

Report to: Development
Executive Member

Date: 26th February 2007

Report of: Director of Development and
Regeneration

Report No: EMDR/10/07

Contact Officer: Diane Vaughton
Urban Design & Conservation
Officer

Tele No: Ext 6269

Report Title: Horwich Locomotive Works Conservation Area Management
Plan – Draft Consultation

Non Confidential:

This report does **not** contain information which warrants its consideration in the absence of the press or members of the public

Purpose:

To put forward views of the Policy Development Group, if any, to the Executive Member Development. PDG report attached.

Recommendations:

To approve suggested changes to the Conservation Area Management Plan

Decision:

Background Doc(s):

Horwich Locomotive Works Conservation Area Management Plan produced by Marion Barter of the Architectural History Practice

Signed:

Leader / Executive Member

Monitoring Officer

Date:

Summary:

Background Information

ANNEX 1

1.Introduction

1.1 The Authority is required by Performance Value indicator BV 219 to review and update its Conservation Areas and secondly to produce Management Plans. It is also a statutory requirement that public consultation is carried out and reported on.

1.2 The Management Plan is designed to help facilitate the regeneration of the Horwich Locomotive works and form initiatives to improve the area for development control purposes.

1.3 Conservation Area Appraisals and Management Plans form background evidence towards the preparation of the Core Strategy and Local Development Framework however they are not Supplementary Planning Documents.

1.4 Planning Policy Guidance 15 stresses the need for Local Authorities to define and record the special interest, character and appearance of all Conservation Areas in their districts in order to enable the development of a robust policy framework and which inspectors at appeal will have regard.

2. Background

2.1 The purpose of the attached report is to present the results of consultation with the public and with stakeholders and to seek approval of final recommendations to the Draft Conservation Area Management Plan for the Horwich Locomotives Works.

2.2 All major landowners of the site have been consulted which include;

Blumantle
Armstrongs
Aubrey Weiss

Other interested parties have been consulted which include;

The Emerson Group
Horwich Heritage
Bolton Civic Trust

Bolton Civic Trust and Aubrey Wiess did not respond.

2.3 A presentation was given to Horwich Town Council on Thursday 23rd November 2006.

2.4 A Drop-In Session was held on the Horwich Locomotives works at Rivington House kindly provided by Bluemantle. The event was chiefly aimed at tenants to provide clarity on the implications of the designation and importantly the Management Plan. At this event a 'Maintenance Guide' was handed out to attendees to inform them of repair and maintenance in the immediate future.

2.5 Members need to be particularly aware of the concern of the Emerson Group in relation to the CAMP. They have submitted detailed comments which are included in the attached schedule. They feel that the CAMP could impact on the overall viability of the project. They will take the view in due course on how this affects their future involvement.

3. Public Consultation

3.1 It is considered that after public consultation there is no perceived negative impact on any particular social group

4. Recommendation

4.1 Any views of the PDG on proposed changes to the Horwich Locomotive works Conservation Area Management Plan are forwarded to the Executive Member of Development.

Equality Impact Assessment Screening Form



Title of report or proposal:

Horwich Locomotive Works Conservation Area Management Plan -
Draft Consultation Statement

Department:	Development and Regeneration.
SIAP Unit:	Planning Control
Date:	26 th February 2007

This report is for decision and is therefore subject to an Equality Impact Assessment. The following questions have been completed to ensure that this proposal, procedure or working practice does not discriminate against any particular social group. Details of the outcome of the Equality Impact Assessment have also been included into the main body of the report.

Equality Impact Assessment Questions

1. Describe in summary the aims, objectives and purpose of the proposal, including desired outcomes:

The consultation statement reflects the concerns and opinions of both the major owners, stakeholders, tenants and members of the general public with regards to the implementation and interpretation of the Conservation Area Management Plan. Suggested changes to the CAMP have been put forward to the Council and the Council has responded accordingly and it is these responses that the Council seeks approval.
2. Who is intended to benefit from the proposal and in what way?

All users of the Locomotive Works in the short term and in the long term the intention is to involve more of the community in Horwich who will benefit from the Conservation Area designation and the subsequent management plan. It will form the basis for determining development in the area in a manner which will safeguard its distinctive character, promote high standards of design and in accordance with planning policy.

3. Who are the main stakeholders in relation to the proposal?

The Council, landowners, tenants and potential developers are the main stakeholders. However the appraisal will also raise awareness of heritage which will affect all users of Horwich Locomotive Works.

4. With regard to:

Is there any potential for differential impact?

Could this lead to adverse impact and if so what?

Can this adverse impact be justified on the grounds of promoting equality of opportunity for one group, or for any other reason

Please detail what measures or changes you will put in place to remedy any identified adverse impact

Race	There is no potential impact.			
Religion	There is no potential impact			
Disability	Poor design could restrict access to development by people with disabilities.	Potential for adverse impact	No	Any potential for differential impact will be prevented through planning control and building control process.
Gender	There is no potential impact.			

Age	There is no potential impact			
Sexuality	There is no potential for differential impact			
Caring Status	There is no potential for differential impact.			
Other comments or issues				

Please provide suitable evidence, such as the results of consultation, service take-up, service monitoring, surveys, stakeholder comments and complaints where appropriate.

For audit trail purposes all consultation, if any has been undertaken, must be added to the corporate Consultation Database. Please contact the Consultation and Research Team to facilitate this on ext. 1083

Please find attached the results of public consultation

5.a Are there any gaps in your evidence or conclusions that make it difficult for you to quantify the potential adverse impact?

There are no gaps that will make it difficult to identify any potential adverse impact.

5.b If so, please explain how you will explore the proposal in greater depth?

You may wish to consider undertaking secondary data analysis, further consultation or research or investigating best practice. Please contact the Consultation Manager on ext. 1083 if you wish to undertake further consultation or research.

If you have undertaken consultation as part of the proposal, has the research been uploaded onto the Corporate Consultation Database?

Yes

NoX

If you are planning to undertake consultation or research as a result of this EIA, please submit a copy of this form to the Consultation Manager.

This EIA form and report has been checked and countersigned by the Departmental Equalities Officer before proceeding to Executive Member(s)

Report Officer

Name: Diane Vaughton

Signature:

Date and Contact No: 30th January 2007 ext 6269

Departmental Equalities Lead Officer

Name: Victoria Mathes

Page 6 of 10

Signature:

Date and Contact No:

Comments



BOLTON COUNCIL HORWICH LOCOMOTIVE WORKS CONSERVATION AREA MANAGEMENT PLAN DRAFT CONSULTATION STATEMENT

This statement sets out the formal consultation initiatives undertaken between Wednesday 22nd November and 8th December 2006. The methods of community involvement applied are in conformity with the Bolton Local Development Framework Statement of Community Involvement. This statement provides details of the methods of consultation used, the submissions made, a response to these and whether an alteration to the draft development brief is considered to be appropriate.

1. Consultation Methods

The period of consultation ran from Wednesday 22nd November and 8th December 2006 and included the following initiatives:-

- Hard copies sent to Statutory Consultees, all organisations likely to have an interest in the development of the area, all persons identified in a Land Registry search as having an interest and all known occupiers. They were Bluemantle, Emerson Group, Armstrongs, Aubrey Weiss, Bolton Civic Trust and Horwich Heritage.
- Hard copies of the document were available free from the Development and Regeneration reception on the 3rd floor of Bolton Town Hall.
- An introduction to the Management Plan was presented to Horwich Town Council on Thursday 23rd November; comments were invited from both Members and the Public.
- A Drop-in Session was held at the Horwich Locomotive Works on Wednesday 6th December. All owners and tenants within the Conservation Area were invited along with the local Heritage bodies including Horwich Heritage and Bolton Civic Trust.

2. Summary of Comments and Recommended Responses

Ten responses were received in writing or by Email during the formal period of consultation. The issues raised regarding the Conservation Area Management Plan (CAMP) by the respondents are set out below.

Respondent:- Bluemantle, Mark Caldwell, Director			
Ref	Comment	Council Response	Suggested Amendment to Text of CAMP
1	Rather than the term 'conservation-led regeneration strategy' they would be more comfortable with 'formulate a regeneration strategy for the area within which conservation will play an important part'.	Agreed	A regeneration strategy which takes full advantage of the heritage value of the site and promotes sustainability and employment.
2	Refurbishment has been carried out with a grant from the ERDF	Agreed	A reference will be made in the CAMP as good practice
3	Buildings 3, 4, 5 & 9 of 'significant buildings' have a neutral impact on the character of the Conservation Area as they are in such a poor state of repair.	The Council understands the need for further condition assessment.	No change is required to the document.
4	Building 6 has been re-roofed with inappropriate materials and therefore the whole building has a neutral impact on the Conservation Area.	Agreed however the main body of the building will still need to be assessed	No change is required.
5	Building 8 has a negative impact on the Conservation Area due to its poor state of repair.	Agreed	No change is required to the document at this stage.
6	Building 10 in Bluemantle's opinion is the most significant building in the CA and it would be highly desirable to see the demolished central bays replaced as part of a regeneration scheme.	Agreed	No change.
7	Building 11 is considered to detract from the character of the CA.	Agreed further assessment is required	No change is required to the document at this stage.
8	The rail tracks should be moved to a more appropriate location.	Agreed, there are health and safety issues that need to be addressed regarding the tracks and this should be made clear in the document.	An appropriate sentence to that effect should be made in Chapter 4 followed up with further discussions with Highways Engineers.
9	Para's 1 & 2 of Chapter 4.3 should be swapped to emphasize development rather than halting the deterioration of the significant structures.	Agreed	Paragraph 1 & 2 will be swapped
10		Agreed	

	The key vista in Bluemantle's opinion is the canyon between 10 & 6/7.		A sentence to this effect to be inserted in Chapter 5.7.
11	The reference to north-west should be north-east on Page 22, Paragraph 3.	Agreed	This will be rectified.
12	The main roads are surfaced with modern materials. Allowances should be given to maintain them as such where required in the short term and stated as such in CAMP.	Agreed	This can be made more clear in Chapter 6.7.
13	In the short term Bluemantle advise that standard security fencing should be permitted.	Agreed, however the design of fencing should be considered as part of an overall planning application and determined on its own merits. The CAMP aims to facilitate design in the short and long term.	A sentence will be inserted to that effect in Chapter 5.8 Page 23 Paragraph 4.
14	It should be recommended that if it proves impossible to adequately preserve significant buildings, resources should be concentrated on the ones that are most significant.	Agreed, however an objective assessment of the buildings as a whole and individually should be undertaken as part of a planning application to ensure quality a sympathetic design is encouraged	No change is required.
15	Bluemantle suggest that either side of the Thirlmere Aqueduct could be used for other activities, not just green/landscaping	Agreed, subject to Greenspace/landscape issues, subject to easement and subject to landowners.	No change is required.
16	Bluemantle do not believe that they are responsible for the commissioning of surveys, archaeological or otherwise.	The Council appreciates the developers/partners position. It is a statutory requirement that will be required as part of a planning application. The Council will ensure an efficient procedure is put in place to aid the planning process.	No change.
17	Reference should be made to the economic viability of temporary holding repairs in Chapter 7.2 – Buildings - Repairs	Agreed, an assessment of these buildings is required which will guide the economic viability of temporary holding repairs.	A sentence will be inserted to that effect.

Respondent:- The Emerson Group, Paul Burgess; Group Main Board Director

Ref	Comment	Council Response	Suggested Amendment to Text of CAMP
18	Widespread neglect could be a consequential effect of CAMP and buildings have deteriorated because	Agreed. The regeneration strategy and CAMP is to provide guidance for landlords and tenants to prevent widespread	No change is required.

	they do not meet contemporary standards.	neglect.	
19	Buildings 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9 & 11 should be removed from the list of 'significant buildings' and question whether 6 & 7 should be on the list.	Initial evaluations by a professional consultant believe these buildings are significant. Further assessment via a planning application will be statutorily required to demonstrate reuse is not viable.	No change required as the document is already flexible enough to allow change.
20	It should be made clear that All buildings described as having a neutral impact on the character of the Conservation Area would ideally be demolished in the regeneration plans	It is agreed that a neutral building could be demolished however it is to ensure future development schemes are sympathetic to the heritage assets.	In the 'Introduction' a sentence will be inserted to articulate that a case for demolition can be made based on its lack of continued viability, & the proposed scheme's contribution to the area.
21	Buildings 1 – 5 of those that are considered to have a negative impact on the character of the conservation Area should be made clear that they are to be demolished as part of the overall regeneration plans.	Agreed	A paragraph should be inserted to this effect.
22	The regeneration of the Loco works should encourage the engagement of the community however it should be at the expense of the demolition of buildings 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9 & 11	Agreed that community engagement should be encouraged however all proposals will need to take a holistic approach to regeneration and will need to demonstrate a thorough reassessment and viability study as part of a planning application which is a statutory requirement.	No change .
23	CAMP should not deter a character or layout which balances the needs and requirements of the mixed use users.	CAMP successfully identifies the existing character and layout but refrains from prescriptive recommendations for mixed use users to allow for flexibility for future users.	No change needed.
24	Some protection should be awarded to the railway tracks to protect heritage however this should not be widespread as it needs to be balanced with the need for contemporary & efficient road layouts.	Agreed that a cautious approach to the retention of these tracks is undertaken. It is appreciated that for health and safety reasons realistic and long term decisions are made.	A sentence inserted in the 'Introduction' to articulate that a case for demolition can be made derived from further detailed assessment of the building and its contribution to the area.
25	A note should be made that demolition is not ruled out & that regeneration of the whole will take precedence over decisions on	Agreed however an objective assessment of the buildings as a whole and individually should be undertaken as part of a planning application to ensure quality and	A sentence to this effect can be inserted in Chapter 4 – Managing Change.

	individual buildings.	sympathetic design is encouraged	
26	More should be made of 'external funding'.	Agreed. The Council is currently investigating the Heritage Lottery Funding for possible funding sources.	More information can be inserted to this effect.
27	In the last paragraph of Chapter 4.3 the insertion of 'wherever possible' in terms of safeguarding the special historic character of the site.	Agreed, however the Council prefer; ' after further assessment and a viability study the historic character would need to be re-evaluated	Change as 'is enhanced for future generations' ,
28	There is an implication that new buildings will detrimentally affect the overall site.	The document aims to ensure sympathetic design of any new build and protect the character of the area	No change is required to the document,
29	Referring to views and spatial form it is suggested that views between the residential areas beyond should be maintained in future development 'wherever possible'	Agreed, however substitute 'wherever possible' for an objective assessment/consultation will inform any decision to ensure positive new development'	Insert sentence as suggested.
30	Not too many onerous conditions are placed on any new residential	Agreed	No change is required.
31	Long term viability should not be prejudiced by security issues such as fencing which are not fit for purpose	Agreed, however the design of fencing should be considered as part of an overall planning application and determined on its own merits. The CAMP aims to facilitate design in the short & long term.	No change is required.
32	Accessibility is vastly improved from both Middlebrook & Horwich Town Centre.	Agreed	Insert sentence to reinforce this in Chapter 5.9
33	A list of 'important open spaces could be included in Chapter 6.7	Agreed	A list will be compiled based on the current layout however this may be change subject to assessment of existing buildings,
34	The recommendation to commission an archaeological & architectural record be made of the site and to consult GMAU is too onerous.	The Council appreciates the developer/partners position. It is a statutory requirement as part of a planning application. The Council will ensure an efficient procedure is put in place to aid the planning process.	A paragraph will be inserted to this effect.
35	The need for public funding is absolutely paramount.	Agreed the Council will endeavour to locate funding sources	A sentence to this effect can be inserted in Chapter 7.1
36		Page 16 of 19	

	The recommendation for owners to assess and survey their own properties at a cost to be factored into financial planning for the site's regeneration is too burdensome.	Agreed, the Council appreciates the developers/partners position. Objective assessment is a statutory requirement as part of a planning application.	The survey/assessment should be part of a business plan. The Council will endeavour to source funding for this initial stage of development.
37	The wider range of mixed uses should also provide for a range of those uses.	Agreed	No change is required to the document.
38	The option of including other areas within the boundary of the Conservation Area needs to be very carefully dealt with.	Agreed	No change is required to the document.
Respondent:- Horwich Heritage Stuart Whittle Chairman			
Ref	Comment	Council Response	Suggested Amendment to Text of CAMP
39	HH willing to assist with CAMP as required in order to ensure the survival of this site of 'national importance'.	HH are recognised to be a great source of knowledge & support of the Loco Works and the offer of assistance is greatly appreciated.	No change is required to the document.
40	It is important that the custodians ie the owners & tenants receive the maximum amount of support & encouragement in the daunting task of maintaining and repairing these historic structures	Owners and tenants will be given all the advice and guidance possible. Grant aid will be thoroughly researched.	No change is required to the document.
41	It is slightly curious to be asked to comment on a Management Plan without a Development Plan to measure against it.	The document has been designed carefully to allow for flexibility for future strategic schemes and to minimise further decay until a Development Plan (if one is to be produced) is approved.	No change is required to the document.
42	It is hoped that 'due diligence' will be exercised by the Council now that extra care and attention is being required of the owners and tenants on the site.	Agreed	No change is required to the document.
43	It is a sad reflection on the current status of the report that armed with this information and a recommendation that the Cottage Hospital be saved. The Planning Committee recently voted for its demolition. We trust	The Cottage Hospital is to be demolished and the design of the replacement is considered to be in keeping with the character of the CA. The Council will endeavour to ensure CAMP remains in the public arena and consistently used for reference and as a guide during the decision	No change is required to the document.

	CAMP will be given greater recognition in the future decision making & that other buildings currently 'at risk' can be saved.	making process.	
44	To the present owners/tenants, even interim repairs might appear uneconomic without financial incentives. It is hoped therefore that grant assistance will be forthcoming in the near future.	Grant Assistance will be fully investigated.	No change is required to the document.
45	HH are pleased that the Management Plan recognises the totality of the complex: the buildings, spaces and surrounding areas and the necessity to retain the historic grid, rail routes and building relationships.	Noted	No change is required to the document.
46	Apart from providing jobs and possibly residential accommodation at some point in the future, one way to improve access and achieve greater recognition of the heritage of the site by dedicating certain buildings & spaces to commemorate its history.	Agreed	No change is required to the document.
47	There is a need for a coordinated approach to maintenance & management including surveys, audits & buildings at risk that needs to be undertaken at once.	Agreed	No change is required to the document.

Respondent :- Armstrongs

Ref	Comment	Council Response	Suggested Amendment to Text of CAMP
48	To demolish every building without exception on Armstrongs site as they have outlived their usefulness and are totally impractical for modern day uses.	It is the Council's opinion that this is not the case; there are several buildings of significance which are on Armstrong' site that the Council seek to retain as they contribute to the overall character of the CA.	No change, the purpose of CAMP is to objectively assess the existing buildings on Horwich Locomotive Works in order to encourage sympathetic design. Demolition will only be considered when an objective assessment has been made.

Comments recorded from the Drop-In Session on Wednesday 6 th December 2006			
Ref	Comment	Council Response	Suggested Amendment to Text of CAMP
49	The majority of enquiries were concerned with the future uses on this site. Many had concerns that they would soon need to find another site to operate their business.	The Council's response was to explain that current 'use classification' on this site is industrial and that there are no planning applications to date for any changes on this site.	No change is required to the document.
50	Armstrong's waste 'pile' and daily business causing a nuisance was a concern to the majority of attendees.	It was explained that all was being done to reduce the impact of the waste 'pile' within the parameters of Planning Legislation. It was explained that the Council were not aware of any 'core-drilling' but that it may be to do with checking for contaminated land.	No change is required to the document.
51	Core-drilling has been carried out at various points within the site.	As the Urban Design & Conservation Officer I knew nothing of this but suggested it may have been a routine exercise.	No change is required to the document.
52	The railway tracks throughout the site are a Health & Safety issues causing damage to vehicles and are 'trip' hazards.	The response was that the Planning Dept would be working alongside Highways engineers to assess the issue.	No change is required to the document.
53	Concerns that 'industry' is being pushed out.	The Council's response was to explain that current 'use classification' on this site is industrial and that there are no planning applications to date for a residential development on this site.	No change is required to the document.