**Appendix 4 – West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Schedule of Consultation Responses**

A summary of the issues raised in relation to the West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD, and the council response is provided below. The consultation period ran from 27 November 2025 to 22 January 2026.

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Vision and Objectives** | | | |
| 1 | Vision and Objectives | The vision and objectives are clear and thorough. | Noted | Resident (x1) |
| 2 | Vision and Objectives | Agree with the vision and objectives, however, don't believe they will be met. | Support for vision and objectives noted. The SPD thoroughly address how they will be met including through 8 design principles and Section 9 on Phasing, Delivery and Governance. | Resident (x3) |
| 3 | Vision and Objectives | The sustainable inclusive vision should refer to sustainable water management principals i.e. both sustainable drainage and efficient use of water | Change made – this has been incorporated into page 6 bullet text under 1.2 | United Utilities |
| 4 | Vision and Objectives | Vision statement needs to include reference to public transport and access to jobs | Text added as below in bold:<br><br>'West of Wingates will be a sustainable and well-connected employment hub that delivers long-term economic and social value for Westhoughton and, by extension, Bolton. This exemplar development will provide modern, adaptable, and accessible business space in a strong landscape setting**, supported by integrated and accessible public transport connections**. Green corridors and open spaces will define the site's character, supporting biodiversity, active sustainable travel, and wellbeing. This balance of high-quality employment space and integrated green infrastructure will create a place where businesses thrive, people want to work, and wider benefits are afforded to the local community' | TfGM |
| 5 | Vision and Objectives | Request that vision includes reference to the delivery of an exemplar development to ensure consistency with the wider references to exemplar development within the wider consultation document. | Change made - incorporated into vision text on page 42 | United Utilities |
| 6 | Vision and Objectives | United Utilities request that the second to last paragraph on page 42, which refers to the climate emergency, refers to the need to ensure that the development embraces sustainable water management principles in terms of multi-functional SuDS and water efficiency measures. | Change made - Incorporated into fifth paragraph on page 42 | United Utilities |
| 7 | Vision and Objectives | Vision statement should include reference to public transport and access to jobs.<br><br>Suggested wording:<br>'Wellbeing and inclusion will be at the heart of site delivery, ensuring transport choice and access for those without a car by provision of safe active travel routes and enhanced bus services from local communities and transport hubs.' | Change made - incorporated text change under 6.1 on page 42 | TfGM |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | In body text of the page<br>Suggest rewording to:<br>'Set within the strategic Northfold Growth Location, the site offers an opportunity to reinvent the local economy and create a vibrant new employment hub.'<br><br>'The site will deliver a diverse mix of building typologies, carefully integrated with green spaces, active transport routes, public transport networks and social value initiatives' | | |
| | **Ambition** | | | |
| 8 | Masterplan ambition | It would strengthen the overall ambition to make specific reference ensuring the place principles address the climate change challenge and the need for any development to be resilient through both design and construction. | Change made - Text amended on page 12 | Environment Agency |
| | **Consultation** | | | |
| 9 | N/A | We have had no communication with anyone from Harworth or the council until the drop-in session on 15th of December. We feel like we are being completely forgotten about. I would like to know how a plan can be produced without any meetings with residents whose homes will be blighted by this development. | Between Thursday 27 November 2025 and Thursday 22 January 2026, Bolton Council ran a public consultation, seeking views on the draft West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). During the consultation period, a comprehensive communication plan was implemented to raise awareness of the draft SPD across the borough, with a strong emphasis on engaging developers, landlords, agents, existing businesses on the adjacent West of Wingates Industrial Estate, and residents.<br><br>Direct communications were distributed via email, to all stakeholders, in accordance with the requirements of the Statement of Community Involvement and Planning Regulations. In addition, leaflets were distributed to households (949) and 172 businesses. Correspondence was also distributed to wider stakeholders including the Vision Partnership, Elected Members and community organisations. Furthermore, the Planning team met with the Westhoughton Town Council on the 8th of December 2025 to share the consultation proposal. Supporting documentation in the form of the West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD document and Frequently Asked Questions were made accessible on the council's consultation webpages and social media was utilised throughout the period to share key messages about consultation. Paper surveys and the draft Masterplan was also made available in all borough libraries and the One Stop Shop at Bolton Town Hall.<br><br>A questionnaire made up of open and closed questions was made available over a period of 8 weeks, providing respondents the opportunity to reflect and share their thoughts on the draft Masterplan. The questionnaire was made available both digitally and offline, with | Resident (x2) |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | the questionnaire being accessible on the council's consultation web page, as well as in hard copy format, on request.<br><br>In addition, a drop-in event was held on Monday 15 December 2025 at the Westhoughton Hub, Central Drive, BL5 3DS, between 1pm and 7pm, where people could view the West of Wingates draft Masterplans document, exhibition boards, ask questions and speak to a planning officer or the developer, Harworth. Paper copies of the questionnaire were distributed at this event. | |
| | **Principle of Development** | | | |
| 10 | N/A | Need for development - the development is not needed and should not be built. Development will not meet any of the principles it set out to achieve | Adopted PfE Policy JPA6 allocates this land for around 440,000 sqm of industrial and warehousing development. This response is outside the scope of the consultation which relates to the West of Wingates Masterplan SPD. | Residents (x24) |
| 11 | N/A | Scale of development - the proposal should be reduced in scale | PfE Policy JPA6 allocates this land for around 440,000 sqm of industrial and warehousing floorspace. Comment out of scope of consultation. | Resident (x1) |
| 12 | Chapter 7 (Strategic Masterplan) | Strategic Masterplan (Chapter. 7): The maximum extent of development should be reduced and there should be wider green corridors & landscape buffers. The areas of development are too big and should be kept further away from existing farmsteads & the properties adjacent to Dicconson Lane.<br><br>Retain as much green space as possible | This topic is already addressed under the design principles DP1 Green Corridors, DP2 Landscape Buffers, and DP8 Building Design. This will guide evaluation of planning applications proposing specific uses in specific locations. | Residents (x3) |
| 13 | N/A | The development area is too big. | Adopted PfE Policy JPA6 allocates this land for around 440,000 sqm of industrial and warehousing development. This response is outside the scope of the consultation which relates to the West of Wingates Masterplan SPD. | Residents (x22) |
| 14 | N/A | The development is a detriment to the town, not an addition. The development will destroy lives and wellbeing. | Out of scope of consultation. The principle of development, and quantity of floorspace was established through Policy JPA6 (West of Wingates) of the Adopted Places for Everyone Plan. | Residents (x2) |
| 15 | N/A | The development will result in the loss of Green Belt | Out of scope of consultation. The principle of development, and quantity of floorspace was established through Policy JPA6 (West of Wingates) of the Adopted Places for Everyone Plan. | Resident |
| | **Impact on Westhoughton** | | | |
| 16 | N/A | It is important that Westhoughton remains a country town, not a mini inner-city full of traffic & people. The proposed development will add nothing and will cause Westhoughton town centre to slip into decline. | Out of scope of consultation - the principle of the development and quantity of floorspace was established in Policy JPA6 (West of Wingates) of the adopted Places for Everyone. | Residents (x2) |
| 17 | N/A | The development will result in additional crime. | This is addressed through Section 8.2 of the West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD (A legible, safe and accessible place) | Residents (x2) |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 18 | N/A | Fly tipping is already an everyday occurrence in Westhoughton. | Out of scope of consultation. | Resident |
| | **Impact on homes within the development area** | | | |
| 19 | N/A | There should be no immediate development behind the existing residential properties on the A6. This area should remain as open space for the benefit of local population and existing wildlife. | West of Wingates Design Principle DP2 Landscape Buffers states addresses the issue of appropriate buffers around residential properties. | Resident |
| 20 | N/A | The views of residents will be harmed. The development will create an eyesore in the area. | PfE Policy JPA6 West of Wingates states that development will be required to ensure that the siting and scale of buildings and the landscape planting scheme minimises the prominence of the development and its impact upon the surrounding landscape and views.<br><br>This is also addressed through West of Wingates Masterplan SPD Design Principle 2 Landscape Buffers | Residents (x3) |
| 21 | N/A | These impacts go beyond air quality and include noise. Landscape buffers to the corner of Chorley Road and Dicconson lane are not large enough and the proposed development at that corner fails to take into consideration the housing opposite it, which will have to look out on those buildings. A much greater investment into landscape here is required, residents don't want to look out on humongous warehouses when they currently look out at Protected greenbelt. They should be much more akin to those outlined in other areas. There are a number of missing images throughout the documents. This isn't a fair representation of the plan. We need details of massing, buildings on the corner of Chorley Road and Dicconson lane should be restricted to a maximum height in keeping with the existing building typography like the farm buildings or the Royal Oak pub. | The corner of the Dicconson Lane and Chorley Road is one of, if not, the most prominent part of the entire site, therefore the principles and parameters set out within the SPD set the framework for what officers would consider acceptable within this part of the site. The detail of the area in relation to final building design (scale, massing, use) will not be established until the planning application stage, currently anticipated to form part of phase 3 of the development sometime between 2030 and 2040.<br><br>Regarding landscape buffers, the exact width/depth of these will also be established during the detailed planning application stage. DP2 sets out what good looks like in relation to the landscape buffers and includes aspects such as 'Buildings visually contained by planting and landform', 'Neighbouring homes are screened by planting, bunding.....', 'Buffers reduce noise, light and visual impact while delivering measurable BNG' and 'Local landowners and neighbours given the opportunity to shape buffers, creating a respectful edge...'. | Resident |
| 22 | N/A | There should be sufficient mounding between the properties at Willow Bank and the construction site, similar to what we see at Engine lane at the rear of Logistics North. This should not impact any existing trees or shrubbery on Long Lane. Acoustic fencing will be necessary to keep noise to a minimum after construction. All existing convenances on the private road (Long Lane) must be retained. This would also be a good opportunity to connect Willow Bank to the gas network. | Flood risk is already addressed under the design principles DP1 Green Corridors and DP2 Landscape Buffers. This will guide evaluation of planning applications proposing specific uses in specific locations. | Resident |
| | **Environment** | | | |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 23 | N/A | The proposal will bring environmental destruction. | The West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD sets out an ambitious vision to transform the land to the West of Wingates into one of the North Wests premier employment destinations. It sets out that the aim is to retain key environmental characteristics wherever possible, but accepts that given the sites allocation for industrial and warehousing floorspace, some existing landscape features will necessarily be altered or removed. The character of the site will be landscape-led, with the ambition to create a strong and distinctive environment that integrates new industrial and warehousing uses into the surrounding rural landscape setting enhancing ecological and biodiversity qualities and providing new accessible green space. The Design Principles will set out how this will be achieved. | Resident |
| 24 | N/A | Request that the first sentence of the fourth paragraph is amended to state:<br><br>'Sustainability should be embedded at the core of the design approach, with energy-efficient construction, low-carbon technologies, sustainable water management principles (sustainable drainage and water efficiency), and climate resilience measures forming integral elements of the scheme." | Change made - incorporated into text in fourth paragraph on page 74 | United Utilities |
| | **Environment – Green Spaces** | | | |
| 25 | N/A | The reference to greenfield pockets is an insult to the wide loss of greenfield space. | This is addressed through Design Principle 1 (Green Infrastructure Corridors) and Design Principle 2 (Landscape Buffers) | Resident |
| 26 | N/A | Even though the masterplan aims to protect the landscape, creating open spaces & green corridors, etc, nothing can compensate for the loss of natural open space, essential for our health & wellbeing and wildlife habitats. Maintenance of green spaces is an opportunity. We need more green space, not less. | Out of scope of consultation. The principle of development, and quantity of floorspace was established through Policy JPA6 (West of Wingates) of the Adopted Places for Everyone Plan. | Residents (x3) |
| 27 | N/A | The development will cause the loss of green fields and rural land. Green land should be left for local residents. The development will damage the landscape. | Adopted PfE Policy JPA6 allocates this land for around 440,000 sqm of industrial and warehousing development. This response is outside the scope of the consultation which relates to the West of Wingates Masterplan SPD. | Residents (x19) |
| | **Environment – Green (and blue) Infrastructure** | | | |
| 28 | 8.1 (A Distinctive Landscape Character) | The Environment Agency welcome the principle of delivering a comprehensive joined up strategy that embeds landscape and ecology and seeks to deliver multifunctional green and blue spaces. Specifically, the prioritisation of existing natural features such as watercourses. | Noted | Environment Agency |
| 29 | N/A | Bolton has some fantastic countryside and landscape around Westhoughton. A range of very large developments including West of Wingates are coming online or planned in this area. Collectively, these could have considerable impact on ecological connectivity. A primary opportunity here is to deliver a | Agreed. A landscape-led approach will integrate development with its natural setting, supporting ecology, climate resilience, and Biodiversity Net Gain through on and off-site habitat creation. | Green Spaces Officer, Bolton Council |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | development that minimises the negative impact on our blue and green infrastructure and supports the borough's natural environment. | | |
| 30 | N/A | Consider using Building with Nature (BwN). Building with Nature provides green infrastructure Standards as a benchmark to define what 'good looks like'. There are 12 BwN standards that are built around the themes of Core, Wellbeing, Water, and Wildlife. Schemes can go forward for accreditation to show how high standards have been met. | The SPD sets out locally appropriate standards and guidance in relation to biodiversity. | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |
| 31 | N/A | Recommend reference to the Green Infrastructure Framework standards as set out by Natural England, and Manchester Cities Urban Green Factor guidance which promotes the use of vegetation and surfaces that provide shade, passive cooling, flood risk mitigation, biodiversity, air quality, and visual interest. Features such as permeable paving, rain gardens, street trees, and green roofs are scored, and the aim is for a development site to achieve a collective threshold score. | The SPD sets out locally appropriate standards and guidance in relation to green infrastructure. | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |
| 32 | | The objective for green and blue infrastructure is too caveated. Terms like 'provision for', 'where practicable', and 'take account of' give the impression that environmental considerations are secondary. I know this isn't the case as the council has endorsed the LNRS and is implementing a new Greenspace Strategy, so please firm up the language here to demonstrate our commitment to protecting and enhancing the natural environment. | This has been considered thoroughly in preparation of the SPD. The language has been firmed up where possible but needs to be appropriate for the site and SPD. | Green Space Officer, Bolton Council |
| | **Environment: Green Corridors** | | | |
| 33 | N/A | There needs to be a vision of creating green corridors rather than over development. | This is addressed through Design Principle 1 (Green Infrastructure Corridors). | Residents (x2) |
| 34 | N/A | Green corridors are not big enough, this site is losing too much land to development. At logistics North they have a 550acre country park. AI says that 85% of this site is taken by the development plateaus this needs to be substantially lower between 65%-75%. Buffering down Dicconson Lane also needs to be improved. | The site allocation specifies a floor area of employment uses that needs to be delivered on the site. The SPD strikes a balance between the delivery of this much needed employment floorspace and the green infrastructure to support it. | Antalis |
| | **Environment: Trees** | | | |
| 35 | N/A | Natural England has now published the review of the Ancient Woodland Inventory (AWI), which has included two parcels of woodland within the allocation as Ancient Woodland. These had previously been identified during the consultation workshops, and along with a third parcel (too small to be on the AWI) are | Change made - Plans amended on page 27, 31, 52 and 53 | GMEU |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | included as a new Site of Biological Importance – Holdens Wood (boundary of current candidate SBI attached).<br><br>In addition, we have previously identified that a section of woodland to the east of Holden Woods was potentially Long-Established Woodland (LEW). However, as part of GMEUs review, it is not considered to qualify as LEW, due to the amount of clearance/previous disturbance that has previously taken place. There are some older trees present in this section, and the southern part of the woodland would potentially be LEW, the parcel on its own is too small under the definitions. Therefore, this area of woodland has no formal designation.<br><br>The SPD currently has Area 3/3a as LEW which can now be amended, and the text in the document should include that Holden Woods is a Candidate SBI in the ecological designations, which will be put to Bolton in the SBI Review for 2024. | | |
| 36 | N/A | I am surprised that there is only one veteran tree on the whole site and assume the trees have been surveyed | Where access has been permitted arboriculture surveys have been undertaken on the site by TEP arboriculturists. These have identified a single veteran tree within the areas surveyed. Tree surveys and Arboricultural Impact Assessments will be undertaken for each phase of development as part of any planning application. These will identify any further veteran trees within areas not yet surveyed. | Resident |
| 37 | N/A | The self-seeded willow trees which now cover the field at Willow Bank are now classed as “retained woodland area”. These fields have not been maintained by Harworth (all the other fields on the site have been regularly ploughed) and these have been left to self seed and seemingly forgotten about. This area is designated as an amenity space and I worry how this would impact residents. | The Willow Bank self-seeded tree area forms a key ecological habitat area in the southeast corner of the site and will have active travel links that go around it but not through it. | Resident |
| 38 | N/A | The SPD should endeavour to retain the young woodland at the Southeastern corner of the site. Protection and enhancement of this area will support our obligations within the Environment Act mitigation hierarchy. Any walking/cycling routes should avoid this area. | Change made - Plans updated on page 57, 65 and 75. Design Principle DP1 states that values woodland and trees will be retained and enhanced. Development at the site will need to deliver the 10% biodiversity net gain requirement. Specific cycling and walking routes will be addressed at planning application stage. | Green Spaces Officer, Bolton Council |
| | **Environment: Pollution** | | | |
| 39 | 3.4 (Infrastructure) | Air Quality: As per previous comment, suggest rewording to “The operational impacts of the proposed development on existing receptors will be a material consideration in bringing forward the development, with any necessary mitigation forming an important component of future proposals. Delivery of the site following a vision-led approach which prioritises sustainable transport infrastructure and services as well as the preparation of a Travel Plan to promote sustainable travel choices for those working at the site, such as the use of public transport and cycling.” | Change made - incorporated text change under 3.4 Air Quality text on page 28 | TfGM |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 40 | N/A | Operating hours should be restricted to address issues around noise and light pollution | Any necessary restrictions on operating hours will be dealt with at the planning application stage. | Resident |
| 41 | N/A | The development will cause pollution including 24-hour light, 24-hour noise pollution, and air pollution which will cause health issues for residents. This is a concern both during and after construction. Acoustic fencing will be paramount. Acoustics must be prioritised, not just with mounds of earth. | One of the strategic objectives of the West of Wingates Masterplan SPD is that development proposals should demonstrate that they limit the impacts on the site's rural setting to reasonably acceptable levels including minimising any light, noise and air pollution outside of developed areas.<br><br>At planning application stage compliance with PfE will need to be demonstrated including policies such as JP-S5 Streets for All, JP-S2 Carbon and Energy and JP-S5 Clean Air.<br><br>PfE Policy JPA6 specifically states that development will be required to ensure that there is no undue adverse impact of light pollution from the development and its associated operations. | Residents (x24) |
| 42 | | Concerns around light and noise pollution and also the types of business that will occupy, you already have issues with smells coming from Stateside LTD on Wingate Ind Estate. Not enough given to mitigate what will be done and some visual support to show what is being done to mitigate the impact. Concerns for UK Defence manufacture on this site, like at logistics North having missile manufacture brings in a real H&S risk for local residents. | This is detail that will be reviewed and assessed at each individual planning application stage. | Atalis |
| | **Environment: Landscape** | | | |
| 43 | N/A | Local residents do not want large eyesore buildings on our green belt and countryside. There will be a negative impact on the landscape. The current landscape is a beautiful rural landscape of open farmland, bounded by trees and hedgerows, and wide-reaching views northwards to the west Pennine Moors and south to Merseyside. No amount of clever landscaping will disguise the development. | PfE Policy JPA6 states that development at this site will be required to ensure that the siting and scale of buildings and the landscape planting scheme minimises the prominence of the development and its impact upon the surrounding landscape and views. This issue is addressed through the West of Wingates Masterplan SPD including Design Principle 2 Landscape Buffers.<br><br>The West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD sets out an ambitious vision to transform the land to the West of Wingates into one of the North Wests premier employment destinations. It sets out that the aim is to retain key environmental characteristics wherever possible, but accepts that given the sites allocation for industrial and warehousing floorspace, some existing landscape features will necessarily be altered or removed. The character of the site will be landscape-led, with the ambition to create a strong and distinctive environment that integrates new industrial and warehousing uses into the surrounding rural landscape setting | Residents (x5) |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | enhancing ecological and biodiversity qualities and providing new accessible green space. The Design Principles set out how this will be achieved. | |
| 44 | N/A | The development will be an eyesore - just hideous large buildings. The development will permanently alter the character of the area | The West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD sets out an ambitious vision to transform the land to the West of Wingates into one of the North Wests premier employment destinations. It sets out that the aim is to retain key environmental characteristics wherever possible, but accepts that given the sites allocation for industrial and warehousing floorspace, some existing landscape features will necessarily be altered or removed. The character of the site will be landscape-led, with the ambition to create a strong and distinctive environment that integrates new industrial and warehousing uses into the surrounding rural landscape setting enhancing ecological and biodiversity qualities and providing new accessible green space. The Design Principles set out how this will be achieved.<br><br>The purpose of the masterplan is to guide its realisation as a thriving, sustainable and well-connected industrial and warehousing business destination that delivers real and lasting benefits for people, businesses and communities in Bolton and across Greater Manchester. No further action needed. | Residents (x2) |
| 45 | N/A | Agree that design should be landscaped led and strongly recommend that habitats are based both on existing habitats within the site and the priority actions identified within the GMLNRS. | Section 8.1 of the SPD has been amended to include 'prioritising the retention and enhancement of existing habitats where they are of ecological value and Design Principle 1 now references new planting and habitats that support mapped actions within the Local Nature Recovery Strategy. | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |
| | **Environment: Biodiversity** | | | |
| 46 | Design Principle 1 (Green Infrastructure Corridors) | Welcomes that commitment to a mitigation and compensation framework strategy for species is now provided | Noted | GMEU |
| 47 | 9.1 (Phasing and Infrastructure) | “Each phase of development must mitigate its impacts and deliver a minimum 10% Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), in accordance with statutory requirements and the mitigation | Noted, no action needed | GMEU |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | hierarchy. Priority should be given to avoidance wherever feasible, followed by on-site or adjacent-land habitat creation and enhancement, with off-site measures or credit purchases considered only where necessary. This requirement applies to habitat creation and enhancement for BNG, as well as all relevant ecological features" is an important measure in the SOD, A BNG Strategy will be required. | | |
| 48 | N/A | We agree that the development should be sympathetically accommodated within a strong landscaped green framework. We welcome that the development should make provision for green and blue infrastructure including taking appropriate account of the Four Gates SBI. However, the listed objectives make no refence to delivering biodiversity gains. One of the main objectives of the SPD should be to ensure that nature is in a better state post development and that measurable biodiversity gains are delivered. We feel that biodiversity needs to be better highlighted as one of the main objectives delivered.<br><br>Outside of Great Crested Newt, there is little reference within the SPD to ensuring the protection and enhancement of habitat for priority species. This is particularly relevant to priority ground nesting bird species. These species that would not be able to be mitigated for within the development as they are especially vulnerable to disturbance. The development would result in a large loss of grassland habitat which has the potential to support priority species. It is important that where mitigation is not possible within the development site, then off-site provision should be made for key priority species should they be displaced from the development site.<br><br>The Trust is concerned that the high level of recreational activity proposed within the designated green corridors could have an adverse impact on biodiversity objectives. Formal recreational activities such as outdoor gym equipment should be limited and would be better located within the main area of development itself. We note that one of the recreational hubs that appears to be centred on the wildlife mitigation area. This area must surely be prioritised for nature with low level recreational activities proscribed in the immediate area of the SBI. Focusing large amounts of recreational activity within this area could endanger the quality of the wildlife mitigation and should be located elsewhere. | Change made - text added to pages 25 and 56 | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |
| 49 | N/A | Whilst we would agree that the design should be landscaped led, we strongly recommend that habitats are based both on existing habitats within the site and the priority actions identified within the GMLNRS. We would also reiterate the point that where BNG is being delivered, the primary purpose of biodiversity delivery should not be impacted by any recreational requirements. We would also recommend an additional design principle of biodiversity planning. | Change made – text added to page 37 in relation to the Greater Manchester Nature Network (2025) and the Greater Manchester Local Nature Recovery Strategy. | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 50 | N/A | Biodiversity - The Trust is very concerned that biodiversity is not explicitly listed as one of the main opportunities that can be delivered by the development. We are concerned that this absence within the opportunities list might be seen as reducing the important part biodiversity plays in ensuring that development is delivered in a sustainable way. Given the biodiversity emergency we are currently facing this must be seen as one of the main benefits that the development can deliver. | Improvements to biodiversity is a theme running through the West of Wingates Masterplan SPD including the Vision, Strategic Objectives, Indicative Site Development Strategy, Design Principle 1 (Green Infrastructure Corridors) and Design Principle 2 (Landscape Buffers). | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |
| 51 | N/A | The Lancashire Wildlife Trust is a nature conservation charity that seeks to enable wildlife's recovery in our area by working in partnership with others to conserve, restore, create and connect habitats and to increase species abundance; and to connect people with nature and help them to act for wildlife, wherever they are. Given the potential negative impact on biodiversity issues that could occur without adequate mitigation and compensation then the Trust is especially keen that biodiversity gains are seen as one of the main outcomes and drivers from the successful delivery of the West of Wingates Development. The success of biodiversity outcomes will be dependent on the steer from documents such as the SPD. It is therefore vital that the SPD highlights the importance of the development providing full and meaningful biodiversity gains.<br><br>We are particularly concerned that currently biodiversity deliver and recreational requirements have been conflated and that this could lead to reduced biodiversity gains due to increased disturbance.<br><br>We are also concerned that priority S41 species such as ground nesting birds should be recognised and that sufficient and appropriate compensation action is provided to ensure that these species can begin to recover from their current dramatic population declines. | Change made – plan amended on page 75 | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |
| 52 | N/A | Currently, there is little within the SPD relating to species protection and recovery. Habitat provision for woodland and scrub species looks to be sufficient, yet as we have outlined above, S41 priority ground nesting birds would not be able to be retained within the development boundary and would be lost to the site. Whilst we accept that the original bird surveys indicated low numbers of Lapwing, updated surveys would need to be undertaken to assess the value of the land for priority ground nesting birds. Given the decline in these species, it is important that appropriate off-site provision is made if found to be present within the development area. We note that the original bird survey report maintained that it is likely that these birds would disburse and compete for breeding territories in suitable habitat within the local area. We do not feel this approach is acceptable and such a strategy would no doubt lead to the piecemeal loss of these species from the area as a whole. Government guidance makes it clear that development should help to bring about nature's recovery including priority species. The recently | Change made – text added to page 25 | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | published UK Government's Environmental Improvement Plan (EIP) 2025 reiterates the UK Government statutory target to:<br>• halt the decline in species abundance by 2030<br>• increase species abundance so that, by 2042, it is greater than in 2022 and at least 10% greater than in 2030<br>• improve the Red List Index for England for species extinction by 2042 compared to 2022 levels The UK Government has made it clear that impacts on priority species must be mitigated/compensated for.<br><br>Action to ensure that the populations of these vulnerable species are not only protected but enhanced must be undertaken to ensure that the developments are high quality and environmentally sustainable. We therefore recommend that a compensation strategy is provided that is appropriate and commensurate that helps to maintain these birds in the locality. | | |
| 53 | N/A | We would also recommend an additional design principle of biodiversity planning. | BNG is already referenced as part of DP1 and DP2 and also with section 9.2 Site-Wide Infrastructure. Further BNG text added to 8.1. | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |
| 54 | N/A | Given the potential negative impact on biodiversity issues that could occur without adequate mitigation and compensation it is important that biodiversity gains are seen as one of the main outcomes and drivers from the successful delivery of the West of Wingates Development.<br><br>Currently biodiversity and recreational requirements have been conflated and that this could lead to reduced biodiversity gains due to increased disturbance.<br><br>It is vital that the SPD highlights the importance of the development providing full and meaningful biodiversity gains. | BNG is referenced as part of DP1 and DP2 and also with section 9.2 Site-Wide Infrastructure and have been and will continue to be a key consideration of the design process. Further BNG text added to 8.1. | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |
| 55 | N/A | Biodiversity should be explicitly listed as one of the main opportunities that can be delivered by the development. This absence within the opportunities list might be seen as reducing the important part biodiversity plays in ensuring that development is delivered in a sustainable way. Given the biodiversity emergency we are currently facing, this must be seen as one of the main benefits that the development can deliver. | The objectives (6.2) include delivering on the National Design Guide 10 Characteristics of well-designed places which includes enhancing and optimising nature as well as a specific objective on making provision for G&B infrastructure including delivering BNG in line with national principles and local requirements. | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |
| 56 | N/A | Priority S41 species such as ground nesting birds should be recognised and sufficient and appropriate compensation action needs to be provided to ensure that these species can begin to recover from their current dramatic population declines. | Ecological surveys will be undertaken for each phase as part of any planning application. These will inform an agreed mitigation strategy as a result of a robust impact assessment for each phase of development. | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |
| 57 | N/A | Where BNG is being delivered, the primary purpose of biodiversity delivery should not be impacted by any recreational requirements. | Section 8,1 now states that green corridors function as ecological corridors first and foremost, with recreational use carefully managed to avoid adverse effects on biodiversity. | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 58 | N/A | The high level of recreational activity proposed within the designated green corridors could have an adverse impact on biodiversity objectives. Formal recreational activities such as outdoor gym equipment should be limited and would be better located within the main area of development itself. One of the recreational hubs appears to be centred on the wildlife mitigation area. This area must surely be prioritised for nature with low level recreational activities prescribed in the immediate area of the SBI. Focusing large amounts of recreational activity within this area could endanger the quality of the wildlife mitigation and should be located elsewhere. | Green corridors will serve a dual purpose providing both new / enhanced recreational routes as well as wildlife connectivity across the site. The key ecological habitat area is located within the southeast corner of the site. This will have active links around it but not through it in order to prioritise wildlife mitigation. Another key area is the Four Gates Site of Biological Importance located within the northern part of the site which again will have active travel links adjacent but not through it. | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |
| 59 | N/A | The development will cause loss of wildlife habitat including deer, lapwings (a protected species) and skylark. The SPD should include information on native mammals, fox, badger, bats, deer as they are now and how they are modelled to survive long term. | Planning applications will need to address:<br><br>-PfE Policy JPA6 which states that development will be required to Make provision for biodiversity, including taking appropriate account of Four Gates Site of Biological Importance<br>-Other PfE policies including JP-G8 (A Net enhancement of Biodiversity and Geodiversity)<br>-West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan Design Principles 1 (Green Infrastructure Corridors) and 2 (Landscape Buffers)<br><br>Part 8.1 of the West of Wingates Masterplan SPD sets out an approach that enhances biodiversity qualities by prioritising the retention and enhancement of existing trees, hedgerows, watercourses, and ecological habitats, complemented by new landscape buffers, planting, and green corridors that together deliver a comprehensive and connected network of green and blue infrastructure. Development should be designed to deliver biodiversity gains as an integral part of landscape character. | Residents (x17) |
| 60 | N/A | All floras including trees should be native. The SPD should include information on native flora as they are now and how they are modelled to survive long term. | All references to new strategic planting refer to the use of native species including within principle DP2. The specific detail of this will form part of the planning application(s). | Resident |
| 61 | N/A | Currently, there is little within the SPD relating to species protection and recovery. Habitat provision for woodland and scrub species looks to be sufficient, yet as we have outlined above, S41 priority ground nesting birds would not be able to be retained within the development boundary and would be lost to the site. Whilst we accept that the original bird surveys indicated low numbers of Lapwing, updated surveys would need to be undertaken to assess the value of the land for priority ground nesting birds. Given the decline in these species, it is important that appropriate off-site provision is made if found to be present within the development area. We note that the original bird survey report maintained that it is likely that these birds would disburse and compete for breeding territories in suitable habitat within the local area. We do not feel this approach is acceptable and such a strategy would no doubt lead to the piecemeal loss of these species from the area as a whole. Government guidance makes it clear that development should help to bring about | Ecological surveys will be undertaken for each phase as part of any planning application. These will inform an agreed mitigation strategy as a result of a robust impact assessment for each phase of development. | Lancashire Wildlife Trust |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | nature's recovery including priority species. The recently published UK Government's Environmental Improvement Plan (EIP) 2025 reiterates the UK Government statutory target to:<br><br>• halt the decline in species abundance by 2030<br><br>• increase species abundance so that, by 2042, it is greater than in 2022 and at least 10% greater than in 2030<br><br>• improve the Red List Index for England for species extinction by 2042 compared to 2022 levels.<br><br>The UK Government has made it clear that impacts on priority species must be mitigated/compensated for. Action to ensure that the populations of these vulnerable species are not only protected but enhanced must be undertaken to ensure that the developments are high quality and environmentally sustainable. We therefore recommend that a compensation strategy is provided that is appropriate and commensurate and helps to maintain these birds in the locality. | | |
| 62 | 6.4 (Design Strategy) | The initial site strategy (P49) of the Masterplan document, in the key there is a legend for existing ponds, however these are not all marked on the plan. If this is intended to reflect the current baseline of the site, then this is slightly mis-leading. Also flags up that the area at the southeast of the site is identified as an 'Ecological Habitat Area' in the Strategic Master Plan but is also identified as a Key Amenity Space. If there is to be public access/recreation use of this area, the impacts of this will need to be reflected in the proposals for the Ecological Habitat Area. | Changes made - Plans amended on pages 7, 46, 49, 51, 62, 65, 75, 82 and 83 | GMEU |
| 63 | N/A | Concerned that species currently found on the golf course (Fish, Deer, Badgers, Foxes, Bats, Great Crested Newts, Pheasants, Partridges, Geese, Swans, ducks and various other animals and birds) are becoming endangered due to works at West of Wingates. | Development is required to deliver a 10% gain in biodiversity. Guidance in set out in the SPD including DP1 (Green infrastructure Corridors) and DP2 (Landscape Buffers). | Westhoughton Gold Club |
| 64 | N/A | Document has a lack of depth on how you are going to mitigate the impact on wildlife | Further detail will be provided at the planning application stages - the SPD is high-level and establishes development principles for the site, the detail will follow. | Antalis |
| | **Environment: Local Nature Recovery Strategy** | | | |
| 65 | N/A | The LNRS, and particularly nature network core and opportunity areas within the site redline boundary, should be flagged in the site context section. | Reference to the LNRS is included in the Local Policy review section on page 37 (Greater Manchester Nature Network and Natural England GI Framework). | Green Spaces Officer, Bolton Council |
| 66 | 8.1 (A Distinctive Landscape Character) | Welcome that scheme will align with LNRS and suggest that at application stage, evidence to prove this is included. | Noted | GMEU |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Environment: Litter** | | | |
| 67 | N/A | Litter, including along Lostock Lane. There is nothing on litter services and this is a miss given the PROW/bridle and cycleway network, can this be added? | This will be addressed at planning application stage | Residents (x3) |
| | **Environment: Climate Change** | | | |
| 68 | N/A | The development will increase Co2 emissions and will have a negative impact on climate change | One of the ambitions of the West of Wingates Masterplan SPD is exploring the potential for, and where possible delivering, renewable energy generation and sustainable construction, and identifying opportunities to connect where possible, to deliver a low-carbon footprint development to address the climate change challenge.<br><br>Planning applications must address the National Planning Policy Framework and PfE policies including Policy JP-S1 Sustainable Development. | Residents (x2) |
| 69 | N/A | Is there an opportunity for solar power on these buildings? Investors should be looking at renewables. | Yes, one of the ambitions of the West of Wingates Masterplan SPD is exploring the potential for, and where possible delivering, renewable energy generation and sustainable construction, and identifying opportunities to connect where possible, to deliver a low-carbon footprint development to address the climate change challenge. | Resident |
| 70 | N/A | Has a carbon assessment been carried out? How much carbon is produced on the site currently v after construction? Is this in line with Bolton's carbon commitments? | No, this would likely form part of a planning application if required. | Resident |
| | **Hydrology** | | | |
| 71 | 6.4 (Design Strategy) | Bolton Council should not support culverting, removal, or diversion. | The point is acknowledged but too detailed for inclusion in the SPD. The issue will be addressed at planning application stage.<br><br>There will necessarily be some works to watercourse including at highway crossing points where box culverts are expected to be installed (designed so as not to restrict flow or present any blockage risk); works / diversion to convey water across the disused railway cutting south of the site. | Environment Agency |
| 72 | 6.4 (Design Strategy) | Bolton Council should consider a Developer Submission Checklist<br>a) Greenfield runoff calculations and betterment options appraisal<br>b) Catchment flood assessment identifying downstream risks<br>c) SuDS hierarchy assessment and justification for non-green elements<br>d) Multi-stage SuDS layout plan<br>e) Soil infiltration testing results<br>f) Exceedance routing plan<br>g) Operation & maintenance plan<br>h) Biodiversity integration statement | The point is acknowledged but considered too detailed for inclusion in SPD. To be addressed at planning application stage. | Environment Agency |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 73 | 8.1 (A Distinctive Landscape Character) | Request that the first sentence of the 3rd paragraph refers to 'sustainable water management' alongside the references to landscape, ecology and amenity. | Change made - incorporated into text in third paragraph on page 56 | United Utilities |
| | **Environment: Flooding** | | | |
| 74 | 6.4 (Design Strategy) | United Utilities note the fourth paragraph which states:<br>'A key element of the initial strategy is the creation of a series of development plateaus. These will be designed to accommodate large-scale industrial and logistics buildings and will respond directly to the site's undulating topography, providing the level ground conditions required for modern employment operations, including efficient building layouts, servicing areas, and circulation routes.' In accordance with our above comments, we wish to note that the creation of plateaus needs to carefully consider any changes to hydrological characteristics of the site to ensure that exceedance paths are not affected, especially during heavy rainfall events | It is recognised that the creation of the plateaus on site will potentially impact the exceedance flow paths. It is confirmed that this requirement will be considered and incorporated into the project proposals and communicated through future planning applications. | United Utilities |
| 75 | 3.4 (Infrastructure) | The Environment Agency are currently investigating and developing options to reduce flood risk from Hey and Borsdane Brooks in the Hindley, Platt Bridge and Abram area. The proposed development within the catchment area for this project and as noted within the SPD (Page 24) the land within and beyond the site falls to the west and southwest toward the wooded Borsdane Brook. Platt Bridge and Abram are two communities that have experienced recent (January 2025) and significant flooding from Borsdane Brook and residents have reported that they have concerns that new development upstream has the potential to contribute to this pressure. Environment Agency would welcome that new development proposals for West of Wingates seek to align with the wider objectives for this catchment to support an overall objective to reducing flood risk and achieve a betterment in flood risk terms to ensure there is not a detrimental impact in light of future climate change pressures. This is supported by:<br>National Policy (NPPF Para 171 * 172) and PfE (Policy JP-S4 and JPA 6) and Bolton Core Strategy (Policy LO1) | Change made – text amended on page 12 | Environment Agency |
| 76 | 3.4 (Infrastructure) | Further to the strategic plan (infrastructure 3.4) stating that there is No Flood Risk offside impact, Westhoughton Golf Club would like to bring it to the Council's notice that the present ongoing remediation on Phase 1 is causing flooding and extraordinary amounts of water to ingress on to the golf course. Silt is also flowing from the site into multiple areas of the golf club from the development.<br><br>Westhoughton Golf Club Ltd therefore requests that the developer at their expense provides adequate drainage to the watercourses discussed to prevent any further flood risks.<br><br>If possible a site visit at WGC Ltd between Bolton Council, the Developer & the Golf Club would be much appreciated. | Specific points are not appropriate for inclusion within SPD. All matters covered at level appropriate to the SPD. | Westhoughton Golf Club |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 77 | 6.4 (Design Strategy) | Bolton council should consider surface water management and betterment- Development could deliver a measurable improvement in surface water flood risk downstream of the site by reducing post-development runoff below existing greenfield rates.<br><br>wherever technically feasible. Distributed attenuation via ponds, swales, wetlands, and bio-retention areas can potentially achieve 10–30% reductions feasibly on greenfield sites | Page 28 amended. New text is considered sufficient. Matter too specific/detailed to include under ambitions. Ambition inclusion of sustainable drainage is sufficient and appropriate for this matter. | Environment Agency |
| 78 | N/A | The SPD makes some incorrect assumptions and information in relation to flooding. | It is understood that this comment pertains to flooding which occurs outside of the site boundary. The flood risk assessment specifically addresses the project area and is based on official government data, including designated flood risk zones and flood mapping. Flood risk is extensively addressed in the SPD itself and in the comments by the EA & UU.<br><br>This topic is extensively addressed in the document itself and in the comments by the EA & UU. | J Resident |
| 79 | 3.3 | United Utilities note the topography of the site which illustrates a change in levels from 135m to 95m across the site. Given this change in levels, United Utilities query whether the design of the masterplan has assessed and responded to the existing hydrological characteristics of the site to ensure a flood resilient design is achieved and water / flooding is not deflected or constricted. The hydrological assessment of the site must consider site topography, naturally occurring flow paths, ephemeral watercourses and any low-lying areas where water naturally accumulates and ensures that the resulting masterplan takes account of such circumstances. | The Topography and hydrology have been evaluated to develop a strategy for replicating greenfield watercourse flows and determining attenuation needs for respective project phases.<br><br>Flood resilience, overland flow, and flood paths have been taken into account; however, they cannot be clearly defined and communicated within the SPD as they will be dependant on masterplan layouts and plateau creation. This level of detail will be incorporated into future planning applications. | United Utilities |
| 80 | N/A | Flooding and water management needs to be addressed. There is already flood risk in the area and development will increase this. Water and drainage reports are not reflective of actual with flooding on Dicconson Lane at multiple points between A6 and Gerrard Arms pub.<br><br>Following phase 1 development flooding and excess water has been heading towards Westhoughton Golf Course. | The flood risk assessment within the SPD specifically addresses the proposed development site area. The comment referencing pluvial flood risk pertains to sewer systems located outside the boundaries of the proposed development. Surface water drainage will be managed entirely on-site through attenuation basins, with controlled discharge into the surrounding watercourses. | Residents (x4) |
| 81 | N/A | Flooding is an area for concerns, multiple flooding at Borsdane Bridge/Gerrard Arms and local sewerage cannot take off run this estate will produce. | Downstream flood risk is acknowledged via the EA comments. Development proposals for Surface water drainage and planning applications will not increase flood risk and will seek to reduce downstream flood risk where this can be incorporated. Sewerage connections and discharges will be agreed with United Utilities. | Antalis |
| | **Environment: Sustainable Urban Drainage** | | | |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 82 | 2.4 (Masterplan Ambition) | The section titled “Sustainable Drainage” should be rephrased as follows: ‘A comprehensive network of multifunctional SuDS which is fully integrated with landscaping and public realm and provides robust flood protection and management whilst utilising existing watercourses and drainage routes.’ | Change made – Incorporated into page 12 text under Sustainable Drainage within Places ambition | United Utilities |
| 83 | 6.2 (Strategic Objectives) | Request that the final bullet point on page 44 refers to sustainable water management and the delivery of multi-functional SuDS. | Change made - incorporated into final bullet point on page 44. | United Utilities |
| 84 | 6.4 (Design Strategy) | United Utilities note the fifth paragraph which states:<br><br>‘Alongside this, a high-level drainage strategy demonstrates how the site can manage surface water sustainably, utilising existing watercourses and integrating SuDS features within the green corridors.’ As noted above, we wish to understand how strategies for foul and surface water have been prepared in the context of any interdependencies between land ownership and phases’. | The requested statement for United Utilities to understand how strategies for foul and surface water in the context of any interdependencies between land ownership and phases is acknowledged. United Utilities have been consulted in respect to the foul drainage strategy and this includes the requirements for phased infrastructure delivery and any necessary strategic connections to support the coordinated delivery of the development. Further detail relating to drainage delivery, phasing, and infrastructure requirements will be provided within subsequent planning applications. | United Utilities |
| 85 | 6.4 (Design Strategy) | Bolton Council should consider Reference to the 2025 National Standards for Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in England. | There is already reference to this under 'Design Strategy' on p.48, which is appropriate and sufficient. | Environment Agency |
| 86 | 6.4 (Design Strategy) | Bolton Council should consider SuDS Hierarchy - proposals could demonstrate how surface water has been managed as close to source as possible using the SuDS hierarchy. Aboveground, green and nature-based SuDS must be used as the primary approach. | Text changed at p48 paragraph 5 to indicate that drainage design shall follow the recognised SuDS hierarchy. | Environment Agency |
| 87 | 6.4 (Design Strategy) | Bolton Council should consider Multi-Stage SuDS Treatment Train - A multi-stage SuDS treatment train could be required, comprising at least two above-ground components (e.g swales, basins, wetlands, rills, rain gardens, bioretention areas, or tree pits with engineered soil cells) | This is considered too detailed for inclusion in the SPD. This issue will be addressed at planning application stage. | Environment Agency |
| 88 | 6.4 (Design Strategy) | Bolton Council should consider Watercourse and Flow Path Protection - Existing watercourses, ditches, overland flow paths, and depressions should be retained, enhanced, and integrated into the SuDS network. | This is too detailed for inclusion in the SPD. This issue will be addressed at planning application stage. | Environment Agency |
| 89 | 6.4 (Design Strategy) | Bolton Council should consider Climate Change and Long-Duration Events - SuDS must be designed for the 1 in 100-year event plus climate change allowance, with storage for long-duration storms and clearly defined exceedance routes that do not increase downstream flood risk. | The point is acknowledged but considered too detailed for inclusion in SPD. The issue will be addressed at planning application stage.<br><br>The SPD already refer to this in principle at ‘Ambition’, ‘Design Strategy’ and ‘DP1’. | Environment Agency |
| 90 | 6.4 (Design Strategy) | Bolton Council should consider Space for Water and Green Infrastructure Integration - Masterplan layouts should provide ‘space for water’ through integrated green corridors, attenuation areas, and floodable open spaces. SuDS must be multi-functional, contributing to biodiversity, landscape character, and recreational value. | The point is acknowledged but too detailed for inclusion in SPD. The issue will be addressed at planning application stage.<br><br>The issue is sufficiently covered within the SPD, specifically the reference to green/blue infrastructure at ‘DP1’. | Environment Agency |
| 91 | 6.4 (Design Strategy) | Bolton Council should consider Maintenance and Management - SuDS Management and Maintenance Plan(s), including responsible body, funding arrangements, monitoring regime, and long term asset renewal strategy | The point acknowledged but considered too detailed for inclusion in SPD. The issue will be addressed at planning application stage. | Environment Agency |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | The issue is sufficiently covered at 9.5 in the information regarding infrastructure stewardship. | |
| 92 | Design Principle 1 (Green Infrastructure Corridors) | Integration of Green and Blue Infrastructure: United Utilities request that this section also includes reference to the integration of multi-functional SuDS as an inherent part of the design process. | Change made - incorporated into second bullet point on page 58 | United Utilities |
| 93 | Design Principle 1 (Green Infrastructure Corridors) | Request that 9th point in “What looks good” box is amended to state: ‘Multi-functional SuDS are embedded within the design of the green infrastructure corridors to create water features to support drainage, ecology and informal learning.’ | Change made - text edited on ninth bullet point on page 59 | United Utilities |
| 94 | Design Principle 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm) | Public Realm, Amenities and Street Design: United Utilities request that the 3rd point under this heading refers to integrating multi functional SuDS into the public realm, including within car parking areas. | This proposed amendment is rejected on the basis that it is not appropriate for the proposed development type. Car parking will not be accommodated within public realm areas due to the nature of the scheme. Furthermore, Surface Water Management and associated Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) will not necessarily be located within the public realm, as effective sustainable drainage design requires consideration of wider principles, including management at source. | United Utilities |
| 95 | Design Principle 6 (Vehicular Access: Shared, Private and Industrial Vehicles) | What good looks like? United Utilities request that the 3rd to last point of this section refers to the design of car parking being integrated with the strategy for surface water management including the delivery of surface level sustainable drainage features to manage run off. | The inclusion of detailed car parking surface water management requirements within this high-level SPD is not supported. The purpose of the SPD is to set strategic sustainable drainage principles, not prescribe plot-specific standards which would extend beyond its intended scope and risk diluting its focus. Accordingly, the SPD remains focused on overarching sustainable drainage strategies, with such specifics being more suitably addressed in future detailed applications. | United Utilities |
| 96 | 9.2 (Site Wide Infrastructure) | United Utilities request that the list of bullet points in the 3rd paragraph also refers to holistic foul and surface water drainage strategies. These strategies must address delivery on a multi-phase development and how any interdependencies between phases will be addressed. United Utilities does not wish to see a proliferation of pumping stations across the site | Change made - incorporated into second bullet point on page 84 | United Utilities |
| | **Environment: Foul Drainage** | | | |
| 97 | 3.4 (Infrastructure) | United Utilities have undertaken an initial review of our records and can find no record of where the approach to the proposed points of connection has been agreed. As such we require additional discussions with the Council to confirm the position in respect of this matter and agree the approach to the points of connection to the public sewer. We may ask for a change to the points of connection that are suggested above. It is also unclear whether the masterplan is underpinned by a site-wide strategy for foul water drainage. As is noted in consultation document, it would appear that a pumped approach to drainage is likely to be required. We request the opportunity to work with the council and the landowners / developers to understand how a holistic and integrated approach to foul water drainage can be achieved which minimises the risk of a proliferation of foul water pumping stations throughout the site. | BE Design can confirm that consultation was carried out with United Utilities through a pre-development application between October 2024 and February 2025. The UU reference number for this pre-development inquiry is 06553170. The purpose of the consultation was to obtain guidance on the proposed connections, which included the points of connection, potential discharge rates (this involved network modelling by United Utilities), and the site drainage strategy, encompassing the locations of pumping stations, routing of rising mains, and project phasing. Consultation with United Utilities is essential to the development strategy and has been, and will continue to be, a crucial element in the formulation of project proposals leading to the development of planning applications. | United Utilities |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 98 | 3.4 (Infrastructure) | United Utilities query whether the masterplan is underpinned by a site-wide strategy for foul water drainage. There is limited detail on approach to drainage in this section and more detailed is required. United Utilities wish to work with council to understand how a holistic and integrated approach to foul water drainage can be achieved. A wholistic and integrated approach is required by PfE policy JP-D1and JP-S4. Examples of further information required include:<br><br>a. do all landowners have a right to discharge to a local watercourse or are there areas of the site which have no watercourse to discharge to and therefore could they be ransomed as a consequence?<br><br>b. Are there any interdependencies between phases and land ownership which could affect the approach to foul water drainage? If so can this be overcome by the delivery of infrastructure within the proposed spine road?<br><br>c. More detail is required to outline what are the sustainable drainage expectations. The SPD is very light on detail. We request that sustainable drainage requirements are clear and unambiguous. It is imperative that space is made for SuDS in the design of the site through a range of features. This needs to be considered alongside any land ownership constraints to ensure that any drainage features which are part of a wider approach that interconnects across land ownerships / phases can be delivered in practice.<br><br>d. The SPD should reference the need for this site to consider water efficiency measures specifically the need to include the collection of water for non-potable use in accordance with Standard 1: runoff destinations as set out in the National Standards for SuDS | The masterplan is underpinned by a site-wide drainage strategy addressing foul and surface water. Each of the identified development phase areas abuts a watercourse; foul water infrastructure is to be incorporated within the spine road network; SuDS principles are embodied in the SPD and inform the drainage strategy.<br><br>Consideration of all of these points in full detail is a matter for the planning application stage. | United Utilities |
| 99 | 3.5 (Summary of Technical & Environmental Analysis) | Same query as in 3.4 relating to foul water drainage and agreed points of connection | Pre-development correspondence with United Utilities has taken place. As part of this correspondence, UU has offered guidance regarding the connection points. This issue will be addressed at planning application stage. | United Utilities |
| | **Water Supply** | | | |
| 100 | 3.4 (Infrastructure) | This section refers to ‘two water mains’ that cross the site. There are more than two water mains that cross the site as well as a main that is identified as not currently in use. This requires amendment. We also request that reference is made to public sewers that pass through the site. Our preferred wording would be for the document to state that there are a number of water and wastewater assets that pass through, and near to, the site which must be considered in the masterplanning and detailed design. The approach to design and construction near to these assets must be agreed with UUW. | SPD amended to “there are a number of water and wastewater assets that pass through, and near to, the site which must be considered in the masterplanning and detailed design. The approach to design and construction near to these assets must be agreed with UU.” (p28, 30) | United Utilities |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Environment: Loss of farmland** | | | |
| 101 | N/A | Object to the loss of farmland. Instead we will end up transporting food from abroad to those logistics hubs with a massive carbon footprint. | Out of scope of consultation. The principle of development, and quantity of floorspace was established through Policy JPA6 (West of Wingates) of the Adopted Places for Everyone Plan. | Resident |
| | **Economy** | | | |
| 102 | N/A | Support: the development will provide a range of local job opportunities. | Noted | Resident |
| 103 | N/A | Quality of jobs: a key argument for this development is high quality and sustainable employment but the proposed development is heavily focused around industry, warehousing and logistics. This development will create low quality admin and warehouse jobs. These jobs will be minimum wage, require little to no skill and will be automated by 2038. The proposed development lacks ambition. There will be no investment into tech, creative, science-based roles. | PfE Policy JPA6 allocates this land for industrial and warehousing floorspace. A key priority of the Strategic Masterplan SPD is to contribute towards enabling a thriving and productive economy by ensuring there is sufficient and diverse employment land and by encouraging the growth of high-value sectors such as advanced manufacturing and logistics | Residents (x3) |
| 104 | N/A | Land uses: there should be alternative uses - industrial and warehousing won't create sustainable high quality employment opportunities. | PfE Policy JPA6 allocates this land for around 440,000 sqm of industrial and warehousing floorspace. Comment out of scope of consultation. | Resident |
| 105 | N/A | Location of employees: new jobs won't go to Westhoughton residents | One of the purposes of the West of Wingates Economic and Employment Group is to maximise job opportunities for local people, work with local training providers and ensure local people and businesses can take advantage of economic and social value opportunities. | Resident |
| 106 | N/A | Ancillary uses: West of Wingates should not be allowed to develop into another retail/leisure area with supermarkets, shops, pubs, as has happened at Logistics North, attracting even more traffic to the area. | PfE Policy JPA6 allocates the land for industrial and warehousing development only. It is accepted that some ancillary uses will be required. This is addressed through Design Principal 7 (Land Uses). | Anon |
| 107 | N/A | Business expansion: one of the objectives is to provide opportunities for existing businesses who have outgrown their current premises - but what is going to be done with the premises that they vacate? Left derelict? | The comment is out of scope for the consultation. This will be addressed through the emerging Bolton Local Plan. | Resident |
| | **General Transport Comments** | | | |
| 108 | 3 (Site & Context) | Existing active travel and bus provision should be analysed against design guidance standard/what is needed, similar to how access to Westhoughton Railway Station is assessed.<br><br>The map on page 15 shows that the existing cycle network is not adequate. Current PRoW does not accessibly link the site to local destinations / onward public transport. | Comment noted. Existing issues beyond the allocation boundary are beyond the scope of the SPD consultation. Transport and movement issues are addressed through Design Principles 3, 4 and 5. These issues will also be addressed at planning application stage. | TfGM |
| 109 | N/A | There is not enough about the traffic impact on this site, in particular heading from and to Wigan down Dicconson lane, Traffic at roundabout at St Elizabeths Church and going down Hall Lane is already an issue and traffic back up plus already far too many HGVs coming down Dicconson Lane limited traffic calming measures and crossing points for residents. | Transport and movement issues are addressed through Design Principles 3, 4 and 5. These issues will also be addressed at planning application stage. | Antalis |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 110 | 4 (Planning Policy Framework)) | National Planning Policy: context could make reference to NPPF Chapter 9 on enabling sustainable transport via taking a vision-led approach planning, to support the transport elements of the SPD, masterplan and a Transport Framework. | Change made – new text added on page 32 | TfGM |
| 111 | 4.1 (National Planning Policy Context) | Should make reference to NPPF Chapter 9 on vision led approach to sustainable transport. | Change made - incorporated text change under 4.1 on page 32 | TfGM |
| | **Highway Infrastructure Improvements** | | | |
| 112 | | The SPD appears to only identify limited highway infrastructure improvements that do not meet the full – and necessary – requirements identified at PfE Appendix D. A West of Wingates Transport Vision Strategy (TVS) is also referenced in the draft SPD and while the SPD states that it should be read alongside this TVS, the TVS is not available to the review.<br><br>Data evidence prepared by iTransport shows that without a Link Road to De Havilland Way (DHW) / M61J6, the Wingates proposal will result in a very significant increase in traffic flows at both Chequerbent roundabout and M61J5, which will worsen congestion and require mitigation. However no link to De Havilland Way is shown on masterplan, and therefore impact of West of Wingates on Chequerbent could be very high.<br><br>It is likely that contributions will be needed for mitigation at Chequerbent roundabout and M61J5 and thus the SPD should refer to this and specifically to contributions towards the delivery of Park Avenue (the link road at Lee Hall).<br><br>It is important to ensure all development within NorthFold contributes in a fair and proportionate manner to the infrastructure provisions needed to enable the growth and regeneration sought, and to unlock the success of the growth corridor. The scale and cost of strategic infrastructure required cannot be delivered by one developer/site or by the authority themselves. This should include the West of Wingates allocation which is a key strategic development within the NorthFold growth corridor, and which – as identified above – will have a significant impact on the local highway network, and which therefore relies in part upon the delivery of Park Avenue.<br><br>Emerging Local Plan will need to include a developer contributions policy to ensure delivery of such infrastructure in order to unlock the growth of the corridor as envisaged and to ensure all development that relies on the highway infrastructure at Chequerbent roundabout contributes towards it in a fair and proportionate manner. An interim measure is required for proposals coming forward ahead of Local Plan adoption.<br><br>The SPD should also discuss the phasing of offsite infrastructure. | Contributions sought will be in line with relevant CIL regulations, the SPD provides a framework for contributions and assessment and appropriate mitigation at plan stage. The Council is bringing forward a new Local Plan and is considering its strategic cross borough approach to developer contributions, such as Community Infrastructure Levy, via that route. No change is required to the SPD. | Peel |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Peel are happy to discuss these matters further with relevant parties. | | |
| | **Transport: specific wording changes** | | | |
| 113 | 1.2 (A Sustainable, Inclusive Vision) | Suggest rewording:<br>'Reducing carbon emissions through clean energy, digital infrastructure, and active travel routes and public transport services to the site'.<br><br>Add additional bullet:<br>'Promoting sustainable access to the site to ensure it is accessible for those without access to a car' | Change made - incorporated text change under 1.2 on page 6 | TfGM |
| 114 | 1.3 (Delivering in Phases) | Suggest rewording to:<br><br>'Future phases will follow a comprehensive and coordinated approach, supported by new and upgraded services and infrastructure, and a strong environmental framework.' | Change made - incorporated text change under 1.3 on page 6 | TfGM |
| 115 | 1.4 (Long-term Benefits) | Suggest rewording to:<br><br>'Enhance wellbeing through sustainable design, green infrastructure, and providing enhanced travel choice on the Bee Network for local communities' | Change made - incorporated text change under 1.4 on page 6 | TfGM |
| 116 | 2.2 (Purpose of the Strategic Masterplan) | Suggest rewording to:<br>'SPD also aims to reduce inequalities by improving access to jobs and skills training in the local neighbourhoods, providing a well-connected development site by a range of transport modes, and enhancing the local transport network and services to support its inclusive growth.<br><br>Sustainability and resilience are also central priorities, with a strong focus on promoting carbon neutrality and encouraging sustainable travel through reducing car dependency by investment in active travel and public transport services and infrastructure.<br><br>The site is within walking distance of existing transport hubs and will be designed to support and promote bus services and active travel, while also ensuring the inclusion of digital infrastructure and cleaner energy systems where possible.' | Change made - incorporated text change under 2.2 on page 10 | TfGM |
| 117 | 2.4 (Masterplan Ambition) | Suggest rewording to:<br><br>This means harnessing the site's natural assets, embedding sustainable design, and maximising and enhancing connections to the local and regional transport network to deliver a genuinely low-carbon, future-ready development. | Change made - incorporated text change under 2.4 on page 12 | TfGM |
| 118 | 3.1 (The Site) | Strategic Location<br>Change "Northfold growth corridor" to 'Northfield Growth Location'. | Change made - Incorporated text under 3.1 Strategic Location on page 1 | TfGM |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Westhoughton station is over 1.5km away so not a universally accessible walking distance. Suggest rewording to<br>“The site is within walking distance for most users to a number of existing railway stations particularly Westhoughton”.<br><br>Key site features<br>Suggest rewording to:<br>An extensive Public Right of Way network which crosses the site in all directions. However, some of the routes would not be considered universally accessible, are not clearly visible and are somewhat unattractive given they run through existing farmsteads. | | |
| 119 | 6.2 (Strategic Objectives) | Suggest rewording to:<br>‘Make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure, and sustainable transport services, to and across the site, that integrates into the surrounding movement network’.<br><br>‘Create a network of accessible and safe walking and cycling routes including natural green pathways that protect the integrity of the existing PRoW network and adapt to help improve the connections between the site and Westhoughton as well as the wider area. Provide enhanced active travel links to Westhoughton station and Horwich Parkway station’.<br><br>The existing reference to enhanced connections to Horwich Parkway reinforces the need for it to be highlighted on the Strategic Masterplan at the start of the document and on page 51. | Change made - incorporated text changes into bullet points under 6.2 on page 44 | TfGM |
| 120 | 8.2 (A Legible, Safe and Accessible Place) | Suggest rewording to:<br><br>‘Proposals should also provide safe and direct.<br><br>links to the surrounding road network, bus stops and nearby railway stations, and community facilities, ensuring that active travel facilities are part of a fully integrated transport network that supports wellbeing and productivity’ | Change made - incorporated text changes under 8.2 on page 64 | TfGM |
| 121 | Design Principle 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding & Public Realm) | Frontages, Building Design and Natural Surveillance<br><br>Suggest rewording to:<br><br>‘Proposal should use building lines, hedges, and landscaping as security measures, minimising reliance on fencing while avoiding barriers to pedestrian desire lines. Where fencing is unavoidable, it should be reduced in height, visually permeable, and softened with planting or public art.’ | Change made - incorporated text changes under 8.2 on page 64 | TfGM |
| 122 | Design Principle 4 (Walking, Wheeling & the Bridleway Network) | Suggest rewording to:<br>‘Development proposals for the site will be expected to deliver a safe, legible and universally accessible network of walking, wheeling, cycling and bridleway routes that form a fundamental part of the site wide movement strategy.’ | Change made - incorporated various text changes under DP4 on page 68 | TfGM |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | **Public Rights of Way (PRoW)**<br>**Suggest rewording to:**<br>**'The existing PRoW network is a valuable asset and must form the foundation of the active travel strategy. PRoWs should be retained and enhanced wherever needed to encourage greater use for commuting and recreation'.**<br><br>'Any new non-PRoW routes must be clearly identified, with their intended status and purpose defined within the wider transport network.'<br><br>Cycle Parking and Facilities<br>Suggest rewording to:<br>'Cycle parking must be accessible, overlooked and designed to accommodate non-standard cycles, such as cargo bikes and adapted cycles.'<br><br>'Proposals should include complementary amenities such as showers, changing rooms, lockers, repair stands and e-bike charging, ensuring that cycling is practical and attractive for employees and visitors alike.' | | |
| 123 | Design Principle 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport & Micromobility Facilities) | Suggest rewording to:<br>'The approach must maximise the site's proximity to rail stations'.<br><br>Rail integration and accessibility<br>'Proposals should set out how rail access can be improved by active travel, shared transport and micromobility, ensuring that connections are resilient and universally accessible for all users.'<br><br>Shared Transport and Micromobility<br>Hubs should incorporate facilities for shared cycles, e-bikes, e-scooters and car clubs, supported by secure parking, charging infrastructure and clear wayfinding.<br><br>Facilities should be inclusive and universally accessible, designed to meet the needs of a diverse range of users including disabled people, shift workers and visitors from surrounding communities.<br><br>Public Transport, Shared Transport & Micromobility Facilities<br>Suggest rewording to:<br>'Facilities are accessible to all users whenever they need them'.<br><br>What good looks like:<br>Direct, well-lit links connect to Westhoughton and Horwich Parkway Railway Stations and Westhoughton town centre. (to link with reference to Horwich Parkway in 6.2). | Change made - incorporated various text changes under DP5 on page 70 | TfGM |
| 124 | Design Principle 6 (Vehicular Access: Shared, Private & Industrial Vehicles) | New vehicular access proposals (bullet 4) | Change made - incorporated various text changes under DP6 on page 72 | TfGM |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Will all the routes through the site include segregated cycle lanes? To just include this at junctions may be disjointed? Perhaps suggest:<br>'All new routes and junctions through the site will be designed in accordance with a Streets for All assessment (considering trip volumes, vehicular mix and traffic speeds) to identify the most appropriate provision to balance the range of multi-modal users across the site'.<br><br>Electric vehicle charging infrastructure<br>Suggest rewording to:<br>'Development proposals must include EV charging infrastructure across the site, including within development plateaus, mobility hubs and service areas'.<br><br>LGV and HGV access and parking<br>Suggest rewording to:<br>'Service yards must provide for safe turning movements, accommodate longer semi-trailers and avoid manoeuvring on the highway network.'<br><br>Private Car Parking and Service Yards<br>Suggest rewording to:<br>'Adequate private car parking must be provided for employees and visitors in accordance with the vision-led strategy for the site to avoid an over provision, with blue badge bays located within 50m of principal entrances.'<br><br>'Development proposals must demonstrate how these requirements have been addressed as part of the site-wide transport strategy' | | |
| 125 | Design Principle 7 (Land uses) | Ancillary non-industrial and warehousing uses<br>Suggest rewording to:<br>'Such uses should be arranged in accessible hubs, close to active travel corridors, public transport connections and mobility hubs, to maximise accessibility and integration with surrounding communities' | Change made - incorporated text change under Ancillary non-industrial and warehousing uses on page 76 | TfGM |
| 126 | Design Principle 8 (Building Design) | Orientation and frontages<br>Suggest rewording to:<br>'Gateways, junctions and nodes should be defined by distinctive architecture, with enhanced design treatments to reinforce wayfinding and provide identity in accordance with Streets for All Design Guide.'<br><br>Parking, service yards and plot configurations<br>Suggest rewording to:<br>Layout and lighting of parking and service areas must prioritise safety and security whilst being mindful of environmental impacts, with clear segregation from pedestrian and cycle routes whilst promoting direct access routes for those arriving without a car.' | Change made - incorporated text changes on page 78 | |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Transport: Travel Networks** | | | |
| 127 | N/A | The proposed development doesn't enhance travel networks. | This is addressed through Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), Design Principle 4 (walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared, Private and Industrial Vehicles). | Resident |
| | **Transport: Congestion** | | | |
| 128 | N/A | Westhoughton has poor road infrastructure and is already congested even at off-peak times. The development will increase congestion in Wingates, Westhoughton and surrounding area. The A6, Dicconson Lane and the M61 will be negatively affected. This will be an issue both during construction and after completion. There is no clear plan on how the congestion will be improved.<br><br>Blackrod and Horwich are also heavily congested.<br><br>Road infrastructure needs to be invested in before anymore development. | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response. West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place.<br><br>West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place.<br><br>Strategic infrastructure contributions will be secured through Section 106 planning obligations at the planning application stage. | Residents (x45) |
| 129 | N/A | If the development at Hulton Park goes ahead at the same time both junctions from the M61 will have increased traffic. This will lead to more congestion in the area. | Development at Hulton Park is out of scope of this consultation. | Resident |
| 130 | N/A | The existing road between Wingates and church street which constantly clogs Church Street, should be closed. | No evidence has been received supporting the closure of Church Street | Resident |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 131 | N/A | Church Lane is already congested and needs to be an access only road. Also, Church Road will be used as a cut through more than it already is. | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response. West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place.<br><br>No evidence has been submitted demonstrating that Church Road should be an access only road. | Residents |
| | **Transport: Road Safety** | | | |
| 132 | N/A | There will be an increase in road traffic accidents including at motorway junctions which are already dangerous. | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place.<br><br>Strategic infrastructure contributions will be secured through Section 106 planning obligations at the planning application stage. | Residents (x2) |
| | **Transport: HGVs** | | | |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 133 | N/A | Concern about the additional HGV use including on Church Street and A6. There is road degradation and roads are generally poorly maintained. HGV's also drop lots of dust/dirt which leads to drainage manholes being blocked regularly.<br><br>HGVs should be subject to restrictions and have dedicated routes i.e. they shouldn't go through areas including Aspull, Hall Land and Hindley.<br><br>Roads in the area are too small and unfit for HGVs | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place.<br><br>Strategic infrastructure contributions will be secured through Section 106 planning obligations at the planning application stage. | Residents (x3) |
| 134 | | Wingates is being used as a giant lorry park. The development will have a heavy impact on transport systems bringing large-scale heavily polluting industrial machinery and much greater volumes of lorries and commercial vehicles to the area reducing air quality and having a negative impact on the lives of people in the area and their health outcomes. | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response. West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place. | Resident |
| 135 | N/A | There should be route restrictions from Hindley through Aspull for HGVs. | Out of scope of consultation | Resident |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 136 | N/A | Concern around additional HGVs including on Church Street, the A6 and other local roads. Roads are already in poor condition and the HGVs will cause further road degradation because they drop lots of dust/dirt which leads to drainage manholes being blocked regularly. | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place.<br><br>Strategic infrastructure contributions will be secured through Section 106 planning obligations at the planning application stage. | Residents (x2) |
| | **Transport: Car Parking** | | | |
| 137 | N/A | Car parking is already an issue | Car parking is addressed through Design Principle 6 (Vehicular Access: Shared, Private and Industrial Vehicles) | Resident |
| | **Transport: M61 Corridor** | | | |
| 138 | N/A | Where is the impact on J4-6 of the M61? The increase traffic on J5 will put more pressure on others. | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response. | Resident |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 139 | N/A | There is absolutely no consideration of the impact on the M61 corridor. ALL listed traffic works should be completed BEFORE any construction work begins on site. | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place. | Resident |
| 140 | N/A | Improvements to the link road between this site and M61 junction 6 need to be put in place BEFORE this site is developed any further. | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place. | Resident |
| | **Transport: Proposed Junction Improvements** | | | |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 141 | N/A | The proposed junction improvements outlined won't be sufficient to mitigate the extra traffic this development will generate, if it creates the anticipated 6000 jobs. | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place.<br><br>Strategic infrastructure contributions will be secured through Section 106 planning obligations at the planning application stage. | Resident |
| | **Transport: Realigned A6** | | | |
| 142 | N/A | Part of the realigned Chorley Road (A6) had to be dug up for drainage shortly after being laid. These areas are now bumpy. The cycle routes are not used by cyclists, the landscaping is full of weeds and the speed limit has been reduced to 30mph when 40mph was fine. | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response. West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place.<br><br>The speed limit is out of scope of the West of Wingates SPD Masterplan Consultation | Resident |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 143 | N/A | The A6 cannot cope with current traffic at peak time. The new road with a tiny filter lane of two lanes going into one is already resulting in road rage incidents. All traffic is already bottle necking on A6 before the development where you are proposing thousands of additional cars and HGVs | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place.<br><br>Strategic infrastructure contributions will be secured through Section 106 planning obligations at the planning application stage. | Resident |
| | **Transport: Dicconson Lane Junction** | | | |
| 144 | N/A | Dicconson Lane and Wingates junction is already a busy, dangerous junction. | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response. West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place. | Resident |
| | **Road Surfaces** | | | |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 145 | N/A | Roads are poorly maintained, not designed for current traffic levels and are constantly having to be repaired. | Out of scope of Strategic Masterplan SPD Consultation.<br><br>PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place.<br><br>Strategic infrastructure contributions will be secured through Section 106 planning obligations at the planning application stage. | Residents (x2) |
| | **Transport: Roadworks** | | | |
| 146 | N/A | The Phase 1 road works were a major inconvenience on an already busy road which took months to complete. | Comment out of scope of SPD Masterplan consultation. | Resident |
| | **Transport: Road Access** | | | |
| 147 | N/A | Road access needs to be considered including limitations to HGVs in the local town. | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principle 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) addresses this issue.<br><br>Access and other necessary mitigations will be addressed at planning application stage | Resident |
| | **Transport: Bypass** | | | |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 148 | N/A | Bypass roads are needed to divert traffic away from Westhoughton | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place.<br><br>Strategic infrastructure contributions will be secured through Section 106 planning obligations at the planning application stage.<br><br>Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response. West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place. | Residents (x3) |
| | **Transport: Public Transport** | | | |
| 149 | 1 (Executive Summary) | Better emphasis/stronger framing on improved public transport offer needed.<br><br>Strategic Masterplan does not highlight any bus infrastructure or routes (existing or proposed) or Horwich station which is a similar distance to some parts of the site to the Westhoughton station (which is highlighted).<br><br>Public transport penetration through the site remains a key concern. Has any further work been done on the public transport strategy to inform routes through the site? | Change made – including Horwich Parkway Station being added to the Strategic Masterplan. | TfGM |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 150 | 8 (Design Concept & Principles) | More detail needed including off site measures/ pubic transport service improvements - this section along with the phasing plan needs to explicitly detail how the design of the site will meet the needs of users defined in a transport vision, upfront at this early stage.<br><br>It must show how proposed site design/off site measures will:<br>1. Enable end-to-end multimodal trips to/from/through the site<br>2. To/from specific key destinations/onward transport connections identified through analysis of user needs<br>3. At each phase of the development<br>4. Designed in alignment with Streets for All Design Guidance<br><br>Active travel provision should be integrated into street design rather segregated off on green corridors, and link into public transport strategy.<br><br>Clarity is needed for what is meant by ‘mobility hubs’.<br><br>The term ‘routes’ is ambiguous, could mean streets / paths / both, which has implication for whether design aligns with Streets for All | This is considered to be too much detail to include at this stage. | TfGM |
| 151 | N/A | Public transport options are inadequate | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principle 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) addresses this issue. | Resident |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 152 | N/A | There are poor public transport links, both buses and rail. Improvements to public transport, walking & cycling routes are unlikely to help much, as most people will still choose to travel to & from the site by car. | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place.<br><br>Strategic infrastructure contributions will be secured through Section 106 planning obligations at the planning application stage. | Residents (x3) |
| 153 | N/A | Public transport won't support the development. | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C3 (Public Transport) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principle 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) addresses this issue (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place. | Resident |
| | **Transport: Sustainable Travel Hubs** | | | |
| 154 | **N**/A | Clarity needed on what is meant by sustainable travel hubs approach – how will they integrate with public transport strategy | The reference to Sustainable Travel Hubs has been amended as follows:<br><br>*Creation of sustainable transport links and ~~sustainable travel~~ micromobility hubs through the site.*<br><br>Micromobility hubs are fully addressed in the SPD including at Design Principle 5: Public Transport, Shared Transport & Micromobility Facilities. | TfGM |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Transport: Rail** | | | |
| 155 | N/A | Reducing rail prices is an opportunity. | Out of scope of consultation | Resident |
| 156 | N/A | A new rail station and link is needed (in addition to existing) | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place.<br><br>Strategic infrastructure contributions will be secured through Section 106 planning obligations at the planning application stage. | Resident |
| | **Transport: Cycling** | | | |
| 157 | N/A | Cycling provision likely to be needed | This is addressed through the West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD, including Design Principle 4 (walking Wheeling, Cycling & Bridleway Network). | TfGM |
| | **Transport: E Bikes** | | | |
| 158 | N/A | The use of e-bikes is unrealistic due to cost | This is addressed through Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), Design Principle 4 (walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network) and Design Principle 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility facilities). | Resident |
| | **Transport: Public Rights of Way, pedestrian links and walking** | | | |
| 159 | 3.5 (Summary of Technical & Environmental Analysis) | Accessibility influences: as per earlier comments, current PRoW does not accessibly link the site to local destinations / onward public transport. But correct to say there is opportunity to improve. | Comment noted. This is addressed through Design Principle 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network) and will be addressed at planning application stage. | TfGM |
| 160 | 6 (Strategic Masterplan: Vision) | PRoW network not currently accessible enough to provide appropriate active travel links | Comment noted. This is addressed through Design Principle 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network) and will be addressed at planning application stage. | TfGM |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 161 | N/A | Public walkways have been altered and this will continue. The actual paths may be retained, but it is hardly the same walking opportunity if all the greenery is gone and the surroundings are just grey warehouses and industrial units. | PfE Policy JPA6 states that development will be required to ensure that the integrity of the extensive network of existing rights of way is protected. The Strategic Masterplan SPD builds in further detail through Design Principle 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm) and Design Principle 4 (walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network). | Residents (x3) |
| 162 | N/A | Object to the loss of a beautiful area where people walk | PfE Policy JPA6 allocates this land for around 440,000 sqm of industrial and warehousing floorspace, but states that development must ensure that the integrity of the extensive network of existing rights oy way is protected. This is addressed in further detail through West of Wingates Masterplan SPD Design Principle 4 Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network. | Resident |
| 163 | N/A | Some of the lanes are privately owned and can't be used as a public right of way. | PfE Policy JPA6 states that development will be required to ensure that the integrity of the extensive network of existing rights of way is protected. The Strategic Masterplan SPD builds in further detail through Design Principle 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm) and Design Principle 4 (walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network). | Resident |
| 164 | N/A | As a walker, there's no plans to make it safer for me to walk locally, especially to Horwich either down the A6 or Wingates Lane. Increased traffic and HGVs will make it worse. | PfE Policy JPA6 states that development will be required to ensure that the integrity of the extensive network of existing rights of way is protected. The Strategic Masterplan SPD builds in further detail through Design Principle 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm) and Design Principle 4 (walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network). | Resident |
| 165 | N/A | Increased traffic down Wingates and Lostock lane where there is no pavement means it'll be even more dangerous to walk than it is now. People and walking is not being prioritised, it's already dangerous to cross at the motorway roundabout with no traffic lights; but no plans to make that safer. Add the impact of a match day and traffic, it's going to be horrendous. | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place.<br><br>Strategic infrastructure contributions will be secured through Section 106 planning obligations at the planning application stage. | Resident |
| | **Transport: Road Signage** | | | |
| 166 | N/A | Highway signage needs to be in place from junction 6 only to avoid heavy traffic's through Westhoughton from Junction 5. | Out of scope of consultation | Resident |
| | **Transport: Willow Bank Area** | | | |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 167 | N/A | The proposed walking and cycling route to the site would run parallel with Willow Bank and there would be increased numbers of workers passing by at all times of the day. The existing pedestrian path from the train station through Wingates industrial is an absolute mess and the plan shows this extending down past willow bank and this will impact residents. | This is addressed through Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), Design Principle 4 (walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network) and Design Principle 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility facilities). | Resident |
| | **Transport: Information** | | | |
| 168 | N/A | Transport detail is incorrect and not sufficient. For example, the 615 bus is only on for a trial period with restricted hours which will not support businesses and runs irregular, not hourly. | The descriptions at section 3.2 are considered to be suitably accurate. | Resident |
| | **Infrastructure** | | | |
| 169 | 9 (Phasing, Delivery & Governance) | The requirement of Policy JP S4 in Places for Everyone (PFE) is for drainage to be delivered in a holistic and integrated manner. In addition Policy JP D1 in PFE requires applicants to prepare an infrastructure phasing and delivery strategy to be agreed by the LPA for sites where build out will be delivered by different developers or in phases. The strategy must outline what needs to be provided by when and who will fund and deliver it. United Utilities request that the third paragraph is rephrased to more accurately reflect these policy requirements. | It is acknowledged that the phasing and delivery of infrastructure will play a crucial role in the project's execution. Infrastructure limitations and the phasing strategy will be developed routinely to guide the project development approach; however, it is important to note that this will also be linked to commercial needs. There is no opposition to the necessity of an infrastructure phasing and delivery strategy in future planning applications.<br><br>Third paragraph amended on page 80 | United Utilities |
| 170 | 9 (Phasing, Delivery & Governance) | United Utilities support the principle of site-wide measures, such as landscape and ecological enhancements, being implemented during the early phases of earthworks and infrastructure, so they are delivered in advance of individual plots. The successful implementation of this should be informed by a detailed appraisal of site wide infrastructure requirements, environmental assessment, and drainage strategy to identify specific mitigation for masterplan area as part of a holistic framework. It would be useful to provide more detail in the SPD to demonstrate how infrastructure can be delivered in a co-ordinated, holistic, and sustainable manner. | Change made – text amended on page 80 | |
| 171 | N/A | Bringing growth to an already struggle infrastructure isn't going to help Wingates or Westhoughton. The development will have a huge impact on local services including doctors, schools and dentists in Westhoughton which are already at full capacity | PfE Policy JPA6 requires development at this site to 'make provision for new and improved sustainable transport and highways infrastructure'. Planning applications will need to address this as well as PfE policies including JP-C1(an Integrated Network), JP-C3 (Public Transport), JP-C4 (the Strategic Road Network), JP-C6 (Walking and Cycling), JP-C7 (Freight and Logistics) and JP-C8 (Transport Requirements of New Developments). Transport for Greater Manchester have been engaged in the preparation of the SPD, including through stakeholder workshops and provided a detailed consultation response.<br><br>West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding and Public Realm), 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling and Bridleway Network), 5 (Public Transport, Shared Transport and Micromobility Facilities) and 6 (Vehicular | Residents (x10) |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Access - Shared Private and Industrial Vehicles) address achieving a legible, safe and accessible place.<br><br>Strategic infrastructure contributions will be secured through Section 106 planning obligations at the planning application stage.<br><br>The West of Wingates Masterplan SPD emphasises improved physical and social infrastructure including health and recreational facilities. The new Local Plan and Infrastructure Delivery Plan will address services in Westhoughton and across the borough. | |
| 172 | 6.3 (Design Rationale) | Request that the first and second paragraphs clearly refer to how infrastructure must be delivered in a holistic and integrated manner, even where development comes forward in phases, to ensure compliance with policy requirements in Places for Everyone. | Change made - incorporated into second paragraph on page 46 | United Utilities |
| 173 | 9.1 (Phasing & Infrastructure) | Phase 1 – Anticipated development period: 2025-2035 states: 'This planning permission allows construction of a spine road through the site to serve the approved development and land to the south (phase 2).' In the context of our wider comments about the overall drainage strategy for the site, in particular, foul water drainage, we wish to query whether the design of the spine road includes details of infrastructure, e.g., foul and surface water drainage including details of a foul water pumping arrangements which ensure that a proliferation of pumping stations is avoided? | The phase 1 development is delivered in isolation and full details are available through the associated planning application and subsequent drainage S104 submission. There are no plans to establish any drainage connections between phase 1 and future phases, except for the surface water discharge from phase 1 into the watercourse that flows through phase 2. | United Utilities |
| 174 | 9.1 (Phasing & Infrastructure) | 9.1 Phasing and Infrastructure: In respect of the second paragraph of this section, whilst United Utilities acknowledge the need for flexibility, they consider that there must also be an underlying strategy for infrastructure delivery that should underpin the masterplan and the SPD. The strategy for infrastructure delivery should only be varied with Council approval. | The principles within this statement are agreed with and the 3rd paragraph within the introduction statement to section 9 sufficiently acknowledges that this requirement is met within planning applications. | United Utilities |
| 175 | N/A | There is insufficient infrastructure in the area. New infrastructure is needed. There are existing waiting lists for doctors and dentists. New health facilities and and a new high school are needed. | The existing policy position in relation to infrastructure is set out in Places for everyone including Policy JP-D1 (Infrastructure Implementation and JP-D2 (Developer Contributions). This will be addressed in further detail in the Bolton Local Plan, which will be supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Residents (x3) |
| 176 | N/A | The introduction of new jobs will increase pressure to build more houses in Westhoughton. The infrastructure including schools and doctors in Westhoughton is not there and this needs to be address in the development. | The existing policy position in relation to infrastructure is set out in Places for everyone including Policy JP-D1 (Infrastructure Implementation and JP-D2 (Developer Contributions). This will be addressed in further detail in the Bolton Local Plan, which will be supported by an Infrastructure Delivery Plan. | Residents (x3) |
| 177 | 9.2 (Site-wide Infrastructure) | Suggest:<br>'Each phase of development shall be required to mitigate its impact by provision or funding of off-site infrastructure in respect of:<br>` Upgrades to the local highway network (which may include contributions towards upgrade of appropriate active travel infrastructure). | Change made - incorporated text change under 9.2 on page 84 | TfGM |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | ` Public transport service enhancement<br><br>In respect of measures needed across the whole site (e.g. bus enhancements) a strategy for how services will be funded and phased alongside development will be needed, including how each phase will make a proportionate contribution'.<br><br>(We consider that the wording around 'Each phase of development shall be required to mitigate its impact' leaves this open to piece | | |
| 178 | 9.5 (Governance) | United Utilities are not clear what governance will be in place to ensure holistic and integrated delivery of supporting infrastructure on this multi-phase development. | This is sufficiently covered in section 9 and will be addressed via phase specific planning applications. All on-site infrastructure being designed in holistic site-wide and phased manner. | United Utilities |
| | **Phasing** | | | |
| 179 | 9 (Phasing, Delivery & Governance) | As per section 8, the phasing plan needs to explicitly detail how the site buildout /off site infrastructure measures / public transport services will meet the needs for users - as defined through transport vision work - at each phase of the development.<br><br>While it is understood that the more detailed assessment as the site comes forward will build on this phasing plan, the SPD needs to upfront set out a holistic phasing plan for the site as a whole, to avoid piecemeal development.<br><br>Suggest rewording to:<br>'However, elements such as the transport network and drainage strategy are impractical to complete in full upfront due to the site's scale , viability considerations, and long term delivery timescales. Infrastructure should therefore be phased in line with the Transport Vision Strategy as different plateaus and phases come forward, ensuring that sustainable transport facilities and connections are in place and usable from occupation of each parcel, as an integral part of road corridors' | Change made - incorporated text change in final paragraph under section 9 on page 80 | TfGM |
| 180 | 9.1 (Phasing & Infrastructure) | Suggest rewording to:<br>'The development would be expected to come forward in a series of phases, alongside necessary infrastructure provision including streets with provisions for walking and cycling and - where appropriate - public transport, drainage and landscaping and ecology works and as such a flexible but joined-up approach is needed.<br><br>Phasing of parcels:<br>A phasing strategy which seeks to preserve a maximum 400m distance from existing bus stops on Chorley Road and Dicconson Lane until a bus route through the site can be provided would be most beneficial from a sustainability and | Change made - incorporated text changes to paragraph two under 9.1 on page 80 but not further work on bus strategy and infrastructure phasing | TfGM |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | equity perspective. Existing 'Phase 2' and 'Phase 3' may therefore need to be transposed unless a turning facility for buses can be provided as part of the existing 'Phase 2'. Further work on the bus strategy and infrastructure phasing is required. | | |
| | **Recreation** | | | |
| 181 | N/A | The site at present provides informal access to green spaces and promotes healthy lifestyles. It is the only area left in Westhoughton with open fields, tracks and views and is used daily by walkers, cyclist and runners. | Out of scope of consultation. The Principle of development, and quantity of floorspace was established through Policy JPA6 (West of Wingates) of the Adopted Places for Everyone Plan. Policy JPA6 states that development will be required to ensure that the integrity of the extensive network of existing rights of way is protected. West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD Design Principles 3 (Movement Hierarchy, Wayfinding & Public Realm) and 4 (Walking, Wheeling, Cycling & Bridleway Network) provide further detail. | Residents (x2) |
| 182 | N/A | The creation of land space for allotments and outdoor space for recreation should be encouraged | This is addressed through Design Principle 1 (Green Infrastructure Corridors) particularly the section on Recreation, Health and Wellbeing. | Resident |
| 183 | Design Principle 2 (Landscape Buffers) | Involuntary escape of golf balls needs to be considered in landscaping. | The development parcel and landscape buffer position at the boundary with the golf course allows consideration and any design response to the 'involuntary escape of golf balls' matter at the application stage. Points made about public liability claim costs etc are not relevant to the SPD.<br>Westhoughton Golf Course. | Westhoughton Golf Club |
| 184 | N/A | An assessment based on a Google Earth survey has indicated that there is unlikely to be 'playing field' land affected by proposal.<br>However the Masterplan allocations do lie adjacent to Westhoughton Golf Club and the document should fully take account of this and ensure that future development proposals fully meet, in particular, paragraph 200 of the NPPF (Dec 2024). The Council is advised to contact the relevant National Governing Body for golf, England Golf, for further direction on this matter. | This has been considered as part of the masterplanning process with details to be addressed through planning application landscaping scheme. No communication with England Golf necessary in respect of the SPD, but England Golf will be contacted at planning application stage if considered appropriate. | Sport England |
| | **Health** | | | |
| 185 | N/A | Sport England notes that the Masterplan includes an approach to 'Health and Well-being' and 'Connections' to support the Places for Everyone policy allocation which is welcome. | Noted | |
| 186 | N/A | This site would be good for a health hub, it would be a better site than the current suggested HIB site next to Bolton hospital. Westhoughton and blackrod could benefit from a super hub for health, which Bolton hospital could access. Maybe even a CDC. | PfE Policy JPA6 allocates this land for around 440,000 sqm of industrial and warehousing floorspace. Comment out of scope of consultation. | Resident |
| | **Design** | | | |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 187 | N/A | Buildings should be low rise and in keeping with the natural environment, a maximum eaves height of 8-10m suggested. | CM: This topic is already addressed under the design principle DP8 Building Design. This will guide evaluation of planning applications proposing specific uses in specific locations. | Residents (x4) |
| 188 | N/A | Massing should be significantly reduced | This topic is already addressed under the design principle DP8 Building Design. This will guide evaluation of planning applications proposing specific uses in specific locations. | Resident |
| 189 | N/A | The area on the corner of A6 Chorley Road and Dicconson lane Should have much greater green buffering to minimise impact on the typography of the area. | CM: This topic is already addressed under the design principles DP1 Green Corridors and DP2 Landscape Buffers. This will guide evaluation of planning applications proposing specific uses in specific locations. | Resident |
| 190 | N/A | The design principles themselves are fine, however, in practice a warehouse is generally a large building with an office block attached. No matter how well you try to enhance the design the end result is always the same with numerous different looking buildings on the same site with a poor appearance. When viability issues arise the design of buildings suffers.<br><br>There should be increased buffer distances for the houses on Dicconson lane and Millgate estate (Aspull) | CM: This topic is already addressed under the design principles DP1 Green Corridors and DP2 Landscape Buffers. This will guide evaluation of planning applications proposing specific uses in specific locations. | Residents (x2) |
| | **Coal** | | | |
| 191 | N/A | The Coal Authority (trading as the Mining Remediation Authority) records indicate that within the West of Wingates Masterplan area there are recorded coal mining features present at surface and shallow depth including; mine entries, coal workings and surface mining. These features may pose a potential risk to surface stability and public safety. The information held indicates four mine entries located within the northeastern part of the site. These features lie in the vicinity of Phase 1. The Coal Authority is of the opinion that building over the top of, or in close proximity to, mine entries should be avoided wherever possible, even after they have been capped, in line with our adopted policy: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/building-on-or-within-the-influencing-distance-of-mine-entries<br><br>The Coal authority have reviewed the Masterplan and are pleased to see that the recorded mineshafts are identified on the 'Site Influences Plan'. Any formal planning application submitted for development in areas where our records indicate that coal mining features are present should be supported by a Coal Mining Risk Assessment, to assess the risks posed and set out any further works necessary to investigate and address these risks. The Planning team at the Coal Authority have no objections to the Masterplan as proposed. | The response confirms no objection to the masterplan: The response refers to the requirement for planning applications to include a Coal Mining Risk Assessment, to assess the risks posed and set out any further works necessary to investigate and address these risks. This would be carried out as a standard requirement, so it is not an issue. | The Coal Authority |
| | **Misc.** | | | |

| Reference | Relevant section of SPD | Summary of issues raised | Summary of council response | Respondent |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 192 | N/A | Land at Lostock Lane (South), which has been submitted through the Local Plan Call for Sites, can support a mixed-use development close to West of Wingates. Also improve accessibility from Lostock Lane, linking through to the industrial area to the north beyond the Horwich Train Line. | Comment out of scope of consultation. Other allocations will be addressed through the new Local Plan. | Alban Cassidy |
| 193 | N/A | West of Wingates has the opportunity to provide an anchor led-growth scheme. The Wingates Masterplan Site leaves a 'gap' between the Middlebrook and Lostock Lane industrial/residential site and the master plan boundary which served no planning purpose. The 'gap' can support a mixed-use development which can support adjacent sites. The need to encourage development of satellite sites is stressed throughout response. | Out of scope of consultation. Other sites will be addressed through the Local Plan or planning applications. | Cassidy Ashton |
| 194 | N/A | There is no town hall, we still have to go into Bolton | Out of scope of consultation. | Resident |
| 195 | N/A | The cost of the development will go over budget | Out of scope of consultation. | Resident |
| 196 | N/A | Local councils these days just want to sell every single piece of land to developers rather than looking after the environment or local communities. | Out of scope of consultation. The Principle of development, and quantity of floorspace was established through Policy JPA6 (West of Wingates) of the Adopted Places for Everyone Plan. | Resident |
| 197 | N/A | Detail in the masterplan always relates to Bolton Borough only, however, the development is immediately on the border with Wigan. | PfE Policy JPA6 has been adopted by nine Greater Manchester authorities, including Wigan. Impacts on Wigan have been addressed in preparing the West of Wingates Strategic Masterplan SPD and will be addressed through planning applications. | Resident |
| 198 | 7.1 (Strategic Masterplan) | United Utilities note the second to last paragraph on page 50 which states:<br><br>'There may be other acceptable ways that the PfE policy requirements and the design principles can be interpreted and implemented, which are in full accordance with the SPD but may differ spatially from the Masterplan.'<br><br>We wish to query the intention behind this statement and question what this means in the context of the policy requirement for development to be in accordance with a masterplan as per the specific requirements of Policy JPA6 2. We are concerned that this paragraph is undermining the policy requirement and the masterplan that is being prepared. | Change made - text edited in second to last paragraph on page 50 | United Utilities |
| 199 | N/A | Opportunity missed to link the ecology/health & Wellbeing on site into the local AONB Borsdane wood. This could come under the Northfold banner as Borsdane wood spans both Bolton & Wigan but improved access to this area and potentially increasing the size of Borsdane wood via new tree planting in a paid carbon offsetting scheme could be a low-cost option to provide more public amenity at very low cost. Harworth have land ownership to support in this tree planting and public walkways creation/improvement. | This would be offsite works and possibly addressed as part of the detailed application work for phase 3. The Strategic Masterplan includes an active travel link towards Borsdane Woods however the SPD can't commit to anything outside the redline boundary. | Antalis |
| 200 | N/A | Maps not detailed enough and 3D renders should have been provided. | This is too detailed for the Masterplan SPD and will follow at the planning application stage. | Antalis |