

Family Name	Allen
Given Name	Nigel
Person ID	1285738
Title	Stakeholder Submission
Type	Web
Family Name	Allen
Given Name	Nigel
Person ID	1285738
Title	JPA 30: Ashton Moss West
Type	Web
Soundness - Positively prepared?	NA
Soundness - Justified?	Unsound
Soundness - Consistent with national policy?	NA
Soundness - Effective?	NA
Compliance - Legally compliant?	NA
Compliance - In accordance with the Duty to Cooperate?	NA
Redacted reasons - Please give us details of why you consider the consultation point not to be legally compliant, is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.	<p>I was intimately involved in the development of the adjoining Ashton Moss business park between 1990 and 2010.</p> <p>I consider the difficulties and costs needed to prepare the site for development are such as to render any employment development undeliverable without very substantial public funding.</p> <p>The development of Ashton Moss business park was made possible by the contemporaneous construction of the M60. Motorway earthworks helped cover the cost of peat removal and provided the clean fill needed to create development sites. It was a win - win, once in a lifetime opportunity.</p> <p>The remediated area covered all of the moss south of Reyner Lane, [just north of Lord Sheldon Way.] Initially it was hoped that the peat could be sold for horticulture but this proved not to be possible. Instead the peat was piled up in a large mound north of Reyner Lane. It is this tip which makes up most of Allocation 30.</p> <p>The development was successful and the final remediated plot is currently under construction. However no development has occurred on the un-remediated plot 3000 bounded by the M60, railway line, Richmond St and Lord Sheldon Way. The reason is the cost of removing peat and bringing in clean fill.</p> <p>In 8/3/2011 Place NW reported that Muse - the developer, and Tameside had bid for Regional Growth Funding to deliver this 25acre employment site. Fundamental issues of remediation required public sector funding to prepare the ground for development. The bid did not succeed and no development has started.</p> <p>The remediation problems at Plot 3000 pale into insignificance compared with those at Ashton West.</p>

The Ove Arup report of 14/6/2021 describes the state the development site. Natural peat of 1.2 to 2,5 metres is overlain by up to 18 metres of tipped material with lower layers of peat capped with non organic fill. At 8.1 the report concludes that " the site is unsuitable for development in it's current state. " They also conclude that " given the large volume of made ground and natural peat it is neither cost effective or sustainable to re-excavate the unsuitable material and to replace it in accordance with engineering specification". This closes off the remediation solution which made the Ashton Moss development possible.

The only option to render the site developable is to re-engineer the in-situ deposits. Given the compressibility of peat and consequent subsidence and the likely presence of gas this a daunting prospect. Measures such as the treatment of material , piled foundation up to 20 metres and gas proofed foundations are put forward.

Ove Arup have not provided an estimate of the likely cost of such works nor is any evidence provided as to the value of the remediated site and the gap between cost and value. Given the known viability issues on Plot 3000 the deficit on this much more difficult site will inevitably be wider.

Tameside and the other northern boroughs need good quality deliverable employment sites. This is not deliverable and there will remain a serious shortfall of sites to provide local jobs. A more effective strategy would be to concentrate public funding to deliver Plot 3000 and to take effective steps to prevent the continuing loss of existing employment sites to housing.

Redacted modification - Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make this section of the plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified above.

This allocation should be withdrawn.