultation period. A notice was also placed in the Asian Leader newspaper.
- A leaflet was sent out to all the households in the area covered by the SPD. The leaflet detailed the role of the SPD, a summary of some of the key themes and principles from the SPD, the dates of the consultation period and where and when the SPD and its supporting documents were available to view. These leaflets were also available at all the council offices, libraries, community centres and at the exhibitions.
- Staff from the Council were available to answer any questions on the draft guidance at the exhibition planned during the public consultation period below:

Tuesday 22 June	3.30pm – 7.30pm	Newbold Children’s Centre
Wednesday 12 March	3pm – 7pm	Deeplish Community Centre

- A questionnaire was available at the exhibition for anyone who wished to make comments.
- The SPD, SA and related documents were available to view at the Council’s offices, libraries and community centres. Moreover, anyone wishing to make comments was able to visit the Rochdale Councils website to view the SPD and related documents and submit their response online.
- Posters were on display at relevant Council Offices, Libraries and some Community Centres across Rochdale borough. The poster advertised the consultation events and where and when a copy of the SPD and its supporting documents could be viewed and commented on.
- Copies of the SPD and the associated documents were also made available at the first floor reception in the Council’s Planning & Regulation Service, Telegraph House and Information Office, Second floor, Municipal Offices.
- Paper or electronic copies of the documents were available on request. A facility for those who wished to view the documents in large print or in Braille or for translation into Bengali or Urdu was available on request.

4. **RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION**

- 4.1 The two ‘drop in’ exhibitions attracted around 50 people who were able to ask questions and comment on the SPD.

4.2 A total of 17 bodies or individuals responded to the consultation on the draft document. The comments received covered a variety of issues, as can be seen in the schedule in Appendix 2. None of the comments raised questioned the purpose or main aims and objectives of the SPD. Most of the comments related to issues which needed to be covered in greater detail, the need to update some sections to take account of recent developments / information and the need to improve clarity or provide greater explanation. The schedule in Appendix 2 also shows the changes to the document proposed as a result of the comments received.

4.3 The proposed changes include:

- Reference to addressing parking and traffic management issues in the area, particularly in the Milkstone Road area;
- Emphasis on how design can improve safety particularly along key corridors and walking routes;
- Illustrate the links to the adjoining East Central Rochdale area and the River Roch corridor;
- Strengthen reference to flood risk;
- Remove references to the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) now that it has been revoked;
- Add reference to potential bus priority measures, particularly in relation to Oldham Road;
- Add reference to the strategic role of the Rochdale Canal; and
- More emphasis on the role that community centres play in the area and the need to improve them and promote their use.

Other minor changes to the wording and maps, none of which alter the fundamental elements of the document, will also be made to improve clarity / readability of the document.

4.4 Township Committee was asked to approve these changes and adopt the SPD at its meeting on the 8th September 2010.

5. **ADVICE AND ASSISTANCE**

For further information relating to this document please contact:

Strategic Planning Service
Planning & regulation
Rochdale Council
Floor 2, Telegraph House
Bailie Street
Rochdale
Po Box 32
OL161JH

Tel: 01706 924373

By email: wayne.poole@rochdale.gov.uk

Website: www.rochdale.gov.uk/yourviews

APPENDIX 1 – LOCATION WHERE DOCUMENTS COULD BE VIEWED

Council Information Points:

Planning and Regulation Reception, Floor 1, Telegraph House, Rochdale
Rochdale Information Centre, Floor 2, Municipal Offices, Smith Street, Rochdale
Heywood Information Centre, 44-46 Market Street, Heywood
Middleton Information Centre, Sadler Street, Middleton
Milnrow Information centre, 82 Dale Street, Milnrow
Littleborough Information Centre, Council Offices, Hare Hill Park, Littleborough

Libraries

Wheatsheaf Library, Baillie Street, Rochdale
Balderstone Library, Balderstone Park, Rochdale
Belfield Library, Belfield Community School, Samson Street, Rochdale
Castleton Library, 881 Manchester Road, Rochdale
Norden Library, Norden Community School, Shawfield Lane, Rochdale
Smallbridge Library, Stevenson Square, Rochdale
Spotland Library, Ings Lane, Rochdale

Heywood Library, Church Street, Heywood
Darnhill Library, Argyle Parade, Heywood

Middleton Library, Long Street, Middleton
Alkrington Library, Kirkway
Langley Library, Windermere Road, Middleton
Middleton Junction Library, Jumbo Social Centre, Grimshaw Lane, Middleton

Littleborough Library, Hare Hill Park, Littleborough
Milnrow Library, Newhey Road, Milnrow
Smithybridge Library, 121/3 Smithybridge Road, Littleborough
Wardle Library, 448 Bh Road, Wardle, Rochdale

Community Centres / Offices within Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold as follows:

Castlemere Community Centre
Deeplish Community Centre
Ronald Gorton Centre
Castlemere Children's Centre
Deeplish Children's Centre
Newbold Children's Centre

APPENDIX 2 - SCHEDULE OF COMMENTS AND PROPOSED CHANGES

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
1.	The Coal Authority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Coal Authority is keen to ensure that coal resources are not unduly sterilised by new development. • Records show that there are economically viable coal resources present across the SPD area that are capable of extraction. • Presence of surface coal resources will need to be noted specifically in the SPD due to the lack of coverage of the issue in higher level policy. • Although the Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD area is an established urban area there is the opportunity for economically prior extraction of surface coal resources as part of brownfield regeneration proposals. • Evidence of past coal mining at shallow depth in parts of the area could mean area of land instability. Prior extraction may be able to deal with this issue and stabilise sites. • Issue of identifying specific areas where coal mining hazards could pose a risk to new development. Therefore in section 6 of the SPD recommend that the following bullet point be added to the list of planning application information requirements – ‘Coal Mining Risk Assessment (including consideration of prior extraction of surface coal resources). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The presence of coal in the area is acknowledged. However given the existing priorities in the area and the need to deliver regeneration objectives it is unlikely to be practical to undertake even small scale coal extraction within the area. • Agree that it is important to highlight that in some instances such an assessment may be required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change • Add suggested bullet point to the list of planning application information requirements in Section 6.

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
2.	Resident	<p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More emphasis needs to be placed on housing as there are few good quality houses in the area and even fewer new ones. Hard to understand why private companies don't develop in the area given the demand. Could obtaining planning permission be made simpler to boost new developments? <p>Canal Basin (Area 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good proposal as it will lead to new housing and perhaps the mill can be converted into good quality new apartments <p>South of Rochdale Rialway Station (Area 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Very good proposal <p>Milkstone Road (Area 8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better managing of the road system would be a good addition to the plan, more one way streets and better parking facilities next to the shops as it is currently difficult to stop. • More emphasis on good new housing or redevelopment of older housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The emphasis on delivering quality new homes is a key focus of the SPD. However, it is not possible to make planning permission simpler through the SPD as this has to follow statutory procedures. • Noted • Noted • Agreed. Need to strengthen reference to parking and traffic management issues in this section 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change • No change • No change • Importance of addressing these issues is strengthened in the bullets at end of 5.8.
3.	Resident	<p>Open Space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can't access Deeplish Primary School • No basketball / cricket facilities – unauthorised use of Deeplish Primary School • No place for football tournaments. Stoneyfield has a dog fouling problem so don't use it. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is outside the scope of the SPD as it is a management issue • Agreed. Would be useful if SPD referred to sporting facilities. • This is covered through improvements to open space using development contributions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change • Reference to sporting facilities added to bullets under 4.4. • No change
4.	Anon	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raised issue of safety in the area particularly around Canal Basin (Area 3) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. This is a wider issue across the SPD area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reference to importance of design making places feel safer and secure added to 4.3.
5.	Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads need to be improved. There are a lot of pot holes in the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outside scope of SPD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shortage of housing. Happy with proposals for new housing. More houses should be refurbished Specific points made about the parking and road issues close to where they live. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted There is reference to improving the existing stock in the SPD 	
6.	Resident	<p>Oldham Road Corridor (Area 1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrians need to feel safe and welcomed. <p>East of Oldham Road (Area 2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop new uses for all the pubs that are closing down. <p>South of Rochdale Railway Station (Area 4)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Miall Street area and the redundant platforms need attention. <p>Railway Station / Maclure Road (Area 5)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overgrown shrubs / trees need attention. Pedestrian underpass could be reopened. Park and ride? Cycle parking (Sheffield stands). Potential for allotments and community gardens <p>Central Retail park (Area 6)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly a need for high quality retail premises <p>Milkstone Road (Area 8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Secure parking is an issue for visitors to the cafes and restaurants. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree that this should be mentioned Agree but this is covered in relation to more general re-use of buildings in 4.7 Agree. Mention in section 5.4 Agree. Most of these issues are adequately covered in the document but there needs to be specific reference to cycle parking at the station Noted This issue as raised in a previous comment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference made to the importance of proposals improving safety along the corridor No change No change Reference to cycle parking added under 5.5 No change Importance of addressing these issues is strengthened in the bullets at end of 5.8.
7.	British Waterways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BW welcomes and supports the SPD which includes many references to the canal and the opportunities it presents as a important feature in the area. The SPD needs to indicate the importance of contact with BW at the earliest stage possible in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted Covered in section 6 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		<p>working up any proposals relating to the canal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The SPD needs to indicate that the canal is a SSSI throughout its length in this area – this is a key issue that developers will need to take into account. We welcome the reference to potential moorings in the proposals for the canal basin area (Section 5.3). However this could be widened to include other facilities such as secure moorings and water points. Any open space and public realm along and linked to the canal will need to be designed to encourage active use and natural surveillance. This is recognised in the objectives but it would be useful if it was also referred to in the more detailed sections. We welcome reference to S106 agreements in section 5.3 to provide improvements to the canal basin area. However, more generally, S106 funding will be important if developments are likely to result in increased use of the canal and towpath. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Covered in section 4.7 Agree Noted but it is mentioned generally in the SPD. If it was mentioned specifically is would have to be referred to in all the relevant sections. Agree 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Change made to section 5.3 to reference 'other boating facilities' No change Bullet relating to s106 agreements expanded to mention contributions from developments that would themselves lead to increased use of the canal and towpath
8.	Theatres Trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We are disappointed that the section on Area 8 (page 41) does not mention The Curtain Theatre at 47 Milkstone Road in the 'Character and issues' paragraph as this enterprise can make a valuable contribution to the evening economy and vibrancy of Area 8. Your theatres and performance spaces are important community assets, providing jobs, skills, learning and educational opportunities, and offer vital secondary spend to tourism, retail and leisure sectors. The document should aim to support the continued success of these 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Theatre should be mentioned as a facility that contributes to the vibrancy of the area. These issues are noted. However, it is felt that these would be dealt with more generally as a result of the proposals referred to in section 5.8. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reference to the theatre mentioned in the introduction to section 5.8. No change

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		<p>venues as participation in the performing arts can help to build confidence and motivation, and is a powerful tool for developing communications and team-working skills.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With regard to transport and parking arrangements we would like to emphasise that the economics of evening cultural and entertainment venues are reliant on audiences being able to get to a venue by public transport or car, being able to park their cars and bikes, and being able to get home safely. Controlled Parking Zones in central locations can have serious implications on the economic viability of such venues. We would strongly urge any planning policies concerned with parking provision to consider the presence of this theatre. Such leisure venues attract families, young people, disabled patrons, and older people who can be discouraged to attend if the costs of travelling and parking make the price tag of the evening out too high. 		
9.	Network Rail	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comments to make. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change
10.	Environment Agency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We would recommend as part of the Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD, it refer to and integrate with adjoining adopted SPD areas, such as East Central Rochdale Area Framework SPD and in particular the Riverside Area. • As the SPD area encompasses the catchments of both the River Roch and Sudden Brook, it is recommended that where there is redevelopment along the heavily modified waterbodies that opportunities are taken to enhance these river corridors, and remove past poor riparian development that has encroached 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree. The link to the East Central Rochdale area, the River Roch corridor and Newlands should be made clearer • Agree regarding reference to the River Roch corridor. The other issues are picked up adequately in section 4.7 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Link to these key areas shown on the Opportunities Map in the document • See above

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		<p>or even covered the watercourse. Such sustainable development has the potential to provide multiple benefits, including biodiversity, landscape, flood risk and water quality.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.4 - With the north east corner of the SPD area encompassing the River Roch corridor and the Newlands greenspace regeneration area, we would recommend there is significant scope to improve the existing greenspace corridor and its value in regard to biodiversity, landscape and possibly flood risk here, and improve its linkage with the Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold area, and this be highlighted in the SPD. • 4.7 - The SPD states that new development and proposals will be expected to “reduce or protect against flooding”. Development proposals should show that they are following the policies of PPS25 and the Council’s own Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. The principle of PPS25 is to assess, avoid, substitute, control and mitigate in that order. Accordingly, protecting against flooding and reducing risk is only part of the process. Avoiding risk via the sequential approach to development is the preferred approach. • In terms of the SA document, our previous response highlighted in Appendix 1 raised the matter of reference to the Council’s SFRA for information on flood risk. It is noted that reference to this is now made. • Table 2 question 5i relates to a site on Well l’th’ Lane and notes that the Environment Agency 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree regarding reference to the River Roch corridor • Agree although there is reference to flooding in final bullet of 4.7 this needs to be strengthened to refer to national guidance • Noted • Noted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See above regarding reference on the Map. Also reference to River Roch added to bullet in section 4.4 • Add the following to the last bullet in 4.7. “In respect of flooding new development and proposals should have regard to Planning Policy Statement 25 ‘Development and Flood Risk and the Council’s own Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.” • No change • See change to 4.7 referred to above

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		<p>have not made objection to a previous application. It is not clear which site this refers to but, it should be noted that the absence of an objection from us does not suggest that there is no flood risk. All future proposals should be assessed against the most up to date information and selection of sites for development should follow the sequential test approach of PPS25.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5.7 - It recommended as part of any future residential development where currently Sudden Brook is culverted, there be thorough assessment into the feasibility of opening up or 'skylighting' the covered watercourse, and integrating this as part of any overall residential scheme design, creating 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Reference to be added to 5.7 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add the following bullet point to section 5.7. "The site contains a culverted section of the Sudden Brook. Development of the site should explore opportunities to open up the covered water course to improve green infrastructure and biodiversity."
11.	Great Places	<p>Sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could you confirm if the sustainability proposals for the reduction in CO2 emissions through efficient systems and technologies are in addition to any future requirements for developers and RSL's to build to Code for sustainable homes level 3/4? A large amount of Local Authorities are currently requesting for 10% renewable on schemes which currently achieve code for sustainable homes level 3 and sometimes 4. Obviously these technologies are already being utilised to achieve code in the first place. Would it be possible where schemes have code requirements to include the renewables required under planning as being achieved within the code? <p>Canal Basin (Area 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Great Places are currently developing the site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree but this is covered through link to the Energy and New Development SPD Agree. The arrow showing the link on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change Change made to plan in section

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		<p>along Woodbine Street. I note within the proposed plans that you are proposing to enhance the canal corridor through existing links across the canal. Obviously this is a great opportunity and will only enhance and promote future watersides developments in the future. However, please note that the area currently identified on the plan as access is subject to large amounts of anti social behaviour and this link has been closed for sometime due to complaints from residents living along Woodbine Street. The footpath highlighted will be moved as part of the new development and access will be redirected through the open Park area. Great Places is currently working with an Artist who is making every attempt to make contact with young teenagers in the area. Despite good intentions the Artwork placed in this area has been subject to fire bombing. We are hoping once the new development has been completed and surveillance is improved the problems will reduce but for now opening up the canal corridor at this point is likely to increase the current problems already being experienced by residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great Places will be speaking separately to officers with regards to development opportunities within our zoned areas. We hope to work in partnership with land owners and developers and Rochdale to actively contribute to the regeneration of Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold. 	<p>the plan is currently misleading.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted 	<p>5.3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change
12.	Natural England	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We welcome this opportunity to comment on the preparation SPD for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold. In general, we welcome the inclusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deelish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		<p>of principles of sustainable development within the SPD including: Sustainable design and building practices being actively encouraged; Access to green infrastructure feature within the town centre areas; Biodiversity is still relevant in urban areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction - Physical characteristics of the area We note that there is currently a limited provision of open space within the area and that which exists is generally of poor quality, and that this is addressed later within the SPD. The introductory sections of the SPD could go further to consider the landscape/townscape of the area and look to opportunities for development which seeks to conserve and enhance the character and quality of the landscape/townscape. It may be also helpful if the Introduction went further to set out the particular Special Area of Conservation (SAC) status of the Rochdale Canal in this location, and the conservation requirements of this site. It could indicate that development affecting this site will be subject to special legal procedures as set out within the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. • Vision and objectives. We would welcome the inclusion of principles of sustainable development into the vision and objectives. As such, we would wish to see the inclusion of an environmental objective. We would also wish to see added a further bullet point to the list of key objectives, to: "Conserve and enhance the biodiversity value of the Rochdale Canal". • 4.3 Design, corridors and gateways We would welcome the addition of a further bullet point that 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Special Area of Conservation (SAC) status of the Rochdale Canal is mentioned in section 4.7. It would be useful to add a footnote regarding the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. • Sustainable development is covered in the last bullet point of the objectives. The last sentence is a little too detailed for inclusion in the objectives however could emphasise the importance of improving the value of corridors • Biodiversity is covered under section 4.7 with specific reference to the canal. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Footnote to the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 to be added to the bottom of this page • Add the word value to third objective. • No change

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		<p>proposals demonstrate how developers will conserve and enhance the biodiversity of the canal corridor.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.4 Open space and public realm. We are generally supportive of the proposals to increase and enhance the provision of open space within Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold. In particular, we welcome the proposal (bullet point 5) to improve green corridors such as the canal for biodiversity, recreation and amenity. The proposals could go further to set out more specific targets for the provision of open space. We refer you to Natural England's Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) – this provides a set of benchmarks for ensuring access to places near to where people live. These standards recommend that people living in towns and cities should have: an accessible natural greenspace of at least 2 hectares in size, no more than 300 metres (5 minutes walk) from home; at least one accessible 20 hectare site within two kilometres of home; one accessible 100 hectare site within five kilometres of home; one accessible 500 hectare site within ten kilometres of home; one hectare of statutory Local Nature Reserves per thousand population. • As well as creating open spaces, the proposals could develop the availability and accessibility of green infrastructure, and the walking, cycling and bridleway networks, to provide opportunities for people to lead a healthy and active outdoor lifestyle. The link could also be made between health, wellbeing and access to open space. Natural England considers the two concepts of health and wellbeing are inter-connected. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted but this is too specific for this SPD and is covered in the Provision of Recreational Open Space in New Housing SPD which is referred to in section 4.4 • Health and quality of life is referenced and the benefits recognised. It is agreed that there should be reference to wider green infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change • Reference to green infrastructure included in introduction to section 4.4.

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		<p>Without wellbeing good health is vulnerable, and without good health wellbeing fails to thrive. Good health does not guarantee wellbeing. Better health and wellbeing are two of the major social and economic benefits we can secure through good management of the natural environment in both rural and urban settings. We refer the local authority to the evidence linking health and green spaces, and also make the links with accessibility (eg with regards to the walking/cycling network, measures could be taken to develop accessibility and enhance the footpath, cycleway and bridleway network to encourage use by the mobility impaired and those experiencing health issues etc).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4.7 Sustainability. We very much welcome and are supportive of these proposals which seek to fully integrate the principles of sustainability. We also welcome the reference to promoting biodiversity within this section. • The Local Authority may also wish to include the following considerations within the bullet pointed list of proposals: the conservation and enhancement of biodiversity; the conservation and enhancement of landscape character; access to green infrastructure; the use of Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS); the use of locally distinctive designs and materials; visual enhancement of buildings and areas through development proposals; and sensitive design and location of external lighting. We would also encourage the Council to include consider geology and protected species within the SPD. Whilst to our knowledge, the area, or adjacent land is not specifically designated for 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted • Covered adequately in section 4.7. There is also more detail in the Biodiversity and Development SPD which is signposted in section 4.7. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change • No change

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		<p>geological conservation, there may be intrinsic geodiversity value which should be maintained and enhanced. In addition, the possible presence of protected species, such as bats or breeding birds, should be given consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area development guides. In general, the area development guides could go further to consider the landscape/townscape of the areas, and seek to conserve and enhance the character and quality of the landscape/townscape. The guides could also go further to seek the conservation and enhancement of the canal corridor. This is currently omitted from some of the bullet pointed proposals within the area development guides. The area development guides could make greater reference to the designated Rochdale Canal Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and the Rochdale Canal Special Area of Conservation (SAC), and the conservation requirements of these sites. The guides could indicate that development affecting this site will be subject to special legal procedures as set out within the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended). Developments in this locality will need to demonstrate that they avoid risk of harm to the canal. For example, we would be concerned about any proposals that would pose a risk to the integrity of the canal sides or over-shadowed the canal. Any proposed recreational use (e.g. canal moorings) will need to demonstrate that there would be no adverse impact on the Rochdale Canal SAC. Where landscaping schemes are proposed, we would also wish to see the risk of leaf-fall or shading/overhanging 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This issue is covered generally in section 4.7. Specific guidance regarding biodiversity within the canal corridor is mentioned in section 5.3. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		<p>branches over the canal avoided, and planting of shrubs or trees to be set back a reasonable distance from the canal to protect the integrity of the canal banks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Implementation and monitoring. Applicants may need to be aware that, where a plan or project is likely to have a significant effect, alone or in combination with other plans and projects, on one or more European sites (SACs, SPAs) (e.g. the Rochdale Canal SAC) it must be subject to an "appropriate assessment". Under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010, a person applying for any such consent, permission or other authorisation must provide such information as the competent authority may reasonably require for the purposes of the assessment or to enable them to determine whether an appropriate assessment is required. Natural England welcomes references to securing Green Infrastructure through Developer Contributions. Biodiversity Duty. Biodiversity is a core component of sustainable development, underpinning economic development and prosperity, and has an important role to play in developing locally distinctive and sustainable communities. From 1 October 2006, all local authorities and other public authorities in England and Wales have a Duty to have regard to the conservation of biodiversity in exercising their functions. The Duty aims to raise the profile and visibility of biodiversity, to clarify existing commitments with regard to biodiversity and to make it a natural and integral part of policy and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree. Reference to the need for 'appropriate assessment' should be made in section 6 of the SPD. This is too specific for this SPD. Reference is made to the Biodiversity and Development SPD where this and other biodiversity issues and guidance are covered in greater detail. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add the following bullet to the 'Planning Applications' part of section 6 "An "appropriate assessment" under the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations." No change

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		<p>decision making. Guidance is available in Defra publication, Guidance for Local Authorities in Implementing the Biodiversity Duty: http://www.defra.gov.uk/wildlife-countryside/pdfs/biodiversity/la-guid-english.pdf The Duty is set out in Section 40 of the Natural Environment and Communities Act (NERC) 2006 and states that: "Every public authority must, in exercising its functions, have regard, so far as is consistent with the proper exercise of those functions, to the purpose of conserving biodiversity". We would expect to see appropriate references to this duty for Local Authorities in all relevant planning documents. There does not appear to be reference to it in this SPD and we would welcome additional appropriate text perhaps as part of the introduction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Habitats Regulations Assessment. Amendments have recently been made to the Habitats Regulations to reflect clarification of the status of land-use plans as "plans or projects" under Article 6(3) & 4 of the Habitats Directive. In general terms, this means that if a land-use plan is likely to have a significant effect, alone or in combination with other plans and projects, on one or more European sites (SACs, SPAs) it must be subject to an "appropriate assessment". In this particular instance, it is not clear whether the local authority have considered whether this Supplementary Planning Document is likely to have a significant effect on European sites. The matter of significance is for the Competent Authority (in this case Rochdale Metropolitan Borough Council) to determine, and you may 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Habitats Regulations Assessment has been undertaken on this SPD and is available. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		<p>wish to record your own decision accordingly, and include a statement on this within the SPD.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sustainability appraisal. We do not wish to make comments on the sustainability appraisal report. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change
13.	GMPTE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for consulting GMPTE on the above document. GMPTE welcomes the commitment in the document to strengthening the accessibility of the area with a particular focus on improving existing facilities for walking, cycling and public transport. In relation to public transport priorities identified on page 20, GMPTE specifically welcomes the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improvements to Rochdale railway station • Ensuring good access to the proposed Metrolink stops • Exploring opportunities to continue the improvement of the Oldham Road and Manchester Road Quality Bus Corridors. • It is also noted that the document includes a number of proposals for maintaining and improving the road network including the potential to complete the town centre “ring road” by extending Wood Street to join up with Drake Street and also improvements to the junction of Durham Street, Oldham Road and Crawford Street. • Section 5.1 Oldham Road Corridor (Area 1) states that “the completion of the spine road from the M62 motorway through Kingsway 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These points are noted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No changes

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		<p>Business Park means that this corridor is no longer just an important link between Rochdale and Oldham, but is now just a few minutes from the motorway and provides a gateway into the town itself".</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Oldham Road corridor is also an important bus route which forms part of the Rochdale – Oldham – Ashton Quality Bus Corridor. There are a number of bus services that operate along the section of the corridor within the SPD area. From the Oldham Road junction with Durham Street to Wood Street bus services operating on this route are the 6, 7, 24, 409, and 435, between them these services provide approximately 16 buses per hour in each direction. • GMPTE's PRMS (Punctuality and Reliability Monitoring System) figures highlight poor mid-point punctuality for these services indicating that traffic conditions are impacting on bus performance. Rochdale's bus performance figures for mid-point punctuality for 09/10 stands at 74.6% against a Greater Manchester average figure of 70.0%. The mid-point punctuality figures for the monitored services along this Oldham Road corridor for 09/10 are 69.4%, well below the Rochdale performance figure and failing the Traffic Commissioner standards for mid-point punctuality. These bus services represent some of the worst performing services within Rochdale. • The existing Wood Lane junction with Oldham Road is currently traffic signal controlled and has been identified as a cause of delay for bus 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. The SPD refers to junction improvements which would have an impact on some key roads and bus routes. Any proposal would be subject to a detailed Transport Assessment with the aim of improving traffic flow and hopefully having a positive impact on bus punctuality • Reference is made in 4.5 regarding the improvement of the Oldham Road corridor and there are specific 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No change • No change

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		<p>services which the latest proposals would impact on further, in particular extending Wood Street to complete the town centre “ring road”. The recent completion of the new motorway link road through Kingsway Business Park and the increase in housing and economic activity associated with the proposed regeneration of the area are also likely to generate additional trips on the local road network including Oldham Road. An element of bus priority along Oldham Road into Rochdale would assist in mitigating the additional delays likely to occur and would further aid in improving the current poor comparative journey time between a bus passengers and car users.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land assembly, the demolition and redevelopment of sites and the need to remodel highway junctions would appear to provide a one off opportunity to incorporate bus priority measures along Oldham Road, in particular the in bound / western frontage between Durham Street and Wood Street. GMPTE would welcome the opportunity to discuss this with Rochdale Highways and it would be useful if this SPD could make reference to bus priority measures within the priority to explore the opportunities to continue to improve the Oldham Road QBC. 	<p>references to junction improvements in 5.1 and 5.6. Any transport proposals including junction improvements and Metrolink will take account of other public transport services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add reference to bus priority measures to fourth bullet point under 4.5.
14.	GONW	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With the recent announcements on the Regional Spatial Strategy being revoked, it would not be appropriate to retain any reference to the RSS (page 13) and the policies from the RSS in Appendix 1. Also the mention of policy C1 from the emerging Core Strategy, which is related to RSS housing targets should be taken out of 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove references to the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS)

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		Appendix 1.		
15.	NWDA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst parts of the Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD area adjoin the Kingsway Business Park, the SPD addresses local and detailed matters on which the Agency has no wish to comment. We note that the SPD is being prepared before the LDF Core Strategy has been finalised and trust that it will be consistent with the Core Strategy and, where relevant, saved UDP policies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Points noted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes
16.	HCA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, it's a comprehensive document covering quite a large and diverse area but importantly it concentrates detail within the central core which is the most important part of the area linking the town centre with Kingsway strategic site. It's also noted that it complements and works with other relevant SPDs. Chapter 3 Funding. Should this paragraph be strengthened? I would qualify the use of public funds which are carefully used and not spent as an end to themselves. By targeting and utilising a cocktail of public monies, additional value is achieved and impact is maximised. The intention being that the use of public money is a catalyst to stimulate long term private sector investment. (I think is the way things will go in the future so you might as well set your stall out now – reduced public expenditure more private monies more direct outputs). Chapter 4 Background Issues – open space. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted Noted. This issue was already recognised in section 3 but has been strengthened to clarify these points Noted. The Council will always take 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change Refer to the coordination of 'private investment' and the need to 'maximise impact' in section 3 of the SPD No change

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		<p>You could add a line in here about where viability allows, an off site contribution to POS may be applicable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do you also need to mention on going maintenance responsibilities? It mentions high quality environments but will the council adopt if they are expensive to maintain? Finally, you mention the Rochdale Canal Strategy 2003. This was refreshed in 2008 which placed much more emphasis on the canal being a strategic resource – as a movement corridor, a linear recreational opportunity and an area for focused development opportunities in key areas. The canal extends across 4 LA areas so should the canal play a more important strategic role within the core area? Perhaps Area 3 should be really marketed as a high quality hub between the town centre and Kingsway? 	<p>viability issues into account on a site by site basis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In section 4.4 reference is made to the Provision of Recreational Open Space in New Housing SPD. This SPD includes requirements for maintenance that are a key part of the overall s.106 contribution to open space The SPD recognises the strategic role that this area plays being located between Rochdale town centre and Kingsway. This is a key strand of the SPD and is why it is a focus for regeneration and is why the SPD has been produced. The role of the canal corridor as part of this is also recognised. This is illustrated in the opportunities Map. It is agreed that the SPD should mention the fact that the canal extends across a number of local authorities and therefore has a wider role to play. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No change Add reference to the extent of the canal and its strategic importance in the opportunities section.
17.	Resident	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I note that despite the wide ranging coverage of the area it has one glaring omission that has been pointed out by many local residents to me. That is the lack of a role for the one large organisation that they both own and run through a management committee which is the Castlemere Community Centre. It delivers high quality and much needed services from a flagship building that is not core funded and is entirely self sustaining and has begun to plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree but it is not appropriate to make reference to specific community facilities. However, the need to support improvements to such key facilities will be made in section 4.6. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add the following bullet to section 4.6 “Community centres play an important role in the area and proposals to improve their quality and promote usage will be encouraged”

Statement of Consultation for Milkstone, Deeplish and Newbold SPD

	Respondent	Comment	Response	Recommendation/Change <i>(proposed new text in italics)</i>
		<p>extensive developments that will see it create an outreach service and satellite operations around the area. Yet it's not mentioned anywhere that anyone can see, myself included. And with the impending funding reductions from Government for community facilities 3rd sector should be at the heart of area based projects. The centre is at that heart for the people but seemingly not for the Council when the ambitions of the SPD are assessed.</p>		

