

**BURY
UNITARY DEVELOPMENT**



Creating a Brighter Borough

**ADOPTED
PLAN**

**B
U
R
Y**

**M
E
T
R
O**

Ian L. Cheetham
B.Sc., Dip. MS, FRICS, MRTPI

*Dir
and E*



National Planning Policy Framework



www.communities.gov.uk
community, opportunity, prosperity

Consistency of UDP Policies with the National Planning Policy Framework

March 2013

Introduction

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was issued in March 2012 and Paragraph 215 specifies that due weight should be given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the framework. The closer the policies in the plan to the policies in the NPPF, the greater the weight that may be given.

This document details a comprehensive assessment of all UDP Policies to determine their consistency with the NPPF. In broad terms, the UDP is considered to be consistent with the NPPF. However, the assessment has highlighted a number of areas where policies may be partially at variance with the NPPF and where the policies in the NPPF would supersede all or part of a UDP Policy.

Assessment Summary

The following table summarises the position for each of the UDP's topic areas:

Chapter	Summary
1. Economy	<p>In general, the UDP's economic policies are consistent with the NPPF's key aim of delivering a strong, responsive and competitive economy and the Government's commitment to securing economic growth in order to create jobs and prosperity.</p> <p>However, where the economic policies promote the development of main town centre uses in locations that are not within an existing centre (i.e. hotel/conference use at Chamberhall and small scale office development) there will be a need to consider such proposals against a sequential assessment as required under paragraph 24 of the NPPF.</p>
2. Housing	<p>In general, the UDP's housing policies are considered to be consistent with the NPPF's aim to deliver a wide choice of high quality homes.</p>
3. Environment	<p>In general, the UDP's environmental policies are considered to be consistent with the NPPF's aim to seek to secure high quality design and good standards of amenity, to conserve heritage assets and to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p>
4. Open Land	<p>In general, the UDP's open land policies are considered to be consistent with the NPPF's requirement for planning to take account of the different roles and character of different areas, promoting the vitality of our main urban areas, protecting the Green Belt around them, recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and supporting</p>

	<p>thriving rural communities within it.</p> <p>However, when assessing proposals for new development in the Green Belt (UDP Policy OL1/2), the NPPF's definition of what should be considered to be exceptions to inappropriate development should take precedence.</p> <p>In addition, the NPPF's approach to dealing with proposals involving agricultural land is less restrictive than the approach set out under UDP Policy OL4. As such, the NPPF should take precedence in such instances.</p>
<p>5. Recreation and Tourism</p>	<p>In general, the UDP's policies relating to recreation and tourism are considered to be consistent with the NPPF's requirement for planning to promote healthy communities, allowing for access to high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation and capitalising on the economic benefits of tourism.</p> <p>However, there are slight variances between the UDP and the NPPF in terms of what should be considered as an exception to the general policy of protecting recreation sites from development (UDP Policies RT1/1 and RT2/3). As such, the exceptions set out under paragraph 74 of the NPPF should take precedence over those identified under UDP Policies RT1/1 and RT2/3. Similarly, when considering proposals affecting recreation provision in the countryside (UDP Policy RT3/1), the NPPF's exceptions in paragraph 74 will be applicable.</p> <p>In addition, the UDP's promotion of Chamberhall for hotel development (Policy RT4/3) is potentially in conflict with the NPPF's 'town centres first' approach and any proposals for such uses on this site will be subject to a sequential assessment in accordance with paragraph 24 of the NPPF.</p>
<p>6. Shopping</p>	<p>In general, the UDP's shopping policies are considered to be consistent with the NPPF's approach towards the promotion of competitive town centre environments and the general 'town centres first' policy.</p> <p>However, the UDP's general approach towards new retail development is to support this where it is within or immediately adjoining the town centre or to support small scale retail development in other locations. The NPPF operates a stricter policy approach whereby under the sequential approach the priority is for main town centre uses (such as retail) to be located within the centre and to only consider edge-of-centre or out-of-centre proposal when it has been demonstrated that there are not suitable opportunities within the centre itself. As such, UDP policies and proposals promoting retail development that is not within the main shopping area of a town centre will be superseded by the need to adopt the</p>

	<p>sequential approach as set out under paragraph 24 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF specifies that the sequential approach should not apply to small scale retail development within rural villages. However, this is an approach that would be supported by the Council as a way of enhancing facilities for local village communities.</p> <p>In addition, a number of UDP policies seek to consider whether new retail development will have an adverse impact on existing centres. However, the NPPF only allows for the consideration of impact where a proposal is 2,500 sq.m. or above unless there are locally-derived floorspace thresholds. The UDP contains no such thresholds. The emerging Core Strategy is seeking to introduce far lower floorspace thresholds than that set out in the NPPF but these cannot be applied until the Core Strategy is adopted. In the meantime, consideration of impact will only be possible where a proposal is 2,500 sq.m. or above.</p> <p>In addition, the NPPF requires plans to meet the need for retail development in full. The Bury Retail Study which has been prepared as part of the evidence base for the emerging Core Strategy has identified future expenditure capacity for additional future retail development. Proposals for new retail development will need to be consistent with the Retail Study's identified quantitative and qualitative needs.</p>
<p>7. Highways and Transportation</p>	<p>In general, the UDP's policies relating to highways and transportation are considered to be consistent with the NPPF's promotion of sustainable transport as a way of facilitating sustainable development and contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives.</p>
<p>8. Community Facilities</p>	<p>In general, the UDP's policies relating to community facilities are considered to be consistent with the NPPF's aim to improve health, social and cultural wellbeing for all, and deliver sufficient community and cultural facilities and services to meet local needs.</p>
<p>9. Minerals and Waste</p>	<p>UDP Policies and Proposals connected to minerals and waste have now been replaced by Policies and Proposals in the adopted Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan and the Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan.</p>
<p>10. Town Centres</p>	<p>In general, the UDP's policies and proposals relating to town centres are considered to be consistent with the NPPF's approach towards the promotion of competitive town centre environments and the general 'town centres first' policy.</p> <p>However, the consistency of various town centre policies is dependent on the definition of a town centre location in the context of different town centre uses. The NPPF's definition of an edge-of-centre site is:</p> <p><i>'For retail purposes, a location that is well connected and up to 300 metres of the primary</i></p>

shopping area. For all other main town centre uses, a location within 300 metres of a town centre boundary. For office development, this includes locations outside the town centre but within 500 metres of a public transport interchange. In determining whether a site falls within the definition of edge of centre, account should be taken of local circumstances.'

As such, in terms of retail development, the town centre is defined as the Main Shopping Area as is currently defined on the UDP Proposals Map. For all other main town centre uses, the town centre is defined as the wider town centre boundary as identified on the UDP Proposals Map. Proposals for town centre uses that sit beyond the parameters defined above as constituting edge-of-centre locations, would therefore be deemed to be out-of-centre.

In some cases, the town centre Area Policies promote retail development in locations that are within the wider town centre but are outside the Main Shopping Area. The NPPF operates a stricter policy approach whereby under the sequential approach the priority is for main town centre uses (such as retail) to be located within the centre and to only consider edge-of-centre or out-of-centre proposal when it has been demonstrated that there are not suitable opportunities within the centre itself. As such, UDP policies and proposals promoting retail development that is not within the main shopping area of a town centre will be superseded by the need to adopt the sequential approach as set out under paragraph 24 of the NPPF.

In addition, the NPPF requires plans to meet the need for retail development in full. The Bury Retail Study which has been prepared as part of the evidence base for the emerging Core Strategy has identified future expenditure capacity for additional future retail development. Proposals for new retail development will need to be consistent with the Retail Study's identified quantitative and qualitative needs.

The following full assessment operates a 'traffic light' system as follows:

	Consistent
	Some areas of inconsistency
	Inconsistent

ECONOMY

	EXISTING POLICY	NPPF COMPLIANT (Y/N)	NPPF PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS
EC1	EMPLOYMENT LAND PROVISION	✓	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21	<p>UDP Policy EC1 states that the Council will endeavour to ensure that a comprehensive range of employment sites is identified to meet the future needs of manufacturing and service employers.</p> <p>One of the NPPF's key aims for securing sustainable development is to contribute towards the delivery of a strong, responsive and competitive economy by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation and UDP Policy EC1 is consistent with this approach.</p>
	EC1/1 – Land for Business (B1), General Industrial (B2) and Warehousing Uses (B8)	✓	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21	<p>UDP Policy EC1/1 identifies land for Business (B1), General Industrial (B2) and Warehousing (B8) Uses.</p> <p>One of the NPPF's key aims for securing sustainable development is to contribute towards the delivery of a strong, responsive and competitive economy by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation and the remaining allocations made under EC1/1 is consistent with this approach.</p>
	EC1/2 – Land Suitable for Business (B1) and Office Use	✓	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23-27	<p>UDP Policy EC1/2 identifies a fourteen sites that are considered suitable for Business (B1) and Office Uses.</p> <p>The identification of sites under this Policy is consistent with the NPPF's key aims for securing</p>

				<p>sustainable development is to contribute towards the delivery of a strong, responsive and competitive economy by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation.</p> <p>A vast majority of the sites allocated for B1 or office uses under Policy EC1/2 are within town or district centres. Of those allocations that are yet to be developed, only EC1/2/4 – Land adjoining Olives Paper Mill is not within an existing town or district centre and an assessment of this site in conjunction with the Employment Land Review has, in any case, concluded that the site is unsuitable for its allocated purpose. Indeed, the site has an outstanding planning permission for residential development.</p> <p>With the exception of the above, the remaining sites identified under this Policy are also consistent with the NPPF's aim of ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p>
	<p>EC1/3 – Land Suitable for Business (B1), Office and Hotel/Conference Facility Uses</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21</p>	<p>UDP Policy EC1/3 identifies three sites that are considered suitable for business (B1), office uses and hotel/conference facilities. Development for other business and industrial uses will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances and in accordance with other policies and proposals of the Plan.</p> <p>Two of the three sites (Knowsley Street and Crostons Road) have now been developed. The remaining site identified under this Policy is Bury Ground (Chamberhall) which, in the context of the NPPF occupies an edge-of-centre location. Chamberhall is one of the Borough's strategic locations for business and office development and this intention is being maintained within the emerging Core Strategy.</p> <p>The scale and strategic importance of the Chamberhall site means that there are no more central sites capable of accommodating this</p>

			<p>scale of B1/office development. Consequently, the promotion of the Chamberhall site for offices and business uses is considered to be consistent with paragraph 23 of the NPPF which specifies that LPAs should allocated appropriate edge of centre sites for main town centre uses that are well connected to the town centre where suitable and viable town centre sites are not available. The allocation will also support the NPPF's aim to enhance the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>However, Policy EC1/3 also supports the provision of a hotel/conference facility at Chamberhall. Hotels are identified within the NPPF as a 'Main Town Centre Use'. Paragraph 24 of the NPPF on specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres, then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.</p> <p>Paragraph 27 of the NPPF specifies that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test it should be refused.</p> <p>In light of the above, if a proposal for a hotel/conference facility were to come forward on the Chamberhall site consideration should be given as to whether there are any more sequentially preferable sites within the town centre as required by paragraph 24 of the NPPF.</p>
--	--	--	--

<p>EC2</p>	<p>EXISTING INDUSTRIAL AREAS AND PREMISES</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 (with SPD14)</p>	<p>UDP Policy EC2 states that the Council will seek to retain existing industrial areas and premises in employment uses, where appropriate.</p> <p>This approach is consistent with the NPPF's aim of building a strong, responsive and competitive economy and, particularly when following the approach set out in SPD14, avoid the long term protection of employment sites where there is no realistic prospect of a site being used for that purpose.</p>
	<p>EC2/1 – Employment Generating Areas</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22</p>	<p>UDP Policy EC2/1 states that in the defined Employment Generating Areas, as identified on the Proposals Map, the Council will only allow development for the uses specified. Other uses will only be permitted where they constitute limited development or do not substantially detract from an area's value as an Employment Generating Area. The Policy identifies a number of EGAs covering the Borough's main concentrations of employment use.</p> <p>This approach is consistent with the NPPF's aim of building a strong, responsive and competitive economy and, in potentially allowing the loss of employment sites in instances where this would not substantially detract from the area's value as an EGA, allows for the avoidance of long term protection of employment sites where there is no realistic prospect of a site being used for that purpose.</p>
	<p>EC2/2 – Employment Land and Premises Outside the Employment Generating Areas</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 (with SPD14)</p>	<p>UDP Policy EC2/2 states that the Council will seek the retention of existing employment land and premises outside the Employment Generating Areas except where it can be clearly demonstrated that an existing employment site or premises is no longer suited in land use terms to continued employment use. In such circumstances consideration will be given to alternative development providing it does not conflict with the character of the surrounding area and other policies and proposals of the</p>

				<p>Plan.</p> <p>This approach is consistent with the NPPF's aim of building a strong, responsive and competitive economy and, particularly when following the approach set out in SPD14, avoids the long term protection of employment sites where there is no realistic prospect of a site being used for that purpose.</p>
EC3	IMPROVEMENT OF OLDER INDUSTRIAL AREAS AND PREMISES	✓	21	<p>UDP Policy EC3 states that the Council will seek and encourage improvements to the environment and infrastructure of older industrial areas and improvements to the quality of industrial premises.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 21 of the NPPF which specifies that LPAs should identify priority areas for economic regeneration, infrastructure provision and environmental improvements.</p>
	EC3/1 – Measures to Improve Industrial Areas	✓	21	<p>UDP Policy EC3/1 sets out the measures that the Council will be especially concerned with and will encourage in terms of improving older industrial areas and premises.</p> <p>This is particularly consistent with paragraph 21 of the NPPF which specifies that LPAs should identify priority areas for economic regeneration, infrastructure provision and environmental improvements.</p>
EC4	SMALL AND GROWING BUSINESSES	✓	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21	<p>UDP Policy EC4 states that the Council will ensure that the needs of small and growing businesses are met by looking favourably on proposals for such developments, where these do not conflict with other policies and proposals of the Plan.</p> <p>This approach is consistent with the NPPF's aim of building a strong, responsive and competitive economy and the need for local planning authorities to support existing expanding business sectors.</p>

	EC4/1 – Small Businesses	✓	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21	<p>UDP Policy EC4/1 specifies that proposals for small businesses will be acceptable when the scale of development is appropriate to, and the use is environmentally compatible with, the surrounding area in which it is to be located, and where they do not conflict with other policies and proposals of the Plan.</p> <p>This approach is consistent with the NPPF's aim of building a strong, responsive and competitive economy and the need for local planning authorities to support existing expanding business sectors.</p> <p>Consideration of the impact of proposals for small businesses is also consistent with the NPPF's core planning principle of securing good standards of amenity.</p>
EC5	OFFICES	✓	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23	<p>UDP Policy EC5 states that the Council is concerned to attract new office development and will support proposals for such development in appropriate locations.</p> <p>This approach is consistent with the NPPF's aim of building a strong, responsive and competitive economy.</p> <p>The Policies and allocations set out under Policy EC5 seek to attract new office development in sustainable locations, such as town and district centres and to restrict office development in out-of-centre locations to small scale local provision, conversion schemes which would enable the retention of historic assets and home working. This is consistent with the economic aims of the NPPF as well as the 'town centres first' approach.</p>
	EC5/1 – Office Development in Bury Town Centre	✓	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23	<p>UDP Policy EC5/1 states that as a sub-regional centre the main location for new office developments will be Bury Town Centre. The Policy identifies a series of specific sites that are considered suitable for office development.</p>

				<p>This approach is consistent with the NPPF's aim of building a strong, responsive and competitive economy.</p> <p>In addition, given that the Policy seeks to promote office development in Bury town centre, it is consistent with paragraph 23 of the NPPF and its requirement that planning policies should be positive and promote competitive town centre environments and for LPAs to allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale of office development needed in town centres.</p>
	EC5/2 – Other Centres and Preferred Office Locations	✓	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23	<p>UDP Policy EC5/2 relates to other centres and preferred office locations and states that the Council will look favourably on office developments in town and district centres and those sites identified as suitable for office use in Economy Policies EC1/2 and EC1/3. The Policy identifies a series of specific sites that are considered suitable for office development.</p> <p>This approach is consistent with the NPPF's aim of building a strong, responsive and competitive economy.</p> <p>In addition, given that the Policy seeks to promote office development town and district centres, it is consistent with paragraph 23 of the NPPF and its requirement that planning policies should be positive and promote competitive town centre environments and for LPAs to allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale of office development needed in town centres.</p>
	EC5/3 – Other Office Locations	✓/x	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23-27	<p>UDP Policy EC5/3 states that outside town and district centres, and sites identified for office use, development for further office uses will not be permitted except for:</p> <p>a) small scale developments providing a direct service to a local area;</p> <p>b) refurbishment or conversion proposals which</p>

				<p>would result in the retention of buildings of architectural or historic interest;</p> <p>c) proposals for office-type home working where existing residential amenity would not be adversely affected.</p> <p>This approach is generally consistent with the NPPF's aim of building a strong, responsive and competitive economy.</p> <p>However, the NPPF makes no distinction in terms of the scale or type of office development that may be acceptable in out-of-centre locations. Paragraph 24 of the NPPF specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres, then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.</p> <p>Paragraph 27 of the NPPF specifies that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test it should be refused.</p>
EC6	NEW BUSINESS, INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT	✓	17, 58, 59	<p>UDP Policy EC6 states that the Council will seek to ensure that new business, industrial and commercial development is of a suitably acceptable design and does not have a significantly detrimental effect on the surrounding environment and amenity.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 17 of the NPPF which specifies that planning should seek to secure high quality design and a good standard</p>

				<p>of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.</p> <p>Similarly, paragraph 58 specifies that local plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area and in paragraph 59 it states that design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription and concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access.</p>
	EC6/1 – Assessing New Business, Industrial and Commercial Development	✓	17, 58, 59	<p>UDP Policy EC6/1 states that all new business, industrial and commercial development will be expected to be of a high standard of design and appearance and to take account of the surrounding environment, amenity and the safety of employees, visitors and adjacent occupiers. The Policy includes a series of specific criteria relating to what will be specifically considered in assessing the design and environmental impact of such development.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 17 of the NPPF which specifies that planning should seeks to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.</p> <p>Similarly, paragraph 58 specifies that local plans should develop robust and comprehensive policies that set out the quality of development that will be expected for the area and in paragraph 59 it states that design policies should avoid unnecessary prescription and concentrate on guiding the overall scale, density, massing, height, landscape, layout, materials and access.</p>
	EC6/2 – Hazardous Installations	✓	172	<p>UDP Policy EC6/2 states that , in the interest of safety, the Council will ensure that hazardous installations, which pose a risk to the surrounding population, are separated from</p>

				<p>sensitive land uses such as housing.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF which specifies that planning policies should be based on up-to-date information on the location of major hazards</p>
--	--	--	--	---

HOUSING

	EXISTING POLICY	NPPF COMPLIANT (Y/N)	NPPF PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS
H1	HOUSING LAND PROVISION	✓	7, 17, 47, 48	<p>UDP Policy H1 specifies that the Council will ensure that sufficient land is identified to allow for the development of 7,200 new dwellings within the period mid-1986 to mid- 2001.</p> <p>The principle of making provision for housing land is consistent with the NPPF but the specific numbers indicated in the Policy have been superseded by on-going monitoring of housing land.</p>
	H1/1 – Housing Land Allocations	✓	7, 14, 17, 47, 48, 50	<p>The UDP policy allocates a number of sites for residential use and the vast majority of these have already come forward. The remaining allocations would provide limited housing growth but the sites are nevertheless suitable for residential development and in general conformity with the NPPF. They will be considered as part of the Site Allocations DPD to determine whether or not they should be re-allocated, providing they are not developed in the meantime.</p>
	H1/2 – Further Housing Development	✓	7, 14, 17, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 159	<p>This UDP policy sets out a criteria based approach to assess planning applications on sites that are not allocated. The policy generally allows for sites to come forward to help deliver housing growth provided the sites are in sustainable locations and are not protected for alternative uses (e.g. employment, Green Belt, recreation land etc). The policy is flexible enough to consider sites on their own merits and generally conforms with the NPPF principles of delivering housing growth sustainably.</p>

	H1/3 – Provision for Gypsies and Travellers	✓	10, 11, (of separate guidance)	Separate guidance has been issued for national policy on Traveller Sites. The current UDP policy sets out a criteria based approach to assessing planning applications for such accommodation. This is generally in line with the new guidance, which suggests that, as a minimum, development plan documents should have a criteria based policy. The Council intends to produce a separate DPD for such accommodation as part of the Local Plan.
H2	HOUSING ENVIRONMENT AND DESIGN	✓	17, 56, 57, 60, 64	UDP Policy H2 states that the Council will encourage good design in all residential development. This is consistent with the NPPF's requirement for good design in the built environment.
	H2/1 – The Form of New Residential Development	✓	17, 56, 57, 60, 64	The UDP policy is a general design policy that requires good designs in new residential developments and that local character is not adversely affected by new developments. This is generally in accordance with the NPPF.
	H2/2 – The Layout of New Residential Development	✓	17, 56, 57, 60, 64	The UDP policy is a general design policy that requires good designs in new residential developments and that local character is not adversely affected by new developments. This is generally in accordance with the NPPF.
	H2/3 – Extensions and Alterations	✓	17, 56, 57, 60, 64	The UDP policy relates to small extensions to residential buildings, which is not generally covered by national planning guidance. However, the design principles set out in the NPPF are intended to relate to all new developments (including extensions and alterations to existing buildings) and the UDP is generally in accordance with the NPPF, albeit related to small scale developments.

	H2/4 – Conversions	✓	14, 17, 49, 50, 51, 56, 57, 60, 64	The UDP policy supports the conversion of existing buildings to residential development subject to suitability and details. The current policy is general in line with the NPPF's emphasis on the promotion of housing growth and also in relation to key design principles.
	H2/5 – Conversions of Residential Property to Hotels and Guest Houses	✓	17, 56, 57, 60, 64	The UDP seeks to ensure that the amenity of local residents and the local character of areas (where important) are not harmed by the conversion of existing residential buildings to hotels/guest houses. This policy is generally in line with the NPPF's emphasis on good design principles but is more of a localised policy to deal with any local problems that may arise from a concentration of such uses.
	H2/6 – Garden and Backland Development	✓	14, 17, 49, 50, 51, 56, 57, 60, 64	The UDP policy supports the development of garden and backland development subject to suitability and details. The NPPF does suggest that local authorities should consider whether or not to restrict the development of garden areas where it is considered that such developments would cause harm to the local area and it does not allow such schemes to be included in any windfall allowances. The Council has considered this issue and has concluded that this is not a problem locally and each site will continue to be considered on its own merits, against the current H2/6 Policy and other policies relating to design and layout and impact on local buildings/character/amenity. The current policy is general in line with the NPPF's emphasis on ensuring that such developments does not cause harm to the local area and this issue is considered on a site by site basis rather than a blanket policy to prevent such proposals. It also helps with the housing growth agenda in the NPPF.

H3	INCOMPATIBLE USES IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS	✓	17	<p>UDP Policy H3 states that the Council will not permit the development of incompatible uses in areas which are primarily residential in nature and where possible will seek to resolve existing conflicts.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF's aim to secure good standards of amenity.</p>
	H3/1 – Assessing Non-Conforming Uses	✓	14, 17, 56, 57, 58	<p>This policy generally seeks to ensure that proposals for incompatible uses within residential areas are restricted because of the harm that they are likely to have on the local area, in terms of amenity and character. This policy is generally in conformity with NPPF's emphasis in its design policies of new developments positively contributing to making places better for people.</p>
	H3/2 – Existing Incompatible Uses	✓	14, 17, 56, 57, 58	<p>This policy generally seeks to remove incompatible uses from within residential areas because of the harm that they have on the local area, in terms of local amenity and character. The nature of Bury means that residential areas are often located alongside industrial uses and the policy seeks to exploit opportunities to remove any conflicts between such uses through planning applications etc. This policy is generally in conformity with NPPF's emphasis in its design policies of new developments positively contributing to making places better for people.</p>
H4	HOUSING NEED	✓	14, 17, 47, 50, 54	<p>UDP Policy H4 specifies that the Council will encourage the provision of a range of housing types and tenures as appropriate to the housing needs of the Borough.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF which suggests that local plans should meet full, objectively assessed needs.</p>

	H4/1 – Affordable Housing	✓	14, 17, 47, 50, 54	This policy seeks to deliver affordable housing in large residential developments. It is supported by SPD on affordable housing requirements. The Policy is in conformity with the NPPF which suggests that authorities should seek to meet their full needs for affordable housing.
	H4/2 – Special Needs Housing	✓	14, 17, 47, 50, 54	This policy seeks to support proposals for special needs housing on suitable sites. The Policy is in conformity with the NPPF which suggests that authorities should seek to meet their full needs for housing, which will include specialised housing for those households whose needs are not met by mainstream housing.
H5	HOUSING IMPROVEMENT	✓	17	UDP Policy H5 states that the Council will continue to support the improvement of the housing stock and its environment. This is consistent with the NPPF's aim of securing good standards of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

ENVIRONMENT

	EXISTING POLICY	NPPF COMPLIANT (Y/N)	NPPF PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS
EN1	ENVIRONMENT	✓	7, 17, 58	<p>Policy EN1 seeks to protect, preserve and enhance the character, appearance and amenity of the Borough's built environment. The NPPF seeks to secure a high quality design and good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. More specifically, it requires new developments to respond to local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation.</p> <p>This Policy is therefore considered to be consistent with the NPPF.</p>
	EN1/1 – Visual Amenity	✓	7, 17, 58	<p>Policy EN1/1 seeks to ensure that new development does not adversely affect visual amenity in terms of views of prominent or important buildings and the visual amenity within or viewed from areas of environmental interest. This considered to be consistent with the NPPF's aim to secure high standards of design and amenity as described under para 17 and section 7.</p>
	EN1/2 – Townscape and Built Design	✓	7, 17, 56-68	<p>Policy EN1/2 states that the Council will give favourable consideration to proposals which do not have an unacceptable adverse effect on the particular character and townscape of the Borough's towns, villages and other settlements and sets out a number of factors that will be considered with the aim of ensuring that development is acceptable. This approach is consistent with the NPPF's requirement for good design as set out under para 17 and in section 7.</p>

	EN1/3 – Landscaping Provision	✓	7, 17, 58 (Bullet 6)	Policy EN1/3 relates to landscaping provision in new development and states that development proposals will be required to make provision for incidental open space and landscaping to the Council's satisfaction. This is consistent with the NPPF's requirement for good standards of design, amenity and landscaping as set out under paras 17 and 58.
	EN1/4 – Street Furniture	✓	7, 17, 58	Policy EN1/4 specifies that the Council will encourage the provision of suitably located and well designed street furniture which satisfies the requirements of pedestrians, shoppers and other users, and enhances the character and appearance of the urban street scene, including open spaces. This is consistent with the NPPF's requirement for good standards of design, amenity and landscaping as set out under paras 17 and 58.
	EN1/5 – Crime Prevention	✓	7, 58 (Bullet 5)	Policy EN1/5 states that the Council will encourage development proposals which include environmentally sensitive design features aimed at discouraging crime. This is consistent with the NPPF's requirement to create safe and accessible environments where crime and disorder and the fear of crime do not undermine quality of life and community cohesion.
	EN1/6 – Public Art	✓	7, 17, 58	Policy EN1/6 states that the Council will encourage the incorporation of works of art in appropriate new developments in order to enliven the street scene and promote a sense of well being. This is consistent with the NPPF's requirement for good standards of design and amenity as set out under paras 17 and 58.

	EN1/7 – Throughroutes and Gateways	✓	7, 17, 58	Policy EN1/7 states that the Council is concerned to improve the quality of development along throughroutes and at gateways, and will require new proposals fronting major throughroutes and at the identified gateways to display a high standard of design and landscaping. This is consistent with the NPPF's requirement for good standards of design, amenity and landscaping as set out under paras 17 and 58.
	EN1/8 – Shop Fronts	✓	7, 17, 58	Policy EN1/8 states that the Council will seek to ensure that proposals for new and altered shop fronts properly respect the architectural elements of the building and the character of the surrounding street scene. Proposals which are unsympathetic to the building or its surroundings or which break up a harmonious group of buildings will not be permitted. This is consistent with the NPPF's requirement for good standards of design and amenity as set out under paras 17 and 58.
	EN1/9 – Advertisements	✓	7, 17, 58, 67	Policy EN1/9 states that the Council will seek to control advertisements in the interests of amenity and public safety in order to enhance the quality of the Borough's environment. This is consistent with the NPPF's requirement for good standards of design and amenity as set out under paras 17 and 58 as well as the specific reference to advertising under para 67.
	EN1/10 – Telecommunications	✓	7, 17, 42-46, 58	Policy EN1/10 states that the Council will give favourable consideration to proposals for new telecommunications developments whilst having regard to operational and legal requirements and its siting, design and visual impact. This is consistent with the NPPF's requirement for good standards of design and amenity as set out under paras 17 and 58 and accords with the requirement to support high quality communications infrastructure under section 5.

	EN1/11 – Public Utility Infrastructure	✓	177	<p>UDP Policy EN1/11 specifies that the development of operational facilities for public utility provision will be permitted where this is necessary to implement the development objectives of this Plan or to meet relevant statutory obligations and environmental standards, and is consistent with other policies and proposals of the Plan.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF which specifies that It is important to ensure that there is a reasonable prospect that planned infrastructure is deliverable in a timely fashion.</p>
EN2	CONSERVATION AND LISTED BUILDINGS	✓	7, 17, 58, Section 12	<p>Policy EN2 states that the Council will seek to preserve the Borough's built heritage through the control of development, especially that affecting Conservation Areas, Listed Buildings and areas of local historical importance. This is consistent with the NPPF's core planning principles relating to design and amenity and preserving heritage assets and the aim to conserve and enhance the historic environment as set out under section 12.</p>
	EN2/1 – Character of Conservation Areas	✓	7, 17, 58, Section 12	<p>Policy EN2/1 states that the Council will take action as appropriate to preserve or enhance the character or appearance of the Borough's Conservation Areas. This is consistent with the NPPF's core planning principles relating to design and amenity and preserving heritage assets and the aim to conserve and enhance the historic environment as set out under section 12.</p>
	EN2/2 – Conservation Area Control	✓	7, 17, 58, Section 12	<p>Policy EN2/2 states that development within a Conservation Area will only be acceptable if it preserves or enhances the special character or appearance of the area. This is consistent with the NPPF's core planning principles relating to design and amenity and preserving heritage assets and the aim to conserve and enhance the historic environment as set out under section 12.</p>

	EN2/3 – Listed Buildings	✓	7, 17, 58, Section 12	Policy EN2/3 states that the Council will actively safeguard the character and setting of Listed Buildings by not permitting works, alterations or changes of use which would have a detrimental effect on their historical or architectural character and features. This is consistent with the NPPF's core planning principles relating to design and amenity and preserving heritage assets and the aim to conserve and enhance the historic environment as set out under section 12.
	EN2/4 – Historic Parks	✓	7, 17, Section 12	Policy EN2/4 states that the Council will ensure the protection of Philips Park as a registered park of historic interest, together with any other parks and gardens which may be identified in the future as being of historic interest. This is consistent with the NPPF's aim to conserve and enhance the historic environment as set out under section 12.
EN3	ARCHAEOLOGY	✓	7, 17, Section 12	Policy EN3 states that the Council recognises the importance of archaeological remains as part of the Borough's heritage and will seek the protection of sites of archaeological importance as and where they are found. This is consistent with the NPPF's aim to conserve and enhance the historic environment as set out under section 12.
	EN3/1 – Impact of Development on Archaeological Sites	✓	7, 17, Section 12	Policy EN3/1 states that where a development proposal is submitted which will affect an archaeological site, the developer should submit sufficient information on the potential impact of the development to allow the Council to make a full and proper investigation into its archaeological consequences. This is consistent with the NPPF's aim to conserve and enhance the historic environment as set out under section 12.

	EN3/2 – Development Affecting Archaeological Sites	✓	7, 17, Section 12	Policy EN3/2 seeks to ensure, via a series of measures, that development proposals would not adversely affect archaeological sites. This is consistent with the NPPF's aim to conserve and enhance the historic environment as set out under section 12.
	EN3/3 – Ancient Monuments	✓	7, 17, Section 12	Policy EN3/3 states that the Council will not permit development proposals which would adversely affect current and future scheduled ancient monuments and their settings. This is consistent with the NPPF's aim to conserve and enhance the historic environment as set out under section 12.
EN4	ENERGY CONSERVATION	✓	7, 17 (Bullet 6), 93, 95-98	Policy EN4 encourages development which contributes to energy conservation. This is in compliance with the NPPF which supports the transition to a low carbon future and encourages the reuse of existing resources, supports energy efficiency improvements to existing buildings and encourages the use of renewable resources.
	EN4/1 – Renewable Energy	✓	7, 17 (Bullet 6), 93, 95-98	Policy EN4/1 encourages proposals for the provision of renewable energy sources subject to compliance with other policies in the plan. This is in compliance with the NPPF which supports the transition to a low carbon future and encourages the use of renewable resources.
	EN4/2 – Energy Efficiency	✓	7, 17 (Bullet 6), 30, 93, 95	Policy EN4/2 encourages energy efficiency in development proposals by guiding and controlling the location and form of development that takes place. This is in compliance with the NPPF which encourages solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion, therefore supporting a pattern of development which facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport.

EN5	FLOOD PROTECTION AND DEFENCE	✓	7, 17 (Bullet 6), 100	Policy EN5 seeks to guide development away from areas that may be at risk from flooding and to restrict development that would itself increase the risk of flooding. This is in conformity with the NPPF which states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk.
	EN5/1 – New Development and Flood Risk	✓	7, 17 (Bullet 6), 100	Policy EN5/1 seeks to ensure that new development or the intensification of existing development is not at risk from flooding and does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. This is in conformity with the NPPF which states that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas at highest risk.
EN6	CONSERVATION OF THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT		7, 17 (Bullet 7), 109, 113, 114, 117, 118	Policy EN6 states that the Council will retain, protect and enhance the natural environment of the Borough, particularly in relation to areas of ecological, wildlife and geological importance. This approach is consistent with the NPPF's core planning principle of conserving and enhancing the natural environment as set out in para 17 and section 11.
	EN6/1 – Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (SSSIs, NNRs and Grade A SBIs)	✓	7, 17 (Bullet 7), 109, 113, 114, 117, 118	UDP policies EN6/1-5 aim to minimise the impact of development on biodiversity and geodiversity. This approach is consistent with the NPPF's core planning principle of conserving and enhancing the natural environment as set out in para 17 and section 11.
	EN6/2 – Sites of Nature Conservation Interest (LNRs and Grade B and C SBIs)	✓	7, 17 (Bullet 7), 109, 113, 114, 117, 118	UDP policies EN6/1-5 aim to minimise the impact of development on biodiversity and geodiversity. This approach is consistent with the NPPF's core planning principle of conserving and enhancing the natural environment as set out in para 17 and section 11.

	EN6/3 – Features of Ecological Value	✓	7, 17 (Bullet 7), 109, 113, 114, 117, 118	UDP policies EN6/1-5 aim to minimise the impact of development on biodiversity and geodiversity. This approach is consistent with the NPPF's core planning principle of conserving and enhancing the natural environment as set out in para 17 and section 11.
	EN6/4 – Wildlife Links and Corridors	✓	7, 17 (Bullet 7), 109, 113, 114, 117, 118	UDP policies EN6/1-5 aim to minimise the impact of development on biodiversity and geodiversity. This approach is consistent with the NPPF's core planning principle of conserving and enhancing the natural environment as set out in para 17 and section 11.
	EN6/5 – Sites of Geological Interest	✓	7, 17 (Bullet 7), 109, 113, 117	UDP policies EN6/1-5 aim to minimise the impact of development on biodiversity and geodiversity. This approach is consistent with the NPPF's core planning principle of conserving and enhancing the natural environment as set out in para 17 and section 11.
EN7	POLLUTION CONTROL		7, 17, 109, 110, 120, 121, 122, 124	Policy EN7 states that the Council will seek to control environmental nuisance and minimise pollution levels associated with development by limiting the environmental impact of pollution. This is considered to be consistent with the NPPF in that pollution control is one of the integral aspects of securing sustainable development and is one of the core planning principles. It is also consistent with the approach to controlling pollution as set out in section 11 of the NPPF.
	EN7/1 – Atmospheric Pollution	✓	7, 17, 109, 110, 120, 121, 122, 124	Policy EN7/1 seeks to keep air pollution within target limits. This is considered to be consistent with the NPPF in that pollution control is one of the integral aspects of securing sustainable development and is one of the core planning principles. It is also consistent with the approach to controlling pollution as set out in section 11 of the NPPF.

	EN7/2 – Noise Pollution	✓	7, 17, 109, 110, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124	Policy EN7/2 seeks to avoid adverse effects of noise pollution. This is considered to be consistent with the NPPF in that pollution control is one of the integral aspects of securing sustainable development and is one of the core planning principles. It is also consistent with the approach to controlling pollution as set out in section 11 of the NPPF.
	EN7/3 – Water Pollution	✓	7, 17, 109, 110, 120, 121, 122, 124	Policy EN7/3 states that the Council will not permit development which would have an unacceptable adverse effect in terms of pollution upon the water quality of the Borough's water courses and other water features. This is considered to be consistent with the NPPF in that pollution control is one of the integral aspects of securing sustainable development and is one of the core planning principles. It is also consistent with the approach to controlling pollution as set out in section 11 of the NPPF.
	EN7/4 – Groundwater Protection	✓	7, 17, 109, 110, 120, 121, 122, 124	Policy EN7/4 states that the Council will not permit development proposals which would have an unacceptable adverse effect on groundwater resources, particularly in terms of their quality and/or supply. This is considered to be consistent with the NPPF in that pollution control is one of the integral aspects of securing sustainable development and is one of the core planning principles. It is also consistent with the approach to controlling pollution as set out in section 11 of the NPPF.
	EN7/5 – Waste Water Management	✓	7, 17, 109, 110, 120, 121, 122, 124	Policy EN7/5 aims to ensure proper management of waste water. This is considered to be consistent with the NPPF in that pollution control is one of the integral aspects of securing sustainable development and is one of the core planning principles. It is also consistent with the approach to controlling pollution as set out in section 11 of the NPPF.

EN8	WOODLAND AND TREES	✓	7, 17 (Bullets 4 and 7), 109, 114	Policy EN8 states that the Council will support the retention of trees, woods, copses and hedgerows and encourage natural regeneration and new and replacement tree planting throughout the Borough. This is consistent with the NPPF's aims to achieve good standards of amenity as well as conserving and enhancing the natural environment.
	EN8/1 – Tree Preservation Orders	✓	7, 17 (Bullets 4 and 7), 118	Policy EN8/1 sets out the Council's intention to use TPOs to protect important trees. This is consistent with the NPPF's aims to achieve good standards of amenity as well as conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Para 118 bullet 5 particularly advocate protection of ancient woodland and veteran trees.
	EN8/2 – Woodland and Tree Planting	✓	7, 17 (Bullets 4 and 7), 109, 114	Policy EN8/2 states that the Council will support and encourage new woodland and tree planting in the Borough. In considering development proposals, the Council will encourage the planting of hedges, trees and woodlands using locally native species. This is consistent with the NPPF's aims to achieve good standards of amenity as well as conserving and enhancing the natural environment.
	EN8/3 – Red Rose Forest	✓	7, 17 (Bullets 4 and 7), 92, 109, 114	Policy EN8/3 supports the work of the Greater Manchester Community Forest. This is consistent with the NPPF's aims to achieve good standards of amenity as well as conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Furthermore, para 92 of the NPPF specifically supports the development of community forests.
EN9	LANDSCAPE	✓	17, 81, 99, 109, 113	Policy EN9 states that the Council will seek to protect, conserve and improve the landscape quality of the Borough, and will encourage the enhancement of landscapes, where appropriate. This is consistent with the NPPF's aims to achieve good standards of design and amenity as well as conserving and enhancing the natural environment.

	EN9/1 – Special Landscape Area	✓	17, 58, 81, 99, 109, 113	Policy EN9/1 states that in those areas identified on the Proposals Map as Special Landscape Areas, any development which is permitted will be strictly controlled and required to be sympathetic to its surroundings in terms of its visual impact. High standards of design, siting and landscaping will be expected. Unduly obtrusive development will not be permitted in such areas. This is consistent with the NPPF's aims to achieve good standards of design and amenity as well as conserving and enhancing the natural environment.
EN10	ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT	✓	17, 109, 111	Policy EN10 states that the Council will seek to improve the environmental quality of the Borough, within which priority will be given to an on-going environmental improvement programme. This is consistent with the NPPF's core planning principle to achieve good amenity and with its aim to enhance the local environment through remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land and re-using previously-developed land.
	EN10/1 – Derelict Land	✓	17, 109, 111	Policy EN10/1 states that the Council will encourage the reclamation and beneficial use of derelict land by the public and private sectors, including the redevelopment of derelict sites in accordance with the Council's programme for derelict land reclamation. This is consistent with the NPPF's core planning principle to achieve good amenity and with its aim to enhance the local environment through remediating and mitigating despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated and unstable land and re-using previously-developed land.

	EN10/2 – Riverside and Canalside Improvement in Urban Areas	✓	17, 58, 69, 70, 73, 109, 111, 114,	Policy EN10/2 states that when considering new proposals for development adjoining and adjacent to rivers and canals in the urban area, the Council will, where appropriate, require schemes to include improvements to waterside areas, including tree planting, provision of waterside walks and the refurbishment or clearance of redundant buildings and other structures. This is considered to be consistent with the NPPF – particularly in terms of achieving good amenity and design; improving access to high quality open spaces; improving biodiversity and green infrastructure; and re-using previously-developed land.
--	---	---	------------------------------------	---

OPEN LAND

	EXISTING POLICY	NPPF COMPLIANT (Y/N)	NPPF PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS
OL1	GREEN BELT	✓	80, 81	<p>Policy OL1 states that the Council will maintain a Green Belt, ensuring that it fulfils the five strategic purposes of Green Belt. The NPPF has maintained the specific purposes of Green Belt.</p> <p>Whilst the justification to the Policy draws on PPG2, the Policy itself remains relevant and in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>The justification highlights that Green Belt has a positive role to play in fulfilling a number of land use objectives. This is carried forward in the NPPF for the most part except for the objective of retaining land in agricultural, forestry and related uses. However, these uses are still considered to be appropriate in the Green Belt under Para 89.</p>
	OL1/1 – Designation of Green Belt	✓	79-86	<p>Policy OL1/2 states that the Council will operate development control policies over a Green Belt as delineated on the Proposals Map. Para 79 in particular reinforces the Government’s aim of preventing urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. Therefore maintenance of the extent of the Green Belt is compliant with the NPPF.</p>
	OL1/2 – New Development in the Green Belt	✓/x	89	<p>Policy OL1/2’s aim of restricting new inappropriate development within the Green Belt is consistent with paragraph 89 of the NPPF.</p> <p>However, there are slight variances in the definition of the types of development that are excluded, in particular:</p> <p>a) Agriculture and forestry buildings - covered by the NPPF but does not exclude instances where permitted development rights have been withdrawn.</p>

				<p>b) Essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation - The NPPF has downgraded 'essential' to 'appropriate'. The consequence of this is that the previous guidance on essential facilities e.g. small stables or changing rooms is no longer valid and what is 'appropriate' is more open to interpretation (albeit that it is subject to impacts on openness).</p> <p>c) Limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings – Policy OL1/2 is more restrictive than Para 89 of the NPPF. The word 'limited' is not in the NPPF, although the message is essentially the same as extensions and alterations must not represent disproportionate additions. However, the remit has been widened in the NPPF from 'dwellings' to 'buildings' and therefore no use is now specified - except in the case of replacement dwellings where the new building must be in the same use as the original building.</p> <p>d) Limited infilling in existing villages under Policy OL1/3 – This is consistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>Essentially, the exceptions set out under para 89 of the NPPF should take precedence over criteria (a) to (d) of UDP Policy OL1/2.</p>
	OL1/3 – Infilling in Existing Villages in the Green Belt	✓	17, 58, 89	<p>Policy OL1/3 states that in all named villages which lie within the Green Belt, limited infill development may be permitted, provided that it is in scale with the village and would not adversely affect its character or surroundings. The thrust of the policy is in line with para 89 of the NPPF in the context of limited infilling on villages. The Policy's requirement for development to be of an appropriate scale and in keeping with its character and surroundings is supported by the NPPF's core planning principle of achieving good design and amenity and the need for development to respond to local character and history.</p>
	OL1/4 – Conversion and Re-use of Buildings in the Green Belt	✓	17, 32, 58, 90, 118	<p>Policy OL1/4 specifies that the conversion and re-use of buildings in the Green Belt is not</p>

				<p>inappropriate provided that it satisfies a series of criteria. This general policy approach is considered to be consistent with paragraph 90 of the NPPF which specifies that the re-use of buildings that are of permanent and substantial construction are not inappropriate provided that they maintain the openness of the Green Belt and do not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.</p> <p>Criteria (a) and (b) of Policy OL1/4 are concerned with maintaining the openness of the Green Belt and not conflicting with the purposes of including land within the Green Belt and this is consistent with para 90.</p> <p>Criterion (c) required the re-use of buildings to be limited to those of permanent and substantial construction and this is consistent with the fourth bullet under para 90.</p> <p>Criterion (d) to (g) are concerned with matters other than Green Belt but which are still considered to be consistent with other areas of the NPPF.</p> <p>In particular, criterion (d) considers the form, bulk and general design of buildings which is a requirement under paras 17 and 58 of the NPPF. Criteria (e) relates to access and traffic generation which is consistent with para 32 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Criterion (f) relates to the provision of necessary services without extensive works and this could potentially be covered by a range of topics</p> <p>Criterion (g) relates to the need to consider any impacts on protected species which is consistent with para 118 of the NPPF.</p>
	<p>OL1/5 – Mineral Extraction and Other Development in the Green Belt</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>79, 80, 90, 144</p>	<p>Policy OL1/5 covers all other forms of development in the Green Belt stating that this should maintain openness and not conflict with the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. This is consistent with the NPPF approach towards Green Belt. Policy OL1/5 also covers minerals extraction and states that this not conflict with the purposes of including land in the</p>

				Green Belt, and high environmental standards will be maintained and the site well restored. This is also consistent with the NPPF's approach towards minerals extraction in the Green Belt (para 90) as well as its more general approach towards facilitating the sustainable use of minerals (para 144).
	OL1/6 – Reuse/Redevelopment of Clifton House, Prestwich	✓	17, 89, 118	<p>Policy OL1/6 supports the designation of a 'Major Developed Site in the Green Belt' at Clifton House. Whilst there is no specific reference to 'major developed sites in the Green Belt' in the NPPF, the general aim of Policy OL1/6 is to maintain the openness of the Green Belt and to ensure that any development does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.</p> <p>The NPPF deals with the redevelopment of existing developed sites within the Green Belt under the 6th bullet of para 89. This effectively identifies the limited infilling or the partial or complete redevelopment of previously developed sites (brownfield land) whether redundant or in continuing use as appropriate, provided that this does not adversely affect the openness of the Green Belt or the purposes of including land within it. Whilst the NPPF now covers ANY brownfield sites within the Green Belt and not just major developed sites, the principle of re-using or redeveloping Clifton House is consistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>Criterion (i) of Policy OL1/6 specifies that while the healthcare secure unit remains on the site, the re-use or redevelopment of the site could only be for healthcare purposes. OL1/6 states that other uses would only be considered if the secure unit ceases to operate from the site. Whilst the 6th bullet under para 89 of the NPPF makes no reference to the need to maintain an existing use, it is still considered an appropriate approach that is consistent with para 17 of the NPPF and the need to secure a high standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.</p>

				<p>Criteria (a) to (e) seek to ensure that any redevelopment of the site would not have a greater impact on the openness of the Green Belt or conflict with any of the purposes of including land within it. This is consistent with the 6th bullet under para 89.</p> <p>Criteria (f) requires consideration of the adjacent SBI and Wildlife Corridor and this is consistent with Para 118 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Criterion (g) states that any development on the site should have regard to any development brief drawn up for the site. No such brief has ever been done but if one were, it would be considered as a material consideration.</p>
OL2	OTHER PROTECTED OPEN LAND	✓	7, 17	<p>UDP Policy OL2 states that on open land outside the urban area, but not within the Green Belt and/or the river valleys, the Council will seek to retain the existing predominant use and character and will expect the land to remain for the most part undisturbed.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF's aim for the planning system to contribute to protecting and enhancing the natural environment and to take account of the different roles and character of different areas and promoting the vitality of our main urban areas.</p>
	OL2/1 – Development on Other Protected Open Land	✓	7, 17	<p>On all defined open land outside the urban area, but not within the Green Belt and/or river valleys (as shown on the Proposals Map), development will not be permitted for purposes other than:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) agriculture or forestry, or other uses appropriate to a rural area; b) outdoor recreational facilities, such as sports grounds, golf courses or country parks, together with ancillary buildings required in connection with these outdoor facilities; c) cemeteries and institutions standing in large grounds; d) development which is essential for the

				<p>protection of an established source of employment or required in connection with a bona fide rural enterprise;</p> <p>e) essential public utilities infrastructure;</p> <p>f) mineral workings, provided that high environmental standards are maintained and that the site is well restored.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF's aim for the planning system to contribute to protecting and enhancing the natural environment and to take account of the different roles and character of different areas and promoting the vitality of our main urban areas.</p>
OL3	URBAN OPEN SPACE	✓	17, 73, 74	<p>Policy OL3 states that the Council will seek to ensure that valuable areas of urban open space are retained wherever possible for their amenity value. This is consistent with the NPPF's core planning principle of securing a good standard of amenity. It is also consistent with the NPPF's recognition that access to high quality open spaces can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities and that such sites should not be built on.</p>
	OL3/1 – Protection of Urban Open Space	✓	17, 73, 74 , 109, 114, 118	<p>Policy OL3/1 focuses on protection of urban open space which provides value for visual amenity, wildlife habitats, corridors/links, recreation and buffering. This is consistent with the NPPF's core planning principles associated with achieving good levels of amenity, conserving and enhancing the natural environment and improving It is also consistent with the NPPF's recognition that access to high quality open spaces can make an important contribution to the health and well-being of communities and that such sites should not be built on as well as contributing towards the NPPF's objectives for Green Infrastructure and biodiversity.</p>
OL4	AGRICULTURE	✓/x	112	<p>Whilst UDP Policy OL4 and the NPPF both seek to consider the best and most versatile agricultural land when assessing development proposals, the</p>

				<p>NPPF's approach in para 112 is probably less restrictive than OL4. In particular, the NPPF specifies that local authorities should prioritise the use of poorer quality agricultural land to that of higher quality. Policy OL4, on the other hand, is fairly definitive in that it states that higher quality agricultural land will be protected.</p> <p>Although generally consistent, NPPF para 112 should take precedence over Policy OL4 when dealing with proposals involving the development of agricultural land.</p>
	OL4/1 – Agricultural Land Quality	✓/x	112	See comments to OL4.
	OL4/2 – Protection of Farm Holdings	✓	28	<p>UDP Policy OL4/2 specifies that the Council will not permit development which would result in the fragmentation or severing of viable farm holdings.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF's approach to supporting a prosperous rural economy through supporting the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of businesses and enterprises in rural areas and promoting the development and diversification of agriculture and other land-based rural businesses.</p>
	OL4/3 – Development Impact on Farming Areas	✓	28	<p>UDP Policy OL4/3 specifies that the impact of development proposals on neighbouring agricultural areas will be carefully assessed and development likely to have a detrimental effect will not be permitted unless satisfactory methods of minimising any detrimental effect can be found.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF's approach to supporting a prosperous rural economy through supporting the sustainable growth and expansion of all types of businesses and enterprises in rural areas and promoting the development and diversification of agriculture and other land-based rural businesses.</p>
	OL4/4 – Agricultural Diversification	✓	7, 17, 28,	UDP Policy OL4/4 states that the Council will encourage a viable rural economy by supporting

			Section 11	<p>farm diversification enterprises which respect the quality of the built and natural environment. Development proposals should seek to conserve and enhance the landscape character and nature conservation value of the countryside.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF's approach to supporting a prosperous rural economy through promoting the development and diversification of agriculture and other land-based rural businesses.</p> <p>It is also consistent with the NPPF's aim of protecting and enhancing our built and natural environment and securing high standards of design and good levels of amenity.</p>
	OL4/5 – Agricultural Development	✓	17, 28, 58	<p>UDP Policy OL4/5 relates to the siting and design of agricultural development, buildings or structures and seeks to minimise visual impact, ensure that development is well related to existing farm buildings and to not adversely affect amenity.</p> <p>Policy OL4/5 is positively worded and will help to support the rural economy in accordance with para 28 of the NPPF. However, at the same time, the Policy will ensure that design and amenity issues are considered in accordance with paras 17 and 58.</p>
	OL4/6 – Agricultural Dwellings	✓	17, 55, 58	<p>The underlying aim of UDP Policy OL4/6 is to protect the countryside from pressures for additional housing where this is not needed for agricultural reasons and where such provision could be accommodated within the existing built-up area or through the conversion or adaptation of an existing building. This approach is consistent with paragraph 55 of the NPPF which states that LPAs should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances including the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside. Furthermore, OL4/6's consideration of alternative options in criteria (b) and (c) is consistent with some of the core planning</p>

				<p>principles set out under para 17 of the NPPF – particularly the 5th and 8th bullets.</p> <p>Consideration of matters such as scale, siting, design, materials and access under criteria (d) and (e) are consistent with the NPPF and particularly the 4th bullet under para 17, the requirement for good design and adequate access as set out within section 7 (particularly para 58).</p>
	OL4/7 – Development Involving Horses	✓	17, 28, 58, 89	<p>Policy OL4/7 states that the keeping of horses for recreational purposes or as part of commercially based equestrian activities will be considered acceptable where it would not have an adverse effect on the appearance of the rural areas. In particular, high standards of design, construction and maintenance will be expected as part of any development proposals. The issue of horses is not specifically referred to in the NPPF although it is consistent with Para 28 which supports sustainable growth and expansion of all types of business and enterprise in rural areas and that this needs to respect the character of the countryside.</p> <p>The requirement for development to display high standards of design, construction and maintenance is also consistent with the NPPF's objectives for achieving high standards of design and good levels of amenity in accordance with paras 17 and 58.</p> <p>Equestrian development usually occurs in the Green Belt and para 89 considers provision of appropriate facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation to not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt providing it preserves and openness and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.</p> <p>PPG2 used to require these developments to be 'essential' and referred to 'small stables' as being an example, although this approach has now been relaxed with the use of the word 'appropriate'. The openness test still applies however.</p>

OL5	RIVER VALLEYS	✓	114	<p>Policy OL5 states that the Council will maintain and preserve the open character of the Borough's river valleys. The river valley policies originate from the Greater Manchester Structure Plan and their protection has been used as a means of ensuring they remain open and allow access for recreation and movement for wildlife. NPPF para 114 on Green Infrastructure is relevant in that it states Local Plans must plan positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure. Whilst the policies OL5 and OL5/1 to OL5/2 pre-date the concept of GI, these are multi-functional areas and the land around the Rivers Irwell and Roch represent the Borough's key corridors and this has been recognised in the emerging Core Strategy.</p> <p>However, until the Core Strategy is adopted this may be afforded less weight in view of the need to meet the national housing shortage – some recent case law has ruled that policies such as these which protect land which does not have national designations are effectively cancelled out where there is no 5 year supply in place.</p>
	OL5/1 – Designation of River Valleys	✓	114	As above.
	OL5/2 – Development in River Valleys	✓	114	As above.
	OL5/3 – Riverside and Canalside Development in Urban Areas	✓	58, 61, 64, 114	<p>Policy OL5/3 states that, within urban areas, where development has taken place adjacent to the rivers and canal, the Council will, where appropriate, and where opportunities arise, seek to maintain and provide open land corridors to help to re-establish the continuity of the river valleys.</p> <p>Whilst the NPPF does not include any policies specifically on preserving riverside and canalside frontages, the GI policy at Para 114 is relevant in allowing open access and enabling environmental improvements. Also, the design policies of the NPPF, particularly Paras 58, 61</p>

				and 64 highlight that the potential of the site to make connections with green space/natural environment and the opportunities for improving the way an area functions should not be ignored.
OL6	MULTI-FUNCTIONAL COUNTRYSIDE	✓	28	<p>Policy OL6 states that the Council recognises the increasing and often conflicting pressures on the countryside and will seek to ensure, in considering development proposals, that the countryside is used and managed so as to minimise conflicts; and balance the benefits it offers to the community as a whole, with the need to protect the value of the countryside for its own sake.</p> <p>Para 28 of the NPPF, even given its economic focus, is relevant to this policy (particularly the 3rd bullet point) as it encourages sustainable growth in rural areas to promote a strong rural economy which respects the character of the countryside.</p>
	OL6/1 – New Uses and Development of the Countryside	✓	28 109-118 (points a to c) 74 (point d)	<p>Policy OL6/1 states that the Council will consider favourably those proposals for new uses and development in the countryside which will benefit the environment and the community as a whole. In assessing proposals particular regard will be given to their effect on</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) landscape character and diversity; b) nature conservation; c) agricultural land and holdings; and d) recreational value. <p>Again, it is considered that this approach is consistent with the aims of paragraph 28 of the NPPF. Furthermore, the considerations under criteria (a) to (c) are covered by paras 109-118 of the NPPF and Para 74 is relevant to point d).</p>
OL7	SPECIAL OPEN LAND AREAS	✓	Section 11	<p>UDP Policy OL7 states that the Council will give special consideration to the protection of open land areas which fulfil specific functions, when considering proposals for development.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF's aim to</p>

				conserve and enhance the natural environment as set out in Section 11.
	OL7/1 – East Lancashire Paper Mill Water Catchment Area			This Policy is not saved.
	OL7/2 – West Pennine Moors	✓	28, Section 11, Section12	<p>UDP Policy OL7/2 states that throughout the area of the West Pennine Moors, as defined on the Proposals Map, the Council will control development and manage recreational activity and public access, so as to reduce any possible detrimental effects these may have on the important character of the area. In considering proposals for development particular regard will be had to the effect on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) agriculture and forestry; b) water catchment; c) settlements; d) landscape character; e) ecological and geological features; f) archaeological and historic features. <p>This is consistent with the NPPF's approach to supporting a prosperous rural economy through promoting the development and diversification of agriculture and other land-based rural businesses.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF's aim to conserve and enhance the natural and historic environment as set out in Sections 11 and 12</p>

RECREATION AND TOURISM

	EXISTING POLICY	NPPF COMPLIANT (Y/N)	NPPF PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS
RT1	EXISTING PROVISION FOR RECREATION IN THE URBAN AREA	✓	70, 73, 74, 114	<p>Policy RT1 specifies that the Council will protect and give favourable consideration to the improvement of existing recreational land and facilities within the urban area.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraphs 70 and 73 of the NPPF which specify that planning policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces and that high quality open space can make an important contribution to health and well-being.</p> <p>Paragraph 74 of the NPPF goes on to state that because of these factors existing open space, sport and recreational buildings and land should not generally be built on.</p> <p>In addition, Policy RT1 is also consistent with paragraph 114 of the NPPF which specifies that local planning authorities should plan positively for the creation, protection enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p>
	RT1/1 – Protection of Recreation Provision in the Urban Area	✓/x	70, 73, 74, 114	<p>Policy RT1/1 generally seeks to protect recreation provision in the urban area.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraphs 70 and 73 of the NPPF which specify that planning policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces and that high quality open space can make an important contribution to health and well-being.</p> <p>Paragraph 74 of the NPPF goes on to state that because of these factors existing open space, sport and recreational buildings and land should</p>

				<p>not generally be built on.</p> <p>In addition, Policy RT1/1 is also consistent with paragraph 114 of the NPPF which specifies that local planning authorities should plan positively for the creation, protection enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p> <p>However, there are some slight areas of variance. Para 73 requires open space/recreation policies to be based on up-to-date assessments of need. The UDP refers to the 1989 Recreation Survey but is sufficiently worded to allow for up-to-date evidence to take precedence – particularly point d) on other unidentified recreation provision. The most up-to-date evidence for this policy is the 2010 Greenspace Strategy and an update to this is currently underway.</p> <p>The exceptions set out under Policy RT1/1 are generally consistent with the NPPF insofar that development should only be allowed on open space, sport and recreation sites if it can be demonstrated that it is surplus to requirements or that it will generally result in replacement and/or improved recreational facilities.</p> <p>However, the exceptions set out under para. 74 of the NPPF are worded differently and these should take precedence over RT1/1 criteria (i) to (iii).</p>
	RT1/2 – Improvement of Recreation Facilities	✓	70, 73, 114	<p>Policy RT1/2 specifies that the Council will give favourable consideration to proposals for the appropriate improvement of existing recreational land and facilities in the Borough.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraphs 70 and 73 of the NPPF which specify that planning policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces and that high quality open space can make an important contribution to health and well-being.</p>

				In addition, Policy RT1/2 is also consistent with paragraph 114 of the NPPF which specifies that local planning authorities should plan positively for the creation, protection enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.
RT2	NEW PROVISION FOR RECREATION IN THE URBAN AREA	✓	70, 73, 114	<p>Policy RT2 specifies that the Council will encourage the provision of additional land and facilities for recreation in the urban area.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraphs 70 and 73 of the NPPF which specify that planning policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces and that high quality open space can make an important contribution to health and well-being.</p> <p>In addition, Policy RT2 is also consistent with paragraph 114 of the NPPF which specifies that local planning authorities should plan positively for the creation, protection enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p> <p>The need for new and improved facilities for open space, sport and recreation and the application of Policy RT2 will be determined against the findings of Bury's open space assessment.</p>
	RT2/1 – Provision of New Recreation Sites	✓	70, 73, 114	<p>Policy RT2/1 specifies that the Council will give favourable consideration to proposals involving the provision of additional recreational facilities throughout the Borough and identifies a series of opportunities for the provision of new recreational facilities.</p> <p>The broad aim of Policy RT2/1 is consistent with paragraphs 70 and 73 of the NPPF which specify that planning policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces and that high quality open space can make an important contribution to health and well-being.</p>

				<p>In addition, Policy RT2/1 is also consistent with paragraph 114 of the NPPF which specifies that local planning authorities should plan positively for the creation, protection enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p> <p>The need for new facilities for open space, sport and recreation will be determined against the findings of Bury's open space assessment.</p>
	RT2/2 – Recreation Provision in New Housing Development	✓	70, 73, 114	<p>Policy RT2/2 states that developers of new housing will be expected to provide for the recreational needs of the prospective residents. The delivery mechanism for Policy RT2/2 is set out in SPD1.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraphs 70 and 73 of the NPPF which specify that planning policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces and that high quality open space can make an important contribution to health and well-being.</p> <p>In addition, Policy RT2/2 is also consistent with paragraph 114 of the NPPF which specifies that local planning authorities should plan positively for the creation, protection enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p> <p>The need for new and improved facilities for open space, sport and recreation and the application of Policy RT2/2 will be determined against the findings of Bury's open space assessment.</p>
	RT2/3 – Education Recreation Facilities	✓/x	70, 73, 74, 114	<p>UDP Policy RT2/3 generally seeks to prevent the loss of education recreational facilities.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraphs 70 and 73 of the NPPF which specify that planning policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces and that high quality open space can make an important contribution to</p>

				<p>health and well-being.</p> <p>Paragraph 74 of the NPPF goes on to state that because of these factors existing open space, sport and recreational buildings and land should not generally be built on.</p> <p>In addition, Policy RT1/1 is also consistent with paragraph 114 of the NPPF which specifies that local planning authorities should plan positively for the creation, protection enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Policy RT2/3 includes a series of exceptions where the loss of education recreation may be acceptable. These exceptions are generally are generally consistent with those set out under paragraph 74 of the NPPF.</p> <p>However, the exceptions set out under para. 74 of the NPPF are worded differently and these should take precedence over RT2/3 criteria (a) to (c).</p>
	RT2/4 – Dual-Use of Education Facilities	✓	70	<p>UDP Policy RT2/4 specifies that the Council will support an increased level of recreational provision by looking favourably on proposals for the dual-use of education facilities and playing fields by the community.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 70 of the NPPF which encourages a positive approach towards planning the provision and use of shared space and promotes an integrated approach to considering the location of community facilities and services.</p>
RT3	RECREATION IN THE COUNTRYSIDE	✓	73, 75	<p>UDP Policy RT3 states that the Council will encourage the use of the river valleys, moorland fringe and other open land outside the urban area, for appropriate recreational pursuits.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 73 of the NPPF which identifies that access to high quality open space and opportunities for sport and recreation</p>

				<p>can make an important contribution to the health and well being of communities.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 75 of the NPPF encourages policies which seek to capitalise on opportunities to provide better facilities for recreational users by protecting and enhancing public rights of way and access.</p>
	<p>RT3/1 – Protection of Existing Recreation Provision in the Countryside</p>	<p>✓/x</p>	<p>70, 73, 74, 114</p>	<p>UDP Policy RT3/1 states that development will not be allowed where it would result in the loss of, or prejudice the use of, areas predominantly used for recreation outside the urban area.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraphs 70 and 73 of the NPPF which specify that planning policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces and that high quality open space can make an important contribution to health and well-being.</p> <p>Paragraph 74 of the NPPF goes on to state that because of these factors existing open space, sport and recreational buildings and land should not generally be built on unless it satisfies one or more of a series of exceptions.</p> <p>In addition, Policy RT3/1 is also consistent with paragraph 114 of the NPPF which specifies that local planning authorities should plan positively for the creation, protection enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity and green infrastructure.</p> <p>Policy RT3/1 does not include any exceptions where development that involves land used for countryside recreation may be considered acceptable. From a purely recreational perspective and for the purposes of this Policy, the exceptions set out under paragraph 74 of the NPPF should be applied.</p> <p>However, the nature of countryside recreation</p>

				means that it is likely that sites will be subject to additional policy constraints (such as green belt) in situations where an applicant may be able to satisfy any of the exceptions set out under paragraph 74 of the NPPF.
	RT3/2 – Additional Provision for Recreation in the Countryside		17, 34, 70, 73, 109, 112, 117	<p>UDP Policy RT3/2 specifies that the Council will encourage the recreational use of the Borough's countryside, and will, in particular, encourage the re-use of vacant or derelict land or water areas for this purpose. Favourable consideration will be given to proposals for appropriate recreational uses, provided that they would not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) have a significant detrimental effect on the environment of the area; b) have a significant detrimental effect on features of ecological value and wildlife importance; c) result in an unacceptable increase in road traffic in the area; d) adversely affect the amenity of local residents or users of recreational open space; e) conflict with agricultural interests. <p>This is consistent with paragraphs 70 and 73 of the NPPF which specify that planning policies should plan positively for the provision and use of shared spaces and that high quality open space can make an important contribution to health and well-being.</p> <p>In addition, the encouragement of the re-use of vacant or derelict land is consistent with the final bullet point under paragraph 109 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The criteria set out under Policy RT3/2 generally seek to safeguard against any potential adverse impacts that may arise from recreational provision in the countryside and these safeguards are consistent with a number of aspects within the NPPF.</p>

				<p>Section 11 of the NPPF highlights the approach that should be taken towards conserving and enhancing the natural environment.</p> <p>This section includes policies seeking to minimise impacts on biodiversity (paragraph 117) and agricultural land (paragraph 112).</p> <p>Paragraph 17 of the NPPF sets out its Core Planning principles and this includes seeking to secure good standards of amenity.</p> <p>The Policy's safeguards against any development generating unacceptable levels of traffic is consistent with paragraph 34 of the NPPF which seeks to ensure that development that would generate significant amounts of traffic are located where the need to travel will be minimised.</p>
	RT3/3 – Access to the Countryside	✓	75	<p>Policy RT3/3 states that the Council will seek to improve and extend opportunities for all to gain access to the countryside.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 75 of the NPPF which seeks to protect and enhance public rights of way and access and that local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users including adding links to the existing rights of way network.</p>
	RT3/4 – Recreation Routes	✓	75	<p>Policy RT3/4 seeks to promote access to the countryside and states that the Council will seek to establish a network of designated recreational routes to provide access, where appropriate, for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. These routes will be safeguarded and any development which would prejudice their establishment or use will not be permitted.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 75 of the NPPF which seeks to protect and enhance public rights of way and access and that local authorities should seek opportunities to provide better facilities for users including adding links to the</p>

				existing rights of way network.
	RT3/5 – Noisy Sports		17, 109	<p>Policy RT3/5 relates to noisy sports and states that development proposals involving the use of land or buildings for recreational pursuits which generate an unacceptable level of noise or nuisance will not be allowed.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 17 of the NPPF which sets out its Core Planning principles and this includes seeking to secure good standards of amenity.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is also consistent with paragraph 109 of the NPPF which specifies that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by preventing both new and existing development from contributing to or being put at unacceptable risk from, or being adversely affected by unacceptable levels of soil, air, water or noise pollution or land instability.</p>
RT4	TOURISM	✓	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 28	<p>UDP Policy RT4 states that the Council will promote and facilitate the development of tourism in the Borough.</p> <p>Tourism makes an important contribution towards the overall strength of the Borough's wider economy. This is consistent with the NPPFs aim for local plans to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development.</p>
	RT4/1 – Tourism Development	✓	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 28	<p>UDP Policy RT4/1 states that the Council will encourage and support proposals for the development of appropriate visitor related attractions and facilities throughout the Borough, but particularly in the upper Irwell Valley. Two allocations within Ramsbottom town centre sit underneath this Policy but these have subsequently been developed.</p> <p>Tourism makes an important contribution towards the overall strength of the Borough's wider economy. This is consistent with the</p>

				NPPFs aim for local plans to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development.
	RT4/2 - Safeguarding Tourism Assets	✓	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 28	<p>UDP Policy RT4/2 states that the Council will not permit proposals for development which would prejudice existing tourism assets or areas which have potential for tourism development.</p> <p>Tourism makes an important contribution towards the overall strength of the Borough's wider economy. This is consistent with the NPPFs aim for local plans to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development.</p>
	RT4/3 – Visitor Accommodation	✓/x	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23-27, 28, 58, 79	<p>UDP Policy RT4/3 states that the Council will encourage and support proposals for development which would extend the range of visitor accommodation in the Borough. Any development proposals will be assessed and considered against a range of factors concerning the design and layout of proposals and whether it would comply with open land policies.</p> <p>Tourism makes an important contribution towards the overall strength of the Borough's wider economy. This is consistent with the NPPFs aim for local plans to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development.</p> <p>Consideration of design and access is consistent with paragraph 58 of the NPPF which requires policies to set out the quality of development that will be expected.</p> <p>In addition, UDP Policy RT4/3 identifies a number of locations that are considered to be suitable for hotel use. The Knowsley Street allocation is within the town centre and is consistent with the 'town centres first' approach for main town centre uses. The other three allocations identified under this policy are not in existing centres. However, the sites at Crostons Road and Bury New Road have been developed.</p> <p>There are potential inconsistencies with the</p>

				'town centres first' approach with the Bury Ground (Chamberhall) allocation and any proposals for a hotel on this site would need to demonstrate that there were no more sequentially preferable sites available or suitable.
	RT4/4 – Tourism Support Facilities	✓	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 28	<p>UDP Policy RT4/4 states that to aid the development of tourism in the Borough, the Council will seek to improve facilities for tourists.</p> <p>Tourism makes an important contribution towards the overall strength of the Borough's wider economy. This is consistent with the NPPFs aim for local plans to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development.</p>
	RT4/5 – Special Tourism and Leisure Provision	✓	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 28	<p>UDP Policy RT4/5 states that the Council will identify locations for the development of leisure and tourism uses which require large sites and/or buildings.</p> <p>Tourism makes an important contribution towards the overall strength of the Borough's wider economy. This is consistent with the NPPFs aim for local plans to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development.</p>
	RT4/6 – East Lancashire Railway	✓	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 28	<p>UDP Policy RT4/6 states that the Council will encourage and support proposals for the further development and enhancement of facilities associated with the East Lancashire Railway.</p> <p>Tourism makes an important contribution towards the overall strength of the Borough's wider economy. This is consistent with the NPPFs aim for local plans to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development.</p>
	RT4/7 – The Manchester, Bolton and Bury Canal	✓	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 28	<p>UDP Policy RT4/7 states that the Council will protect and safeguard the Manchester, Bolton and Bury Canal and support proposals for its restoration. Proposals for canal-side development will be expected to enhance the</p>

				<p>canal environment and not prejudice its restoration.</p> <p>Tourism makes an important contribution towards the overall strength of the Borough's wider economy. This is consistent with the NPPFs aim for local plans to proactively drive and support sustainable economic development.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

SHOPPING

	EXISTING POLICY	NPPF COMPLIANT (Y/N)	NPPF PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS
S1	EXISTING SHOPPING CENTRES	✓	23	<p>UDP Policy S1 states that the Council will seek to protect, maintain and enhance the role and function of the existing hierarchy of shopping centres within the Borough.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPFs aim to support the vitality of town centres as set out under paragraph 23.</p>
	S1/1 – Shopping in Bury Town Centre	✓	23	<p>UDP Policy S1/1 states that the Council will protect, maintain and enhance the role of Bury Town Centre as a sub-regional shopping centre and promote the centre as a focal point for further development. In particular, the Council will support the expansion of the centre through the development of additional comparison shopping floorspace, complementary non-food retail warehousing and speciality shopping.</p> <p>The general aim of this Policy is consistent with the NPPF's aim of ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>However, the Policy pre-dates the Rock development and the latest evidence contained within the Bury Retail Study suggests that, whilst there is capacity for additional non-food retailing in Bury Town Centre, the priority will be for this capacity to be accommodated by the occupancy of existing vacant floorspace rather than the development of additional retail floorspace.</p>
	S1/2 – Shopping in Other Town Centres	✓	23	<p>UDP Policy S1/2 states that the Council will seek to maintain and strengthen the retail roles of Ramsbottom, Radcliffe and Prestwich Town Centres. The Council will support modest increases in shopping floorspace, however, the</p>

				<p>main emphasis will be on consolidation and enhancement.</p> <p>The general aim of this Policy is consistent with the NPPF's aim of ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>However, the capacity for additional retail floorspace within each town centre will be determined by evidence contained within the Bury Retail Study.</p>
	S1/3 – Shopping in District Centres	✓	23	<p>UDP Policy S1/3 specifies that the Council will support proposals for new shopping development within the Borough's district centres at Tottington, Whitefield, and Sedgley Park, provided that such development is of a size, scale, function and character appropriate to serve the needs of the local area.</p> <p>The general aim of this Policy is consistent with the NPPF's aim of ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>However, the capacity for additional retail floorspace within each town centre will be determined by evidence contained within the Bury Retail Study.</p>
	S1/4 – Local Shopping Centres	✓	23	<p>UDP Policy S1/4 specifies that the Council will seek to maintain and enhance local shopping centres and will encourage the provision of a range of shopping facilities required to serve purely local needs.</p> <p>The general aim of this Policy is consistent with the NPPF's aim of ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p>
	S1/5 – Neighbourhood Centres and Local Shops	✓	17, 34	<p>UDP Policy S1/5 specifies that the Council will seek to retain retailing (Class A1), as the predominant use in small neighbourhood centres and in new or existing local shops, to cater primarily for the day to day needs of residents and businesses.</p> <p>The NPPF's definition of 'town centres' covers town, district and local centres but not neighbourhood centres and local shops.</p>

				<p>Nevertheless, Policy S1/5 aims to protect the retail role of these smaller centres in order to ensure that these facilities are accessible to their surrounding neighbourhoods which encourages access by foot and reduces the need to travel by car.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraphs 17 and 34 of the NPPF which relate to managing patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling and minimising the need to travel.</p>
	S1/6 – Additions to the Shopping Hierarchy		17, 30, 37	<p>UDP Policy S1/6 specifies that the Council will review and, where appropriate, look favourably upon the need for further local shopping provision to serve new and existing residential areas inadequately served by the present pattern of retail provision.</p> <p>The aim of this policy is to ensure that residential neighbourhoods are adequately served by local shopping provision in order to reduce the need to travel. This is particularly consistent with the NPPF which states that planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths for shopping.</p>
S2	CONTROL OF NEW RETAIL AND NON-RETAIL DEVELOPMENT	✓	23-27	<p>UDP Policy S2 specifies that the Council will seek to protect and enhance the vitality and viability of the Borough's shopping centres by encouraging and controlling the type and location of retail and non-retail development to benefit the retailing activities of the centres.</p> <p>This approach is consistent with the 'town centres first' policy approach within the NPPF that seeks to support the vitality of town centres.</p>
	S2/1 – All New Retail Proposals: Assessment Criteria	✓/x	17, 23-27, 32, 40	<p>UDP Policy S2/1 specifies that in establishing the principle of development, the Council will support new retail development proposals which accord satisfactorily with the following factors:</p>

				<p>a) are within or immediately adjoining the main shopping area of existing centres;</p> <p>b) sustain or enhance the vitality and viability of a centre;</p> <p>c) are accessible by and would encourage greater use of public transport;</p> <p>d) are in conformity with other policies and proposals of the Plan.</p> <p>This approach is generally consistent with the 'town centres first' policy approach within the NPPF that seeks to support the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>However, criterion (a) of Policy S2/1 gives equal support for in-centre proposals and those that are immediately adjacent to the main shopping area. Paragraph 24 of the NPPF on the other hand specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres (in the case of retail uses, this should be within the main shopping area), then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 26 of the NPPF specifies that when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres (i.e. including edge-of-centre sites), which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set</p>
--	--	--	--	--

floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:

- the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and
- the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made.

The emerging Core Strategy is seeking to introduce smaller locally-derived floorspace thresholds for requiring consideration of impact. However, these have not been adopted and until such time the 2,500 sq.m. threshold would have to be the default position.

Paragraph 27 of the NPPF specifies that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact, it should be refused.

In light of the above, when considering the principle of all new retail development, criteria (a) to (c) of UDP Policy S2/1 should be replaced by the approach set out in paragraphs 24 to 27 of the NPPF.

Further detail on what should be considered through sequential and impact assessments is included in 'Planning For Town Centres: Practice Guidance on Need, Impact and the Sequential Approach' (CLG, Dec 2009). Whilst this was published to accompany the previous PPS4, this document has not been withdrawn and is considered to be an appropriate form of guidance where this is consistent with the NPPF.

Once the principle has been established, Policy

				<p>S2/1 then goes on to highlight a number of additional and more specific criteria covering matters such as design, amenity, access and parking.</p> <p>The consideration of factors identified in these additional criteria is consistent with a number of areas of the NPPF.</p>
	<p>S2/2 – Prime Shopping Areas and Frontages</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>17, 23, 32, 40</p>	<p>UDP Policy S2/2 states that within prime shopping areas identified in the Borough's town centres, the Council will seek to maintain retailing (Class A1) as the predominant land use at ground floor level. And states that proposals for change of use or redevelopment within these areas will be assessed on their merits and by taking into account factors including design, access, amenity and the maintenance of a display window at the ground floor level.</p> <p>This approach is consistent with paragraph 23 of the NPPF which states that local planning authorities should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recognise town centres as the heart of their communities and pursue policies to support their vitality and viability; ▪ define the extent of town centres and primary shopping areas, based on a clear definition of primary and secondary frontages in designated centres, and set policies that make clear which uses will be permitted in such locations; and ▪ promote competitive town centres that provide customer choice and a diverse retail offer that reflects the individuality of town centres. <p>The consideration of factors identified in the criteria is consistent with a number of areas of the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy S2/2 also includes additional criteria to take into account in instances where a proposal would lead to a Primary Shopping Frontage being occupied by more than 10% non-retail (A1) uses. These criteria are designed to ensure that in such cases, the vitality of the frontage is</p>

				<p>not adversely affected.</p> <p>This is again consistent with paragraph 23 which identifies a series of measures to ensure that planning policies are positive and promote competitive town centre environments.</p>
	S2/3 – Secondary Shopping Areas and Frontages	✓	17, 23, 32, 40	<p>UDP Policy S2/3 is similar to S2/2 in its content but covers the more peripheral shopping areas and frontages. Consequently, Policy S2/3 is less restrictive in terms of the percentage of non-retail (A1) uses that would trigger consideration of additional criteria.</p> <p>This approach is consistent with paragraph 23 of the NPPF which states that local planning authorities should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Recognise town centres as the heart of their communities and pursue policies to support their vitality and viability; ▪ define the extent of town centres and primary shopping areas, based on a clear definition of primary and secondary frontages in designated centres, and set policies that make clear which uses will be permitted in such locations; and ▪ promote competitive town centres that provide customer choice and a diverse retail offer that reflects the individuality of town centres. <p>The consideration of factors identified in the criteria is consistent with a number of areas of the NPPF.</p> <p>Policy S2/3 also includes additional criteria to take into account in instances where a proposal would lead to a Primary Shopping Frontage being occupied by more than 40% non-retail (A1) uses. These criteria are designed to ensure that in such cases, the vitality of the frontage is not adversely affected.</p> <p>This is again consistent with paragraph 23 which identifies a series of measures to ensure that planning policies are positive and promote competitive town centre environments.</p>

	S2/4 – Control of Non-Retail Uses in All Other Areas	✓	23, 32, 40	<p>UDP Policy S2/4 sets out the approach to non-retail uses in all other areas and given that this Policy is applicable to areas outside the main shopping areas of town and district centres, it is again less restrictive than S2/2 and S2/3. Nevertheless, the Policy does set out a number of criteria against which proposals for non-retail uses will be considered. In a similar way to S2/2 and S2/3 these criteria are designed to ensure that the introduction of non-retail uses will not adversely affect vitality and viability and that the use is adequately served for parking and servicing and is accessible.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 23 which identifies a series of measures to ensure that planning policies are positive and promote competitive town centre environments.</p>
	S2/5 – New Local Shopping Provision Outside Recognised Shopping Centres	✓/x	17, 24-27, 28, 32	<p>UDP Policy S2/5 states that outside shopping centres shown on the Proposals Map, the Council will support small scale local shopping provision (within Class A1) provided that this would not adversely affect the vitality and viability of existing centres, that it would not adversely affect residential amenity and that it doesn't lead adverse effects in terms of road safety and traffic generation. Policy S2/5 defines 'local shopping provision' as shops with a gross floorspace of up to 200 sq.m. gross.</p> <p>Whilst the general aim of Policy S2/5 and, specifically, its consideration as to whether the local shopping provision would adversely affect existing centres and whether such provision would be better located within an existing centre is generally consistent with the 'town centres first' approach, paragraph 24 of the NPPF specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres (in the case</p>

			<p>of retail uses, this should be within the main shopping area), then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.</p> <p>However, paragraph 25 of the NPPF specifies that the sequential approach should not be applied to small scale rural development. Similarly, in supporting prosperous rural economies, paragraph 28 of the NPPF specifies that local plans should promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops.</p> <p>Consequently, when assessing new local shopping provision outside recognised shopping centres and outside rural villages, rather than applying criteria (a) to (d) of UDP Policy S2/5, the sequential approach should be applied as set out in paragraph 24 of the NPPF. If an applicant fails to satisfy the sequential test, then an application should be refused in accordance with paragraph 27 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Further detail on what should be considered through sequential and impact assessments is included in 'Planning For Town Centres: Practice Guidance on Need, Impact and the Sequential Approach' (CLG, Dec 2009). Whilst this was published to accompany the previous PPS4, this document has not been withdrawn and is considered to be an appropriate form of guidance where this is consistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>The NPPF gives no definition as to what level of retail floorspace would constitute local provision. However, whether the 200 sq.m. gross that is used for the purposes of UDP Policy S2/5 is</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>applied or not, a reasonable interpretation of 'local shopping provision' would not exceed the NPPF's threshold of 2,500 sq.m. for requiring an impact assessment.</p> <p>Furthermore, the need to consider amenity issues under criterion (e) of Policy S2/5 is consistent with paragraph 17 of the NPPF and the need for planning to seek to secure good standards of amenity.</p> <p>Taking into account transport implications as required under criterion (f) of Policy S2/5 is also consistent with paragraph 32 of the NPPF.</p>
	S2/6 – Food and Drink	✓	17, 23	<p>The main aim of UDP Policy S2/6 is to ensure that the introduction of these types of uses will not be detrimental to the vitality and viability of centres as well as to ensure that the use does not have adverse impact on the amenity of the surrounding area.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 23 which identifies a series of measures to ensure that planning policies are positive and promote competitive town centre environments.</p> <p>Furthermore, the need to consider amenity issues is consistent with paragraph 17 of the NPPF and the need for planning to seek to secure good standards of amenity.</p>
	S2/7 – Amusement Centres and Arcades	✓	17, 23, 126	<p>The main aim of UDP Policy S2/7 is to ensure that the introduction of these types of uses will not be detrimental to the vitality and viability of centres as well as to ensure that the use does not have adverse impact on the amenity of the surrounding area.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 23 which identifies a series of measures to ensure that planning policies are positive and promote competitive town centre environments.</p> <p>Furthermore, the need to consider amenity issues is consistent with paragraph 17 of the NPPF and the need for planning to seek to secure good standards of amenity.</p>

				In seeking to ensure that proposals for these uses do not adversely affect the setting of Listed Buildings or the character and appearance of Conservation Areas, the Policy is also consistent with paragraph 126 of the NPPF which aims to conserve and enhance the historic environment.
S3	NEW RETAIL DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS	✓/x	23-27	<p>UDP Policy S3 states that the Council will encourage and permit appropriately located retail development and environmental improvements within or immediately adjoining the main shopping area of the Borough's main shopping centres.</p> <p>This is generally consistent with paragraph 23 of the NPPF which identifies a series of measures to ensure that planning policies are positive and promote competitive town centre environments.</p> <p>However, UDP Policy S3 gives equal support for in-centre proposals and those that are immediately adjacent to the main shopping area. Paragraph 24 of the NPPF on the other hand specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres (in the case of retail uses, this should be within the main shopping area), then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 26 of the NPPF specifies that when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres (i.e. including edge-of-centre sites),</p>

			<p>which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and▪ the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made. <p>The emerging Core Strategy is seeking to introduce smaller locally-derived floorspace thresholds for requiring consideration of impact. However, these have not been adopted and until such time the 2,500 sq.m. threshold would have to be the default position.</p> <p>Paragraph 27 of the NPPF specifies that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact, it should be refused.</p> <p>In light of the above, whilst Policy S3's support for retail development within existing centres is in accordance with the NPPF, any proposals on land immediately adjoining the main shopping area will be subject to a sequential assessment and may (if in excess of 2,500 sq.m.) be required to undertake an impact assessment in accordance with the approach set out under paragraphs 24 to 27 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Further detail on what should be considered through sequential and impact assessments is included in 'Planning For</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>Town Centres: Practice Guidance on Need, Impact and the Sequential Approach' (CLG, Dec 2009). Whilst this was published to accompany the previous PPS4, this document has not been withdrawn and is considered to be an appropriate form of guidance where this is consistent with the NPPF.</p>
	<p>S3/1 – New Retail Development Opportunities Within or Adjoining Town Centres</p>	<p>✓/x</p>	<p>23-27</p>	<p>UDP Policy S3/1 specifies that on land within or immediately adjoining the main shopping area of the Borough's town centres proposals for new retail development will be permitted. Proposals will, however, be expected to be appropriate in scale and character to the areas which they serve, make provision for adequate access, car parking and servicing, and accord satisfactorily with other policies and proposals of the Plan. A number of specific retail allocations are set out under this Policy.</p> <p>This is generally consistent with paragraph 23 which identifies a series of measures to ensure that planning policies are positive and promote competitive town centre environments including the allocation of a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail, leisure, commercial, office, tourism, cultural, community and residential development needed in town centres.</p> <p>However, UDP Policy S3/1 gives equal support for in-centre proposals and those that are immediately adjacent to the main shopping area. Paragraph 24 of the NPPF on the other hand specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres (in the case of retail uses, this should be within the main shopping area), then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should</p>

out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.

In addition, paragraph 26 of the NPPF specifies that when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres (i.e. including edge-of-centre sites), which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:

- the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and
- the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made.

The emerging Core Strategy is seeking to introduce smaller locally-derived floorspace thresholds for requiring consideration of impact. However, these have not been adopted and until such time the 2,500 sq.m. threshold would have to be the default position.

Paragraph 27 of the NPPF specifies that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact, it should be refused.

In light of the above, whilst Policy S3/1's support for retail development within existing centres is in accordance with the

			<p>NPPF, any proposals on land immediately adjoining the main shopping area will be subject to a sequential assessment and may (if in excess of 2,500 sq.m.) be required to undertake an impact assessment in accordance with the approach set out under paragraphs 24 to 27 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Further detail on what should be considered through sequential and impact assessments is included in 'Planning For Town Centres: Practice Guidance on Need, Impact and the Sequential Approach' (CLG, Dec 2009). Whilst this was published to accompany the previous PPS4, this document has not been withdrawn and is considered to be an appropriate form of guidance where this is consistent with the NPPF.</p>
	<p>S3/2 – New Retail Development Opportunities Within District Centres</p>	<p>✓/x</p>	<p>23-27</p> <p>UDP Policy S3/2 specifies that the Council will encourage and permit appropriate new retail development within or immediately adjoining the main shopping area of the Borough's district centres and highlights a number of criteria against which such proposals will be considered. A number of specific retail allocations are set out under this Policy.</p> <p>This is generally consistent with paragraph 23 which identifies a series of measures to ensure that planning policies are positive and promote competitive town centre environments including the allocation of a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of retail, leisure, commercial, office, tourism, cultural, community and residential development needed in town centres.</p> <p>However, UDP Policy S3/1 gives equal support for in-centre proposals and those that are immediately adjacent to the main shopping area. Paragraph 24 of the NPPF on the other hand specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are</p>

			<p>not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres (in the case of retail uses, this should be within the main shopping area), then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 26 of the NPPF specifies that when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres (i.e. including edge-of-centre sites), which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and▪ the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made. <p>The emerging Core Strategy is seeking to introduce smaller locally-derived floorspace thresholds for requiring consideration of impact. However, these have not been adopted and until such time the 2,500 sq.m. threshold would have</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>to be the default position.</p> <p>Paragraph 27 of the NPPF specifies that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact, it should be refused.</p> <p>In light of the above, whilst Policy S3/1's support for retail development within existing centres is in accordance with the NPPF, any proposals on land immediately adjoining the main shopping area will be subject to a sequential assessment and may (if in excess of 2,500 sq.m.) be required to undertake an impact assessment in accordance with the approach set out under paragraphs 24 to 27 of the NPPF.</p> <p>Further detail on what should be considered through sequential and impact assessments is included in 'Planning For Town Centres: Practice Guidance on Need, Impact and the Sequential Approach' (CLG, Dec 2009). Whilst this was published to accompany the previous PPS4, this document has not been withdrawn and is considered to be an appropriate form of guidance where this is consistent with the NPPF.</p>
	S3/3 – Improvement and Enhancement (All Centres)	✓	23	<p>UDP Policy S3/3 specifies that the Council will encourage the refurbishment and improvement of shopping centres within the Borough in order to actively promote the regeneration of these centres for retailing activities.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 23 which identifies a series of measures to ensure that planning policies are positive and promote competitive town centre environments.</p>
	S3/4 – Markets	✓	23	<p>UDP Policy S3/4 specifies that the Council will encourage and support proposals which seek to consolidate and enhance existing market facilities in Bury, Ramsbottom and Radcliffe Town Centres through environmental and</p>

				<p>physical improvements.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 23 which identifies a series of measures to ensure that planning policies are positive and promote competitive town centre environments including the requirement for local planning authorities to retain and enhance existing markets ensuring that they remain attractive and competitive.</p>
S4	NEW RETAIL DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE TOWN AND DISTRICT CENTRES	✓/x	23-27, 28	<p>UDP Policy S4 specifies that the Council will not permit new retail development to be located outside the main shopping areas of the Borough's town and district centres unless it satisfies criteria set out under Policy S4/1 or S4/2.</p> <p>This general approach is consistent with the 'town centres first' approach highlighted in the NPPF.</p> <p>However, in supporting prosperous rural economies, paragraph 28 of the NPPF specifies that local plans should promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops. Villages are not identified as either town or district centres and, as specified in paragraph 25 of the NPPF small scale rural development should not be subject to the sequential test.</p> <p>As such, this Policy would not be used when considering small scale retail development in rural villages.</p>
	S4/1 – Retail Development Outside Town and District Centres	✓	23	<p>UDP Policy S4/1 identifies a number of types of retailing facilities that would be considered appropriate outside the main shopping area of the Borough's town and district centres.</p> <p>The NPPF makes no mention of certain forms of retailing being acceptable in out-of-centre locations. It does, however, specify that local plans should set policies for the consideration of proposals for main town centre uses which cannot be accommodated in or adjacent to town centres. The list of the types of retail uses that would be acceptable outside existing centres is</p>

				still considered to be appropriate given that these types of uses are not generally suited to town centre locations.
	S4/2 – Assessing Out-of-Centre Retail Development	✓/x	17, 23-27, 32	<p>Policy S4/2 sets out the criteria that will be considered when assessing proposals for out-of-centre retail development. It includes criteria which assesses whether the proposal could be accommodated within or on the edge of an existing centre and whether there would be any unacceptable impacts on the vitality and viability of existing centres.</p> <p>This is generally consistent with the NPPF's 'town centres first' approach.</p> <p>However, paragraph 24 of the NPPF specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres (in the case of retail uses, this should be within the main shopping area), then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 26 of the NPPF specifies that when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres (i.e. including edge-of-centre sites), which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the impact of the proposal on existing,

				<p>committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made. <p>The emerging Core Strategy is seeking to introduce smaller locally-derived floorspace thresholds for requiring consideration of impact. However, these have not been adopted and until such time the 2,500 sq.m. threshold would have to be the default position.</p> <p>Paragraph 27 of the NPPF specifies that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact, it should be refused.</p> <p>In light of the above, whilst the general aims of Policy S4/2 are consistent with the NPPF, for the purposes of development management and the consideration of the principle of out-of-centre retail development, the NPPF's approach set out in paragraphs 24 to 27 should be adopted.</p> <p>Further detail on what should be considered through sequential and impact assessments is included in 'Planning For Town Centres: Practice Guidance on Need, Impact and the Sequential Approach' (CLG, Dec 2009). Whilst this was published to accompany the previous PPS4, this document has not been withdrawn and is considered to be an appropriate form of guidance where this is consistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>The need to consider amenity and transport issues under criteria (d) and (e) of Policy S2/5 is consistent with paragraphs 17 and 32 of the</p>
--	--	--	--	---

				NPPF.
	S4/3 – Nurseries, Farm Shops and Garden Centres	✓	17, 23, 28, 32, 87	<p>UDP Policy S4/3 states that the Council will permit proposals for nurseries, farm shops and garden centres where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the proposal does not detract from the appearance and character of its surroundings; b) the proposal does not prejudice road safety; c) the proposal conforms with the other policies of the Plan including Green Belt, other open land and environmental policies. <p>This is consistent with the NPPF's aim of securing high standards of design and good standards of amenity in new development.</p> <p>The justification to the policy specifies that in approving such schemes, conditions may be imposed which restrict the product range of goods sold in order to ensure that there is no adverse impact on the vitality and viability of existing centres. This is consistent with the NPPF's 'town centres first' policy and ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>The Policy is also consistent with the NPPF's approach towards conserving and enhancing the natural environment and Green Belt.</p> <p>Consideration of road safety is consistent with paragraph 32 of the NPPF.</p>
	S4/4 – Car Showrooms, Car Sales Areas and Petrol Filling Stations	✓	17, 32	<p>UDP Policy S4/4 states that car showrooms, car sales areas and petrol filling stations should be located within or adjoining established shopping areas, along classified roads or within other industrial and commercial areas within the Borough. Proposals should also take account of the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) potential disruption to the free flow of traffic; b) the provision of adequate, well laid out car parking and display facilities together with safe and convenient arrangements for access, circulation and egress;

				<p>c) road safety and the safety of pedestrians; d) the amenity of nearby residents and businesses.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF's approach towards ensuring high standards of design and good levels of amenity in new development and the consideration of transport issues is further consistent with the NPPF's policy of promoting sustainable transport.</p>
S5	LARGE OUT-OF-TOWN SHOPPING CENTRES	✓		<p>UDP Policy S5 states that the Council will oppose new shopping proposals, within Bury or elsewhere in or around the Greater Manchester conurbation, which by reason of their scale, nature or location would significantly prejudice the implementation of development plan policies and proposals and/or the vitality and viability of established town centres.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF's 'town centres first' policy and ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p>

HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

	EXISTING POLICY	NPPF COMPLIANT	NPPF PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS
HT1	A BALANCED TRANSPORTATION STRATEGY	✓	29-41	Policy HT1 seeks to ensure that there is a co-ordinated approach to the alteration, upgrade or improvement of the transport network. This is consistent with the NPPF.
HT2	HIGHWAY NETWORK	✓	41	Policy HT2 seeks to maintain and selectively improve the highway network. This is consistent with the NPPF which states that sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice are protected.
	HT2/1 – The Strategic Route Network	✓	41	Policy HT2/1 seeks to maintain and selectively improve the strategic route network. This is consistent with the NPPF which states that sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice are protected.
	HT2/2 – Improvements to the Strategic Route Network	✓	41	Policy HT2/3 seeks undertake minor highway improvements and implement local traffic management schemes where necessary to ensure the safe and efficient operation of all other roads in the Borough. This is consistent with the NPPF which states that sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice are protected.

	HT2/3 – Improvements to Other Roads	✓	41	<p>Policy HT2/2 seeks to maintain and selectively improve specific routes along the strategic route network.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF which states that sites and routes which could be critical in developing infrastructure to widen transport choice are protected.</p>
	HT2/4 – Car Parking and New Development	✓	39	<p>Policy HT2/4 requires development to make adequate provision for car parking and servicing in accordance with the Council's car parking standards.</p> <p>In developing the Council's car parking standards, regard was given to those matters set out under paragraph 39 of the NPPF.</p>
	HT2/5 – Public Car Parks	✓	40	<p>Policy HT2/5 seeks to ensure that an adequate level of public car parking provision is made and identifies a number of sites in town centres for new car parking provision.</p> <p>A number of these sites have been developed for car parking and the policy remains consistent with the NPPF in that it seeks to improve the quality of parking within town centres.</p>
	HT2/6 – Replacement Car Parking	✓	40	<p>Policy HT2/6 requires the provision of replacement car parking, particularly in town centres.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF which seeks to improve the quality of parking in town centres.</p>
	HT2/7 – Lorry Parking	✓	31	<p>Policy HT2/7, seeks to ensure the provision of off-street lorry parking facilities.</p> <p>This is in conformity with the NPPF which seeks to provide roadside facilities which support the safety and welfare of the road user.</p>

	HT2/8 – Taxi and Private Hire Business	✓	17 (Bullet 4)	<p>Policy HT2/8 seeks to ensure that the provision of taxi and private hire businesses does not give rise to adverse impacts on amenity in terms of their location and levels of activity they generate.</p> <p>This is in conformity with the NPPF which states that planning should seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.</p>
	HT2/9 – Highways Agency Road Schemes	✓/x	30	<p>UDP Policy HT2/9 states that the Highways Agency has identified a number of major highway schemes as part of the national trunk road programme and specifically identifies M60 improvement between Junctions 12 to 18.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF which specifies that encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions and reduce congestion.</p> <p>Improvements to the M60 remain on the Highways Agency's programme of works. However, these works are confined to between junctions 15 and 12 and these are due to commence in 2014/15.</p>
	HT2/10 – Development Affecting Trunk Roads	✓	32	<p>Policy HT2/10 states that a Transport Assessment may need to be submitted with planning applications, identifying the effect on the highway network of traffic generated by new development.</p> <p>This is in conformity with the NPPF which requires a Transport Assessment to be submitted with all developments that generate a significant amount of movement.</p>

HT3	PUBLIC TRANSPORT	✓	17, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35	<p>Policy HT3 seeks to maintain and increase the use of public transport.</p> <p>The aim of encouraging greater use of more sustainable modes of transport is consistent with one of the NPPF's Core Planning Principles to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling as well as some of the more specific NPPF policies designed to promote sustainable transport (Section 4).</p>
	HT3/1 – Schemes to Assist Bus Movement	✓	17, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35	<p>Policy HT3/1 seeks to promote and support measures to assist bus movement in order encourage the public to make better use of these facilities.</p> <p>The aim of encouraging greater use of more sustainable modes of transport is consistent with one of the NPPF's Core Planning Principles to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling as well as some of the more specific NPPF policies designed to promote sustainable transport (Section 4).</p>
	HT3/2 – Bus Services	✓	17, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35	<p>Policy HT3/2 seeks to provide the necessary infrastructure to ensure the efficient operation of bus services and the availability of a safe and pleasant environment for all bus users. The broad aim of this Policy is to again encourage greater use of public transport.</p> <p>The aim of encouraging greater use of more sustainable modes of transport is consistent with one of the NPPF's Core Planning Principles to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling as well as some of the more specific NPPF policies designed to promote sustainable transport (Section 4).</p>

	HT3/3 – Design of Roads for Bus Routes	✓	17 (Bullets 4 and 11), 29, 30, 32, 34, 35	<p>Policy HT3/3 specifies that the Council will ensure that, where appropriate, the road layout in all new developments, especially residential developments, incorporates appropriate roads to a sufficient standard of design to accommodate bus services.</p> <p>The aim of encouraging greater use of more sustainable modes of transport is consistent with one of the NPPF's Core Planning Principles to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling as well as some of the more specific NPPF policies designed to promote sustainable transport (Section 4).</p> <p>Furthermore, the Policy is also considered to be consistent with the need for planning to always seek to secure high quality design.</p>
	HT3/4 – Schemes to Assist Metrolink	✓	17, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35	<p>Policy HT3/4 seeks the provision of new or improved stations to encourage the increased use of Metrolink.</p> <p>The aim of encouraging greater use of more sustainable modes of transport is consistent with one of the NPPF's Core Planning Principles to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling as well as some of the more specific NPPF policies designed to promote sustainable transport (Section 4).</p>
HT4	NEW DEVELOPMENT	✓	17, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35	<p>Policy HT4 seeks to locate new development in sustainable locations which support the principles of sustainable development; assist the implementation of a balanced transportation strategy; and minimise the environmental impact of traffic.</p> <p>This is consistent with one of the NPPF's Core Planning Principles to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling as well as some of the more specific NPPF policies designed to promote sustainable transport (Section 4).</p>

HT5	ACCESSIBILITY FOR THOSE WITH SPECIAL NEEDS	✓	35	<p>Policy HT5 seeks to improve accessibility and the means of movement for the mobility impaired and those with special needs.</p> <p>This is in conformity with paragraph 35 of the NPPF which requires new developments to consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport.</p>
	HT5/1 – Access for Those with Special Needs	✓	35	<p>Policy H5/1 specifies that the Council will encourage the provision of satisfactory access to public transport, car parks, pedestrian areas and public and private buildings for the mobility impaired and those with special needs.</p> <p>This is in conformity with paragraph 35 of the NPPF which requires new developments to consider the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport.</p>
HT6	PEDESTRIANS AND CYCLISTS	✓	17, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35	<p>Policy HT6 seeks to provide new and improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>The aim of encouraging greater use of more sustainable modes of transport is consistent with one of the NPPF's Core Planning Principles to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling as well as some of the more specific NPPF policies designed to promote sustainable transport (Section 4).</p> <p>This is also consistent with paragraph 35 of the NPPF which states that development should be designed to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements.</p>

	HT6/1 – Pedestrian and Cyclist Movement	✓	17, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35	<p>Policy HT6/1 specifies that the Council will seek to ensure that pedestrians and cyclists are able to move safely and conveniently and highlights a number of ways by which this can be achieved.</p> <p>The aim of encouraging greater use of more sustainable modes of transport is consistent with one of the NPPF's Core Planning Principles to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling as well as some of the more specific NPPF policies designed to promote sustainable transport (Section 4).</p> <p>This is also consistent with paragraph 35 of the NPPF which states that development should be designed to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements.</p>
	HT6/2 – Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict	✓	17, 29, 30, 32, 34, 35	<p>Policy HT6/2 seeks to reduce pedestrian and vehicular conflict.</p> <p>The aim of encouraging greater use of more sustainable modes of transport is consistent with one of the NPPF's Core Planning Principles to actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest use of public transport, walking and cycling as well as some of the more specific NPPF policies designed to promote sustainable transport (Section 4).</p> <p>This is also in conformity with paragraph 35 of the NPPF which states that developments should create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians.</p>
	HT6/3 – Cycle Routes	✓	41	<p>Policy HT6/3 identifies four potential cycle routes. Two of these routes have been completed whilst two are partially complete.</p> <p>The remaining sections of these two routes are still considered suitable for cycling and are in conformity with the NPPF which states that routes should be protected to widen transport choice.</p>

HT7	FREIGHT	✓	31	<p>UDP Policy HT7 states that the Council will support measures which encourage and facilitate the transfer of freight from road to rail.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF which specifies that local authorities should develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including rail freight interchanges.</p>
	HT7/1 – Freight Facilities	✓	31	<p>UDP Policy HT7/1 states that the provision of facilities for the transfer of freight from road to the East Lancashire Railway will be supported at appropriate locations in response to demand from industrialists and other users.</p> <p>This is consistent with the NPPF which specifies that local authorities should develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development, including rail freight interchanges.</p>

COMMUNITY FACILITIES

	EXISTING POLICY	NPPF COMPLIANT (Y/N)	NPPF PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS
CF1	PROPOSALS FOR NEW AND IMPROVED COMMUNITY FACILITIES	✓	7, 70	<p>Policy CF1 states that proposals for new and improved community facilities will be looked upon favourably.</p> <p>This approach is supported by Para 7 of the NPPF which encourages the development of accessible local services that reflect community needs and support social well-being. Para 70 requires that planning policies and decisions should plan positively for community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities. Improved facilities are also supported by Para 70 which seeks to ensure that facilities can develop and modernise in a sustainable manner.</p>
	CF1/1 – Location of New Community Facilities	✓	17 32, 34, 39	<p>Policy CF1/1 states that proposals for new and improved community facilities will be considered against a range of factors and identifies 3 sites for new facilities.</p> <p>Criterion a) considers the impact on residential amenity and the local environment. This is consistent with paragraph 17 of the NPPF which states that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.</p> <p>Criterion b) considers traffic generation and car parking provision. Para 32 of the NPPF requires developments that generate significant amounts of movement to be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up and whether improvements can be made to limit any significant impacts of the development. Para 34 states that developments</p>

			<p>59, 70</p> <p>37, 70</p> <p>70</p> <p>32, 34, 39</p>	<p>which generate significant movement should be located where the need to travel can be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised.</p> <p>Whilst there is a focus on sustainable travel, Para 39 allows local authorities to set parking standards for non-residential development bearing in mind the type, mix and use of the development and its accessibility.</p> <p>Criterion c) considers the scale and size of the development. There is no specific guidance in the NPPF on the size and scale of community facilities although Para 59 supports policies that guide the overall scale, density, massing, height and layout of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area. It is also worth noting the message of Para 70 on planning positively for community facilities which enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments.</p> <p>Criterion d) considers, where applicable, access to shops and other services. Para 37 of the NPPF advises that policies should aim for a balance of uses so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey times for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities. Para 70 encourages an integrated approach to considering the location of economic uses and community facilities and services.</p> <p>Criterion e) considers, if the use is intended to serve a local community or catchment area, the suitability of the chosen location in relation to it. Location of community facilities and the sustainability in relation to residential environments and communities as a whole is covered in Para 70 of the NPPF and is compliant with this criterion.</p> <p>Criterion f) considers accessibility by public and private transport. Para 32 of the NPPF requires developments that generate significant amounts of movement to be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether</p>
--	--	--	---	--

			35, 57, 58	<p>opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up and whether improvements can be made to limit any significant impacts of the development. Para 34 states that developments which generate significant movement should be located where the need to travel can be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. Para 39 allows local authorities to set parking standards for non-residential development bearing in mind the type, mix and use of the development and its accessibility.</p> <p>Criterion g) considers the needs and requirements of the disabled. This is consistent with various NPPF policies. In particular, paragraph 35 specifies that development should be located and designed considering the needs of people with disabilities by all modes of transport. In addition, para 57 of the NPPF encourages local planning authorities to plan positively for high quality and inclusive design for all development whilst Para 58 advises that policies should create safe and accessible environments that function well and do not undermine quality of life or community cohesion.</p>
CF2	EDUCATION LAND AND BUILDINGS	✓	70, 72	<p>Policy CF2 states that the Council will, where appropriate, consider proposals for the provision, improvement and dual use of education facilities.</p> <p>This is compliant with Para 72 of the NPPF which attaches great importance to ensuring there is sufficient choice of school places available to meet community needs and encourages local planning authorities to proactively work with school promoters to resolve issues before applications are submitted and to give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter schools.</p> <p>Para 70 also encourages planning policies and decisions to plan positively for the provision and use of shared space to enhance the sustainability of communities.</p>
	CF2/1 – Bury College	✓	23, 37	<p>Policy CF2/1 states that proposals for the establishment of Bury College on a single site will be supported. Two areas are identified in the</p>

				<p>Policy for this provision.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 37 of the NPPF which aims for a balance of land uses so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities.</p> <p>Also relevant is para 23 of the NPPF which requires local planning authorities to allocate a range of suitable sites to meet the scale and type of community development needed in town centres, as it is important needs are met in full and not compromised by limited site availability.</p>
CF3	SOCIAL SERVICES	✓	70	<p>Policy CF3 states that, where appropriate, proposals for the provision of new and the improvement of existing social services facilities for children and young people, elderly and persons with mental illnesses/handicaps and other special needs groups will be considered favourably.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 70 of the NPPF which requires that planning policies and decisions should plan positively for community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities.</p>
	CF3/1 – Residential Care Homes and Nursing Facilities	✓	17, 70	<p>Policy CF3/1 states that residential care homes will be located in residential areas and will be permitted where they do not conflict with the amenity of adjoining areas.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 17 of the NPPF which states that planning should always seek to secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 70 of the NPPF requires a positive approach towards the provision and use of community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments.</p>
CF4	HEALTHCARE FACILITIES	✓	70	<p>Policy CF4 states that improvements to existing, and proposals for new healthcare facilities will generally be looked on favourably.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 70 of the NPPF</p>

				which requires a positive approach towards the provision and use of community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and which seeks to ensure that facilities can develop and modernise in a sustainable manner.
	CF4/1 – Fairfield General Hospital	✓	70	<p>UDP Policy CF4/1 identifies a site for the possible future expansion of Fairfield Hospital.</p> <p>This proposal has now been implemented. However, supporting improved healthcare facilities is consistent with the NPPF's support for healthy and inclusive communities and the need to plan positively for the provision and use of community facilities.</p>
CF5	CHILDCARE FACILITIES	✓	70	<p>Policy CF5 states that proposals for childcare facilities e.g. nurseries, workplace nurseries, crèches and playgroups will be looked on favourably.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 70 of the NPPF which requires a positive approach towards the provision and use of community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities.</p>
	CF5/1 – Childcare Facilities in New Developments	✓	70	<p>Policy CF5/1 states that the Council will seek and encourage, where appropriate, the provision of nursery facilities in connection with employment generating development proposals and crèche facilities as part of proposals for retail, leisure and tourism development.</p> <p>This is consistent with paragraph 70 of the NPPF which requires a positive approach towards the provision and use of community facilities and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities. Paragraph 70 also requires that planning policies ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of economic uses and community facilities and services.</p>

MINERALS AND WASTE

Note: Policies and Proposals connected to minerals and waste have now been replaced by Policies and Proposals in the adopted Greater Manchester Joint Waste Plan and the Greater Manchester Joint Minerals Plan.

	EXISTING POLICY	NPPF COMPLIANT (Y/N)	NPPF PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS
MW1	PROTECTION OF MINERAL RESOURCES			
	MW1/1 – Areas of Search			
	MW1/2 – Mineral Working Within Areas of Search			
	MW1/3 – Sterilisation of Mineral Deposits			
	MW1/4 – The Need for Aggregates			
MW2	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR MINERAL WORKINGS			
	MW2/1 – Assessing Mineral Extraction Proposals			
	MW2/2 – Planning Applications for Mineral Workings			
	MW2/3 – Development Control Conditions (Minerals)			
	MW2/4 – Longstanding Planning Permissions			
	MW2/5 – Derelict or Degraded Land (minerals)			
	MW2/6 – Alternatives to Newly Won Minerals			
	MW2/7 – Transport Routes for Minerals and Minerals Waste			

	MW2/8 – Materials for Restoration			
	MW2/9 – Standards of Restoration (Minerals)			
MW3	WASTE DISPOSAL FACILITIES			
	MW3/1 – Derelict or Degraded Land (Waste)			
	MW3/2 – Waste Recycling and Bulk Reduction			
MW4	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS FOR WASTE DISPOSAL SITES			
	MW4/1 – Assessing Waste Disposal Proposals			
	MW4/2 – Development Control Conditions (Waste)			
	MW4/3 – Household Waste Disposal			
	MW4/4 – Transport Routes for Waste Disposal Sites			
	MW4/5 – Land Contamination			
	MW4/6 – Standards of Restoration (Waste)			

TOWN CENTRES

Note: Within this chapter of the UDP, the consistency of various town centre policies is dependent on the definition of a town centre location in the context of different town centre uses. The NPPF's definition of an edge-of-centre site is:

'For retail purposes, a location that is well connected and up to 300 metres of the primary shopping area. For all other main town centre uses, a location within 300 metres of a town centre boundary. For office development, this includes locations outside the town centre but within 500 metres of a public transport interchange. In determining whether a site falls within the definition of edge of centre, account should be taken of local circumstances.'

As such, in terms of retail development, the town centre is defined as the Main Shopping Area as is currently defined on the UDP Proposals Map. For all other main town centre uses, the town centre is defined as the wider town centre boundary as identified on the UDP Proposals Map. Proposals for town centre uses that sit beyond the parameters defined above as constituting edge-of-centre locations, would therefore be deemed to be out-of-centre.

	EXISTING POLICY	NPPF COMPLIANT (Y/N)	NPPF PARAGRAPH	COMMENTS
TC1	TOWN CENTRES	✓	23-27	<p>Under UDP Policy TC1, the Council will seek to protect, maintain and improve the town centres of Bury, Ramsbottom, Radcliffe and Prestwich.</p> <p>This approach is consistent with the NPPF's policies that are designed to ensure the vitality of town centres and, in particular, paragraphs 23-27.</p>
	TC1/1 – Open Space in Town Centres	✓	17, 56, 57, 69, 70, 109	<p>Under UDP Policy TC1/1, the Council will protect identified areas of open space which provide an important element in civic design; valuable visual amenity; important outlets for recreation; valuable wildlife habitats; or act as buffers between incompatible uses or provide links between other open land areas.</p> <p>This approach is consistent with various areas of the NPPF. In particular, paragraph 17 of the NPPF identifies a series of Core Planning Principles including the aims to enhance and improve the places in which people live their lives and to secure a good standard of design and amenity.</p> <p>Paragraphs 56 of the NPPF identifies that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, is indivisible from good planning</p>

				<p>and should contribute positively to making places better for people. Similarly, paragraph 57 states that it is important to plan positively for the achievement of high quality and inclusive design for all development, including public and private spaces.</p> <p>Furthermore, Policy TC1/1 is also consistent with paragraph 69 of the NPPF insofar that it will help to facilitate social interaction and create healthy, inclusive communities by maintaining high quality public spaces and opportunities for recreational activity.</p> <p>Similarly, it is also consistent with paragraph 70 of the NPPF in that Policy TC1/1 plans positively for the provision and use of shared space.</p> <p>In addition, the retention of open spaces on the basis of their wildlife value is also consistent with paragraph 109 of the NPPF in that it will help to conserve and enhance the natural environment.</p>
	TC1/2 – Pedestrian/Vehicular Conflict in Town Centres	✓	35	<p>UDP Policy TC1/2 states that the Council will undertake appropriate schemes to reduce the conflict between pedestrians and vehicles in the Borough's Town Centres.</p> <p>This is consistent with the paragraph 35 of the NPPF's and its approach towards promoting sustainable transport and, in particular, the need to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movement and to create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists and pedestrians.</p>
TC2	TOWN CENTRE ENHANCEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT	✓	23-27	<p>UDP Policy TC2 specifies that the Borough's town centres will be encouraged to develop as the principal focal points for cultural, leisure, business, professional services, commercial and retailing activities. Development proposals which would have a detrimental effect on the vitality and viability of these centres will not be permitted.</p> <p>These uses fall within the definition of main town centre uses within the NPPF and the</p>

				identification of town centres as the principal focal points for these uses is consistent with the NPPF's 'town centres first' approach.
	TC2/1 – Upper Floors	✓	17, 23	<p>UDP Policy TC2/1 specifies that within the town centres the Council will support proposals which bring underused and vacant space on upper floors of premises into beneficial use.</p> <p>This Policy is consistent with the NPPF's approach towards encouraging the reuse of previously developed sites as identified as a Core Planning Principle under paragraph 17.</p> <p>In addition, it is also consistent with paragraph 23 of the NPPF which seeks positively promote competitive town centre environments.</p>
	TC2/2 – Mixed Use Development	✓	17, 23, 69	<p>Under Policy TC2/2, the Council will encourage and support compatible mixed use development within the town centres.</p> <p>This Policy is consistent with the NPPF's aim of promoting mixed use development as one of its core planning principles as set out under paragraph 17.</p> <p>In addition, it is also consistent with paragraph 23 of the NPPF which seeks positively promote competitive town centre environments.</p> <p>It will also assist in the creation of healthy communities in accordance with paragraph 69 of the NPPF which states that planning policies should aim to achieve places which promote opportunities for meetings between members of the community who might otherwise not come into contact with each other, including through mixed-use developments.</p>
	TC2/3 – Vacant And Cleared Sites	✓	17, 23	<p>Under Policy TC2/3, the Council is concerned that vacant and cleared sites should not detract from the overall appearance of the town centres. Where it appears that sites may remain undeveloped for some time, the Council will support proposals for their temporary use or improvement prior to their long term redevelopment.</p>

				<p>This Policy is consistent with the NPPF's approach towards encouraging the reuse of previously developed sites as identified as a Core Planning Principle under paragraph 17.</p> <p>In addition, it is also consistent with paragraph 23 of the NPPF which seeks positively promote competitive town centre environments.</p>
TC3	BURY TOWN CENTRE	✓	23-27	<p>Under Policy T3, the Council will be particularly concerned to bring forward, promote and support proposals to expand and enhance Bury Town Centre, in order to maintain its role as an important centre of sub-regional significance.</p> <p>This Policy is generally consistent with the NPPF's approach towards ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>However, the Policy pre-dates the Rock development and the latest evidence contained within the Bury Retail Study suggests that, whilst there is capacity for additional non-food retailing in Bury Town Centre, the priority will be for this capacity to be accommodated by the occupancy of existing vacant floorspace rather than the development of additional retail floorspace.</p>
	BURY TOWN CENTRE			
	Area BY1 – Tentersfield/Millet Street/Tenterden Street	✓	23-27	<p>UDP Area Policy BY1 states that the Council will consider favourably proposals for business (B1), office, civic uses, car parking and residential development in the Tentersfield/Millett Street/Tenterden Street area of the Town Centre. The change of use from residential to other uses will not be permitted.</p> <p>This Area Policy is generally consistent with the NPPF's approach towards ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>Since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Bury But Better' Town Centre Vision and Development Strategy and this was published in November 2009. This Strategy has</p>

				been adopted as a material planning consideration and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.
	Area BY2 – Bridge Road/Buckley Wells	✓	23	<p>UDP Area Policy BY2 states that the Council will consider favourably proposals for the enhancement of the Bridge Road/Buckley Wells area of the town centre for education, residential, car parking and railway related uses. The change of use from residential to other uses will not be supported.</p> <p>This Area Policy is generally consistent with the NPPF's approach towards ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p>
	Area BY3 – Bolton Street/Market Street	✓/x	23-27	<p>UDP Area Policy BY3 states that the Council will encourage and consider favourably proposals for cultural, leisure and tourism, shopping, business (B1), office and car parking uses in the Bolton Street/Market Place area of the town centre.</p> <p>This Area Policy is generally consistent with the NPPF's approach towards ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>Certain parts of Area BY3 do not sit within the Main Shopping Area of the town centre as is currently defined in the UDP. Sites outside the main shopping area would, therefore be considered to occupy edge-of-centre locations and it cannot be automatically assumed that these sites would be suitable for retail uses.</p> <p>Paragraph 24 of the NPPF specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres (in the case of retail uses, this should be within the main shopping area), then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When</p>

			<p>considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 26 of the NPPF specifies that when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres (i.e. including edge-of-centre sites), which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and▪ the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made. <p>The emerging Core Strategy is seeking to introduce smaller locally-derived floorspace thresholds for requiring consideration of impact. However, these have not been adopted and until such time the 2,500 sq.m. threshold would have to be the default position.</p> <p>Paragraph 27 of the NPPF specifies that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact, it should be refused.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Policy pre-dates the Rock development and the latest evidence contained within the Bury Retail Study suggests that, whilst there is capacity for additional non-food</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>retailing in Bury Town Centre, the priority will be for this capacity to be accommodated by the occupancy of existing vacant floorspace rather than the development of additional retail floorspace.</p> <p>In addition, since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Bury But Better' Town Centre Vision and Development Strategy and this was published in November 2009. This Strategy has been adopted as a material planning consideration and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>
	Area BY4 – Manchester Road/Knowsley Street	✓	23-27	<p>UDP Area Policy BY4 states that the Council will consider favourably proposals for business (B1), office, hotel/conference facilities, car parking and civic uses within the Manchester Road/Knowsley Street area of the town centre.</p> <p>This Area Policy is generally consistent with the NPPF's approach towards ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>Since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Bury But Better' Town Centre Vision and Development Strategy and this was published in November 2009. This Strategy has been adopted as a material planning consideration and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>
	Area BY5 – The Rock/Peel Way	✓/x	23-27	<p>UDP Area Policy BY5 states that the Council will encourage and promote proposals for retailing and ancillary uses, business (B1), office and car parking uses within The Rock/Peel Way area of the town centre.</p> <p>This Area Policy is generally consistent with the NPPF's approach towards ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>Certain parts of Area BY5 do not sit within the Main Shopping Area of the town centre as is currently defined in the UDP. Sites outside the main shopping area would, therefore be</p>

				<p>considered to occupy edge-of-centre locations and it cannot be automatically assumed that these sites would be suitable for retail uses.</p> <p>Paragraph 24 of the NPPF specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres (in the case of retail uses, this should be within the main shopping area), then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 26 of the NPPF specifies that when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres (i.e. including edge-of-centre sites), which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and▪ the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>made.</p> <p>The emerging Core Strategy is seeking to introduce smaller locally-derived floorspace thresholds for requiring consideration of impact. However, these have not been adopted and until such time the 2,500 sq.m. threshold would have to be the default position.</p> <p>Paragraph 27 of the NPPF specifies that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact, it should be refused.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Policy pre-dates the Rock development and the latest evidence contained within the Bury Retail Study suggests that, whilst there is capacity for additional non-food retailing in Bury Town Centre, the priority will be for this capacity to be accommodated by the occupancy of existing vacant floorspace rather than the development of additional retail floorspace.</p> <p>In addition, since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Bury But Better' Town Centre Vision and Development Strategy and this was published in November 2009. This Strategy has been adopted as a material planning consideration and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>
	Area BY6 – Central Shopping Area	✓	23	<p>UDP Area Policy BY6 states that the Council will encourage and support proposals for retailing and appropriate ancillary retail uses within the town centre's central shopping area.</p> <p>This Area Policy is generally consistent with the NPPF's approach towards ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>However, the Policy pre-dates the Rock development and the latest evidence contained within the Bury Retail Study suggests that, whilst there is capacity for additional non-food retailing in Bury Town Centre, the priority will be for this capacity to be accommodated by the occupancy of existing vacant floorspace</p>

				<p>rather than the development of additional retail floorspace.</p> <p>In addition, since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Bury But Better' Town Centre Vision and Development Strategy and this was published in November 2009. This Strategy has been adopted as a material planning consideration and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>
	Area BY7 – Townside/Market Street	✓	23	<p>UDP Area Policy BY7 states that the Council will encourage and promote proposals for community facilities, business (B1), office, leisure, recreation and car parking uses within the Townside/Market Street area of the town centre. This area is not considered appropriate for large scale retail development.</p> <p>This Area Policy is generally consistent with the NPPF's approach towards ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>Since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Bury But Better' Town Centre Vision and Development Strategy and this was published in November 2009. This Strategy has been adopted as a material planning consideration and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>
	Area BY8 – The Rock/Moorgate	✓/x	23-27	<p>UDP Area Policy BY8 states that the Council will encourage and promote proposals for retailing, business (B1), office and car parking uses within The Rock/Moorgate area of the town centre.</p> <p>This Area Policy is generally consistent with the NPPF's approach towards ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>Certain parts of Area BY5 do not sit within the Main Shopping Area of the town centre as is currently defined in the UDP. Sites outside the main shopping area would, therefore be considered to occupy edge-of-centre locations and it cannot be automatically assumed that</p>

			<p>these sites would be suitable for retail uses.</p> <p>Paragraph 24 of the NPPF specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres (in the case of retail uses, this should be within the main shopping area), then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 26 of the NPPF specifies that when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres (i.e. including edge-of-centre sites), which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and▪ the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made. <p>The emerging Core Strategy is seeking to</p>
--	--	--	---

				<p>introduce smaller locally-derived floorspace thresholds for requiring consideration of impact. However, these have not been adopted and until such time the 2,500 sq.m. threshold would have to be the default position.</p> <p>Paragraph 27 of the NPPF specifies that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact, it should be refused.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Policy pre-dates the Rock development and the latest evidence contained within the Bury Retail Study suggests that, whilst there is capacity for additional non-food retailing in Bury Town Centre, the priority will be for this capacity to be accommodated by the occupancy of existing vacant floorspace rather than the development of additional retail floorspace.</p> <p>In addition, since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Bury But Better' Town Centre Vision and Development Strategy and this was published in November 2009. This Strategy has been adopted as a material planning consideration and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>
	Area BY9 – George Street	✓	23-27	<p>UDP Area Policy BY9 states that the Council will encourage and promote proposals for additional non-food retailing and/or car parking facilities within the George Street area of the town centre. Retail development will be expected to complement activities within the centre's prime shopping area and provide replacement car parking.</p> <p>This Area Policy is generally consistent with the NPPF's approach towards ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>However, the Policy pre-dates the Rock development and the latest evidence contained within the Bury Retail Study suggests that, whilst there is capacity for additional non-food retailing in Bury Town Centre, the priority will</p>

				<p>be for this capacity to be accommodated by the occupancy of existing vacant floorspace rather than the development of additional retail floorspace.</p> <p>In addition, since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Bury But Better' Town Centre Vision and Development Strategy and this was published in November 2009. This Strategy has been adopted as a material planning consideration and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>
	<p>Area BY10 – Rochdale Road/Lord Street/York Street</p>	<p>✓/x</p>	<p>7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23-27</p>	<p>UDP Area Policy BY10 states that the Council will encourage and promote proposals for business (B1) and industrial (B2 and B8) uses within the Rochdale Road/Lord Street/York Street area of the town centre. Within the identified secondary shopping area fronting Rochdale Road, appropriate retail/mixed retail development will also be permitted. Further residential development within this area will not be encouraged.</p> <p>Area BY10 includes an area of business and industrial uses on the fringe of the town centre. The Policy seeks to encourage B1, B2 and B8 uses within this area which will help to build a strong, responsive and competitive local economy in accordance with the NPPF.</p> <p>However, the Rochdale Road Secondary Shopping Area does not fall within the Main Shopping Area of Bury town centre as identified on the UDP Proposals Map. Sites outside the Main Shopping Area would, therefore be considered to occupy edge-of-centre locations and it cannot be automatically assumed that these sites would be suitable for retail uses.</p> <p>Paragraph 24 of the NPPF specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs</p>

			<p>should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres (in the case of retail uses, this should be within the main shopping area), then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 26 of the NPPF specifies that when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres (i.e. including edge-of-centre sites), which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and▪ the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made. <p>The emerging Core Strategy is seeking to introduce smaller locally-derived floorspace thresholds for requiring consideration of impact. However, these have not been adopted and until such time the 2,500 sq.m. threshold would have to be the default position.</p> <p>Paragraph 27 of the NPPF specifies that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact, it</p>
--	--	--	---

				<p>should be refused.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Policy pre-dates the Rock development and the latest evidence contained within the Bury Retail Study suggests that, whilst there is capacity for additional non-food retailing in Bury Town Centre, the priority will be for this capacity to be accommodated by the occupancy of existing vacant floorspace rather than the development of additional retail floorspace.</p> <p>In addition, since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Bury But Better' Town Centre Vision and Development Strategy and this was published in November 2009. This Strategy has been adopted as a material planning consideration and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>
	<p>Area BY11- Heywood Street/Spring Street</p>	<p>✓</p>	<p>23, 69, 73</p>	<p>UDP Area Policy BY11 states that the Council will maintain housing as the predominant land use within the Heywood Street/Spring Street area of the town centre. The Council will also encourage and support proposals which enhance the residential character of the area and provide opportunities for housing/environmental improvement and/or additional amenity open space.</p> <p>In addition to supporting the vitality of the town centre, this Area Policy is also consistent with the NPPF in terms of promoting healthy communities, particularly through the promotion of high quality public open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation.</p> <p>Since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Bury But Better' Town Centre Vision and Development Strategy and this was published in November 2009. This Strategy has been adopted as a material planning consideration and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>

RAMSBOTTOM TOWN CENTRE				
	Area RM1 – Market Place/Carr Street/Ramsbottom Lane	✓	23, 69, 73	<p>UDP Area Policy RM1 specifies that the Council will maintain and seek to improve community facilities, recreation and housing within the Market Street/Carr Street/Ramsbottom Lane area of the town centre.</p> <p>In addition to supporting the vitality of the town centre, this Area Policy is also consistent with the NPPF in terms of promoting healthy communities, particularly through the promotion of high quality public open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation.</p>
	Area RM2 – St Paul's/Crow Lane	✓	17, 23, 69, 73	<p>UDP Area Policy RM2 specifies that the Council will maintain housing and community facilities as the predominant land uses in the St Paul's/Crow Lane area of the town centre. The Council will also encourage and support proposals which enhance the residential character of the area and provide opportunities for housing/ environmental improvement and/or additional amenity open space.</p> <p>In addition to supporting the vitality of the town centre, this Area Policy is also consistent with the NPPF in terms of enhancing and improving places within which people live and securing a good standard of amenity. It is also consistent with the NPPF in terms of promoting healthy communities, particularly through the promotion of high quality public open spaces and opportunities for sport and recreation.</p>
	Area RM3 – Bolton Street/Bridge Street	✓	23-27	<p>Under UDP Area Policy RM3, the Council will encourage and support proposals for retailing and appropriate ancillary uses within the Bolton Street/Bridge Street area, the town's main shopping area.</p> <p>This Policy is consistent with the NPPF's approach towards ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, any proposals for retail development within Area RM3</p>

				<p>would need to be consistent the levels expenditure capacity for Ramsbottom as identified in the Bury Retail Study.</p>
	<p>Area RM4 – Square Street</p>	<p>✓/x</p>	<p>23-27</p>	<p>UDP Area Policy RM4 specifies that the Council will consider favourably proposals for retail, business (B1), office, leisure, tourism, community and car parking uses in the Square Street area of the town centre. However, the mill site, west of Square Street, is not considered suitable for retail use, although in addition to the other uses listed above, the site would be considered appropriate for residential use.</p> <p>This Policy is generally consistent with the NPPF's approach towards ensuring the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>However, Area RM4 sits outside the Main Shopping Area of Ramsbottom centre as is currently defined in the UDP. Sites outside the main shopping area would, therefore be considered to occupy edge-of-centre locations and it cannot be automatically assumed that these sites would be suitable for retail uses.</p> <p>Paragraph 24 of the NPPF specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres (in the case of retail uses, this should be within the main shopping area), then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 26 of the NPPF specifies</p>

				<p>that when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres (i.e. including edge-of-centre sites), which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and ▪ the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made. <p>The emerging Core Strategy is seeking to introduce smaller locally-derived floorspace thresholds for requiring consideration of impact. However, these have not been adopted and until such time the 2,500 sq.m. threshold would have to be the default position.</p> <p>Paragraph 27 of the NPPF specifies that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact, it should be refused.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, any proposals for retail development within Area RM4 would also need to be consistent the levels expenditure capacity for Ramsbottom as identified in the Bury Retail Study.</p>
	Area RM5 – Railway Street/Bridge Street/Peel Brow	✓	7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23-27	Under UDP Area Policy RM5, the Council will consider favourably proposals for leisure and tourism related uses, business (B1), office and industrial uses (within Classes B2 and B8), and car parking uses within the Railway

				<p>Street/Bridge Street/Peel Brow area of the town centre. Measures to improve the area's environmental and physical appearance will also be encouraged.</p> <p>In addition to supporting the vitality of town centres, Area RM5 includes business and industrial uses on the fringe of the town centre. The Policy seeks to encourage B2 and B8 uses within this area which will help to build a strong, responsive and competitive local economy in accordance with the NPPF.</p>
	RADCLIFFE TOWN CENTRE			
	Area RD1 – Blackburn Street/Dale Street/Church Street West	✓	23-27, 35, 70	<p>UDP Area Policy RD1 covers the Blackburn Street/Dale Street/Church Street West area of the town centre and contains the town's main shopping facilities and, as such, proposals for retailing, appropriate ancillary Town Centre uses and environmental improvements will be acceptable. Proposals for the development of new or improved community facilities and for improvements to transport facilities will also be viewed favourably.</p> <p>This approach is consistent with the NPPF in terms of ensuring the vitality of town centres, promoting sustainable transport and promoting healthy communities through improved community facilities.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, any proposals for retail development within Area RD1 would need to be consistent the levels expenditure capacity for Radcliffe as identified in the Bury Retail Study.</p> <p>Furthermore, since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Re-Inventing Radcliffe' Strategy and the Radcliffe Town Centre Masterplan in order to guide the future regeneration of Inner Radcliffe. These strategies have been adopted as material planning considerations and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>

	<p>Area RD2 – Green Street/New Church Street</p>	<p>✓/x</p>	<p>23-27, 69, 73</p>	<p>Under UDP Area Policy RD2 the Council will maintain community facilities and public open space as the predominant land uses within the Green Street/New Church Street area of the town centre. Should the opportunity arise, the Council will also support retailing, business (B1), office and leisure uses on the Opportunity Site identified on Green Street.</p> <p>This approach is generally consistent with the NPPF in terms of ensuring the vitality of town centres and promoting healthy communities through maintained community facilities and public open space.</p> <p>However, Area RD2 sits outside the Main Shopping Area of Radcliffe town centre as is currently defined in the UDP. Sites outside the main shopping area would, therefore be considered to occupy edge-of-centre locations and it cannot be automatically assumed that these sites would be suitable for retail uses.</p> <p>Paragraph 24 of the NPPF specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres (in the case of retail uses, this should be within the main shopping area), then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 26 of the NPPF specifies that when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres (i.e. including edge-of-centre sites), which are not in accordance with an up-to-date</p>
--	--	------------	----------------------	--

			<p>Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and▪ the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made. <p>The emerging Core Strategy is seeking to introduce smaller locally-derived floorspace thresholds for requiring consideration of impact. However, these have not been adopted and until such time the 2,500 sq.m. threshold would have to be the default position.</p> <p>Paragraph 27 of the NPPF specifies that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact, it should be refused.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, any proposals for retail development within Area RD2 would also need to be consistent the levels expenditure capacity for Radcliffe as identified in the Bury Retail Study.</p> <p>Furthermore, since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Re-Inventing Radcliffe' Strategy and the Radcliffe Town Centre Masterplan in order to guide the future regeneration of Inner Radcliffe. These strategies have been adopted as material planning considerations and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>
--	--	--	---

	<p>Area RD3 – South of Pilkington Way</p>	<p>✓/x</p>	<p>7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23-27</p>	<p>Under UDP Area Policy RD3 the Council will consider favourably proposals for complementary town centre retailing, business (B1), office and industrial uses (B2 and B8), within the area of the town centre south of Pilkington Way. Measures to improve the area's environmental and physical appearance will also be encouraged.</p> <p>The promotion of B1, B2 and B8 development in this part of the town centre is consistent with the NPPF's aim to proactively drive economic development .</p> <p>Promoting improvements to the environment and physical appearance of this area is also consistent with the NPPF's core planning principles to improve and enhance the places in which people live and to seek to secure a good standard of amenity.</p> <p>However, Area RD3 sits outside the Main Shopping Area of Radcliffe town centre as is currently defined in the UDP. Sites outside the main shopping area would, therefore be considered to occupy edge-of-centre locations and it cannot be automatically assumed that these sites would be suitable for retail uses.</p> <p>Paragraph 24 of the NPPF specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres (in the case of retail uses, this should be within the main shopping area), then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on</p>
--	---	------------	-------------------------------------	---

			<p>issues such as format and scale.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 26 of the NPPF specifies that when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres (i.e. including edge-of-centre sites), which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and▪ the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made. <p>The emerging Core Strategy is seeking to introduce smaller locally-derived floorspace thresholds for requiring consideration of impact. However, these have not been adopted and until such time the 2,500 sq.m. threshold would have to be the default position.</p> <p>Paragraph 27 of the NPPF specifies that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact, it should be refused.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, any proposals for retail development within Area RD3 would also need to be consistent the levels expenditure capacity for Radcliffe as identified in the Bury Retail Study.</p> <p>Furthermore, since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Re-Inventing Radcliffe' Strategy in order to guide the future</p>
--	--	--	---

				regeneration of Inner Radcliffe. This strategy has been adopted as material planning considerations and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.
	Area RD4 – Stand Lane/Milltown Street	✓	17, 23-27, 69, 73	<p>Under UDP Area Policy RD4 the Council will maintain housing as the predominant land use within the Stand Lane/Milltown Street area of the town centre. The Council will also encourage and support proposals which improve commercial properties on Stand Lane and New Road, enhance the residential character of the area and which provide opportunities for housing/environmental improvements and/or additional amenity open space.</p> <p>Maintaining residential uses within the town centre supports the NPPF's aim to ensure the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>Promoting improvements to commercial properties is also consistent with the NPPF's core planning principles to improve and enhance the places in which people live and to seek to secure a good standard of amenity.</p> <p>The provision of additional amenity open space is also consistent with the NPPF's objective of promoting healthy communities.</p> <p>Since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Re-Inventing Radcliffe' Strategy in order to guide the future regeneration of Inner Radcliffe. This strategy has been adopted as material planning considerations and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>
	Area RD5 – St Thomas's/Bridgefield Street	✓	23-27, 69, 73	<p>Under UDP Area Policy RD5 the Council will maintain housing as the predominant land use within the St Thomas's/Bridgefield Street area of the town centre. The Council will also encourage and support proposals which enhance the residential character of the area and provide opportunities for housing/environmental improvements and/or additional amenity open</p>

				<p>space.</p> <p>Maintaining residential uses within the town centre supports the NPPF's aim to ensure the vitality of town centres.</p> <p>Promoting housing/environmental improvements also consistent with the NPPF's core planning principles to improve and enhance the places in which people live and to seek to secure a good standard of amenity.</p> <p>The provision of additional amenity open space is also consistent with the NPPF's objective of promoting healthy communities.</p> <p>Since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Re-Inventing Radcliffe' Strategy in order to guide the future regeneration of Inner Radcliffe. This strategy has been adopted as material planning considerations and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>
	<p>Area RD6 – Spring Lane/Church Street West/Radcliffe Metrolink Station</p>	<p>✓/x</p>	<p>7, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23-27</p>	<p>Under UDP Area Policy RD6 the Council will encourage the consolidation of existing employment generating uses within the Spring Lane/Church Street West/Radcliffe Station area of the town centre, and will, where appropriate, support the introduction of further employment generating uses, such as business (B1) and offices, industrial (B2 and B8), and complementary town centre retailing uses. Housing development will also be welcomed, where appropriate, together with measures to improve the area's environmental and physical appearance.</p> <p>The promotion of B2 and B8 development in this part of the town centre is consistent with the NPPF's aim to proactively drive economic development.</p> <p>Additional housing in this area will support the vitality of the town centre.</p> <p>Promoting improvements to the environment and physical appearance of this area is also consistent with the NPPF's core planning</p>

			<p>principles to improve and enhance the places in which people live and to seek to secure a good standard of amenity.</p> <p>However, Area RD6 sits outside the Main Shopping Area of Radcliffe town centre as is currently defined in the UDP. Sites outside the main shopping area would, therefore be considered to occupy edge-of-centre locations and it cannot be automatically assumed that these sites would be suitable for retail uses.</p> <p>Paragraph 24 of the NPPF specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres (in the case of retail uses, this should be within the main shopping area), then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 26 of the NPPF specifies that when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres (i.e. including edge-of-centre sites), which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and▪ the impact of the proposal on town centre
--	--	--	---

				<p>vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made.</p> <p>The emerging Core Strategy is seeking to introduce smaller locally-derived floorspace thresholds for requiring consideration of impact. However, these have not been adopted and until such time the 2,500 sq.m. threshold would have to be the default position.</p> <p>Paragraph 27 of the NPPF specifies that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact, it should be refused.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, any proposals for retail development within Area RD6 would also need to be consistent the levels expenditure capacity for Radcliffe as identified in the Bury Retail Study.</p> <p>Furthermore, since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Re-Inventing Radcliffe' Strategy in order to guide the future regeneration of Inner Radcliffe. This strategy has been adopted as material planning considerations and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>
	PRESTWICH TOWN CENTRE			
	Area PR1 – The Longfield Centre/Bury New Road	✓/x	23-27	<p>Under UDP Area Policy PR1 the Council will encourage and support proposals for retailing and other appropriate ancillary town centre uses within The Longfield Centre and the Bury New Road area of the town centre.</p> <p>This approach is generally consistent with the NPPF's aim to ensure the vitality of town centres.</p>

				<p>For the most part, Area PR1 comprises the Main Shopping Area of Prestwich town centre. However, land to the east of Rectory Lane sits outside the Main Shopping Area as is currently defined in the UDP. Sites outside the main shopping area would, therefore be considered to occupy edge-of-centre locations and it cannot be automatically assumed that these sites would be suitable for retail uses.</p> <p>Paragraph 24 of the NPPF specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres (in the case of retail uses, this should be within the main shopping area), then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 26 of the NPPF specifies that when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres (i.e. including edge-of-centre sites), which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and▪ the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer
--	--	--	--	---

				<p>choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made.</p> <p>The emerging Core Strategy is seeking to introduce smaller locally-derived floorspace thresholds for requiring consideration of impact. However, these have not been adopted and until such time the 2,500 sq.m. threshold would have to be the default position.</p> <p>Paragraph 27 of the NPPF specifies that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact, it should be refused.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, any proposals for retail development within Area PR1 would also need to be consistent the levels expenditure capacity for Radcliffe as identified in the Bury Retail Study.</p> <p>Furthermore, since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Love Prestwich' Strategy in order to guide the future regeneration of Prestwich Village. This strategy has been adopted as material planning considerations and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>
	Area PR2 – Warwick Street/Derby Street	✓	23-27, 69, 70, 73	<p>Under UDP Area Policy PR2 the Council will maintain housing as the predominant land use within the Warwick Street/Derby Street area of the town centre. The Council will also encourage and support proposals which enhance the residential character of the area and provide opportunities for housing/environmental improvements and/or additional amenity open space.</p> <p>Maintaining residential uses within the town centre supports the NPPF's aim to ensure the vitality of town centres.</p>

				<p>Promoting housing/environmental improvements is also consistent with the NPPF's core planning principles to improve and enhance the places in which people live and to seek to secure a good standard of amenity.</p> <p>The provision of additional amenity open space is also consistent with the NPPF's objective of promoting healthy communities.</p> <p>Since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Love Prestwich' Strategy in order to guide the future regeneration of Prestwich Village. This strategy has been adopted as material planning considerations and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>
	Area PR3 – Rectory Lane	✓	23-27, 70	<p>Under UDP Area Policy PR3 the Council will maintain housing and community facilities as the predominant land uses within the Rectory Lane area of the town centre.</p> <p>Maintaining residential uses within the town centre supports the NPPF's aim to ensure the vitality of town centres and retaining community facilities contributes towards the promotion of healthy communities.</p> <p>Since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Love Prestwich' Strategy in order to guide the future regeneration of Prestwich Village. This strategy has been adopted as material planning considerations and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>
	Area PR4 – Church Lane/Bury New Road/Clark's Hill	✓/x	23-27, 40, 70	<p>Under UDP Area Policy PR4 the Council will consider favourably proposals for office, residential, retail and complementary town centre retail uses within the Church Lane/Bury New Road/ Clark's Hill area of the town centre. The existing housing and community facilities should be retained wherever possible. Where appropriate, proposals will be required to provide independent car parking and demonstrate satisfactory means of access and</p>

			<p>egress.</p> <p>The promotion of main town centre uses and housing in this part of the town centre will generally support the NPPF's aim of ensuring the vitality of town centres and retaining community facilities contributes towards the promotion of healthy communities.</p> <p>Area PR4 includes part of the Main Shopping Area of Prestwich town centre as is currently defined in the UDP. However, this is predominantly confined to premises running along the Bury New Road Frontage and other areas within PR4 sit outside the Main Shopping Area. Sites outside the main shopping area would, therefore be considered to occupy edge-of-centre locations and it cannot be automatically assumed that these sites would be suitable for retail uses.</p> <p>Paragraph 24 of the NPPF specifically advocates the use of a sequential assessment in determining applications for main town centre uses that are not in an existing centre and are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan.</p> <p>In particular, paragraph 24 specifies that LPAs should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres (in the case of retail uses, this should be within the main shopping area), then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre. Applicants and local planning authorities should demonstrate flexibility on issues such as format and scale.</p> <p>In addition, paragraph 26 of the NPPF specifies that when assessing applications for retail, leisure and office development outside of town centres (i.e. including edge-of-centre sites), which are not in accordance with an up-to-date Local Plan, local planning authorities should require an impact assessment if the</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>development is over a proportionate, locally set floorspace threshold (if there is no locally set threshold, the default threshold is 2,500 sq m). This should include assessment of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ the impact of the proposal on existing, committed and planned public and private investment in a centre or centres in the catchment area of the proposal; and▪ the impact of the proposal on town centre vitality and viability, including local consumer choice and trade in the town centre and wider area, up to five years from the time the application is made. For major schemes where the full impact will not be realised in five years, the impact should also be assessed up to ten years from the time the application is made. <p>The emerging Core Strategy is seeking to introduce smaller locally-derived floorspace thresholds for requiring consideration of impact. However, these have not been adopted and until such time the 2,500 sq.m. threshold would have to be the default position.</p> <p>Paragraph 27 of the NPPF specifies that where an application fails to satisfy the sequential test or is likely to have significant adverse impact, it should be refused.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, any proposals for retail development within Area PR4 would also need to be consistent the levels expenditure capacity for Radcliffe as identified in the Bury Retail Study.</p> <p>Furthermore, since the UDP was adopted, the Council has commissioned the 'Love Prestwich' Strategy in order to guide the future regeneration of Prestwich Village. This strategy has been adopted as material planning considerations and should be taken into account when considering proposals for development within this part of the town centre.</p>
--	--	--	--	--