

PLANNING COMMITTEE
Schedule of Supplementary Information

Thursday 22nd April 2021

Members are advised of the enclosed information that was either received or requested after the production of the planning applications report.

**Bolton
Council**

09862/20	
Ward	Location
HOBL	HORWICH LOCO WORKS

Paragraphs 80 and 84 of the report should refer to a "supplementary" Section 106 Agreement, not a "Deed of Variation".

For Members' information, the HIF grant and funding agreement for the spine road commits the Council to deliver 120 affordable homes across the wider Rivington Chase site, and before a decision can be made to accept the grant and deliver the spine road the Council must have certainty that the grant conditions can be met. This planning application for 116 affordable homes, if approved, would provide the level of certainty required for the £12m to deliver the spine road. It is therefore considered that this benefit, along with the benefits associated with increasing the supply of affordable homes in Horwich, should carry significant planning weight in the determination of this application.

Correspondence with Horwich Heritage

Following the publication of the officer's report, Horwich Heritage have written to officers (cc'ing the Chair of Committee, the leaders of Bolton's Conservative, Labour and Liberal Democrats parties and Chris Green MP), stating the following:

"For the benefit of the people of Horwich, can you please explain why you believe the developer's 'promised' (but not yet committed) proposals for the Millwrights/Pattern shop which include a heritage centre, health & wellbeing centre and food & drinks hall constitute an adequate replacement for the education, health, welfare, retail, leisure and public open space facilities which were intended to be located in the 'heritage core' for the benefit of the 5000 people who will ultimately live there.

The Millwrights/Pattern shop proposals, whilst being a welcome re-use for these original Loco Works buildings, are clearly 'tourist facilities' which will attract visitors rather than serve the local population and therefore will not provide any of the necessary community facilities that were promised in the SPD, Master Plan and Phasing Strategy. By approving house building on the area 'allocated' for community facilities (including the public square) you are denying the possibility of these facilities ever being provided - since there is no other area allocated on the Master Plan for them."

Officers have replied to the above with the following:

"Thank you for email.

As you will know, the application site for 09862/20 (the proposed Lane End development) forms the south western corner of the designated Heritage Core; that is, not the entirety of the designated Heritage Core. The Heritage Core has been approved for mixed-use development and it is clear within the approved Design and Access Statement for the development that residential development within the Heritage Core is permitted, provided that it follows the core design principles set within it. The outline approval for the Rivington Chase development (91352/14) grants permission for the change of use of the retained buildings within the Heritage Core for any of the following uses – A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, B1, C1, D1 and/or D2 – provided that they do not exceed the floorspace thresholds set out in condition 10 of the approval.

The buildings on the application site have now been demolished, but the Millwrights and Pattern Makers Shop buildings are still retained on the adjoining site and therefore would be subject to condition 10 on the outline approval (change of use). The proposed residential development of this vacant site is not contrary to either the outline approval, the masterplan, the approved phasing strategy or any of the policy or policy guidance concerning the Rivington Chase development, as set out in the Officer's report to Committee. There is nothing within any of the approved documentation that states that the application site cannot be developed solely for housing.

Officers have no current reason to believe that the adjacent site and buildings (which the landowner are currently proposing as the community hub and focus within the Heritage Core: comprising a community health and well-being centre, a retail food and drink hall, along with a public square and heritage/memorial parks) will not come forward at a later stage, and indeed, should the LPA receive a contrary application for this adjacent site, that application would need to be considered and assessed separately against the outline approval and the relevant policy guidance for Rivington Chase.

Furthermore, the current planning application does not constrain any future development on the neighbouring site.

As stated above, a variety of different uses have been approved within the Heritage Core. It was however never the intention that *all* the listed uses would be provided within the Heritage Core: the list instead confirms which uses (other than residential) would be permitted. I therefore cannot agree with you that the landowner's proposal for the neighbouring site would be an inadequate replacement, as the proposed uses fully comply with the parameters set out in the outline approval. I also cannot agree that the landowner's mooted proposed uses would be 'tourist facilities' as I would expect that the community health and well-being centre and the A1 (now Class E) uses would be frequented by the residents of Rivington Chase given their close proximity to these residents.

I hope that this answers your concerns.

Please note that I will be providing a summary of your concerns and my response within the Schedule of Supplementary Information, which will be presented to Committee Members before the meeting on Thursday."

Further to this response Horwich Heritage replied with the following:

"Many thanks for your reply.

However, in your lengthy response I did not see a clear answer to my 2 main points:

1. How will the future uses proposed for the Millwrights/Pattern Shop be guaranteed?
2. Where will the 'missing' community facilities like a primary school, a range of local shops, pubs, cafes and other leisure facilities and the public square be located if there is nowhere left in the 'heritage core' and there are no other areas allocated for them on the Master Plan?"

To which Officers have replied:

"In response to your email, please find my further response:

1. There can be no "guarantee" as such until a planning application for the site has been approved and commenced, however as I stated in my email, we have no current reason to believe that the plans will not come forward.
2. I do not believe that the facilities you have listed are "missing", given that it was never explicit in the outline permission that all these facilities/uses were to be provided within the development (as I tried to explain in my email to you). With regards to the primary school, a new school was not envisaged on site: developers are instead expected to contribute towards the expansion of existing schools within the local area through the S106 requirements, and indeed Chorley New Road Primary has already been expanded. With regards to a public square, this is proposed within Bluemantle's plans for the Heritage Core, proposed to the south of the Millwrights and Pattern Makers Shop."