ARUP

Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council

Integrated Assessment of The Homes, Spaces, Places – Regulation 18 Draft Plan

Consultation Addendum

Reference: 289676-00

V2 | 8 May 2026

This report takes into account the particular instructions and requirements of our client. It is not intended for and should not be relied upon by any third party and no responsibility is undertaken to any third party.

Job number 289676-00

Ove Arup & Partners Limited
10th Floor The Plaza
100 Old Hall Street
Liverpool, Merseyside
L3 9QJ
United Kingdom
arup.com

Contents

1. Amendments to Main Report Following the Consultation 1

Tables

Table 1 Consultee Comments and Actions 18

Figures

No table of figures entries found.

Drawings

No table of figures entries found.

Pictures

No table of figures entries found.

Photographs

No table of figures entries found.

Attachments

No table of figures entries found.

Appendices

No table of contents entries found.

1. Amendments to Main Report Following the Consultation

Consultation comments and amendments

Consultation on the Integrated Assessment (IA) at the Regulation 18 stage is a key requirement under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (SEA Regulations). These regulations require that statutory environmental bodies, alongside the public and other stakeholders, are given the opportunity to comment on the likely significant effects of the plan and reasonable alternatives identified through the IA. This helps to ensure environmental, social, and economic considerations are fully integrated into the plan-making process from an early stage.

The IA was subject to consultation during the 7-week Regulation 18 consultation on the draft Homes, Spaces, Places Plan, which took place between December 2025 and February 2026. This report summarises the consultation responses and associated actions. The IA Main Report has subsequently been updated subsequently to reflect relevant feedback received.

Key:

Underlined text – new text added

Strikethrough text – text removed

Table 1 Consultee Comments (from letters) and Actions

Consultee	Consultee comments	Action
Environment Agency	We supported the reference in paragraph 7.10 of the earlier draft to this requirement but recommended that the Local Plan should: • Strengthen policy wording to ensure new homes are resilient and energy efficient. • Integrate recommendations from the Integrated Assessment (IA) regarding climate change adaptation. • Consider best practice examples, such as Warwick District Local Plan Policy CC1, which consolidates climate change measures into a dedicated policy.	Support noted. The IA has identified opportunities to strengthen the Plan's approach to climate change mitigation and adaptation, including improving resilience, energy efficiency, and the integration of nature-based solutions.
	1. Climate Change Integrated Assessment Findings The IA assessment of thematic policies indicates that while Policy HSP E1 scored positively for promoting renewable and low-carbon energy, many spatial and housing policies scored neutral or weak against IA Objective 12 (resilience to climate change).	Support noted. The IA highlights recommendations for the integration of climate resilience and adaptation measures across spatial and housing policies. Integrating these is a matter for the HSP to consider.

	The IA recommends enhancements including: • Explicit inclusion of nature-based solutions such as Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and green infrastructure (as noted in Page 58 of the IA). • Clear requirements for energy demand reduction and efficiency in all new developments. • Stronger wording on climate adaptation measures within housing and employment policies.	
	2. Flood Risk Integrated Assessment Findings The IA assessment of flood risk (Objective 13) found: • Policy HSP S1 scored positively for referencing flood risk management consistent with PfE JP-S4. • Policy HSP E2 scored strongly for reducing surface water runoff and promoting SuDS. • However, many spatial and housing policies scored negative or neutral, as they do not explicitly reference avoiding high flood risk areas, managing residual risk, or future-proofing developments for climate change impacts.	Support noted. The IA highlights recommendations for the integration of flood risk avoidance, climate change adaptation and residual risk management across spatial and housing policies. Integrating these is a matter for the HSP to consider.

	• IA recommends enhancements including: o Clear reference to avoiding development in high flood risk areas. o Explicit requirements for climate change adaptation measures and nature-based solutions. o Stronger integration of flood risk considerations into all thematic policies, not just environmental ones	
	3. Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) Integrated Assessment Findings The IA assessment of flood risk and climate resilience objectives found that Policy HSP E2 scored positively for promoting SuDS and reducing surface water runoff. However, many other policies scored neutral or weak, as they do not reference SuDS or nature-based solutions explicitly. IA recommends enhancements including: • Stronger integration of SuDS requirements across all relevant policies.	Support noted. The IA highlights recommendations for the integration of SuDS and nature based solutions across relevant policies. Integrating these is a matter for the HSP to consider.

	• Explicit reference to nature-based solutions and multifunctional benefits (biodiversity, amenity, climate resilience). • Clearer standards for runoff rates and long-term maintenance of SuDS.	
	4. Biodiversity Integrated Assessment Findings The IA assessment of biodiversity objectives (Objective 11) found: • Policy HSP E3 scored strongly for protecting designated sites and requiring biodiversity net gain. • However, spatial and housing policies scored neutral or weak, as they do not embed biodiversity considerations beyond general references to green space. • IA recommends enhancements including: o Explicit reference to wildlife corridors and ecological connectivity. o Integration of biodiversity measures with SuDS and climate adaptation strategies o Stronger linkage to LNRS	Support noted. The IA highlights recommendations for the integration of biodiversity considerations across relevant policies. Integrating these is a matter for the HSP to consider.

	and RBMP to identify opportunities for habitat creation and restoration.	
	5. Water Protection and Groundwater Integrated Assessment Findings The IA assessment of water-related objectives (Objective 14) found: • Policy HSP E2 scored positively for promoting water efficiency but weakly for addressing pollution control and safeguarding water resources. • Most other policies scored neutral, as they do not reference water quality or groundwater protection explicitly. • IA recommends enhancements including: o Explicit reference to the Water Framework Directive and RBMP objectives. o Requirements for pollution prevention measures and wastewater management infrastructure. o Stronger integration of groundwater protection and contaminated land remediation within environmental and design policies.	Support noted. The IA highlights recommendations for the integration of water protection and groundwater considerations across relevant policies. Integrating these is a matter for the HSP to consider.

	6. Air Quality In our response to the Options and Preferences consultation, we agreed with the Integrated Assessment (IA) that the Local Plan needed to strengthen its approach to air quality. Integrated Assessment Findings The IA acknowledges that: • Many spatial, centres, jobs, and homes policies scored neutral or weak against IA Objective 3 (Air Quality), as they lacked explicit air quality references. • The IA recommends including specific measures to reduce emissions, such as: o Low-emission heating systems. o Electric vehicle (EV) charging infrastructure. o Sustainable transport interventions that reduce reliance on private vehicles. o Measures to reduce dust and pollution from construction.	Support noted. The IA highlights recommendations for the integration of specific measures to reduce emissions across relevant policies. Integrating these is a matter for the HSP to consider.

	• The IA identifies a need to reference nature-based solutions, which also provide co-benefits for air quality, such as tree planting and green corridors. • It also recommends restricting development in locations where air quality is already poor and ensuring that site layout and design reduce exposure where development does occur. These recommendations have not yet been fully addressed within the Preferred Options draft.	
	9. River Basin Management Plans (RBMP) Integrated Assessment findings The IA identifies several weaknesses that are directly relevant to RBMP integration: • IA Objective 14 (Water Resources Protection) shows neutral or weak scores for many thematic policies because they do not reference water quality protection, WFD compliance, or pollution reduction measures. • IA recommendations include adding explicit references to avoiding deterioration of watercourses, supporting water resource improvements, and protecting water infrastructure. These align closely with RBMP priorities for the North West.	Support noted. The IA highlights recommendations for the integration of references to River Basin Management Plans and other water protection measures across relevant policies. Integrating these is a matter for the HSP to consider.

	• Biodiversity and climate objectives in the IA also highlight missed opportunities to embed nature-based measures that would support RBMP outcomes, such as wetland creation, river corridor enhancements, and riparian buffer zones. Despite these signals, the Preferred Options draft has not yet incorporated these RBMP aligned enhancements.	
Historic England	In terms of the historic environment, on the whole, we consider that the Report has identified the majority of plans and programmes which are of relevance to the development of the Tameside Local Plan, that it has established an appropriate baseline against which to assess the Plan's proposals and that it has put forward a suitable set of objectives and indicators. Overall, therefore, we believe that it provides an appropriate framework for assessing the likely significant effects which this plan might have upon the historic environment.	Support noted. No action required.
	As highlighted in our responses to earlier iterations of the Integrated Assessment (April 2024 and April 2025), we welcome the inclusion of the topic of the historic environment within SA Objective 16. However, it seeks to deal with the consideration of landscape and townscape as	The importance of considering the historic environment as a distinct matter is recognised, as outlined in Paragraph 2.10 of Historic England's Advice Note 8. Although landscape, townscape, and heritage assets have been grouped under a

	part of the same objective. Whilst often related, these topics need to be dealt with under separate objectives in order to be given proper consideration. As highlighted in Historic England Advice Note 8: Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment, a separate and specific objective relating to the historic environment may help avoid the masking of adverse impacts through blending several topics together under a single sustainability objective.	single objective, the criteria under IA Objective 16 addresses each topic separately, including two that specifically consider heritage assets ('Conserve and enhance the historic environment, heritage assets and their setting?' and 'Protect or enhance the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets?'). These are considered to appropriately reflect the guidance in Paragraph 2.11 of the Advice Note and are proportionate to the rest of the assessment topics. This objective and the criteria which sits beneath it were also used in the IA for the Greater Manchester Places for Everyone (PfE) Plan and therefore will provide consistency between both plans that will ultimately form part of the Tameside Local Plan. The objective has therefore not been amended.
	This opinion is based on the information provided by you in the Integrated Assessment Report dated December 2025 and, for the avoidance of doubt, does not affect our obligation to advise you on, and potentially object to any specific development proposal which may subsequently	As above. No action required.

	arise from this or later versions of the plan which is the subject to consultation, and which may, despite the Integrated Assessment, have adverse effects on the environment.	
Natural England	Policy HSP S1: Overall Spatial Strategy 5.64 Spatial Strategy and Neighbourhood areas in Tameside Natural England note that there are many allocations across these policies which are within an SSSI Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) for Huddersfield Narrow Canal SSSI. These identify potential development impacts on SSSIs and can be viewed on MAGIC maps. We expect these concerns to be addressed within the assessment of housing and employment site allocations in the Integrated Assessment (IA) and any necessary mitigation and enhancement measures carried into site-specific requirements within the Local Plan. We refer you to Annex A which outlines which allocations have IRZ triggers, as well as other biodiversity constraints that also require assessment in the IA.	Potential impacts on European sites, SSSIs, and SACs have been considered under IA Objective 11, through the following criterion: 'Protect, conserve and enhance new and existing European, nationally and locally designated wildlife and geological sites?'. If the site has been found to be within close proximity to an SSSI, this has been scored negative. During reassessment, at the Regulation 19 Stage, other biodiversity constraints, such as SSSI Impact Risk Zones (IRZ), will be considered to ensure appropriate alignment with IA Objective 11.

	Based on the aforementioned England Peat Status Greenhouse Gas and Carbon Storage dataset, there are shallow peaty soils present at Policy HSP S2K: Mossley Allocation 4: Cheshire Street and Allocation 6: Huddersfield Road, and Policy HSP S2L: Stalybridge Allocation 5: Huddersfield Road and Allocation 8: Millbrook. Shallow peat should be considered in the IA. Natural England recommend that further information is required here to determine if restorable peat is present at these locations. We advise that it may be useful to refer to existing borehole data from the British Geological Survey (BGS), and that best available evidence from a range of desktop and ecological surveys could provide an indication.	IA Objective 12 includes a criterion related specifically to peat ('Encourage the restoration and enhancement of peatlands?'). Policy HSP S2K: Mossley Allocation 4: Cheshire Street and Allocation 6: Huddersfield Road received negative scores against the aforementioned criterion under IA Objective 12 due to the presence of peaty soils within the site. It was also recommended that the allocations could be enhanced by ensuring that new developments avoid these areas and/or maximise the ability to mitigate any impacts or loss of biodiversity. In relation to Policy HSP S2L: Stalybridge Allocation 5: Huddersfield Road, the site already benefits from an extant permission for residential development, which was supported by a suite of technical reports; one of which demonstrates that shallow peat is not present on site. The extant permission also received no objections from Natural England. As a result, the IA score for this allocation against IA Objective 12 has not been updated.

		Policy HSP S2L: Allocation 8: Millbrook originally scored neutral against the aforementioned criterion under IA Objective 12, however, this has been amended to negative to reflect the presence of shallow peat at part of this site. The following mitigation has been added to the assessment table: "Any development needs to consider the potential presence of restorable peat on site and mitigate appropriately, for example, through drainage modifications, direct reinstatement, or restoration". Tameside Council also intend to have an 'overall allocation policy' that highlights the consideration of this matter in any development on the site. During reassessment, at the Regulation 19 Stage, the presence of shallow peat will be considered to ensure appropriate alignment with IA Objective 12.
	Integrated Assessment 4 Assessment of the Plan 4.1 Thematic Policies Natural England has recommended additional matters for inclusion within certain policies. Should these changes be	Comment noted. Updates will be assessed in the next iteration of the IA.

	incorporated, or new policies introduced to address our concerns, we expect these updates to be assessed in the next iteration of the IA.	
	4.2 Allocations While Natural England welcomes the detailed assessment of housing and employment site allocations, we consider the evaluation of biodiversity criteria and associated mitigation and enhancement measures insufficient to address the concerns highlighted in our advice provided above within the 'Spatial Strategy and Neighbourhood Areas in Tameside' section. Where allocations trigger designated site IRZs we would expect to see an assessment of impacts and suitable mitigation proposed that should be clearly outlined in the Local Plan policy. Furthermore, the IA should consider whether priority habitat is present at any of the allocations. Natural England's Priority Habitats Inventory gives an indication of where these are located and can also be viewed on MAGIC maps.	As noted above, during reassessment, at the Regulation 19 Stage, other biodiversity constraints, such as SSSI Impact Risk Zones (IRZ), will be considered to ensure appropriate alignment with IA Objective 11, with suitable mitigation proposed. The IA will also consider the presence of priority habitats to ensure appropriate alignment with IA Objective 11, with suitable mitigation proposed.
	Annex B: Standard Advice for Air Quality Impacts for Local Plans	The IA Framework assesses air quality impacts under IA Objective 10: 'Air Quality', and particularly the impacts from new developments under the

	Local Plans are likely to generate increased emissions of nitrogen oxides (NOx) and ammonia, and additional nitrogen deposition as a result of increased traffic generation associated with new development. As impacts from individual development management proposals would be difficult to quantify without an overarching assessment of the cumulative impacts from Local Plan development, it is necessary for this to be considered strategically at plan level. Natural England would expect the environmental assessment of the plan including the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to consider any detrimental impacts on the natural environment from these emissions. It should also suggest appropriate avoidance or mitigation measures where applicable. Technical guidance about the ecological impacts from road transport can also be found in the Natural England research report 'The ecological effects of air pollution from road transport: an updated review' (NECR199)	following criterion: 'Minimise emissions and particulates from harmful pollutants when delivering new developments?' and 'Locates development not within existing areas of poor air quality?'. Cumulative effects have been considered at a high level to reflect the strategic nature of the HSP policies. These will look to be strengthened during the next iteration of the IA. Where a policy and/or site allocation has scored negative, appropriate mitigation measures have been provided.
Peak District National Park Authority	Policy HSP:E6 Peak District National Park The NPA welcomes this policy as it gives specific regard to the Peak District National Park (PDNP) in terms of	Support noted. The more positive framing of the policy is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.

	assessing impact and restricting development that has adverse impacts. The Integrated Assessment of the Homes, Spaces, Places Preferred Option document notes at pages 50 and 51 that the policy could make more explicit reference to enhancement and restoration measures. The NPA agrees with this assessment. A more positively framed policy would also be consistent with Section 245 (Protected Landscapes) of the Levelling-up and Regeneration Act 2023 which requires relevant authorities to 'seek to further' the statutory purposes of Protected Landscapes.	
Public	1. Failure of "Soundness": Conflict with Residential Amenity The Integrated Assessment (IA) for Kerry Way acknowledges a "Minor Negative" impact on human health due to noise and air quality. However, the policy fails to provide a specific, enforceable mitigation strategy to protect the residential amenity of existing residents and the adjacent Manley Grove (HSP S2J:3) housing allocation. This creates an internal contradiction in the Plan, making it unjustified and ineffective.	Site allocations have been assessed against the IA Framework using spatial data and supporting text provided by Tameside Council. Site allocations have not been subject to a review of cumulative impacts. Site allocation HSP S2J Allocation 1: Kerry Way has been assessed against the IA Framework. It has received negative scoring against IA Objective 6: 'Support improved health and wellbeing of the population and reduce health inequalities' as 82%

	2. Severe Cumulative Impact on Highways (NPPF Paragraph 115) The proposal for 14,480 sqm of industrial space, with primary access via Hamersley Road West, has not been subjected to a rigorous cumulative impact assessment. The introduction of HGV traffic into a residential bottleneck constitutes a "severe" impact on road safety. Any approval without a pre-committed infrastructure upgrade renders the site undeliverable within the plan period. 4. Breach of Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) The proximity of heavy industrial operations to established residential areas disproportionately impacts vulnerable groups (the elderly and children) regarding air quality. I see no evidence that a site-specific Equality Impact Assessment has been conducted for the Kerry Way residents. 5. Procedural Impropriety and Inadequate Publicity I further object on the grounds of procedural unfairness. A site notice for Allocation HSP S2J:1 was only displayed on February 13, 2026—just seven days before the close of the extended consultation. This fails to meet the Gunning Principle that 'sufficient time must be given for consideration	of the site is covered by typology in the 2025 Tameside Council Open Space Assessment. It has received positive scoring against IA Objective 10: 'Improve air quality', however, mitigation has been provided stating: 'The allocation could be enhanced by seeking to minimise the number of trips made by private car to/from the site, and by considering the use of mitigation, such as implementing green infrastructure and/or incentivising electric vehicles'. It received a positive score against IA Objective 3 and IA Objective 10, as it is within 800m of two rail stations, bus routes and according to Greater Manchester's 'Places for Everyone' is located within an area considered appropriate for higher density homes based on the GMAL score of 4 and accessibility, in accordance with Policy JP-H4. Both rail stations are future Bee Network Stations, so it is anticipated that bus routes and rail infrastructure will improve in the future due to this. Existing mitigation has been retained: 'A new employment facility could increase pressure on transport facilities and therefore the improvement or

	and response.' Furthermore, this appears to be a breach of the Council's own Statement of Community Involvement (SCI). Such a late notification prevents the majority of affected residents from seeking technical advice or formulating a detailed response, rendering the consultation for this specific site legally flawed. Conclusion I strongly urge the Council to remove HSP S2J: Allocation 1 from the Plan, following the precedent set by the removal of HSP S2E (Junction 24), which was also deemed "undeliverable." Failure to do so will result in a formal request for the Planning Inspector to strike out this allocation during the Examination in Public (EiP).	additional provision of these could be considered' and 'The allocation could be enhanced by seeking to minimise the number of trips made by private car to/from the site, and by considering the use of mitigation, such as implementing green infrastructure and/or incentivising electric vehicles.' Further details around mitigation and assessment of highways impacts will be for HSP to consider. Individual projects will also be subject to their own assessments.

Table 2 Consultee Comments to Questions 109: "Do you consider that the Integrated Assessment has adequately assessed the potential environmental, social, and economic impacts of the proposed policies and allocations within the Plan?" and Q110: "Please give a reason for your answer" and Actions

Consultee	Consultee comments	Action
CPRE Lancashire, Liverpool City Region	No.	Impacts on wildlife have been considered under IA Objective 11: 'Conserve and enhance biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure and geodiversity assets', and where policies and site allocations

and Greater Manchester	The amount of wildlife in this area would be massively impacted by this. East Manchester has minimal green spaces and Tameside Council is coming after it.	have scored negative, appropriate mitigation has been recommended. For the assessment of site allocations, where sites are located in an area of designated and/or informal green space, they have been scored negatively and appropriate mitigation has been recommended. A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has also been conducted as part of the IA for HSP, and it concluded that, providing the available mitigation is applied appropriately, the operation of the Plan will not have any effects on the integrity of any European designated sites.
Hutchinson Roylance	No.	No action required.
Plan:9 Town Planning Ltd	No. Sufficient homes should be provided particularly with the problem of deliverability of the Godley Garden Village. Policy HSP S2C: Hyde the policy is too narrow. Grey belt land should be included to ensure housing delivery. Land at Mottram Road (GM525596 and GM525597) Hattersley is a good example of	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.

	grey belt land that should be included as an addition to Godley Garden Village to ensure new homes through the district	
Watkin Jones Group PLC	Yes.	Support noted.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. The developments in some areas are not focused on upscaling Brown sites and redeveloping existing spaces and homes. Removing green space along with community sports facilities should not be the aim of the plane.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. Brownfield sites have been considered under IA Objective 17: 'Ensure that land resources are allocated and used in an efficient and sustainable manner to meet the housing and employment needs of GM, whilst reducing land contamination'. Where a policy or allocation has scored negative, for example, for being located within the Green Belt, appropriate mitigation has been recommended. Impacts on green space have been considered under IA Objective 11: 'Conserve and enhance biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure and geodiversity assets', and impacts on community

		facilities have been considered under IA Objective 7: 'Ensure access to and provision of appropriate social infrastructure'. Where policies and site allocations have scored negative, appropriate mitigation has been recommended.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. Not enough questions on solar energy farms	Solar energy farms and related technologies have been considered under IA Objective 12, which includes a criterion related specifically to renewable energy technology: 'Support the delivery of renewable and low carbon energy technology?'. No action required.
Public	Yes. The Integrated Assessment appears thorough in scope and methodology, giving a clear picture of environmental, social, and economic considerations at a strategic level. Strengths: • Broad coverage of sustainability issues • Clear links to plan policies and objectives	Support noted. The IA focuses on assessing policy wording and their wider implications against each IA Objective. Site-specific detail is a matter for the HSP to consider, and site allocations have been assessed as part of the IA. Cumulative and long-term effects have been considered at a high level to reflect the strategic

	• Identification of mitigation measures Limitations: • May lack site specific detail for local residents to fully understand impacts • Cumulative and long term effects could be stronger • Assumes mitigation measures are implemented successfully Practical view: The IA provides a reasonable strategic assessment, but residents and stakeholders should continue to review site specific impacts, cumulative effects and delivery mechanisms to ensure the plan truly delivers sustainable development across Tameside.	nature of the HSP policies. These will look to be strengthened during the next iteration of the IA. The IA, as previously stated, focuses on assessing policy wording, and therefore, if mitigation measures have been outlined within the policy, these have been assessed at face value. As part of the IA process, further mitigation measures have been recommended to strengthen the policy wording and the scoring against the IA Framework. If these are applied, the IA Framework will be updated accordingly during the next iteration of assessment. Monitoring of the site-specific impacts, cumulative effects, and delivery mechanisms is ongoing throughout the plan development process, and any new findings will be taken forward for consideration in future iterations of the IA.
Public	No.	No action required.

Public	No. The Integrated Assessment is useful at a high level, but it does not fully demonstrate how key risks will be managed in practice. The IA itself identifies gaps around climate adaptation, green and blue infrastructure, and supporting infrastructure such as utilities, health and social provision. It also highlights mixed or uncertain impacts in areas such as loss of open space, health outcomes, deprivation and pressure on transport and local services. Overall, the assessment feels more descriptive than definitive, and would benefit from clearer evidence on how identified risks and uncertainties will be mitigated as development is delivered.	The IA focuses on assessing policy wording and their wider implications against each IA Objective. Mitigation measures have been provided where it is considered that practical measures can further strengthen the policy wording. However, it is not appropriate for the IA to conclude definitive effects of development delivery, and individual developments will be subject to their own assessments as they come forward. Monitoring of key risks, uncertain effects, and updated evidence is ongoing throughout the plan development process, and any new findings will be taken forward for consideration in future iterations of the IA.
Public	No. Who's going to read a 1400 page document. this is completely impossible to digest and read as a citizen, this needs to be summarised for the community to understand the key points and to build out further discussion.	Comment noted. A Non-Technical Summary has been provided in the suite of documentation to set forth a high-level, more accessible summary of the assessment process and conclusions.

Public	No. The wider area needs to be included in any sale.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No. Hands off greenbelt and invest in bringing old uninhabited buildings back to life and habitable. Utilise brown sites.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	Yes. Very thorough.	Support noted.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. Drawings have in accurate boarders that seem to be taking land of residents gardens. The meeting that was held at Ryecroft Hall on the 28th January 2026 was very disorganised. There was at least 50 people at any given time crammed into the smallest room with only 3 councilors to discuss concerns/find out information. The councillors knew very little and the whole session was a waste of time.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	Yes.	Support noted.
Public	No.	No action required.

Public	No. This does not take into account or minimises the concerns raised - the assessments are overly optimistic and do not provide evidential data to validate the results.	The IA focuses on assessing policy wording only and the wider implications against each IA Objective. The IA Framework and Objectives were developed based on the findings of the IA Scoping Report, which includes baseline data in relation to environmental, economic, and social topics across the administrative area of Tameside and is benchmarked against wider geographical scales. Site allocations were assessed based on spatial, social and environmental data, such as, but not limited to, distance from transport links and facilities, Indices of Multiple Deprivation, percentage of site within each flood zone, and proximity to sites with biodiversity value.
Public	No. Where is the due diligence based on the environmental impact, the use of Meadow Lane and the infrastructure to support 18 new premises.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.

Public	No. I have concerns about the cumulative impact of multiple housing sites proposed across Haughton Green and south Denton. The scale and density of development does not reflect the character of the area, and there is insufficient clarity on infrastructure, traffic and services. The Council should reconsider both the scale and location of these proposals.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. Lacks detail and specifics on how to achieve and whether promises will be feasibly achieved.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No. Solar farms highlighted in totally unsuitable areas, so what else has not been investigated properly.	Site allocations have been assessed against the IA Framework. Of the sites assessed, none were identified as being within 'Solar energy opportunity areas'. This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No. Local people have not openly been consulted	A 7-week Regulation 18 consultation on the draft Homes, Spaces, Places Plan took place between December 2025 and February 2026, the findings of

		which have been taken into account when preparing the Regulation 19 Plan.
Public	Yes. Yes development is being considered where there is only one road in and out meaning in excess of 4,000 vehicles will be driving through small villages and public transport cannot be extended	Transport impacts have been assessed IA Objective 3: 'Ensure that there is sufficient coverage and capacity of transport and utilities to support growth and development' and IA Objective 9: 'Promote sustainable modes of transport'. For site allocations, if transport connectivity has been found to be insufficient, it has received a negative score and mitigation has been provided, for example: 'A new housing development without sufficient connectivity to centres could increase car dependency and therefore the additional provision of transport facilities could be considered.'
Public	Yes.	Support noted.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	Yes.	Support noted.
Public	No. The allocations presented contradict the stated goals and environmental considerations haven't been severe enough.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. Environmental impacts have been assessed against IA Objective 11: 'Conserve and enhance

		biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure and geodiversity assets'. If site allocations are within or in close proximity to environmental designations, they have received a negative score, and appropriate mitigation has been provided, for example: 'The allocation could be enhanced by ensuring that the new development avoids these areas and/or maximises the ability to mitigate any impacts or loss of biodiversity.' A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has also been conducted as part of the IA for HSP, and it concluded that, providing the available mitigation is applied appropriately, the operation of the Plan will not have any effects on the integrity of any European designated sites.
Public	No. I do not see published the biodiversity statistics for this plan. whether there is going to be biodiversity net gain. Which species are being prioritised, and how this marries with the UK BAP species.	Matters relating to biodiversity have been considered within the IA Scoping Report under Section 4.1.8 Biodiversity and Green and Blue Infrastructure – Biodiversity (Page 46). This includes findings on biodiversity statistics in relation to existing habitats (including the UK BAP priority

		habitats), species, environmental designations, and biodiversity net gain policies. A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has also been conducted as part of the IA for HSP, and it concluded that, providing the available mitigation is applied appropriately, the operation of the Plan will not have any effects on the integrity of any European designated sites. Details relating to the implementation of biodiversity net gain and prioritisation of species are matters for the HSP to consider and may be addressed at a site-specific level during the development management process.
Public	No. Proper consultation, well advertised hasnt been carried out.	A 7-week Regulation 18 consultation on the draft Homes, Spaces, Places Plan took place between December 2025 and February 2026, the findings of which have been taken into account when preparing the Regulation 19 Plan.
Public	No.	Site allocations have been assessed against the IA Framework. Of the sites assessed, none were

	Stop solar panels in fields stop building new homes and plant trees instead if your that keen on being green.	identified as being within 'Solar energy opportunity areas'. This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	Yes. Appears to follow the correct procedure	Support noted.
Public	Yes. fine except absence of focus on TA	Support noted.
Public	No. No thought gone into it, as usual	Comment noted. No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	Yes.	Support noted.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	Yes.	Support noted.
Public	No.	No action required.

Public	No. You haven't taken consideration of all the previous complaints or the fact that Stockport and other places have stopped this	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. Because they don't live here. And don't see what the day to day life is like, with traffic and people.	Comment noted. The importance of local knowledge and experience is recognised. The assessment draws on a range of local data, baseline information, and consultation responses to ensure that local context and day-to-day considerations are reflected, alongside a consistent and objective methodology.
Public	Yes. I understand that develpment is badly needed so am generally supportive.	Support noted.
Public	No.	Impacts on social infrastructure have been assessed against IA Objective 7: 'Ensure access to and provision of appropriate social infrastructure'.

	It does not address the lack of GP services, NHS services and leisure facilities.	For site allocations, where the site is not within close proximity to a GP, dentist, school and/or sports and leisure facility, it has received a negative score, and appropriate mitigation has been provided, for example: 'Ensure any new provision is accessible to all and that local capacity is considered throughout future masterplanning stages'. The additional provision of these services and facilities is a matter for the HSP to consider.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. Doesn't listen to the people	No action required.
Public	No. Too much proposed at the Two Trees site	This is a matter for the HSP to consider.
Public	No. I would be grateful if you could also please provide further clarification regarding the land that is currently proposed as a site of allocation, referenced below:	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.

	HSP Allocation Reference: se rights 2025 OS 0100022697 HSP S2D: Allocation 4 – Ashton Moss East Ashton Moss East (Plot 3000), Lord Sheldon Way, Ashton-under-Lyne Open grassland plot north of Lord Sheldon Way, with drainage features, bounded by Rayner Lane and adjacent to Ashton West retail and leisure uses. Could you please confirm what development is being proposed for this site, particularly given that it is currently another green space, is this green land? In addition, I would like to ask when a public meeting or consultation event will be held to discuss this allocation. There has been a significant amount of recent activity on the land, and a sign was recently erected in a very obscure location on Rayner Lane, which many local residents appear not to have seen. I am concerned that awareness of this proposal may therefore be limited. I would also appreciate clarification on what assessments will be carried out in relation to traffic impact, infrastructure capacity,	

	and any other associated environmental or community considerations. Thank you for your time and assistance. I look forward to your response.	
Public	No. No environmental thoughts if you're building on green belt.	Site allocations have been assessed using the IA Framework. If a percentage of the site allocation has been found to be within the Green Belt, it has received a negative score against IA Objective 16: 'Conserve and/or enhance landscape, townscape, heritage assets and their setting and the character of Tameside?' and IA Objective 17: 'Ensure that land resources are allocated and used in an efficient and sustainable manner to meet the housing and employment needs of GM, whilst reducing land contamination'. Where a negative score has been applied, appropriate mitigation has been recommended, for example, 'The allocation could be enhanced by ensuring that the new development avoids these areas and/or maximises the ability to mitigate any impacts or loss of landscape designations' and/or

		‘Consider how development of derelict land, properties, buildings and infrastructure could be encouraged as a result of greenfield development (e.g. by incentives or inclusion of adjacent PDL)’.
Public	No. You don’t take into account the land you are building on is open to flooding.	Flood impacts have been considered under IA Objective 13: ‘Reduce the risk of flooding to people and property’. For the assessment of site allocations, where sites are located in Flood Zones 2 and/or 3, they have been scored negatively, and appropriate mitigation has been recommended.
Public	No. You want to destroy green belt	Site allocations have been assessed using the IA Framework. If a percentage of the site allocation has been found to be within the Green Belt, it has received a negative score against IA Objective 16: ‘Conserve and/or enhance landscape, townscape, heritage assets and their setting and the character of Tameside?’ and IA Objective 17: ‘Ensure that land resources are allocated and used in an efficient and sustainable manner to meet the

		housing and employment needs of GM, whilst reducing land contamination'. Where a negative score has been applied, appropriate mitigation has been recommended, for example, 'The allocation could be enhanced by ensuring that the new development avoids these areas and/or maximises the ability to mitigate any impacts or loss of landscape designations' and/or 'Consider how development of derelict land, properties, buildings and infrastructure could be encouraged as a result of greenfield development (e.g. by incentives or inclusion of adjacent PDL)'.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. Denton is gridlocked, how can you add more Plus takeaways, barbers and vape shops is ridiculous	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.

Public	No. Proposal doesn't take into consideration current situation of the local residents and their opinion.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	Yes.	Support noted.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. I do not feel Tameside residents should have to fight to save precious green spaces when they are vital to our health and wellbeing and for the protection of wildlife	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	Yes.	Support noted.
Public	No. I have already outlined that there is little detail on the provision of the essential infrastructure to support the planned development	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.

	No future statistics of the effects that this build on any bit of grass will cause to denton. The negative effects to existing residents, traffic flow and support infrastructure. I don't think building so near to denton centre will have a positive outcome and will only increase the existing issues. New building plots need to be found and not just crammed in anywhere to meet targets	
Public	No. Because central government is demanding the number of houses to be built so how does that take the impact into account	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. All of these areas haven't been evaluated. To build on green belt land is irresponsible and will have irreversible negative impact to the whole community	Site allocations have been assessed using the IA Framework. If a percentage of the site allocation has been found to be within the Green Belt, it has received a negative score against IA Objective 16: 'Conserve and/or enhance landscape, townscape, heritage assets and their setting and the character of Tameside?' and IA Objective 17: 'Ensure that land resources are allocated and used in an

		efficient and sustainable manner to meet the housing and employment needs of GM, whilst reducing land contamination'. Where a negative score has been applied, appropriate mitigation has been recommended, for example, 'The allocation could be enhanced by ensuring that the new development avoids these areas and/or maximises the ability to mitigate any impacts or loss of landscape designations' and/or 'Consider how development of derelict land, properties, buildings and infrastructure could be encouraged as a result of greenfield development (e.g. by incentives or inclusion of adjacent PDL)'.
Public	No. You're looking at putting solar panels on greenbelt not owned by Tameside?	Site allocations have been assessed using the IA Framework. If a percentage of the site allocation has been found to be within the Green Belt, it has received a negative score against IA Objective 16: 'Conserve and/or enhance landscape, townscape, heritage assets and their setting and the character of Tameside?' and IA Objective 17: 'Ensure that land resources are allocated and used in an efficient and sustainable manner to meet the

		housing and employment needs of GM, whilst reducing land contamination'. Where a negative score has been applied, appropriate mitigation has been recommended, for example, 'The allocation could be enhanced by ensuring that the new development avoids these areas and/or maximises the ability to mitigate any impacts or loss of landscape designations' and/or 'Consider how development of derelict land, properties, buildings and infrastructure could be encouraged as a result of greenfield development (e.g. by incentives or inclusion of adjacent PDL)'. Of the sites assessed, none were identified as being within 'Solar energy opportunity areas'. This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.

	I hope this message finds you well. I'm reaching out with deep concern regarding the proposed site allocation near our homes and the profound impact it may have on our community. The area referenced below also has the presence of Japanese knotweed within the proposed site, Which signs have also been put up to let people know. This invasive species poses serious challenges for any future development. How do you propose to address the removal of this knotweed? Furthermore, what procedures will be followed regarding the construction of buildings on land previously affected by it? The implications for structural integrity and environmental impact are significant and must be addressed. **HSP Allocation Reference:** - **Allocation Reference:** se rights 2025 OS 0100022697 - **HSP S2D:** Allocation 4 – Ashton Moss East - **Location:** Ashton Moss East (Plot 3000), Lord Sheldon Way, Ashton-under-Lyne This open grassland, located north of Lord Sheldon Way and bordered by Rayner Lane, is not merely a plot of land; it is part of the fabric of our community, surrounding us with nature and	

	tranquility. We need to understand what development is being proposed for this site. As this could drastically alter our way of life? It's concerning that, despite recent activity on the land, a sign about this proposal was placed in a location that many residents have missed. This lack of visibility could mean that our community is unaware of changes that could significantly affect our lives. Additionally, could you please clarify what assessments will be conducted regarding traffic impact, infrastructure capacity, and other environmental and community considerations? These factors are crucial in understanding how this development could influence our daily lives and the environment we cherish. Thank you for your attention to these important matters. I look forward to your response.	
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. Don't understand	No action required.

Public	No. No social impacts have been considered. A poster was pinned to a gate - most residents didn't know about the proposed plans until people who had seen the posted spread the word. A letter should have been posted to each household.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required. A 7-week Regulation 18 consultation on the draft Homes, Spaces, Places Plan took place between December 2025 and February 2026, the findings of which have been taken into account when preparing the Regulation 19 Plan.
Public	No. It is far too long for me to read now when submitting my views	Comment noted. A Non-Technical Summary has been provided in the suite of documentation to set forth a high-level, more accessible summary of the assessment process and conclusions.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	Yes. Spare land	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	Yes.	Support noted.
Public	Yes. Paid lip service to environmental with land now classified as grey belt, never such a term and proposed solar farms.	Site allocations have been assessed against the IA Framework. Of the sites assessed, none were identified as being within 'Solar energy opportunity areas.

		This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. It.shows a complete lack of awareness of the local areas as if someone has just looked on a map from an office and given no thought to community preference at all	Comment noted. The importance of local knowledge and experience is recognised. The IA draws on a range of local data, baseline information, and consultation responses to ensure that local context and day-to-day considerations are reflected, alongside a consistent and objective methodology. The IA focuses on assessing policy wording and their wider implications against each IA Objective. Detailed decisions in relation to community preference is a matter for the HSP to consider.
Public	No.	The IA Framework and Objectives were developed based on the findings of the IA Scoping Report, which includes review of policy context and baseline data in relation to environmental and

	Badly thought out, not properly researched and just a load of proposals thrown out with no consideration on who or what is being affected.	social topics across the administrative area of Tameside, and is benchmarked against wider geographical scales, to tailor considerations that is relevant to the local area.
Public	No illegal immigrants	No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. To long and to complicated	No action required.
Public	No. I love here and have seen the village slowly torn apart for the sake of keeping the revenue coming into the council and keeping there developer friends happy Influx of commuters and exodus of local people who can't afford 300K plus for all the new housing And zero social housing built	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No. The Integrated Assessment does not adequately reflect lived experience. It reads as a technical exercise rather than a	Comment noted. The importance of local knowledge and living experience is recognised. The IA is intended to provide a structured and objective evaluation of policy wording against a defined

	realistic assessment of how the policies and allocations will affect people, places, and services in practice. Environmental impacts are treated as things that can be mitigated or offset, rather than losses that are often permanent. Social impacts are discussed in broad terms, but the cumulative pressure on education, SEND provision, health services, mental health support, accessibility, and everyday life is not properly accounted for. Economic impacts focus on growth and opportunity, without enough attention to who actually benefits or who is left carrying the cost. Most importantly, the assessment does not sufficiently consider how multiple policies interact in the same places over time. It looks at impacts in isolation, when residents experience them all at once. That gap means the conclusions feel optimistic on paper but disconnected from reality.	framework that draws on a range of local data, baseline information, and consultation responses to ensure that local context and day-to-day considerations are reflected, alongside a consistent and objective methodology. Environmental impacts have been assessed against IA Objective 11: 'Conserve and enhance biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure and geodiversity assets'. A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has also been conducted as part of the IA for HSP, and it concluded that, providing the available mitigation is applied appropriately, the operation of the Plan will not have any effects on the integrity of any European designated sites. Health impacts have been assessed against IA Objective 6: 'Support improved health and wellbeing of the population and reduce health inequalities' and economic impacts have been assessed against IA Objective 2: 'Provide a sustainable supply of employment land to ensure sustainable economic growth and job creation.'

		Where a negative score has been applied, appropriate mitigation has been recommended. Mitigation measures are provided where it is considered that practical measures can be included to further strengthen the policy wordings. The IA scoring was based on the quality of individual policy wording against each IA Objective. Cumulative effects are considered where significant effect may be introduced through a combination of policies, however, it should be noted that the Plan must be considered as a whole, and it is recognised that it is not desirable or practicable to have all objectives covered by every policy.
Public	No. Building additional houses in haughton green will seriously impact the education and health insfrastructure already in place. Traffic will be affected to a detrimental level.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. Site allocation S2F Allocation 6: Meadow Lane has been assessed against the IA Framework. It received a positive score against IA Objective 7: 'Ensure access to and provision of appropriate social infrastructure' for being located in close proximity to a GP and dentist, however, mitigation was still provided: 'Ensure any new provision is

		accessible to all and that local capacity is considered throughout future masterplanning stages'. It received a negative score against IA Objective 7 for not being in close proximity to schools, and therefore the following mitigation was recommended: 'Ensure any new development suitably considers the local capacity of and access to community social infrastructure.' The allocation also received negative scores against Objective 9: 'Promote sustainable modes of transport' as it has limited accessibility to sustainable and active travel modes and could therefore increase reliance on private vehicles. The following mitigation was provided: 'A new housing development could increase pressure on transport facilities and therefore the improvement or additional provision of these could be considered.'
Public	No. I would say that most places in Tameside are already full and adding more residents will lead to deterioration in life quality.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.

Public	No. By building the new houses and making existing access roads double yellow lines this will impact our lives significantly	IA Objective 3 considers the sufficient coverage of infrastructure to support growth and development across Tameside. Where existing infrastructure has found to be insufficient, the IA has recommended mitigation, such as, 'Consider feasibility study into requirements and ability of local network to support development'. However, specific local issues are a matter for the HSP to consider.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. PROVIDING INFORMATION IN HUNDREDS OF PAGES DOES NOT MAKE THE PASSING OF PLANS ANY BETTER	Comment noted. A Non-Technical Summary has been provided in the suite of documentation to set forth a high-level, more accessible summary of the assessment process and conclusions.
Public	No. Pepole who have lived for a number of years around the Capesthorne Walk area of Denton should have been advised with notices through our letter boxes with information to each of the websites to allow us to have our say. I have had to search multi sites to be able to get to this questionnaire. We should	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.

	have received a pack through our door, which only makes me think you do not want our input at all.	
Public	No. more detail required on the impact the increase in housing will have on local services, protection of existing green space and outdoor sports facilities.	The IA scoring was based on the assessment of individual policy wording against each IA Objective. The impact on local services and outdoor sports facilities was assessed against IA Objective 7: 'Ensure access to and provision of appropriate social infrastructure', and the impact on green space was assessed against IA Objective 11: 'Conserve and enhance biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure and geodiversity assets.' Impacts will be reconsidered during the next iteration of the IA.
Public	Yes.	Support noted.
Public	Yes. Feel you cover each are fairly	Support noted.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. Stop proposing to build on green spaces	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.

Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. Another survey which will be ignored	Feedback from the consultation will be fed into the next iteration of the IA.
Public	No. Not possible to have in depth knowledge of all the TMBC boroughs	Comment noted. The importance of local knowledge and living experience is recognised. The IA is intended to provide a structured and objective evaluation of policy wording against a defined framework that draws on a range of local data, baseline information, and consultation responses to ensure that local context and day-to-day considerations are reflected, alongside a consistent and objective methodology.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. I am not convinced the Integrated Assessment has fully assessed the environmental, social and economic impacts of the proposed policies. It touches on the main themes, but it does not go far enough in looking at the real pressure new development will place on essential public services. Extra policing, community safety measures, healthcare capacity, school places and	The IA scoring was based on the assessment of individual policy wording against each IA Objective. The impact on local services and facilities was assessed against IA Objective 7: 'Ensure access to and provision of appropriate social infrastructure'; and health and safety impacts have been assessed against IA Objective 6: 'Support improved health

	general public service provision are all areas that will be directly affected by population growth, yet these issues seem to be treated lightly. Residents want reassurance that the plan has properly considered the need for stronger community policing and the resources required to keep streets safe and reduce antisocial behaviour. Without this, the social impact of new development could be far greater than the assessment suggests. The same applies to public services, which are already stretched in many areas. Growth must be matched with investment, not assumptions. Economically, the assessment also needs to look more closely at whether the proposed jobs and housing genuinely support long term stability. If the plan aims to attract working families who want to buy homes and invest in the area, then the supporting services and safety measures must be in place from the start. Overall, the assessment feels incomplete because it does not fully address the practical realities of increased demand on policing, public services and community infrastructure. These	and wellbeing of the population and reduce health inequalities'. Economic impacts have been assessed against IA Objective 2: 'Provide a sustainable supply of employment land to ensure sustainable economic growth and job creation', and impacts have been scored temporally. Where a negative score has been applied, appropriate mitigation has been recommended. Policy HSP PE1: Development and Healthier Environments scored positively against IA Objective 6 as it references community safety as a consideration in HIAs for new developments, and mitigation has been provided, stating: 'The policy could be enhanced by making explicit reference to design principles that discourage crime.' Safety has also been referenced in policies HSP C8 (Food, Drink and Leisure Uses in Centres), HSP PE4 (Strategic Recreation and Countryside Access), HSP T6 (Walking, Wheeling and Cycling), HSP PL8 (Design and Amenity), HSP PL11

	factors are essential if the plan is going to succeed in a sustainable and positive way.	(Outdoor Advertisements and Signage) and HSP PL13 (Design of Public Realm and Urban Spaces), and have therefore received positive scores against IA Objective 6. Where policies score negatively against this objective, or require strengthening, mitigation has been added to ensure specific measures for achieving public safety have been outlined. Further impacts and mitigation, such as stronger community policing, will be considered in the next iteration of the IA.
Public	No. This is a comprehensive, consolidated objection regarding HSP S2I: Allocation 3 (Hyde). It combines the legal, environmental, and infrastructure-based arguments into a single response that you can copy and paste into a consultation form. Formal Objection to HSP S2I: Allocation 3 (, Hyde) Representation Type: Object Policy / Site Reference: HSP S2I: Allocation 3	This is a matter for Tameside Council to consider. Site allocation HSP S2I Allocation 3: Leigh Street has been assessed against the IA Framework. The site allocation received negative scores against IA Objective 7: 'Ensure access to and provision of appropriate social infrastructure' as it an area of green space/playing field and is not located in close proximity to a secondary school. As an area of green space/open space, it also scored negatively against IA Objective 6: 'Support improved health

	Reason for Objection: I am writing to formally object to the proposed residential allocation at Leigh Street (HSP S2I: Allocation 3). This objection is based on the council's own evidence base and specific policy requirements set out in the "Homes, Spaces, Places" draft Local Plan. The allocation is unsound and unjustified for the following reasons: 1. Conflict with Policy HSP PE2 & PE5: Loss of Essential Green Infrastructure The functions as a community playing field and urban "green lung." * Local Deficiency: The Local Plan explicitly acknowledges that while borough-wide open space may be adequate, South Hyde specifically suffers from "very low levels of both publicly accessible open space, as well as low levels of private garden space" (Section 10.28). Policy HSP PE2 states that development will not be supported if it leads to a local deficiency; building 39 homes here would directly exacerbate an officially recognized crisis.	and wellbeing of the population and reduce health inequalities'; IA Objective 11: 'Conserve and enhance biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure and geodiversity assets'; IA Objective 16: 'Conserve and/or enhance landscape, townscape, heritage assets and their setting and the character of Tameside?', and IA Objective 17: 'Ensure that land resources are allocated and used in an efficient and sustainable manner to meet the housing and employment needs of GM, whilst reducing land contamination'. Where negative scored have been applied, appropriate mitigation has been recommended. The site allocation scored positively against IA Objective 9: 'Promote sustainable modes of transport', however, the following mitigation was provided to address the impact of growth: 'A new housing development could increase pressure on transport facilities and therefore the improvement or additional provision of these could be considered.' The site allocation scored neutral against IA Objective 13: 'Reduce the risk of flooding to people

	* Protection of Sports Facilities: Under Policy HSP PE5, the loss of playing fields is prohibited unless the land is proven "surplus to requirements" or replaced with "equivalent or better provision." No such evidence or replacement strategy has been provided for this site. 2. Undermining Health and Wellbeing (Policy HSP PE1) The plan identifies "Healthy and Active Lives" as a priority, noting that Tameside faces "significant health inequalities," with female healthy life expectancy being 5.7 years below the national average. * Contradiction: Policy HSP PE1 requires all developments to "contribute positively to health and wellbeing." Removing an accessible site for physical activity in a high-density area with poor health outcomes is a direct contradiction of the Strategic Objectives (Section 4.3) to reduce inequalities and support active lifestyles. 3. Breach of the "Brownfield First" Spatial Strategy (Policy HSP S1) Policy HSP S1 mandates a "strong focus on making as much use as possible of suitable previously developed brownfield land".	and property' and IA Objective 14: 'Protect and improve the quality and availability of water resources' as the site is located within Flood Zone 1 and there is very minimal risk of surface water flooding. Specific objections to HSP policies and site allocations are a matter for Tameside Council to consider.

	* Housing Surplus: The council's housing supply tables (Table 5.1) show a total supply of 11,170 dwellings, which is significantly higher than the requirement of 9,700. There is no planning necessity to build on a greenfield recreational asset when the borough has a surplus of supply and has already identified major brownfield regeneration opportunities (such as Queen Street, Mossley) that should be prioritized. 4. Infrastructure and Service Capacity (Policies HSP T8, PE7, PE8, E2) The proposed density of 39 homes will place unsustainable pressure on local infrastructure: * Parking & Traffic: Under the "Parking for All" zonal strategy (Policy HSP T8), this site likely falls under Zone A, which restricts onsite parking. This will inevitably cause parking overspill onto narrow residential streets (Gordon Street, Princess Street), creating safety hazards and obstructing active travel. * Education: The plan notes that the quality of Tameside's secondary schools is "significantly lower" than the national average (Section 2.10). Adding family-sized homes without expanding school capacity fails the requirements of Policy PE7.	

	* Health Services: There is no evidence that local GP surgeries can accommodate 39 additional households. Removing recreational space while increasing population density will increase pressure on Tameside General Hospital, contrary to Policies PE8 and PE9. * Utilities & Flood Risk: Residents have previously raised concerns regarding the "lack of investment in water infrastructure" (Section 1.68). Developing this greenfield site will increase surface water runoff and strain the existing Victorian sewer network, violating the objectives of Policy HSP E2. 5. Disregard for Consultation Feedback In previous scoping consultations, 65% of respondents prioritized "People" (health and green space) as their top concern, specifically calling for the protection of accessible green spaces. Proceeding with Allocation 3 ignores the clear public mandate and the "brownfield first" preference expressed by the community (Section 1.45). Conclusion: Allocation HSP S2I: 3 is inconsistent with the council's evidence regarding open space deficiency in South Hyde and contradicts the core policies of Health, Environment, and Spatial Strategy. I	

	request that this site be removed from the residential allocations and protected as a permanent recreational asset under Policy HSP PE2.	
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. The Integrated Assessment has not adequately assessed the environmental, social, and economic impacts of the proposed policies and allocations. Key issues include: Insufficient assessment of greenbelt impacts, despite several policy layers and designations affecting greenbelt and trust protected land. Lack of transparency around the methodology used to identify areas for renewable energy designations, development allocations, and regeneration areas. No clear evidence that brownfield alternatives were fully assessed before sensitive land was included within policy layers.	Green Belt impacts from site allocations have been assessed using the IA Framework. If a percentage of the site allocation has been found to be within the Green Belt, it has received a negative score against IA Objective 16: 'Conserve and/or enhance landscape, townscape, heritage assets and their setting and the character of Tameside?' and IA Objective 17: 'Ensure that land resources are allocated and used in an efficient and sustainable manner to meet the housing and employment needs of GM, whilst reducing land contamination'. Where a negative score has been applied, appropriate mitigation has been recommended, for example, 'The allocation could be enhanced by ensuring that the new development avoids these areas and/or maximises the ability to mitigate any impacts or loss of landscape designations' and/or

	Inadequate consideration of cumulative impacts, particularly where multiple overlapping designations affect the same locations. Limited engagement with custodians and landowners, meaning the assessment does not reflect local knowledge or site specific constraints. Without transparent methodology and a full assessment of impacts on protected land, heritage assets, and community wellbeing, the Integrated Assessment cannot be considered robust.	'Consider how development of derelict land, properties, buildings and infrastructure could be encouraged as a result of greenfield development (e.g. by incentives or inclusion of adjacent PDL)'. Impacts on heritage assets have been assessed against IA Objective 16: 'Conserve and/or enhance landscape, townscape, heritage assets and their setting and the character of Tameside?', and impacts on community wellbeing have been assessed against IA Objective 6: 'Support improved health and wellbeing of the population and reduce health inequalities'. Where a negative score has been applied, appropriate mitigation has been recommended. Cumulative effects have been considered at a high level to reflect the strategic nature of the HSP policies. These will look to be strengthened during the next iteration of the IA. Other matters, including the site identification methodology and engagement with custodians and

		landowners are matters for Tameside Council to consider.
Public	Several sections require further explanation: Site selection methodology: The assessment does not explain how sites were chosen or why certain greenbelt and trust protected areas were included. Renewable energy designations: The criteria for identifying these areas are not published, making it impossible to understand or scrutinise the assessment. Cumulative impact analysis: The assessment does not clearly evaluate how multiple policy layers interact, particularly where they overlap sensitive land. Green infrastructure impacts: The assessment does not fully consider how designations may undermine the plan's own objectives for health, wellbeing, and environmental resilience.	Site allocation impacts on environmental resilience have been assessed against IA Objective 12: 'Ensure communities, developments and infrastructure are resilient to the effects of expected climate change' and impacts on community wellbeing have been assessed against IA Objective 6: 'Support improved health and wellbeing of the population and reduce health inequalities'. Where a negative score has been applied, appropriate mitigation has been recommended. The IA scoring was based on the quality of individual policy wording against each IA Objective. Cumulative effects are considered where significant effect may be introduced through a combination of policies, however, it should be noted that the Plan must be considered as a whole, and it is recognised that it is not desirable or practicable to have all objectives covered by every policy.

	Engagement evidence: There is no clear record of consultation with custodians of affected land, which is essential for an accurate assessment.	Other matters, including the site identification methodology and engagement with custodians and landowners, are for Tameside Council to consider.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. Your assessment starting on page 203 does not at all go into depth about the environmental impact. Of course if will negatively impact emissions and air quality, nevermind it being part of an overall vision. You want to actively destroy green space and it would never recover	Policy HSP S2E: Audenshaw, which starts on page 203 of the IA Main Report consultation document, has received a negative score against IA Objective 10: 'Improve Air Quality', as it is not explicit with regard to minimising emissions when delivering new developments within the area. Mitigation has been provided: 'The policy could be enhanced by explicitly referencing air quality control measures in relation to new developments within the area.' It scored positively against IA Objective 11: 'Conserve and enhance biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure and geodiversity assets' as it aims to enhance connectivity to the park and access to reservoirs.
Public	No.	No action required.

Public	No. What is meant by Integrated Assessment?	An Integrated Assessment (IA) is a structured process used to evaluate the potential environmental, social, health, and economic effects of a plan. The IA assesses draft policy wording against and IA Framework including a set of assessment Objectives, which are developed from baseline research findings on local conditions. The IA focuses on reviewing and strengthening policy wording through an iterative process, helping to identify opportunities for improvement. While it informs plan-making, it does not directly determine policy decisions.
Public	Yes. Yes, the Integrated Assessment broadly covers the key environmental, social and economic impacts of the Plan, and it has informed policy refinement. However, it would benefit from clearer place-specific assessments, stronger analysis of cumulative impacts, and more explicit links between identified risks and required mitigation measures.	Site allocations have been assessed as part of the IA. Monitoring of key risks, uncertain effects, and updated evidence is ongoing throughout the plan development process, and any new findings will be taken forward for consideration in future iterations of the IA.

Public	No. There's just no joined up thinking. On the one hand your spatial vision is: Environment: A greener place with a thriving natural environment and clean air, where communities and infrastructure are sustainable and climate resilient. People: A place where children are given the best start in life, are able to exceed expectations and where everyone is able to live a healthy, happy and active life within thriving supportive communities, supported by the services they need. But on the other hand you have allocated all the spare green spaces that should be protected in order to fulfil the above vision, for development. You set targets for 10% BNG, but then look to remove multiple acres of green space and wildlife areas. I would like my Council to be more considerate of what the people want and need, and less focused on building as many houses as possible to increase council tax revenue.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No. Little consultation to guidance to residents	A 7-week Regulation 18 consultation on the draft Homes, Spaces, Places Plan took place between December 2025 and February 2026, the findings of

		which have been taken into account when preparing the Regulation 19 Plan.
Public	No. Parts feel like they have been done with a lack of consideration and knowledge of each area	Comment noted. The importance of local knowledge and experience is recognised. The assessment draws on a range of local data, baseline information, and consultation responses to ensure that local context and day-to-day considerations are reflected, alongside a consistent and objective methodology.
Public	No. Just don't have faith it will be implemented correctly	As part of the IA process, monitoring of the Plan will be completed, in accordance with the SEA Directive and Regulation 17 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. The directive requires the person by whom the plan or programme was prepared to monitor its implementation with a view to identifying, at an early stage, unforeseen adverse effects, and being able to undertake appropriate remedial action. This will be completed later in the IA process with the monitoring arrangements set out in a Post-Adoption Statement once the Plan is adopted.

Public	No. Council are only interested in building more houses for council tax, they do nothing in Mossley, they don't clear grids or street clean yet your council tax goes up every year	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No. I don't think there is enough consideration on the impact to the areas where development is proposed.	Spatial policies and site allocations have been assessed as part of the IA against the IA Framework. Where site allocations have scored negatively, appropriate mitigation has been provided.
Public	No. You are not bothered about the people of these areas, dissruption and chaos building these houses. The traffic, the Doctors, schools, dentists	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No. Is GP or School can accept more people moving to Tameside?	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	Yes.	Support noted.
Public	No.	No action required.

Public	No. Devastating destruction of greenspace in a valuable biodiverse area that rare animals, plants and birds make their home should not be allowed. Areas should be used as a wild area and be left to nature. Wildlife experts should be allowed to conduct surveys on the biodiversity in each area and this should be made public. The destruction of trees has a huge impact on the climate and in times of a climate crisis this is totally irresponsible. This destruction is irreversible and will have a huge effect on the planet for the future generation. There will be increased flooding and poorer mental and physical health of those living in the area. All the numerous disused buildings in the area should be converted and this will provide plentiful housing . Less green spaces result in lower housing prices and poorer health and wellbeing for those living in the area. The destruction of trees has a huge impact on the climate in times of a climate crisis this is totally irresponsible. This has been poorly thought out and is obviously about greed rather than the need for affordable housing. New homes, flats and apartments in the area are lying empty which proves this is greed and not down to a housing crisis.	Environmental impacts have been assessed against IA Objective 11: 'Conserve and enhance biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure and geodiversity assets'. If site allocations are within or in close proximity to environmental designations, they have received a negative score, and appropriate mitigation has been provided, for example: 'The allocation could be enhanced by ensuring that the new development avoids these areas and/or maximises the ability to mitigate any impacts or loss of biodiversity.' A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) has also been conducted as part of the IA for HSP, and it concluded that, providing the available mitigation is applied appropriately, the operation of the Plan will not have any effects on the integrity of any European designated sites. Impacts of flooding have been assessed against IA Objective 13: 'Reduce the risk of flooding to people and property' and impacts on health and wellbeing have been assessed against IA Objective 6: 'Support improved health and wellbeing of the

	Any new buildings built should be affordable, built higher taking up less ground space, build in areas of poor biodiversity and where appropriate must include wild spaces/living walls, native mature trees and bushes, wildlife corridors, solar panels and swift bricks. Environmental science should be taught to all prospective teachers during teacher training . Environmental science should become a part of the curriculum from nursery to year 11.	population and reduce health inequalities'. Where a policy and/or site allocation has scored negative, appropriate mitigation measures have been provided.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. The solar panel farms would devastate the local agricultural economy, losing livelihoods, food production and animal grazing	Site allocations have been assessed against the IA Framework. Of the sites assessed, none were identified as being within 'Solar energy opportunity areas'. This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No. I have said all I want to. I have no wish to keep repeating myself	No action required.

Table 3 Consultee Comments to Question Q111 "Are there any sections of the Integrated Assessment that require further explanation or clarification?"

Consultee	Consultee comments	Action
CPRE Lancashire, Liverpool City Region and Greater Manchester	ALL OF IT.	Comment noted. The IA is an iterative process and updates are made at each stage, with additional clarification provided. No action required.
Public	Further explanation of the proposed developments, along with justification as to the site selections.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	While the IA provides a comprehensive strategic assessment, it would benefit from further explanation of site-specific impacts, cumulative effects, implementation and monitoring mechanisms, social/economic impacts, and assumptions about mitigation. Clarifying these areas will make it easier for residents, stakeholders, and decision makers to fully understand the potential consequences of the plan.	Site allocations were assessed as part of the IA against the IA Framework. Where site allocations received a negative score, appropriate mitigation was provided. Monitoring of key risks, cumulative effects, and updated evidence is ongoing throughout the plan development process, and any new findings will be taken forward for consideration in future iterations of the IA.

		As part of the IA process, monitoring of the Plan will be completed, in accordance with the SEA Directive and Regulation 17 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. The directive requires the person by whom the plan or programme was prepared to monitor implementation with a view to identifying, at an early stage, unforeseen adverse effects, and being able to undertake appropriate remedial action. This will be completed later in the IA process with the monitoring arrangements set out in a Post-Adoption Statement once the Plan is adopted.
Public	Yes. Further explanation would be helpful in several areas, particularly where the IA identifies uncertainty or limited evidence. The IA notes uncertainty around impacts on deprivation, health outcomes, open space loss and pressure on transport and social infrastructure, but does not clearly explain how these risks will be resolved or monitored in practice. There is also limited clarity on how flood risk, climate adaptation and green/blue infrastructure will be embedded	As part of the IA process, monitoring of the Plan will be completed, in accordance with the SEA Directive and Regulation 17 of The Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. The directive requires the person by whom the plan or programme was prepared to monitor implementation with a view to identifying, at an early stage, unforeseen adverse effects, and being able to undertake appropriate remedial action. This will be completed later in the IA process with the

	consistently across policies and allocations, despite these being identified as areas of weaker alignment. Finally, the IA would benefit from clearer explanation of how supporting infrastructure (utilities, health, social and waste) will be delivered alongside growth, as this is identified as a gap across alternatives and policy areas.	monitoring arrangements set out in a Post-Adoption Statement once the Plan is adopted. Impacts on green and blue infrastructure, climate adaptation, and flood risk, have been assessed against IA Objectives 11, 12, and 13 respectively. Delivery of supporting infrastructure have been assessed against IA Objectives 3 (utilities), 6 (health), 7 (social infrastructure), and 18 (waste). Where a negative score has been applied, appropriate mitigation has been recommended. The incorporation of related management and delivery measures is a matter for the HSP to consider. The IA scoring will be updated accordingly as policy wording is updated to address these issues.
Public	Why include Trust land? Hands off greenbelt and invest in bringing old uninhabited buildings back to life and habitable. Utilise brown sites	Site allocations have been assessed using the IA Framework. If a percentage of the site allocation has been found to be within the Green Belt, it has received a negative score against IA Objective 16: 'Conserve and/or enhance landscape, townscape, heritage assets and their setting and the character of Tameside?' and IA Objective 17: 'Ensure that land resources are allocated and used in an

		efficient and sustainable manner to meet the housing and employment needs of GM, whilst reducing land contamination'. Where a negative score has been applied, appropriate mitigation has been recommended, for example, 'The allocation could be enhanced by ensuring that the new development avoids these areas and/or maximises the ability to mitigate any impacts or loss of landscape designations' and/or 'Consider how development of derelict land, properties, buildings and infrastructure could be encouraged as a result of greenfield development (e.g. by incentives or inclusion of adjacent PDL)'.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	Yes, all of it. We have been told to object but the councillors couldn't even answer what it is we are objecting because they couldn't confirm what the plans would be.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	I object to the proposal to allocate the Two Trees site for over 300 homes. The loss of the former school playing field and local green space would be unacceptable, and the scale of development would place undue pressure on roads,	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. Site allocation HSP S2F Allocation 4: Two Trees Lane has been assessed against the IA

	schools and health services. The Council should significantly reduce the size of this allocation.	Framework. The site allocation received negative scores against IA Objective 6: 'Support improved health and wellbeing of the population and reduce health inequalities', IA Objective 11: 'Conserve and enhance biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure and geodiversity assets', and IA Objective 16: 'Conserve and/or enhance landscape, townscape, heritage assets and their setting and the character of Tameside?', due to 71% of the site being 'open space'. Mitigation has been recommended, for example: 'Ensure that the new development maximises the ability to mitigate for the loss of the existing open space.' It also received uncertain scores against IA Objective 3: 'Ensure that there is sufficient coverage and capacity of transport and utilities to support growth and development' and IA Objective 7: 'Ensure access to and provision of appropriate social infrastructure', with the following mitigation being recommended: 'Ensure any new development suitably considers the local capacity of and access to community social infrastructure'

		and ‘Consider feasibility study into requirements and ability of local network to support development.’ Specific objections to HSP policies and site allocations are a matter for Tameside Council to consider.
Public	Solar farms proposals	Site allocations have been assessed against the IA Framework. Of the sites assessed, none were identified as being within ‘Solar energy opportunity areas’. This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	solar panel zones	Site allocations have been assessed against the IA Framework. Of the sites assessed, none were identified as being within ‘Solar energy opportunity areas’. This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	Yes, publish all wildlife surveys of the areas marked for development.	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.

Public	All of it.	Comment noted. The IA is an iterative process and updates are made at each stage, with additional clarification provided. No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	None.	No action required.
Public	I would be grateful if you could also please provide further clarification regarding the land that is currently proposed as a site of allocation, referenced below: HSP Allocation Reference: se rights 2025 OS 0100022697 HSP S2D: Allocation 4 – Ashton Moss East Ashton Moss East (Plot 3000), Lord Sheldon Way, Ashton-under-Lyne	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.

	Open grassland plot north of Lord Sheldon Way, with drainage features, bounded by Rayner Lane and adjacent to Ashton West retail and leisure uses. Could you please confirm what development is being proposed for this site, particularly given that it is currently another green space, is this green land? In addition, I would like to ask when a public meeting or consultation event will be held to discuss this allocation. There has been a significant amount of recent activity on the land, and a sign was recently erected in a very obscure location on Rayner Lane, which many local residents appear not to have seen. I am concerned that awareness of this proposal may therefore be limited. I would also appreciate clarification on what assessments will be carried out in relation to traffic impact, infrastructure capacity, and any other associated environmental or community considerations. Thank you for your time and assistance. I look forward to your response.	
Public	It has 1400 pages!	Comment noted. A Non-Technical Summary has been provided in the suite of documentation to set

	How you factor in the greed of the developers and their investors	forth a high-level, more accessible summary of the assessment process and conclusions.
Public	All of it.	No action required.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	Remove the proposal for a solar farm on Werneth Low being built in land owned by the Hyde War Memorial Trust.	Site allocations have been assessed against the IA Framework. Of the sites assessed, none were identified as being within 'Solar energy opportunity areas'. This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	No illegal immigrants	No action required.
Public	All.	No action required.
Public	There needs more details of each site	This is a matter for the HSP to consider. No action required.
Public	NO	No action required.
Public	I do not understand a lot of the section, there is too much information regarding the council policy, rather than the impact it is going to have on the residents within each area.	Comment noted. A Non-Technical Summary has been provided in the suite of documentation to set

		forth a high-level, more accessible summary of the assessment process and conclusions.
Public	No.	No action required.
Public	I think there are parts of the Integrated Assessment that need much clearer explanation, especially around housing. It does not give enough clarity on what the new homes will actually be used for or who they are intended to support. Residents want reassurance that the plan is focused on affordable homes that families can buy, not large numbers of rental properties or developments that end up in the hands of landlords. The assessment talks about housing numbers, but it does not properly address the difference between homes that help build a stable community and homes that simply increase short term occupancy. Working families who want to buy and put down roots bring long term value to the area, support local services and help strengthen the local economy. This distinction is important, yet the assessment does not explore it in enough detail. A clearer explanation is needed on how the plan will prioritise home ownership, how affordability will be	Impacts of housing supply have been assessed against IA Objective 1: 'Provide a sustainable supply of housing land including for an appropriate mix of sizes, types, tenures in locations to meet housing need, and to support economic growth?'. This Objective includes 6 different assessment criteria covering housing mix, affordability, sustainable land supply, energy efficiency, and connectivity of housing locations to ensure the robustness of assessment against housing related policies. Impacts on local services have been assessed against IA Objectives 6, 7, and 8 relating to health facilities, social infrastructure, and educational facilities respectively. Impact on the local economy have been assessed against IA Objective 2: 'Provide a sustainable supply of employment land to ensure sustainable economic growth and job

	protected, and how the housing mix will support the kind of stable, long term community the wider strategy depends on. Without this, it is difficult to understand the real social and economic impact of the proposed housing policies	creation?'. Where a negative score has been applied, appropriate mitigation has been recommended. Other matters, including housing and affordable housing policy priorities, are for the HSP to consider.
Public	Yes, the whole justification for even considering hsp s2e audenshaw when it is an actively leisure space with huge amounts of green space and providing a great local amenity positively impact people's quality of life by encouraging sport and exercise whilst playing a big part in local wildlife and absorbing emissions from local routes as well as providing local walking routes and a meeting and events space for business and networking.	Policy HSP S2E has received a negative score against IA Objective 10: 'Improve Air Quality', as it is not explicit with regard to minimising emissions when delivering new developments within the area. Mitigation has been provided: 'The policy could be enhanced by explicitly referencing air quality control measures in relation to new developments within the area.' It scored positively against IA Objective 11: 'Conserve and enhance biodiversity, green and blue infrastructure and geodiversity assets' as it aims to enhance connectivity to the park and access to reservoirs.

Public	While the Integrated Assessment provides a useful overview of environmental, social and economic impacts, several areas would benefit from clearer explanation. First, the IA states that "reasonable alternatives" were tested, but because many strategic decisions have already been fixed through Places for Everyone, the options considered feel limited. It would be helpful for the IA to more clearly describe what alternatives within those constraints were assessed, for example, differing spatial distributions or densities within town centres. Second, the IA should provide more detail on cumulative impacts, especially in the Eastern Growth Cluster, where multiple allocations, regeneration areas and transport schemes interact. Impacts on air quality, junction capacity, flood risk and social infrastructure need to be assessed collectively, not individually. Third, given the reliance on large strategic projects such as Godley Green and Ashton Moss, the IA should clarify how delivery risk was considered and how mitigation (e.g., transport upgrades, health facilities, green-blue	The three reasonable alternatives outlined on page 22 of the IA Main Report were developed by Tameside Council to reflect the local context. The IA has considered the key opportunities and constraints associated with each option including variations in the distribution, scale and focus of development across the borough. The IA scoring was based on the quality of individual policy wording against each IA Objective. Cumulative effects are considered where significant effect may be introduced through a combination of policies, however, it should be noted that the Plan must be considered as a whole, and it is recognised that it is not desirable or practicable to have all objectives covered by every policy. Other matters, including the delivery risk and future mitigation measures in specific areas, are for Tameside Council to consider. Monitoring of the site-specific impacts, cumulative effects, and delivery mechanisms is ongoing throughout the plan development process, and any new findings

	infrastructure) would be triggered if development phases shift or under-deliver. Finally, area-specific impact summaries for each Strategic Regeneration Area would make the assessment far more accessible to residents. Overall, the IA is broadly sound but would benefit from clearer alternatives testing, cumulative impact analysis, delivery-risk scenarios and more place-based detail.	will be taken forward for consideration in future iterations of the IA. For future iterations of the IA, area-specific summaries for each Strategic Regeneration Area will be considered.
Public	All of it.	Comment noted. The IA is an iterative process and updates are made at each stage, with additional clarification provided. No action required.