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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>I recommend that the third and fourth sentences of paragraph 1.7.2 of the draft Area Plan are replaced by the following.... However, it is intended that the allocation of land for development in the East will be reconsidered as soon as is practicable after the next review of the Strategic Plan has been completed. In the meantime, in addition to land allocated for immediate development, the Area Plan contains some 'Strategic Reserve Sites', which identify land for future residential development, should this be required. Until these sites are released for development, they will be subject to General Policy 3 of the Strategic Plan. The arrangements for the future release of the 'Strategic Reserve Sites' are set out below, where the sites in question are identified. (R1)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M1) for replacement text at para 1.7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>I recommend that paragraph 3.4.5 of the Area Plan be modified to read as follows: The majority of these new homes will be located in Douglas and Onchan (making the best use of existing urban areas and previously developed land) and in sustainable extensions to those settlements. The focus will be on high-quality and well-designed housing, supported by the right infrastructure (including educational and health care provision, open space and recreational opportunities, and adequate transport and utility services). The existing character of the smaller settlements around Douglas and Onchan will largely be retained. (R2)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M2) for para 3.4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>I recommend that the Area Plan Proposals Maps show the development boundaries of the relevant settlements identified in Chapter 4 of the Strategic Plan, drawn to include sustainable urban extensions, but excluding Strategic Reserve Sites. (R3)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q2. (M30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>I also recommend that the whole of the waste management area at Richmond Hill should be similarly delineated and washed over as a site for 'Special Industry' (as defined in paragraph 9.2.3 of the Strategic Plan). (R4)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q3. (M31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>I recommend that consideration be given to the designation, in the Area Plan, of Areas of High Landscape Value, with precise and justified boundaries. Environment Policy 2 of the Strategic Plan would continue to apply within such areas. (R5)</td>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>See Paper 5- Recommendations in the Inspector’s Report which Cabinet Office proposes to reject/amend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>I recommend that the words 'and cultural' be inserted after the word ‘natural’ in Section 5.3 i of the draft Area Plan. (R6)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M3) for modified text at para 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>I recommend that the words ‘cultural assets,’ be inserted after the word ‘vulnerable’ in Section 5.4 iv of the draft Area Plan. (R7)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M4) for modified text at para 5.4. This recommendation now references 5.4 ii of the written statement after formatting adjustments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>I recommend that the precise boundaries be defined for the proposed Green Gaps shown on the draft Area Plan Proposals Maps. (R8)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q4. (M32) See Map showing Proposed Green Gap Boundaries for changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>I recommend that the draft Area Plan be modified to show Green Gaps to avoid coalescence between the built-up areas of Douglas, Union Mills and Strang. (R9)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q5. (M33) See Map showing Proposed Green Gap Boundaries for changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>I recommend that the following text be added to paragraph 5.16.1: Furthermore, the uplands are a rich repository of cultural and archaeological remains, which are sensitive to change and can easily be damaged by inappropriate development. (R10)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M5) for new text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>I recommend that Urban Environment Policy 7 be deleted from the draft Area Plan. (R11)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M6) for deletion of Environment Proposal 7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R12</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>I recommend that Urban Environment Proposal 3 be modified to read as follows: Development proposals must make a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness. Traditional or contemporary approaches may be appropriate, depending upon the nature of the proposal and the context of the surrounding area. (R12)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M7) for replacement Environment Proposal 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R13</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>I recommend that Urban Environment Proposal 8 be deleted from the draft Area Plan. (R13)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M8) for deleted Environment Proposal 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R14</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>I recommend that Urban Environment Proposal 9 be deleted from the draft Area Plan. (R14)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M9) for deleted Environment Proposal 9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R15</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>I recommend that the provision of cycle parking and changing facilities, and the production of a Travel Plan, should be considered for any proposed employment development. (R15)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Paper 7: Schedule of Development Briefs and general reference set out in Residential Proposal 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>I recommend that a bullet point be added to Transport Proposal 2 as follows: - Improve the TT Access Road to provide for a traffic lane in either direction by 2022. (R16)</td>
<td>Amend</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Paper 5: Recommendations in the Inspector’s Report which Cabinet Office proposes to reject/amend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>I recommend that the final paragraph in Utilities Proposal 3 be amended to read as follows: If a reticulated gas supply system is to be connected to new development, this must be designed in accordance with the requirements of the relevant gas supply agency. (R17)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M10) for amended Utilities Proposal 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>In my view, the format of Utilities Proposal 6 could be improved. First, as a Proposal of the Area Plan, I consider that it should be in a bold typeface, to differentiate it from the supporting text. (The same applies to a number of other policies e.g. Transport Policy 2, and Utilities Policies 2 and 5). Second, there appears to be an error of syntax at the start of the second sentence of Utilities Proposal 6, which should perhaps read ‘Strategies to achieve this will include …’. Third, the third bullet point of this Proposal introduces SuDS. Subsequent bullet points describe features of SuDS, and are therefore subordinate to the third bullet point. For clarity, I consider that they should be indented. I recommend that the draft Area Plan be modified accordingly. (R18)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M11) for amended Utilities Proposal 2, 5, 6, and Transport Policy 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R19</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>I recommend that all but the first sentence of paragraph 5.19.1 be deleted from the draft Area Plan, but that otherwise no action be taken in respect of this objection. (R19)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M12) for amended paragraph 5.19.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R20</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>I recommend that Employment Proposals 1 and 2 be merged to read as follows (after paragraph 8.10.2 of the draft Area Plan): The development of existing industrial land, including the following sites, will be supported for the following uses only: manufacturing; warehousing and distribution; office accommodation (subject to compliance with Strategic Plan Business Policy 7); or retail outlets (subject to compliance with Strategic Plan Business Policy 5) … (R20)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M13) for amended Employment Proposal 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R21</td>
<td>105</td>
<td></td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M14). Note - PIP 5 document proposed these changes but Inspector rejected them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R22 106</td>
<td></td>
<td>I recommend that a development brief replace the existing text of Employment Policy 3 as follows: Site BE002a, to the south of Cool Road, is designated for industrial and business park uses. This allows for manufacturing (including light and general industry); research and development; storage and distribution; and offices (subject to compliance with Business Policy 7 of the Strategic Plan): 1) Development will not be permitted on Site BE002a if it could reasonably and acceptably be located on one of the sites listed in Employment Proposal 2, 2) No planning approval will be granted for the development of any part of Site BE002a until a Master Plan for the whole of that site has been submitted to and approved by the planning authority. This must show all spatial elements, including areas intended for general industrial and business park uses, open spaces and landscaped areas, and circulation arrangements; and it must show how these elements will be phased, 3) There must be no net qualitative loss of biodiversity as a result of the development of this site, 4) The Master Plan must demonstrate how the high-pressure gas pipeline (on Cool Road) will be protected to ensure that no adverse effects will result as a consequence of the development of this site, 5) Notwithstanding Strategic Plan Business Policy 5, no retail development (including bulky goods) will be approved on this site, 6) An Environmental Impact Assessment will be needed for any development proposed on this site. (R22)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M15) for deletion of Employment Proposal 3 and replacement with Emp Proposal 4. And tidying of tables. See Paper 7: Schedule of Development Briefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R23 106</td>
<td></td>
<td>I further recommend that, if necessary, the word ‘Kewaigue’ be deleted from the descriptions of site BE002 in Employment Proposals 3 and 4. (R23)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M16) for edits.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R24 &amp; R25</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>I recommend that Section 8.11 of the draft Strategic Plan be deleted, save for Employment Proposal 4, which should be amended to read as follows: Sites BE002b and BE006, to the south of Cool Road and north of New Castletown Road, are jointly designated for industrial and business park uses. This allows for their development for manufacturing (including light and general industry); research and development; storage and distribution; and offices (subject to compliance with Business Policy 7 of the Strategic Plan). 1 Development will not be permitted on these sites if it could reasonably and acceptably be located on the site referred to in Employment Proposal 3. 2 No planning approval will be granted for the development of any part of these sites until a Master Plan for the whole of both sites has been submitted to and approved by the planning authority. The Master Plan must show all proposed spatial elements, including areas intended for general industrial and business park uses; open spaces and structural landscaping areas; and circulation and parking arrangements. The Master Plan must show how these elements will be phased. 3 There must be no net qualitative loss of biodiversity as a result of the development of this site. 4 The route of the high-pressure gas pipeline to the south of Cool Road must be safeguarded. 5 Notwithstanding Strategic Plan Business Policy 5, no retail development (including bulky goods) will be approved on this site. 6 An Environmental Impact Assessment will be needed for any development proposed on this site. (R24) I further recommend that the table in Employment Proposal 4 be amended to show the correct areas for these two sites under each of the three headings; and that Section 8.16 of the draft Area Plan be deleted. (R25)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M17) for deletion of paragraph 8.11 See Paper 7: Schedule of Development Briefs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R26</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>For the avoidance of doubt, I consider that Site BE001 should be colour washed on the Proposals Map as ‘industrial’ in a similar manner to the Snugborough Trading Estate (see paragraph 24 above). I recommend that the Proposal Map be modified accordingly. (R26)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q7. (M35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R27</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>Site BE009 Clybane - I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection. (R27)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R28</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>I recommend that paragraph 8.13.1 of the draft Area Plan be amended to read as follows: Additional facilities may be required for the collection, sorting, processing, recycling and disposal of waste. There is a dedicated waste site adjacent to the Energy from Waste facility (BE024), which is an existing site for a specialist use outside the existing settlement boundary. The expansion of this area is proposed by the allocation of 6.9ha of additional land for specialist waste management purposes at Middle Farm, Braddan. (R28)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M18) for amended text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insp. No.</td>
<td>Inspector’s Report (Para. no.)</td>
<td>Inspector’s Recommendation</td>
<td>Cabinet Office (Department) Views</td>
<td>Modification to Draft Plan?</td>
<td>What is the effect of the Modification?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R29      | 132                           | I further recommend that Employment Proposal 6 of the draft Area Plan be amended to read as follows:  
Part of Site BE010 at Middle Farm, Braddan, measuring some 6.9ha, and lying immediately to the east of the existing waste management complex at Richmond Hill, is allocated for special industrial use, particularly the management processing, recycling and storage of waste.  
1) No planning approval will be granted for the development of any part of this site until a Master Plan for the whole of the 6.9ha site has been submitted to and approved by the planning authority. The Master Plan must show all proposed spatial elements, including areas intended for buildings; open work areas; structural landscaping areas; and circulation and parking arrangements. The Master Plan must show how these elements will be phased.  
2) There must be no net qualitative loss of biodiversity as a result of the development of this site,  
3) An Environmental Impact Assessment will be needed for any development proposed on this site.  (R29) | Accept | Yes | See Modified Written Statement (M19) for amended Employment Proposal 6. |
| R30      | 133                           | I further recommend that the Proposals Map be amended to show the 6.9ha site allocated for special industrial purposes, as shown in Appendix 2 of the evidence submitted to the public inquiry by Dandara Group Holdings Ltd in respect of this site.  (R30) | Accept | Yes | See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q8. (M36) See Amended Site Plan Boundary for Site BE010 |
| R31      | 141                           | I recommend that a zone with a radius of 300m from the centre of the HWTF at Richmond Hill be shown as a Major Hazard Site, on the Infrastructure Constraints Map of the Area Plan (Map 1b).  (R31) | Amend | Yes | See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q9. (M37) See map showing Waste Infrastructure Consultation Zone and Paper 5 for further details. |
| R32      | 141                           | I further recommend that a new Proposal be inserted into the draft Area Plan after Employment Proposal 6, to read as follows:  
Within the Major Hazard Zone at Richmond Hill, there will be a presumption against development for purposes in which vulnerable members of the public would be present, including housing, and educational and medical establishments.  (R32) | Accept | Yes but amend | See Modified Written Statement (M20) for new Employment Proposal 7. |
| R33      | 147                           | Site BE025 Land Adjacent to Tromode Industrial Estate - I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection.  (R33) | Accept | No | No change |
| R34      | 153                           | I recommend that the boundary of Douglas Town Centre, as shown on the draft Area Plan Proposals Map, be modified to exclude the whole of Mixed Use Area 8 (the Riverside Gateway).  (R34) | Accept | Yes | See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q10. (M38) |
| R35      | 153                           | I also recommend that the first two sentences of paragraph 9.8.8 of the draft Area Plan be amended to read as follows:  
Mixed Use Area 8 - This area, adjacent to the town centre, presents an opportunity to accommodate changing and evolving leisure time pursuits. The continuation of existing uses would be supported in the short to medium term, with potential comprehensive development in the longer term for bulky retail, leisure activities and residential purposes ...  (R35) | Accept | Yes | See Modified Written Statement (M21) for amended text. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R36</th>
<th>154</th>
<th>Mixed Use Area 3 – I recommend that no modification be made to the Mixed Use Proposal 3 of the draft Area Plan.  (R36)</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R37</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>Mixed Use Area 5 – I recommend that no modification be made to the Mixed Use Proposal 5 of the draft Area Plan (R37)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R38</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>Mixed Use Area 7 – I recommend that no modification be made to Mixed Use Proposal 7 of the draft Area Plan. (R38)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R39</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>I recommend that no change be made to Mixed Use Proposal 8a of the draft area Plan, save for the deletion of the words 'Town Centre' from its heading. (R39)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M22) for amended text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R40</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>I further recommend that clearly defined boundaries between Mixed Use Areas 8a, b and c be shown on the Area Plan Proposals Map, in accordance with the plan submitted to the inquiry by the Cabinet Office. (R40)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q11. (M39) See Map showing Mixed Use Areas 8a, 8b and 8c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R41</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>I recommend that references to office uses be deleted from Mixed Use Proposals 8b and 8c; and that the words 'Town Centre' be deleted from each of their headings. (R41)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M23) for amended text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R42</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>Town Centre Conservation Areas – I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection. (R42)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R43</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>I recommend that a new Tourism Proposal 10 be introduced into the Area Plan, to read as follows: The environment of the Raad ny Foillan long-distance footpath will be protected from unsympathetic development. Where development proposals provide an opportunity to re-align inland sections of this route closer to the coast, these will be taken whenever possible. (R43)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M24) for new Tourism Proposal 9 (due to editing the number of Tourism proposals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R44</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>I recommend that any requisite corrections be made to Table 10 of the draft Area Plan. (R44)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Modified Written Statement (M29) for updated tables.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| R45           | 215                           | **I recommend that paragraph 12.9.2 of the draft Area Plan should be amended to read as follows: The findings of this work are:**  
   i) The housing need calculations in the Strategic Plan are based on a projected Island-wide population, living in private households, of 91,898 by 2026. This assumed net inward migration of 500 people a year between 2011 and 2026,  
   ii) With an average household size of 2.27 persons, this indicated that there would be 40,484 resident households on the Isle of Man by 2026,  
   iii) At the time of the 2011 Census there were 35,599 resident households in the Isle of Man. So there was expected to be an increase of 4,885 households between 2011 and 2026. After allowing for vacancies and rounding, this resulted in a total housing requirement of 5,100 additional dwellings for the period 2011 to 2026, as set out in Housing Policy 1 of the Strategic Plan. Assuming that 48% of these dwellings would be needed in the East, the housing requirement for the East was for 2,440 additional dwellings, as set out in Housing Policy 3 of the Strategic Plan,  
   iv) A more recent projection based on the results of the 2016 Census, and assuming net inward migration of 500 people a year between 2016 and 2026, shows that by the end of that period, there would be an Island-wide population of 85,671 living in private households,  
   v) With an average household size of 2.24 persons, this indicates that there would be 38,317 households on the Isle of Man by 2026,  
   vi) Whereas the Strategic Plan assumed an increase of 4,885 resident households between 2011 and 2026, the later projection points to a smaller increase of 2,718 households during that period,  
   vii) The Strategic Plan assumes that 48% of the additional households would live in the East. On that assumption, there would be 1,358 additional households in the East between 2011 and 2026,  
   viii) In order to provide some flexibility, and allow for the possibility that some allocated sites might not be brought forward for development, it would be prudent to make provision for some 1,500 additional dwellings in the East during this period. (R45) | Accept | Yes | See Modified Written Statement (M25) for amended text. |
<p>| R46           | 223                           | <strong>I recommend that paragraph 12.20.1 of the draft Area Plan be replaced by the following text:</strong> A Strategic Reserve Site is land which may be suitable for residential development, but which will be held ‘in reserve’ until the need for such development has been established. Strategic Reserve Sites will not be released for development until the population of the Isle of Man exceeds 89,000. The identification of Reserve Sites in this Plan allows for flexibility in land supply, should it be found that additional land is necessary. This accords with the ‘plan, monitor and manage’ approach identified in the Isle of Man Strategic Plan; and is necessary to ensure that the Plan can react to changing circumstances. The status of Strategic Reserve Sites will be reconsidered when the development plan is next reviewed. (R46) | Amend | Yes | See Modified Written Statement (M26) for deletion. See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q37. (M65) See Paper 5 - Recommendations in the Inspector’s Report which Cabinet Office proposes to reject/amend |
| R47           | 225                           | <strong>I recommend that paragraph 12.8 of the draft Area Plan be amended to read as follows:</strong> Urban Capacity Findings – i) Between mid-2011 and mid-2018, 270 dwellings were completed or started in the East; ii) In mid-2018, there were outstanding planning approvals for a further 195 dwellings in the East. At an average take-up rate of 73%, this could be expected to yield a further 144 dwellings; iii) It is forecast that, between 2018 and 2026, 187 dwellings will be created by the change of use of existing buildings in the East; iv) In aggregate, 601 additional dwellings could be provided from these three sources. (R47) | Accept | Yes | See Modified Written Statement (M27) for amended text. |
| R48           | 225                           | <strong>I further recommend that this amended paragraph should follow paragraph 12.9.2 of the draft Area Plan.</strong> (R48) | Accept | Yes | See Modified Written Statement (M27) |
| R49           | 240                           | <strong>I recommend that the following text be added at the end of paragraph 12.21.1 of the draft Area Plan:</strong> In accordance with Section 8.8 of the Strategic Plan 2016, an assessment has been made of groups of houses in the countryside, but no such group is identified in the Area Plan as having potential for further residential development. (R49) | Accept | Yes | See Modified Written Statement (M28) for new text. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>R50</th>
<th>244</th>
<th><strong>Accordingly, I recommend against the modification of the draft Area Plan to show areas of Low Density Housing in Parkland, either within or outside settlements.</strong> (R50)</th>
<th>Accept</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R51 267</td>
<td>I recommend that Sites BH030 and DBH002 be retained as allocated for predominantly residential development in the Area Plan. (R51)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>See Paper 7: Schedule of Development Briefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R52 272</td>
<td>Site BM006, Land to the North of Vicarage Road, Braddan – I recommend that no modification be made to Site BM006 as shown in the Area Plan. (R52)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>See Paper 7: Schedule of Development Briefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R53 289</td>
<td>I recommend that the allocation of the eastern part of Site BH031 be deleted from the Area Plan; but that Field No 521518, at the western end of this site, be shown as a Strategic Reserve Site, with capacity for about 50 dwellings. (R53)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q40. (M68) See Paper 7: Schedule of Development Briefs, see Amended Site Plan Boundary for Site BH031</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R54 293</td>
<td>It would be better to show the Finch Hill Sports Activity Park coloured green (as open space) on the Area Plan Proposals Map, and omit that land from the mixed use allocation. I recommend accordingly. (R54)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Consultation Hub Q12. (M40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R55 303</td>
<td>I recommend that the whole of Sites DH002, DH057 and DM002 should be shown as a Strategic Reserve Site in the Area Plan. (R55)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q13. (M41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R56 311</td>
<td>I recommend that Site DH009 be deleted from the Area Plan as a proposed allocation for residential development. (R56)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q14. (M42) Mapping Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R57 316</td>
<td>Site DH011, Ballanard Woods – I recommend that no action be taken in response to these objections (R57)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>See Paper 7: Schedule of Development Briefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R58 318</td>
<td>Site DH039, Park Road School and the ‘Bowling Green’ Public House – I recommend that no modification be made to Site DH039 as shown in the draft Area Plan. (R58)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Text change within modified written statement - please refer to PC65 in PIP 5: Schedule of Proposed Changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R59 320</td>
<td>Site DH046, Victoria Road Prison – I recommend that no modification be made to Site DH046 as shown in the draft Area Plan (R59)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change. See Paper 7: Schedule of Development Briefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R60 331</td>
<td>I recommend that Site OH011 be shown as a Strategic Reserve Site in the Area Plan. (R60)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q15. (M43) Mapping Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R61 336</td>
<td>Site OH017, Land west of Summer Hill, Onchan – I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection. (R61)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R62 342</td>
<td>Site OH018, Governor’s Road, Onchan – I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection. (R62)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R63 348</td>
<td>I recommend that the proposal to show Site BH032 as a Strategic Reserve Site for potential residential development be deleted from the Area Plan. (R63)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q16. (M44)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R64 355</td>
<td>I recommend that neither Site GH011 nor Site GH015 be allocated for residential use in the Area Plan, either for immediate development, or as strategic reserve land. (R64)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q17. (M45)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R65 359</td>
<td>I recommend that Site GH020 be deleted from the Area Plan as either a specific housing allocation or as a reserve site for residential development. (R65)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q18. (M46)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R66</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>I recommend against Site GH038 being allocated in the Area Plan, either for immediate residential development, or as a reserve site. <em>(R66)</em></td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q19. <em>(M47)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R67</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>I recommend the Site GH013 be shown in the Area Plan as a Strategic Reserve for possible future residential development. <em>(R67)</em></td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q20. <em>(M48)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R68</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>I recommend that part of Site GM001 be shown for future primary school provision in the Area Plan, but that no part of this site be allocated for housing or shown as a Strategic Reserve Site for future residential development. <em>(R68)</em></td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q21. <em>(M49)</em> See Amended Site Plan Boundary for Site GM001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R69</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>I recommend against Site MH001 being shown as either a residential allocation or a strategic reserve in the Area Plan <em>(R69)</em></td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q22. <em>(M50)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R70</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>I recommend against Site MH003 being shown either as a residential allocation or as a strategic reserve in the Area Plan. <em>(R70)</em></td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q23. <em>(M51)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R71</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>I recommend that Site MH023 be washed over as part of a predominantly residential area, in the Area Plan. <em>(R71)</em></td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q24. <em>(M52)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R72</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>I recommend against the allocation of Site MM001 in the Area Plan, either for immediate development or as a strategic reserve. <em>(R72)</em></td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q25. <em>(M53)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R73</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>I recommend that the proposal to allocate Site DH004 as a strategic reserve be deleted from the Area Plan. <em>(R73)</em></td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q26. <em>(M54)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R74</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>I recommend that Site SH013 be left unallocated in the Area Plan. <em>(R74)</em></td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q27. <em>(M55)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R75</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>I recommend against the allocation of Site BH001 in the Area Plan. <em>(R75)</em></td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q28. <em>(M56)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R76</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>Site BH007, Ballamillighyn Mansion, Mount Rule – I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection. <em>(R76)</em></td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R77</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>Site BH042, Ballafletcher Cottage, Peel Road, Braddan – I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection <em>(R77)</em></td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R78</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>Site BH013, Land at West Baldwin – I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection. <em>(R78)</em></td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R79</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>Site BH014, Hampton Court, Quine's Hill – I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection. <em>(R79)</em></td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R80 442</td>
<td>I recommend that Sites BH015 and BH019 be shown in the Area Plan as a strategic reserve for residential development. (R80)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q29. (M57) And Paper 7 Development Briefs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R81 445</td>
<td>Sites BH016 and BH 017, Land at Port Soderick – I recommend that no action be taken in response to these objections (R81)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R82 447</td>
<td>Site BH021, Ballavare Farm, Old Castletown Road, Port Soderick – I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection. D113</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R83 450</td>
<td>Site BH022, Colloney's Road, Braddan - I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection. (R83)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R84 452</td>
<td>Site BH039, Bridge House, West Baldwin - I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection. (R84)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R85 455</td>
<td>Site BH041, Land at Oak Hill, Port Soderick - - I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection. (R85)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R86 460</td>
<td>Site BM008, Castleward Farm, Braddan - I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection. (R86)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R87 463</td>
<td>Late Site 3 between Braaid Hall and Braaid Cottage, Braaid - I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection. (R87)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R88 466</td>
<td>I recommend that Site DH008 should be shown in the Area Plan as strategic reserve land for possible future residential development. (R88)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q30. (M58)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R89 467</td>
<td>Land to the rear of the Shoprite Store, Victoria Road, Summerhill Village, Douglas - I recommend that no further action be taken in respect of this matter. (R89)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R90 470</td>
<td>I recommend that site GH023 be allocated in the Area Plan for Mixed Use development. (R90)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q31. (M59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R91 471</td>
<td>Site GH002 – Clay Head Road, Baldrine - I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection. (R91)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R92 474</td>
<td>Site GH033/GH040 – Clay Head Road, Baldrine - I recommend that no action be taken in response to this site. (R92)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R93 478</td>
<td>Site GH032 – Land to the East of Main Road, Baldrine – I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection. (R93)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R94 483</td>
<td>I recommend against the allocation of site GH039 for development in the Area Plan. (R94)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R95 486</td>
<td>Field No 614595, Old Laxey Hill, Laxey – I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection.(R95)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R96 494</td>
<td>I recommend against the allocation of Site MH002 for residential development in the Area Plan. (R96)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R97 497</td>
<td>I recommend against the allocation of either of these sites for residential development in the Area Plan. (R97)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R98 499</td>
<td>Site MH015, Ballahutchin Hill – I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection (R98)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R99 504</td>
<td>I recommend against the allocation of either part of site MM002 for development in the Area Plan. (R99)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R100 506</td>
<td>Site OH002, Bibaloe Moor Farm, Onchan – I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection (R100)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R101 510</td>
<td>I recommend against the allocation of Site OH003 for residential development in the Area Plan. (R101)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R102 518</td>
<td>Site OH007, King Edward Bay Golf Course – I recommend that no modification be made to the draft Area Plan in response to this objection. (R102)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Map to show as green wash (GC) for Golf Course - refer to paper 6: Schedule of Mapping Amendments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R103 524</td>
<td>Site OH009, Howstrake Holiday Camp - I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection (R103)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R104 526</td>
<td>Site OH013, Land adjacent to ‘La Serene’, Ballacottier Road, Onchan - I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection (R104)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R105 528</td>
<td>Site OH025, Little Mill Road, Onchan – I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection. (R105)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R106 533</td>
<td>I recommend that the development boundary of Newtown be drawn to enclose Site SH003 and adjacent vacant land to the east; and that the area thereby enclosed be washed over as part of the adjacent ‘predominantly residential’ area. (R106)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q32. (M60)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R107 536</td>
<td>Site SH010, Land to the South East of Main Road, Newton - I recommend that no action be taken in response to this objection. (R107)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R108</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>Late Site 2 is within the existing settlement boundary, and appears to be used for residential purposes, I consider that it should be washed over as part of the primarily residential area of Newtown. I recommend that the draft Area Plan be modified accordingly. (R108)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q33. (M61) See Site Boundary for Late Site 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R109</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>In my view, it would be logical to include this land within the development boundary and within the predominantly residential area. I recommend accordingly. (R109)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q34. (M62) See Site Boundary for 'Antillas', Ballanard Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R110</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>I recommend that the Tables in Chapter 12 of the Strategic Plan be amended to reflect the content of Table 2 above. (R110)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>See Response Form/Consultation Hub Q35. (M63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R111</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>CTA Proposal 4, Peel Road – I recommend that no action be taken in regard to this matter (R111)</td>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13