



# Area Plan for the North and West Schedule of Responses

A Department Response to All Objections and  
Representations Received on the Modifications  
Published

September 2025



## **Area Plan for the North and West schedule of responses to the proposed modifications consultation (January-March 2025) procedure note.**

In November 2024, Cabinet Office published the Inspector's Report on the Draft Area Plan for the North and West. Following consideration of the Inspector's recommendations, in January 2025 the Cabinet Office published a schedule of proposed modifications to the Draft Plan.

Between January and March 2025, the Cabinet Office accepted objections and representations on the proposed modifications. The Department received 365 responses which have been made publicly available on the [Government Consultation Hub](#)<sup>1</sup>.

Below is a schedule of the objections and representations received with a Cabinet Office comment. The schedule is organised by modification number, a full list of the proposed modifications can be found in [Paper 3 – Schedule of Proposed Modifications](#) published January 2025. Where comments related to a specific development site, a site code is given.

Cabinet Office has considered each representation duly made and, in some cases, has made amendments to the Written Statement or maps as a result. Where this is the case it is indicated in the 'map amendment' and 'written statement amendment' columns of the schedule.

The Area Plan for the North and West has been adopted by Order. Prior to doing so, the Department updated text including the proposals (shown in **bold** in the Written Statement) as part of final changes to the Plan to ensure they made sense contextually and were grammatically correct – this may or may not be reflected in the schedule below.

<sup>1</sup> Where consent was given by the respondent to publish the response

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKC8-G			1		Not enough green space close in to Peel for children and sport recreational facilities.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment.</b>  In accordance with Strategic Plan policy, the Area Plan identifies and protects existing open spaces and has, where possible, included proposals to increase the supply of open space.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHB-Y	Joanne Hocking		1		We simply do not have the infrastructure to support more people in Peel, we would need complete overhaul of sewage network (already have bad smells and pipe collapses), overhaul of water pipes (several bursts especially on Ballaquaine road). Bigger schools, more doctors, more dentists, more parking (as more kids are being forced into staying at home with parents as unable to afford their own housing we are ending up with several cars per household and not enough parking). Too many of these houses are bought by "landlords" and locals are being priced out of the market. The requirement that planners have to provide "play areas" for children is not met by a small climbing frame in a pub garden.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your concern regarding the future provision of community facilities in Peel, especially in the context of future development. Cabinet Office is satisfied that development briefs for sites in Peel take adequate account of the needs of the community to ensure that infrastructure and community facility needs are met as far as possible.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		2		I am supportive in principle but with regard to Biosphere status, as with other aspects of the Plan, the laudable and desirable objectives and outcomes are approached independently without acknowledgment of their inter-relationships.  There is an absence of imaginative lateral thinking which, if applied, could make some of the problems identified part of the solution.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKC8-G			2		Especially Peel insufficient infrastructure to support extending/existing housing especially Sewerage	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Area Plan for the North and West supports the broad aim and goals associated with the Island's status as a UNESCO Biosphere reserve. The importance of Biosphere status is recognised in the natural environment chapter of the written statement but also in Chapter 4 - National Strategies relevant to the North and West, reflecting that the Area Plan is closely linked with the aims of the Biosphere.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKGV-J			2		We are not a Biosphere. We pump raw sewage into the sea. This new plan ensures there will be more cars on the road.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comments.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHE-2			2		All modifications referred to. If we want to preserve our biosphere status and quality of life we should not be planning to build on greenfield sites around Peel. It is also prime agricultural land, the houses won't be affordable and our infrastructure can't cope with any more.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHE-2			2		Awful plans to wreck our biosphere status	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Area Plan for the North and West supports the broad aim and goals associated with the Island's status as a UNESCO Biosphere reserve. The importance of Biosphere status is recognised in the natural environment chapter of the written statement but also in Chapter 4 - National Strategies relevant to the North and West, reflecting that the Area Plan is closely linked with the aims of the Biosphere.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKVC-E			2		Getting rid of greenfields for more houses doesn't really go with the UNESCO Biosphere status!	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Area Plan for the North and West supports the broad aim and goals associated with the Island's status as a UNESCO Biosphere reserve. The importance of Biosphere status is recognised in the natural environment chapter of the written statement but also in Chapter 4 - National Strategies relevant to the North and West, reflecting that the Area Plan is closely linked with the aims of the Biosphere.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKWC-F			2		The government talks of "sustainable development" and "climate change sustainability" and yet it is the development of our island so far that has caused the degradation of our soil, coastal waters, natural habitats and consequent loss of biodiversity. There is very little in the way of a give back to natural habitat and a lot of land being gobbled up for development which is pushing the island towards net habitat destruction and biodiversity loss. Would the government please stop hiding behind its UNESCO Biosphere status shield and actually do something towards the protection of biodiversity that it has signed up to.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Area Plan for the North and West is in accordance with the Strategic Plan, an overarching aim of which is the concept of sustainable development and environmental protection. The Development Plan (Area Plans and Strategic Plan) are integral to ensuring that the Island's housing needs are met in the most sustainable way possible.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			2		We have already 'fouled' any biosphere status. This will be used to stop the general population from improving structures or planning, when it will be ignored by government when it suits them to build more housing instead of looking at the issues at hand, give credence to their 100% sustainability plans, when in fact it will destroy habitats, and allow them to ignore the sewage and waste issues at hand.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Area Plan for the North and West supports the broad aim and goals associated with the Island's status as a UNESCO Biosphere reserve. The importance of Biosphere status is recognised in the natural environment chapter of the written statement but also in Chapter 4 - National Strategies relevant to the North and West, reflecting that the Area Plan is closely linked with the aims of the Biosphere.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			2		M2 biased. Undue emphasis given to Natural Environment; para 4.6.1 should also make reference to Chapter 6 Landscape Character and Appearance and Chapter 8 The Built Environment and Urban Regeneration.  Para 6.1.2 Suggest after "protected for the future" add "in support of the Island's Biosphere's Status", remaining  Para 7.4.1 Remove first two sentences. Add after various legislation, such as the Town and Country Planning Act for Conservation Areas and Registered Buildings.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment but is content with the current wording of paragraph 4.6.1, 6.1.2 and 7.4.1 and does not propose changes to the wording of these paragraphs.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			2		Following a suggestion by me, mention of Biosphere Status was added into the Modified Draft. Biosphere Status encompasses both the cultural (Built) environment and the natural environment. However, the follow-up is only included in the chapter on the Natural Environment. Absolutely no consideration of it is given under the Chapter on Built Environment. In terms of policy, constraints and assessment, this is totally unbalanced.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment and the contribution of our built environment to the Island's UNESCO Biosphere status</b>  <b>The importance of Biosphere status is recognised in the natural environment chapter of the written statement but also in Chapter 4 - National Strategies relevant to the North and West, reflecting that the Area Plan is closely linked with the aims of the Biosphere.</b>		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			2		Emphasis given to the fact that the designation of the Island as a nation Biosphere includes cultural i.e built environment and therefore there should be a recognition of what is important in the built environment not just whether houses are single or two storey. Substantial submissions were made on this aspect but they have not been reported on by the Inspector. The plan is wholly unbalanced in not giving these further consideration. Motion to Tynwald 22 June 2016 Architecture, built environment and built heritage Building Conservation Forum and Isle of Architecture Motion carried The Hon. Member for Douglas West (Mr Thomas) to move:"That Tynwald welcomes the formation of the Building Conservation Forum and the launch of the Isle ofArchitecture by Culture Vannin and Manx National Heritage; notes the humble petition of Mr Charles Guard regarding the Government's stewardship of the history rich built environment, which he presented on 6th July 2015 at Tynwald Hill; and encourages the review of Government strategies, plans and policies to raise the quality of the island's architecture and built environment, including those aimed to conserve its built heritage.The intentions of this motion appears to have been ignored. Cabinet Office is responsible for designatingConservation Area and recognising areas of Architectural and Historic interest (as per Kirk Michael 1994plan) but have ignored doing any of this as part of this are plan including ignoring the proposed Conservation Area in the Bride Village Study. These are major shortcomings	<b>Cabinet Office note your comments. The Area Plan for the North and West recognises the importance of the Island's built heritage and Conservation Areas and their contribution to the character and identify of our settlements and national identity.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office accepts that there are currently Conservation Areas in the North and West which exist in Draft and are yet to be approved. Although the Department does have the statutory responsibility for the designation of Conservation Areas it is noted that this under Section 18 of the Town and Country Planning Act and is therefore distinct to the Development Plan procedure set out under S. 1 of the Act.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish	Manx National Farmers Union (MNFU)	2		MNFU asks that recognition of agriculture's significant contribution to the Island's Biosphere status is acknowledged in this statement.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment and recognise the importance of agriculture and the management of our Island's countryside in contributing to Biosphere status but do not propose amendments in this regard.</b>		
			2		Para 7.4.1 Remove first two sentences .Add after various legislation, such as the Town and Country Planning Act for Conservation Areas and Registered Buildings Natural	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comments but are content with the wording of the paragraph as it stands.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		3		The practicality and potential benefits accruing from the incorporation of Sustainable Drainage Systems, beyond the basic provision of drainage for a specific development, are insufficiently emphasised.	<b>The Area Plan for the North and West fully supports the integration of greener drainage initiatives into development schemes as part of the wider approach to manage flood risk.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKC8-G			3		Why go forward with a special vision of decentralization when We cannot even support our local shopping areas within Peel - Currently 12 empty shops !!	<b>Cabinet Office notes your concern regarding town centre vacancy. Please see section 9.5 of the Written Statement - a renewed focus on Town Centres.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKGV-J			3		Why Ruin the whole island when you can just build in the Douglas area where shops, employment etc all are.	<b>In accordance with the Strategic Plan Cabinet Office maintains it is appropriate that the Area Plan for the North and West makes proposals to meet local housing need.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK31-S		Peel Town Commissioners	3		The Commissioners note planning application 23/01407/B received planning consent in December 2024 at appeal and once this approval is enacted there is no requirement for a strategic reserve site for sewage treatment The Commissioners have previously advocated the need for a strategic reserve location for the sewerage treatment works should the proposed site (PE003 Part B) included within the Draft Area Plan prove to be unsuitable or should planning permission be refused. The Commissioners have previously proposed the land between Glenfaba House and the disused Quarry, adjacent to the River Neb, could be used for this strategic reserve purpose. The Commissioners note planning approval was obtained in December 2024 for sewage treatment on site PE003 Part B under PA 23/01407 /B. If this planning consent is developed there is no need for a strategic reserve for this purpose. The Commissioners' welcomed the support contained within the Inspector's report on page 28 at paragraph 174 The designation of Peel's settlement boundary could be made clearer by including all the land within the Town boundary and any proposed development immediately outside the Town with the appropriate land classification use	<b>Cabinet Office notes the Commissioners position that a strategic reserve or otherwise alternative site for the development of a sewage treatment works for Peel be identified in the Area Plan for the North and West. Likewise, the Department notes that work on the site has recently commenced following planning approval being granted and further the Cabinet Office does not amend its position that an alternative site (in strategic reserve or otherwise) is not required as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		4		M6 RMC5 86, warrants greater emphasis and application. This has seemingly been ignored in connection with LR020 and LR040.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment but do not support sites LR020 or LR040 for development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7U-1			4		It is a unique area, home to mountain hares and hen harriers , no development or disturbance should be allowed to alter or degrade it. Such as the debacle of the 3 legs instalment on Barrule, subsequent disagreement and painting by individuals causing further disturbance. It is not a part of the natural landscape. I feel sometimes there is not enough protection for such areas.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Area Plan for the north and West recognises the importance of landscape and landscape character, Please see Landscape Proposal 1.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		5		It should not be forgotten that the island's smaller village settlements are integral to the landscape and character and, as such, are worthy of being 'sustained'.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment and the Area Plan makes proposals with the aim of maintaining existing village facilities.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK38-Z	Andrew Johnson	Manx National Heritage	5		6.6.1 – 6.8.3 We would like to record our view that landscape protection has been articulated particularly well within the Plan using the Descriptions and the Landscape Proposals arising from them, and hope that this will result in greater acknowledgement on the part of developers of the need to safeguard this valuable resource.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your support.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		6		The adoption of all the principles Sustainable Drainage Systems and ancillary provisions warrants greater emphasis. As with previous responses the wider potential benefits of SuDS for other objectives in addition to being a practical drainage solution, has apparently been ignored when arriving at decisions in connection specifically with LR020 and LR040.	<b>The Area Plan supports the integration of greener drainage initiatives such as SUDS into development schemes as part of the wider approach to manage flood risk however Cabinet Office do not support the proposal of LR020 or LR040 as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			6		this leaves room for ambiguity - appropriate statutory undertaking - what is appropriate? This should be better detailed. The undertaking should be looked at by experts and local consultation, not national.	<b>Cabinet Office is content with the wording of Chapter 7 Plan Objective 4 and Outcome 4a</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			7		Manx National Glens Why are these not shown on constraints map if they are to be retained. Eleven National Glens exist in the area covered and in addition there are three gardens / arboretum. Development around these glens must recognise the importance including the setting of the glens. Without appearing either as a constraint on the constraints map or as land use on the proposals map their importance is diminished contrary to all other 'green' objectives put forward in this chapter.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comments regarding the Island's National Glens and have amended the Environmental Constraints maps to show National Glens in the North and West.</b>	y	

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			7		While the Strategic Plan recognises the theoretical importance of such sites (Areas of Ecological Interest/Wildlife Sites), it is noted that no technical information is available either as part of this Area Plan or on any web site as a whole as to the reasons for their designation. Much of the work in identifying the sites is done outside of Government departments by private organisations. Notwithstanding that, such designations have been used to block allocation of sites for development. This is unsupportable. Any designation should have to be supported by publicly available information. As this is not available the sites should not be identified as constraints on development. Post inquiry a further 8 such sites have now been listed. This simply looks as abuse of power. No consideration has been given at all to most comments on the need for greater protection of the built environment.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. This issue was discussed during Inquiry sessions and as a result Cabinet Office published Cabinet Office Document 12 (COD 12) which sets out the evidence base for the assessment of Areas of Ecological Interest.</b>  <b>The Written Statement acknowledges that Wildlife Sites are non-statutory designations. These sites are Areas considered to have high wildlife value and are designated by MWT but with the support of DEFA. Cabinet Office maintain that it is proportionate and fair for both designations to be identified as constraints as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			7		Natural Environment Plan outcomes 6 and 6a omitted why? They are not RMC Natural Environmental Recommendation 1 Who is this a recommendation to? You could designate the whole Island and be none the wiser. RMC 6 Para 7.13.1 Manx Wildlife Trust could change their policies any time outside of the control of Government. They should not be given special status in a Government Policy document. It is horrific that another 8 have designated out of the blue and since the Inquiry and just accepted by CO without query. There is no public consultation about such sites. No information is available on what makes these sites important and no opportunity to query designation or how information is gathered. Areas of Ecological Interest are also extensive but unexplained. In effect Cabinet Office / DEFA are enabling a private organisation / charity to dictate where development can or cannot go with or without the consent of the landowner and without any public consultation on such designations.	<b>The removal of paragraph 7.18 - Dark Skies and natural Environment Plan Objective 6 and Plan Outcome 6a are covered in Paper 7 (extract of PIP 1 showing minor changes).</b>  <b>Natural Environment Proposal 1 was removed from the Plan because Cabinet Office does not influence the designation of Wildlife Sites in the Plan Area.</b>  <b>Wildlife Sites are the most important places for wildlife outside areas of legally protected land (ASSI etc.) and their importance is recognised in Strategic Planning Policy. It is therefore important that they are referenced in Area Plans and shown on the Environmental Constraints Maps.</b>  <b>The evidence base being AEI's was discussed during inquiry sessions and in response to this, Cabinet Office produced Cabinet Office Document 12 (COD 12). AEI's are areas proposed by DEFA to have known wildlife interest but which have not yet been surveyed in detail. As with Wildlife Sites, the importance of AEI's is recognised in the Strategic Plan and Cabinet Office maintain that it is right that they are recognised on the Environmental Constraints Maps.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			7		Despite being shown on the Environmental Constraints map as MNT owned land which is used as part of their farm base around The Grove land east of Bowring Road is now designated for development of unto 19 houses Site RR011. This site should be deleted from residential proposals.	<b>Cabinet Office notes that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage may be proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish	Manx National Farmers Union (MNFU)	7		We note the inspectors report states; 'Wildlife Sites are designated by the Manx Wildlife Trust' Other jurisdictions have a very comprehensive approach with specific criteria requirements and local authority/stakeholder involvement. We cannot identify an equivalent process on Island.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment and will have the opportunity to review this issue as part of the wider Strategic Plan review.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish	Manx National Farmers Union (MNFU)	7		The accepted designation process of Wildlife Sites on the Island is not currently a collaborative process involving multiple stakeholders. The Isle of Man Government needs to ensure that a balanced process is followed when land is designated for a purpose and that any policy around this is influenced by all of those that it affects. Extract from UK Government information on Wildlife Sites	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment and will have the opportunity to review this issue as part of the wider Strategic Plan review.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			7		Natural Environment Proposal 6 Where are wetlands defined, shown or listed ? Cannot have a proposal covering a designated area which is not otherwise identified. RMC 7 Natural Environment Proposal 8 what are designated sites? That terminology could include any of the unspecified MWT sites. Nature Conservation should be given equal status as other considerations to give balanced proposals. I.e the wording "(including designated should be omitted. They should not include MWTs sites as Government appear to have no control over how or on what basis these are designated by MWT.	<b>The only designated wetland in the plan area is the Ramsar Site of Ballaugh Curragh noted earlier in that chapter of the written statement. Ballaugh Curragh is also labelled on Environmental Constraints map 1aN.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	9		It's paragraph 7.25. Outlining the approach to BNG is helpful, but the wording of NEP 12 could be less ambiguous. We would suggest something along the lines of "There will be no net loss of biodiversity resulting from development within the Plan area and Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) will be sought when required by the extant Isle of Man Strategic Plan".	<b>Cabinet Office propose an amendment to remove any ambiguity. Please see amended development briefs and Natural Environment Proposal 11 on Biodiversity Net Gain</b>		y
ANON-UVCN-NK46-Y			9		Can not see any net gain for biodiversity when the natural environment and ecology is being built over	<b>Cabinet Office has a legal duty under the Climate Change Act to have due consideration for Biodiversity Net Gain within the development plan and acknowledge that the existing policy within the Strategic Plan is for no net loss.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		9		Greater understanding of the interdependence of all aspects of this Plan in relation to the Strategic Plan and Our Island Plan would illustrate that the objectives of Biodiversity / Natural Environment Proposals and development of the Built Environment are not mutually exclusive but are capable of being mutually supportive.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		9		This is critical to developments. It is deplorable that it is only here as an enabler for when the 2016 Strategic Plan is revised/replaced	<b>Cabinet Office has a legal duty under the Climate Change Act to have due consideration for Biodiversity Net Gain within the development plan and acknowledge that the existing policy within the Strategic Plan is for no net loss.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	9		Guidance on building density can be helpful, but should be more appropriately considered in the IoMSP	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			9		I strongly object to this, which is basically saying, 'we can put in what we like as government, but we will move the plants and species elsewhere or pay to so scheme to show we have a net gain.' There should be a strong statement that no changes can be made. How can you say we will protect nature then rip through areas to build more housing or put in wind farms based on some ideological political reasoning? You either conserve what's there or you don't. We are either a biosphere or we are not. It must be a statement of positive stopping rather than a 'consideration' that you may or may not look at.	<b>Cabinet Office has a legal duty under the Climate Change Act to have due consideration for Biodiversity Net Gain within the development plan and acknowledge that the existing policy within the Strategic Plan is for no net loss.</b>  <b>Notwithstanding the issues of the evidence base behind the Agricultural Land Use Capability mapping, Agricultural Soils are already considered at the planning application stage under the Strategic Plan 2016 Environment Policy 14 and do not need to be repeated in a development brief. This was noted in COD21 at the Public Inquiry.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			9		RMC 8 This proposal which essentially cannot be assessed by Planning Officers as they do not have the technical knowledge and are not part of the Biodiversity Delivery Group is a dangerous one. It would be very hard to assess and monitor. By way of contrast sites allocated for development are to have their agricultural land capability assessed as part of applications for development ie after they have been allocated whereas Strategic Plan Environment Policy 14 states which categories of such land are not to be developed unless there is overriding national need. There is no stipulation that biodiversity net gain, let alone that assessed by a non Government Department should override such policy thus potentially generating an artificial lack of developable land with the resultant loss of good quality agricultural land 19. The Report is focussed mainly upon the reasons why the RMCs are necessary. Within the Report text the RMCs are referenced in the form RMC* and are set out in full in single schedule at Appendix A. Chapter 9 non e of changes proposed by Inspector The current version of the changes in the Written statement and map is not accompanied by any reasons for the changes. (It is noted that one of the changes for RR009 is that "the applicant / respondent requested it"	Cabinet Office has a legal duty under the Climate Change Act to have due consideration for Biodiversity Net Gain within the development plan and acknowledge that the existing policy within the Strategic Plan is for no net loss.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish	Manx National Farmers Union (MNFU)	9		Reference to the inclusion of opportunity for agriculture to benefit from BNG opportunities to mitigate the loss of agricultural land to development, and support the sustainable viability of food production on the Island. Minimal reference has been made to agriculture and inclusion would support commitment to its retention as an essential industry. Proposals have been put forward through the consultation on the Strategic Plan to this effect and we expect them to be included and acknowledged in the area plan. Increased designation of planning constraints such as AEI sites needs more investigation as the inclusion of some of these sites as having protected species is questionable - no ground survey has been done to evidence the need for protection. Acknowledgement that agricultural livelihoods are dependent on the countryside and should not be hindered and needs inclusion. The agricultural industry was not considered when the inclusion of BNG as policy or other was discussed yet will be directly affected and could potentially benefit.	<b>Area of Ecological Interest are a non statutory protection that alerts development management officers in DEFA, the applicant &amp; DEFA ecology to possible constraints early in the application process so the appropriate surveys and mitigating measures can be properly considered.</b>  <b>Notwithstanding the issues of the evidence base behind the Agricultural Land Use Capability mapping, Agricultural Soils are already considered at the planning application stage under the Strategic Plan 2016 Environment Policy 14 and do not need to be repeated in a development brief. This was noted in COD21 at the Public Inquiry.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK46-Y			10		I would highly agree to urban regeneration using existing unused brown field sites for redevelopment. classic in point is the old Barfords factory site on the coast road side of Ballawattleworth and the redundant Creg Manin site.	Cabinet Office notes your comment.		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		10		The utilisation of previously developed land and property as part of positively facilitating Urban Regeneration is vital if the island is to address so many of the problems and deficiencies currently evident. Including - Housing provision; Local Economy / High Streets;	Cabinet Office notes your comments. The Area Plan for the North and West has a focus on town centres and regeneration in accordance with the aims of Our Island Plan relating to town centre vibrancy. As noted at paragraph 9.5.1, the Area Plan supports work underway in other Government Departments and Bodies, such as Business Isle of Man in the development of the Local Economy Strategy.  In addition to this, proposals for a CTA in Ramsey provide Government with the opportunity to develop a co-ordinated regeneration approach.		
ANON-UVCN-NKC8-G			10		1A is prime that locals in any of the urban areas have easy access to the panoramic scenery without having to get in their vehicles and travel even a few miles to appreciate it. People are naturally lazy and drive to all the facilities even in their immediate locale, major problem lies around schools with all the vehicular traffic now. You are asking for zero carbon and then look at all the rest of the world who are not even trying to comply and you want to impose it here, what difference will it make overall - or is it yet another nice tag the IOM can use as well as being UNESCO Biosphere tag. The aim should be to ensure local properties are used to the full. Unsure how many properties for the DOLGE and commissioners are empty or under populated. Personally I know of single (whether widowed divorced or otherwise) in multi bedroom state houses. Another problem not addressed - when are local authorities going to apply means testing to these people.	The Area Plan for the North and West is fully supportive of active travel and recognises the importance of this approach in making progress towards the Island's net zero goals. In the absence of a more up to date Active Travel Strategy, the Area Plan attempts where possible to facilitate the expansion of the existing active travel network as well as the establishment of new routes.  Please see Transport and Utilities Proposals 2 and 3 of the Written Statement.		
ANON-UVCN-NKC8-G			20		It is understood that we are to remove the use of fossil fuels from new builds but delay it for a few more years to understand the structure of increasing cost for electricity generation	As of January 2025, the installation of fossil fuel heating systems (such as boilers) in new buildings was banned.		
ANON-UVCN-NK46-Y			21		Better drainage and sewage treatment are extremely important to any development, but should be addressed first.	Cabinet Office notes your comment.		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		21		For this to be more than merely paying lip-service to the potentially wide ranging benefits there has to be clear evidence that SuDS are being acknowledged and given appropriate consideration in practice - as mentioned in prior responses the deletion of LR040 and non-allocation of LR020 indicate that this is not the case in those submissions.	The Area Plan for the North and West fully supports the integration of greener drainage initiatives into development schemes as part of the wider approach to manage flood risk. Cabinet office does not support the proposal of LR020 or LR040 as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish		21		considerations for the introduction of floodwater on to agricultural land need further discussion.	Cabinet Office notes your comment		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		22		This should not only be given greater emphasis but there should be demonstrable evidence of the efficacy of SuDS as an alternative drainage solution. LR020 and LR040 decisions give the impression that this was not the case when those sites were assessed.	Cabinet Office notes your support for the sites in question but does not propose them as part of the Area Plan.  The Area Plan for the North and West fully supports the integration of greener drainage initiatives into development schemes as part of the wider approach to manage flood risk.		
ANON-UVCN-NK46-Y			23		Full support for de-carbonisation and environmentally friendly energy supply. However I believe that Hydrogen fuel cell vehicles should be further considered as opposed to battery powered vehicles given the general environmental impact world wide of the devastation caused by Lithium mining.	Cabinet Office notes this comment but consider that it falls beyond the remit if the Area Plan for the North and West.		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			23		The cost to the taxpayer far outweighs the plans. The costs to flora and fauna far outweighs the plans. Solar should be the go to, with all new building utilising this as well as existing buildings where possible and ALL government buildings. Transport should be better with smaller greener buses and more frequent travel links. Home grown energy production should be biomass from agriculture.	Cabinet Office notes this comment but consider that it falls beyond the remit if the Area Plan for the North and West.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish		23		Support paragraph proposal 10.12.5. This aligns with MNFU Policy on renewable energy opportunities and risks for agriculture.	Cabinet Office notes your comment.		
ANON-UVCN-NK46-Y			24		Re-development of such sites would be beneficial, especially if they were to be considered for wild meadow areas.	Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see Minerals Proposal 4.		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		24		This is an important addition I suggest it should also require that in addition to a remediation plan provision should be made for sufficient funding to implement the plan which is held in escrow or some such arrangement.	Cabinet Office notes your comment but is content with the wording of Minerals Proposal 4.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish		24		Recognition of impact of the relatively much larger buffer (consultation) zones for mineral sites (in comparison to UK) will have on nearby farmland and business has not been assessed or consulted on to our knowledge. Recognition of constraint implications of either IOM significantly larger mineral buffer (Consultation) zones (in comparison to UK) or future habitat buffer zone ambitions that impact the productivity and value of farmland. Inspectors report references this but does not explain how or why it is justified.	Cabinet Office notes your concerns on the consultation zones applied to minerals sites in the North and West. Mineral consultation zones were developed in collaboration with DEFA's technical consultants and have formed part of the Area Plan throughout various rounds of public consultation since the Draft Plan (2022).		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NKMB-4	Kirree Jenkins		24		<p>The Minerals and Secondary Aggregates Technical Group Report (MSTAG), published in 2012, first mentioned buffer zones for quarries and mineral resources but despite its importance, the MSTAG report was not included as a core document for the APNW process.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significance: The MSTAG report identifies constraints thought essential for strategic planning. Its omission undermines the validity of the Inspector's recommendations and raises concerns about whether they were based on complete and accurate evidence.</li> <li>Inspector's Awareness: It is clear that the Planning Inspector did not have access to the MSTAG report. If the Inspector was unaware of this foundational document, the inquiry process cannot be considered sound</li> </ul>	<p><b>Cabinet Office note your comment. The core documents list is produced as a helpful aid to assist in the inquiry process being the documents which are more likely to be referred to during inquiry sessions.</b></p> <p><b>The MSTAG report was not on the core documents list during the inquiry but this does not mean that the document is immaterial to the plan process as whole. Cabinet Office notes that no requests were made in submissions to the inquiry for the MSTAG report to be added to the core documents list.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKMB-4	Kirree Jenkins		24		<p>The Cabinet Office appears to have arbitrarily adopted buffer zone policies from Staffordshire County Council, resulting in distances that are double the average typically applied in comparable jurisdictions.</p> <p>Lack of Justification: No evidence has been provided to explain why Staffordshire's policies were deemed relevant to the Isle of Man, particularly given the island's unique geography and planning context</p> <p>Inspector's Comments: The Inspector highlighted in his report that the resulting buffer zone distances are significantly above average, further questioning the appropriateness of this approach.</p> <p>Impact on Stakeholders: This decision has led to disproportionately large buffer zones, adversely affecting landowners and communities without clear evidence to justify these distances.</p>	<p><b>The 500m buffer zones around hard rock quarries were developed by Cabinet Office in co-operation with DEFA and their technical advisors and were not arbitrarily adopted from Staffordshire County Council.</b></p> <p><b>In his report, the inspector acknowledges that the threshold distances are greater than those generally applied in the UK but that in the particular circumstances of the Isle of Man, this was justified (inspector's report paragraph 180).</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKMB-4	Kirree Jenkins		24		<p>The handling of buffer zones for other critical national infrastructure raises additional concerns:</p> <p>Inconsistent Application: There is no unified framework for determining buffer zones for infrastructure such as airports, renewable energy and utility facilities. For instance, the airport runway extension at Jurby highlighted similar gaps in planning policy and stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>Transparency Issues: The lack of a Planning Policy Statement (PPS) or comparable document means stakeholders have little clarity on how buffer zones are determined or applied.</p>	<p><b>The issue of safeguarding Jurby Airfield for potential use as a future national airport was addressed at length during inquiry sessions and in the period immediately after the inquiry came to a close.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office propose to accept the inspector's recommendation to remove Transport and Utilities Proposal 5 and reword paragraph 10.7.1 to reflect that any future airport masterplan will be fully consulted on through the Department of Infrastructure (Airports Division).</b></p> <p><b>It is the position of Cabinet Office that the extent of buffer zones around minerals sites is best dealt with by the Area Plan process as opposed to the production of a Planning Policy Statement.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKMB-4	Kirree Jenkins		24		In conclusion the procedural and evidentiary issues outlined in this submission mirror concerns raised during the airport runway extension buffer zone at Jurby, where a lack of transparency, inadequate consultation, and questionable policy decisions resulted in significant controversy. To avoid similar outcomes, it is imperative that the Cabinet Office addresses these deficiencies during the modifications process. This will ensure that the final Area Plan is robust, evidence-based, and reflective of the Isle of Man's unique planning needs.	<p><b>The issue of safeguarding Jurby Airfield for potential use as a future national airport was addressed at length during inquiry sessions and in the period immediately after the inquiry came to a close.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office propose to accept the inspector's recommendation to remove Transport and Utilities Proposal 5 and reword paragraph 10.7.1 to reflect that any future airport masterplan will be fully consulted on through the Department of Infrastructure (Airports Division).</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVZ-6	Ken Milne	Department of Environment, Food and Agriculture	24		Referencing Paper 3: Schedule of proposed Modifications regarding Modification 24 (the "Addition of Mineral Proposal 4..."). This addition is supported as it is important to ensure the full restoration of all mineral sites	<b>Cabinet Office notes your support for Minerals Proposal 4.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		25		The rewording itself is fine but surely "the recognised issue" must be addressed?	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment and the Area Plan supports the treatment of silt dredged from the Peel Marina. Cabinet Office considers that the frequency by which the Marina is dredged is an issue to be dealt with by the Department of Infrastructure.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKC8-G			25		Again a requirement of continuous desilting rather than the methodology of a mass dredging on a ineffectual periodic basis.	<b>The Area Plan recognises the problem of silt accumulation in Peel and supports the retention of Rockmount as a waste facility for non-toxic silt storage. Cabinet Office considers that the frequency by which the Marina is dredged is an issue to be dealt with by the Department of Infrastructure.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK46-Y			26		Only as long as waste is dealt with in an effective and ecologically manor.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		27		The new Proposal 1 (previous Proposal 2) seems to continue the retention of Rockmount as a waste facility with no end date. That does not seem appropriate it also takes no account of potential hazardous silt deposits which seem likely given the source and their impact	<b>Cabinet Office notes that the use of Rockmount was originally as a temporary facility but do note that the Department of Infrastructure are exploring options with regards to how to best deal with the silt dredged from Peel Marina including using treated silt to restore land around former mine works in the River Neb catchment.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK46-Y			28		Uncertain, as at this time I see no responsible alternative offered other than the lack of recycling and a reduction of plastic and other non-degradable materials	<b>The Area Plan supports the use of Rockmount as a waste facility.</b> <b>Cabinet Office notes this.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		28		The record and planning history of this facility should preclude its continuing use.	<b>Cabinet Office considers that Wright's Pit North forms an important part of the Island's waste strategy and the Area Plan for the North and West supports its retention and notes the extension of planning approval for operational and restoration plans to 31st December 2030. Please see Waste Proposal 2.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		28		I cannot see an alternative but I am concerned given the vulnerability of the site to rising sea levels and storms that hazardous waste will be released into the sea. This hazard has not been addressed	<b>Cabinet Office considers that Wright's Pit North forms an important part of the Island's waste strategy and the Area Plan for the North and West supports its retention and notes the extension of planning approval for operational and restoration plans to 31st December 2030. Please see Waste Proposal 2.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKER-C			28		Bride has done its fair share of all Island rubbish in the past. It shouldn't keep being used. Another site should be chosen.	<b>Cabinet Office considers that Wright's Pit North forms an important part of the Island's waste strategy and the Area Plan for the North and West supports its retention and notes the extension of planning approval for operational and restoration plans to 31st December 2030. Please see Waste Proposal 2.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			29		Why remove the longer term strategy?	<b>Cabinet Office removed the sentences as part of the proposed modifications to the Draft Plan in order to ensure that the Written Statement accurately reflected the rest of the Plan and its proposals.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish		31		Consideration as to the area of Andreas Airfield zoned for Employment Land.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Area Plan for the north and West does recognise existing employment uses on land which was not previously allocated for development around Andreas airfield</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK31-S		Peel Town Commissioners	32		The 1989 Local Plan had a significantly greater provision of land designated for employment either through an Industrial or Mixed Use designations than the Draft Area Plan. The Commissioners welcome the content of the Inspector's report at paragraph 31 on page 31 concerning the role of Peel service centre being ignored in the Employment Land Review 2017 Supplement (ELR17) and the Cabinet Office's rectification of this matter as described in paragraph 192 of his report. The Commissioners welcome the Inspector's support on page 32 paragraphs 199 to 201 that insufficient employment land remains in the Draft 2022 Area Plan to support the requirements of the Strategic Plan for employment to be focused in service centres such as Peel.	<b>Cabinet Office notes the comments of the Commissioners. As discussed during inquiry sessions on this topic and as noted at paragraph 11.10 of the Written Statement Cabinet Office does acknowledge that a large area of 'predominantly industrial' land in the Peel Local Plan remains undeveloped for employment purposes. Cabinet Office notes the Commissioners support for the proposal of land in Peel for employment purposes.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		36	PR001/PR010	An overly simplistic decision requiring more detailed, site and location specific consideration.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		38		Alternative uses would accord better with local needs and broader Island Plan.	<b>Cabinet Office notes these comments but the site is to remain proposed for employment uses.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	38		The context of the site has changed since its previous industrial use was established, and it is now located within an extensive residential area. The original use of the site is redundant and it is now the subject of a valid planning approval in principle for residential use. As such it seems unlikely that the site will be made available for industrial use - its proposal for such at the Plan Inquiry did not afford the owner the opportunity to make representations over the proposed changes to its allocation - and identifying it as a site which can help to meet a need for industrial development would appear to be unrealistic. Its allocation for industrial use in the APNW therefore risks the possibility of the site remaining unused in the longer term.	<b>Cabinet Office accept that since the 1989 Local Plan the character of the area is now more residential in nature. Cabinet Office note the approval in principle for residential development on the site but does not consider that this would necessarily preclude a future application coming forward to develop an employment use on the site.</b>		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK31-S		Peel Town Commissioners	38		The Commissioners noted the reinstatement of the employment use of the Barfords off Ramsey Road and that this land has planning approval in principle (August 2024) for residential use which results in a requirement to designate another location of 1.4 ha for employment use in Peel.	<b>Cabinet Office notes the approval in principle for the site in question but the department does not consider that this results in a requirement to propose land of the same size for employment use to compensate for any 'loss' of employment land resulting from residential development on the site.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		39		Alternative use is more realistically attainable and deliverable.	<b>Cabinet Office are content that the site be proposed for employment uses as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	39		The site is located within an area which is allocated for Predominantly Residential use in the Peel Local Plan, which reflects the fact that the existing agricultural machinery repair business only occupies a relatively small part of the site and was originally established outside of the town's built area. It is now located within an extensive residential area, which includes the adjacent Oak Park which was developed on land associated with the existing business. Access to the existing business is substandard and not suitable for increased use; alternative access may be available through Oak Park to the NE but that would take industrial traffic through a residential development which is not designed for that purpose. As such it seems unlikely that the site will be developed for industrial use - its proposal for such at the Plan Inquiry did not afford the owner the opportunity to make representations over the proposed changes to its allocation - and identifying it as a site which can help to meet a need for industrial development would appear to be unrealistic. Its allocation for industrial use in the APNW therefore risks the possibility of the site remaining unused in the longer term. We would support the allocation of the site for residential development as previously proposed.	<b>Cabinet Office accept that since the 1989 Local Plan the character of the area is now more residential in nature. Cabinet Office considers that detailed considerations relating to access and movement arrangements are best dealt with at the planning application stage and that there is no presumption that any future employment uses on the site would need to be accessed through existing residential development to the North.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office are content that the site be proposed for employment uses as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		40		This sites existing uses have been random and so unstructured. To develop this site consideration, indeed a requirement, should be for existing and new businesses for landscaping to both blend it into a rolling largely agricultural landscape and also to minimise noise levels from rock crushing and heavy machinery	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment but have not included a Development Brief for site AE001.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		43		Consideration of EVMC proposals should not be precluded on the grounds of scale.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Proposals for a Ramsey Marina do not form part of this Plan. Please see Tourism Proposal 3.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		43		I do not believe that any further marinas are viable, indeed whether the Peel marina is viable seems questionable particularly given the silt issue. A marina in Ramsey flies in the face of the Marine reserve, our biosphere status and much else.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Proposals for a Ramsey Marina do not form part of this Plan. Please see Tourism Proposal 3.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			44		This is very easy to be interpreted in any way. There is no specific detail and it should be made clearer i regards to perhaps percentage of building and planning to be given to care home facilities.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 3.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		45		Support with the caveat that Section 13 provisions should be implemented and not manipulated on financial grounds.	<b>Cabinet Office do not have input into how Legal Agreements under Section 13 of the Town and Country Planning Act are negotiated.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKGB-X			45		This proposal should remain. The plan should benefit residents by ensuring infrastructure for the community is in place.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Area Plan for the North and West recognises the importance of community facilities and infrastructure and the contribution these facilities make to the development of sustainable communities. However, the proposal, as worded was not reflective of how community facilities and other infrastructure are provided, and the wording was potentially vague about how any assessment of need would be taken into consideration as part of a detailed planning application for the development of the sites in question. Cabinet Office is content that the proposal does not form part of the adopted Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	45		We are fully in support of the removal of OSCP1 as recommended by the Inquiry Inspector, which accords with our previous representations.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			45		Open space, recreation, is very important, why would you not include these in any development including shops and services. This statement took into account existing and future needs.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Area Plan for the North and West recognises the importance of community facilities and infrastructure and the contribution these facilities make to the development of sustainable communities. However, the proposal, as worded was not reflective of how community facilities and other infrastructure are provided, and the wording was potentially vague about how any assessment of need would be taken into consideration as part of a detailed planning application for the development of the sites in question. Cabinet office is content that the proposal does not form part of the adopted Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKWY-5			47		Even though the Report says it will still be recognized as having the potential to deliver residential care facilities, the Corrin Memorial Home should specifically be retained for the specific purpose as a residential care home for the elderly or those in need of care. It provided this for many years and had a very good reputation. It should not at any time be taken for any proposed residential development/dwelling houses. Can the Isle of Man Government not help as part of the regeneration of the town and assist to put this home back on the map and also provide much needed employment opportunities within the town.	<b>Open Space and Community Proposal 3 recognises that the site may still be suitable to provide a care use in the future given the site's former use and does state that any proposals for purely residential uses (class 3.3 dwelling houses) on the site would need to have regards to work underway in the Department of Health and Social Care relating to future land needs.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office is content that this approach is correct and does not propose a change in this regard.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK86-3			47		The position of the Trustees of the Corrin Estate on the proposed allocation of the Corrin Memorial Home remains the same as in their submission to the North and West Area Plan Inquiry dated 3 June 2024. These submissions highlighted the inconsistency of the Draft Area Plan as compared to other Area Plans and the fact that the proposed allocation of the Corrin Memorial Home would have a negative effect on both the site and the success of the Plan as a whole.  The Trustees were therefore pleased to see that the Inspector who considered representations to the Draft Plan recognised the inconsistency of the approach to the Corrin Memorial Home site, and welcomed, at paragraph 259 of the report, the recommendation that the site allocation be returned to 'Predominantly Residential'.  The Trustees support the decision of the Cabinet Office to change the allocation of the Corrin Memorial Home, but object to the caveats being placed on the future of the site. In particular the Trustees object to Modification M47 which it is submitted effectively maintains the approach being taken in the Submission Draft Local Plan and does not reflect the Inspectors recommendation that  "Amended designation of former Corrin Memorial Care Home to Predominantly Residential as shown on Map attached to COD 18"	<b>Cabinet Office note your comment.</b>  <b>The Department notes the changes made to the site of the former Corrin Home as shown on Map 6 - Peel from Civic, Cultural or other use in both the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022) and the Public Inquiry Papers (2024). During Inquiry sessions, the Department recognised the need for consistency of approach with other similar institutions providing care and considering the Home is no longer open the Department recognised that the site should be part of the wider predominantly residential area.</b>  <b>Considering this, the Department continues to recognise the potential importance of the site should it be able to provide a care use in future and maintains that it is important that the development of a purely residential use on the site should have regard to work streams underway in the Department of Health and Social Care in relation to future land needs.</b>  <b>Accordingly, Cabinet Office does not propose a change to the wording of Open Space and Community Proposal 3.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK86-3			47		The changes proposed by Modification M47 effectively place a blight on the future of the site by requiring any decision on a proposal for residential development to have regard to " the progress and outcomes of any nursing, residential and care home reform project " (my emphasis) As stated in their original submissions the Trustees have had various discussions, over several years, with Government Departments on the site, but none have been progressed. They are concerned that the approach being proposed will further delay anything happening with the site. Such delays can only lead to the deterioration of the site and place an unacceptable burden on the ability of the Trustees to maintain support for its condition. The Trustees are aware that the likelihood of Government funding coming forward for infrastructure projects in at least the next five years is not available due to none being currently set out in the capital programme. The potential for the future of the site to be finally determined is therefore placed in the hands of a project which has no timescale, and, in the meantime the buildings on the site will continue to deteriorate and have an adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area. The Trustees therefore recommend that the need to have regard to a project with no foreseeable outcome is removed and the site be allocated as 'Predominantly Residential' with no caveats.	<b>Cabinet Office note your comments and as noted above the Department is content with the current wording of the Proposal and does not propose a change in this regard.</b>		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	48		Our views in respect of the wording of future BNG provisions are outlined at Modification 9 above and should be applied consistently to Development Briefs.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment and have amended Natural Environment Proposal 11 to read:</b>  <b>Natural Environment Proposal 11: Until such time as Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) becomes a formal requirement within the Isle of Man Strategic Plan, development as part of this plan must ensure there is not net loss of biodiversity.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office has carried forward this change to the relevant development briefs</b>		y
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		49		Whilst the principle of this is supported residential development of this land is not for many practical reasons expressed at last year's Public Inquiry in connection with the extension of Ramsey Town Boundaries, not least the potentially adverse impact of greenfield residential provision on efforts to encourage and enable Housing provision and Urban Regeneration within the Town.	<b>Open Space and Community Proposal 5 is a proposal for the development of formal open space</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHN-B	Bob		49		The proposed footpath is in a designated Ramsey Bay Marine Nature Reserve which goes up to the highest astronomical tide. How can you build a footpath on a reedbed?	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment but consider that the placement of the proposed active travel link is appropriate.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		50		This is supported with the proviso that the stakeholder workshop is facilitated in a robust and timely manner.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3T-V			54		Objection to addition of paragraph 14.2.3: •This paragraph should be deleted, as it is baseless. It only accounts for one factor (changing household size) but not the other (population size).	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comments and 14.2.3. However, Cabinet Office are providing the opportunity for an approved population growth. Cabinet Office accept that this paragraph only notes one of the factors that have arisen from the census data and propose to amend this paragraph to note the vacancy rates. The vacancy factor of 4% used in the Strategic Plan 2016 projections do not account for the actual vacancy rate of 15%. 14.2.3 will therefore read as follows:</b>  <b>14.2.3 Proposed housing allocations in this plan therefore go beyond the housing numbers specified in the Strategic Plan to take into account the changes in average household size and vacancy rates that were at the time acknowledged as susceptible to influence from a wide range of macroeconomic factors and is in the spirit of the plan with the intention of having a regular reviews to plan, monitor and manage.</b>		Y
ANON-UVCN-NK1S-S			54		Peel has had a massive amount of redevelopment since 1989. More than most parts of the island. More and more of our greenfield areas are being built upon and quite frankly enough is enough. Peel does not have the infrastructure to sustain 517 new housing units. The medical centre cannot cope with the number of patients at the moment without adding even more. There is not sufficient parking in Peel now without a possible extra 1000 cars being added into the mix. The school cannot cope with more pupils there is already difficulty in recruiting teachers. The inclusion of fields GMRO23, GMRO08 and GMRO09 appear to have been sneaked into the plan and were never originally included for development. Why is this? Is the financial opportunity of the developers more important to the Isle of Man government than the residents of Peel? Why has this not been discussed with the residents? There appears to be a great lack of transparency on the party of the government. I strongly object to the District Link Road cutting across swathes of green belt and paving the way for even more redevelopment, lining the pockets of the developers while totally ignoring the concerns of those us who live in Peel. Perhaps it is time to look at the vast amounts of empty housing on the island instead of mindlessly building new housing at the whim of fat cat developers.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your concern regarding the provision of community facilities and other infrastructure in Peel, an issue which was discussed at length during the inquiry. Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community.</b>  <b>In most cases, infrastructure provision lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions.</b>  <b>GMR009, 009, 023, GMC002 and GMR003 were supported by Cabinet Office during public inquiry sessions and, following the Inspector's recommendation Cabinet Office Cabinet Office proposes these sites as a modification to the Draft Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK5D-E			54		1. No further housing developments should take place in Peel, until the Sewage works is completed. 2. The Sewage Works effectiveness should be evaluated. 3. There should be no further housing developments in Peel or near its boundaries. e.g. No houses or link road from Douglas Road to Ramsey Road. Over 500 houses are proposed in this area. 4. There is very limited work opportunities in Peel. So most of the workers would be travelling on this already congested Route. And where will they Park when they got to Douglas? 5. There would be Chaos on the narrow back roads to Douglas, when the T.T.races (or other Road closures) e.g. due to accidents or road works. The Air would be polluted and toxic, due to the Traffic fumes of slowed down traffic. 6. The infrastructure of Peel.(schools Doctors and Dental Surgery), are already under stress. 7. Down Town Peel is dying, because of lack of parking.	<b>In connection to this, Cabinet Office also note that work on the RSTW has recently commenced on site. Cabinet Office notes that there is a large area of employment land proposed in the peel Local Plan the majority of which has not been developed for employment uses for a variety of reasons. In noting this, Cabinet Office does make proposals to allow for future employment land development in Peel, please see Employment Proposals and 5 and 6 of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b> <b>Cabinet Office notes your concern regarding the provision of community facilities and other infrastructure in Peel, an issue which was discussed at length during the inquiry. Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community. In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7B-E	Jenny Alford		54		In amendment 14.1, it is stated that in the future housing will not only be determined by the Census i.e. how many people live on the Island but also by "Objectively Assessed housing need". Who is doing this assessment?? Given that the Island's population has remained static for 15 years, how can this be justified. I know you say households are getting smaller - build low rise flats or similar not rows of rabbit hutches	<b>The Objective Assessment of Housing Need has been undertaken by consultants Opinion Research Services and is available online via the Planning Policy website. Cabinet Office notes that the Island's population has not increased in line with the projections of the Strategic Plan but notes that resident population is not the only metric in determining housing need and setting population growth targets.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKC4-C			54		Peel is already under tremendous strain in terms of what the residents can access in the way of dentists, doctors, childcare, class sizes etc. The last thing we need is more pressure being put on the limited access that remains.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your concern regarding the provision of community facilities and other infrastructure in Peel, an issue which was discussed at length during the inquiry. Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community.</b>  <b>In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions. The Area Plan for the North and West sets a development framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth and increased demand as a result of planned development.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKGX-M	Zoe Beatrice Tweedy		54		The influence of the 2021 Census upon the housing development plan still remains unclear, the amendment does not situate the data in any meaningful way.	<b>Cabinet Office maintain that the impact of the 2021 census on the Island's population projections and housing need figures is understood.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			54		Whilst I am neutral, it is clear from this statement that households are getting smaller and the need for larger housing, is no longer and more terrace style housing should be implemented. In addition it is clear the government have got wrong the figures in the past and current so these projections should be able to be reviewed every 3 years and plans for housing stock needs amended accordingly.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment and consider that the data provided by the Objective Assessment of Housing Need (OAHN) and how this informs the Strategic Plan review, will allow for a full and proper analysis of housing typologies.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK31-S		Peel Town Commissioners	54		<p>i. The Commissioners recommend the adoption of the Draft Area Plan should be postponed until a New Strategic Plan 2026 to 2036 is approved.</p> <p>ii. This postponement would permit the limited Cabinet Office resources to be used to fully review the Strategic Plan which has not occurred since 2007. In the meantime, the Peel Local Plan 1989 could continue to be used in conjunction the with 2016 Strategic Plan.</p> <p>iii. Alternatively, if the existing Plans cannot be relied upon a short-term time duration must be applied to the operation of any North &amp; West Area Plan. This duration should be no longer than three years to permit the urgent development of this New Strategic Plan. In addition, the Commissioners recommend further safeguards including the mandatory use of strategic reserves must now be utilised in the absence of a New Draft Strategic Plan (2026-2036) which was scheduled to be brought forward before September 2024.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes the comments of the Commissioners but remain committed to progressing the development of the Area Plan for the North and West prior to the adoption of a reviewed Strategic Plan.</b></p> <p><b>The Area Plan for the North and West will remain in force until it is replaced by any future all-Island Area Plan. Cabinet Office continue to recognise the importance of the Development Plan in providing medium to long-term certainty for communities, developers and local authorities alike when it comes to the future development needs of the Island.</b></p> <p><b>As stated during public inquiry sessions on the matter, Cabinet Office do not consider that there is a need for land to be placed in strategic reserve in the Area Plan for the North and West. This approach was supported by the Inspector in his report.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK31-V			54		<p>In 14.2.1, it should be stated that the population projections produced by Cabinet Office do not contain a baseline scenario that reflects long-term migration patterns, but only include political targets based on a minimum of 650 persons net migration per annum. The projections are therefore not applicable to the APNW, as they were produced for a different purpose. Objections to new text in 14.2.2 and 14.2.3:</p> <p>The Draft Area Plan concluded that housing need for the area had largely been met when considering that the Island's population had not increased since 2011, and this approach should be re-adopted.</p> <p>You do not state a time horizon for the proposed land zoning in the APNW. The included increases – based on long-term migration trends and gradually declining household ratios – allocate enough housing for beyond 2050, which is far longer than a 'transitional period'. Cabinet Office must state clearly the estimated time for which the plan is provisioning land supply. Cabinet Office were quick to apply an up-to-date household ratio from the Census 2021 but have failed to include the stagnant population figure between 2011 and 2021. More recent information from CO indicates the population is the same size in 2024 as 2011 and has not grown. Both lines of evidence must be included in any calculations of housing need. The new plan seeks to justify to "go beyond" the housing need figures of the Strategic Plan because the 2021 census indicated a decline in the household ratio that was faster than predicted in the Strategic Plan.</p>	<p><b>Through this plan Cabinet Office are seeking to provide the opportunities for development to meet those ambitions and goals approved by Tynwald as part of the Our Island Plan/Objective Assessment of Housing Need. These rates are greater than natural population growth.</b></p> <p><b>At the time of the Draft Plan (2022) it was envisaged that housing need could be met in the short term by a smaller number of proposal sites before evidence was re-examined as a part of the Strategic Plan review preliminary publicity which was originally published in 2023. In the period between the Draft Plan and the Inquiry, it became apparent that once adopted, the Area Plan for the North and West would remain in force beyond the Plan period (March 2026) and therefore an uplift was required in housing need - this approach was tested during inquiry sessions and found to pragmatic by the Inspector. Cabinet Office note that the Island's population has not increased in accordance with the projections of the Strategic Plan which used data from the 2011 Census report. The Department maintains that it is appropriate for the Area Plan for the North and West to use the Strategic Plan housing need figures.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3T-V			54		<p>However, Cabinet Office have not revised the 2026 housing need figure of the Strategic Plan to indicate what they believe to be the housing need figure for the plan period. Cabinet Office failed to present an analysis that combined the decline in mean household size with up-to-date population projections based on a realistic migration scenario. This must be included to demonstrate (a) the expected overshoot of the Strategic Plan housing need figures, and (b) the estimated lifetime of this plan based on land supply. If it is assumed that the mean household size continues to decline at 0.01 per annum (as stated in 14.2.1 based on 2016 – 2021), it becomes clear that the APNW as it currently stands allocates housing need figures well beyond that predicted to be required by 2026. A population projection that applies the long-term migration trends as future trends (i.e. the 1976 – 2021 median) predicts a population of 85,153 by 2026 (84,222 – 86,070, 95% prediction interval). The predicted households for 2026 (based on the probabilistic projection with long-term migration patterns) is 39,061 households. The projection is 1,423 less households than the 40,484 planned for in the Strategic Plan. Importantly, this Island-wide 1,423 less household figure is AFTER accounting for ongoing household size declines, completely destroying Cabinet Office's argument that despite population not increasing as fast as expected, the household ratio declines compensate for this in housing need terms.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes these comments. However, the issues with the Strategic Plan projections have been widely explored in the Area Plan for the East and Strategic Plan Review documents, both at the 2023 and 2025 Preliminary Publicity stage. The Area Plan cannot change these policies and policy changes elsewhere which are material considerations that must be taken into account.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3T-V			54		<p>Calculations by me – based on progressively declining household size and a stable migration trend based on the 1976-2021 trend – suggest that the plan as proposed could be allocating more residential land than required beyond 2050, if migration rates keep along their medium-term 40-year trend. Please see workings in the supporting information at the end of this document.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes these comments. However, the issues with the Strategic Plan projections have been widely explored in the Area Plan for the East and Strategic Plan Review documents, both at the 2023 and 2025 Preliminary Publicity stage. The Area Plan cannot change these policies and policy changes elsewhere which are material considerations that must be taken into account.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3T-V			54		<p>Proposed revision to new paragraph 14.2.2:</p> <p>Paragraph 14.2.2 should be revised to state that – once 2021 census population size and declines in household ratio are accounted for – the Strategic Plan housing need figures –:</p> <p>(a) Are sufficient to meet housing need of the Island's population to 2026 (based on RLAS release 17).</p> <p>(b) Provide additional headroom of 1,423 dwellings Island-wide, or 423 dwellings for the North and West only.</p> <p>(c) Naively taking the need figures for 2011 – 2026, 423 dwellings represents around 27% of the total 2011 – 2026 allocation, so allocation of this amount would provide a transitional period of around four years, enough for the new Strategic Plan to be developed.</p> <p>(d) No additional greenfield development beyond Strategic Plan targets is therefore required to provide a transitional period.</p> <p>CO can and should replicate my workings 'officially' and tweak as needed above.</p> <p>Paragraph 14.2.2 admits that proposed APNW is no longer in conformity with the Strategic Plan, alluding that transitional arrangements are practical even if not in compliance with the Strategic Plan. The length of the transition period needs to be explicitly stated.</p>	<p><b>The plan development process takes several years. Only allowing opportunities for a short transitional period would create the situation whereby the Area Plan would have an insufficient supply of development land to meet the immediate needs of the Strategic Plan potentially allowing sporadic and piecemeal development in the countryside to address those shortcomings. The Area Plan must therefore go beyond the plan period to ensure infrastructure and facilities can be properly planned for.</b></p> <p><b>The plan is in general conformity with the Strategic Plan as evidenced by the Attorney Generals advice on the matter Cabinet Office submitted to the Inquiry as Core Document 96.</b></p>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK3T-V			54		<p>14.3 Strategic Plan Implementation</p> <p>I object to the addition of 14.3.6:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The pro-rata method is completely non-sensical and must be removed. You do not state the period over which pro-rata is occurring. I believe from the public inquiry it was stated as four years.</li> <li>•There is no calculation presented for the pro-rata method.</li> <li>•Please see my earlier comments on the transition period; there is enough allocation in the plan without going over Strategic Plan housing need figures to contain a four-year transition period. Enough headroom exists in the Strategic Plan's 1,540 allocation (after accounting for mean household size and population size of the 2021 census) to provide enough land supply for a four-year transition period.</li> <li>•The pro-rata method is therefore not just non-sensical but also completely unneeded.</li> <li>•Pro-rata makes no sense, as now there is less than one year until the end of the plan period. No planning permissions for greenfield housing development will be granted this quickly (e.g. after EIAs etc.), so the true "pro-rata" of "development opportunities" for the plan period is zero.</li> </ul>	<p>The prorata period is for the length of a valid planning approval from the anticipated date of the Area Plan approval at the time of publication using figures from the Residential Land Availability Study. Applications for sites within the plan have come forward during this period. The housing need therefore has a specific date at which the calculation runs from and continued adjustment up until the adoption date would not be logical and agreed by the Inspector. This is set out in Table 1 of the land supply paper.</p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3T-V			54		<p>1.1.A cynical view is that the residential allocations proposed allocate far more land than required on a per-dwelling basis to enable Government's 100,000 population target to be progressed through the back door when they are yet to be included in the Strategic Plan. The 965 proposed residential yield represents 16 years of allocation for the North and West. If we assume that the 2026 mean household size was 2.18 as specified in APNW, then the proposed allocation of land can theoretically enable a population increase of 3,906 people. Clearly, this allocation provides for beyond 2026 as the provision is drastically higher than the Island's net migration rate. The 965 units figure represents 16 years of allocation for the North and West.</p> <p>1.2.To emphasise, the residential allocation proposed would accommodate the Island's population on a baseline migration scenario until 2040 (using the APNW yield assumptions), not 2026.</p>	<p>Land use allocation in the North and West plan go some way to addressing future needs outlined in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need which run from 2021 up until 2041. Allocations do not provide the full 20 year supply.</p> <p>Cabinet Office notes your comments on the rate of average household size decline and will review this throughout the next plan period.</p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3T-V			54		<p>1.3.The minimum household size in the EU at present is Finland at 1.9. It is reasonable to consider that the rate of decline may slow as it lowers.1.4. Taking a household size of 1.99 for 2040 (very conservative estimate), the overall IOM population will increase from now by 4,293 based population projections that use the long-term migration trend. For the 30% allocation for North and West, this would be 1,288 people. The proposed housing (APNW assumption) would enable 1,920 people.1.5.For 2045, it would be 4,992 IOM or 1,497 in the North and West. Given household size of 1.94, it enables 1,872 people.1.6. For 2050, it would be 5,500 or 1,650 N and W. Given HH size of 1.89, it enables 1,823. So even with a very high decline in household size, it still would be more than enough housing until after 2050.</p> <p>1.7.In other words, here we could be allocating more land than required beyond 2050, if migration rates keep along their medium-term 40-year trend.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comments on the rate of average household size decline and will review this throughout the next plan period.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK8W-4	Kate Lord-Brennan MHK		55		<p>I support this and it reflects the reality, however the figures do not reflect this. Basically the reduced shock / perceived impact value achieved by referencing the plan period in terms of number of houses etc, is really still preserved in the document, not withstanding this acknowledgement that the plan period, is really irrelevant.</p> <p>The effect of the proposed modification ("Cabinet Office looks to plan modestly beyond the end of the Plan Period in 2026") is not accurate nor can it be born out - I am not sure if this is some grave misunderstanding by the Inspector or a nuance from Cabinet Office planning policy officials.</p> <p>The bottom line is that lands are either allocated or they are not, and if allocated, the only figure that ultimately matters, is the developable housing units, because that is the true potential. Other figures, plan period, and "yield" are irrelevant.</p> <p>It is correct to acknowledge that the plan if adopted would stay in place until it is replaced.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office maintains that the plan period remains a key determinant in providing for the needs of the inhabitants of a plan area within a given time frame. Cabinet Office maintains that the effect or description of the proposed modification is accurate.</p> <p>In accordance with the Strategic Plan, and as tested at public inquiry, the Area Plan for the North and West makes land use proposals to meet need with the Plan period. In developing this pragmatic approach, Cabinet Office has considered need up to March 2026 and acknowledges that the Area Plan for the North and West will remain in force beyond the end of the plan period and until replaced by any future all-Island Area Plan. Cabinet Office maintain that this approach is sensible and appropriate. Cabinet Office have amended Table 17 - summary of residential land provision to show the full yield of the development sites in the North and West.</p>		y
ANON-UVCN-NK5D-E			55		<p>The plan should not continue beyond 2026. Everything needs reassessing.</p> <p>1The first stage of the plans affect on infrastructure.</p> <p>2Traffic congestion.</p> <p>3 The beauty of the area should be protected.</p> <p>4 The standard of health and well-being and happiness of the community should be assessed.</p> <p>5 The people of IOM, don't want to live in an over- built up area, with little leisure facilities.</p> <p>6. People who come to live in the IOM, come, because (at the moment), they like the pace of life, it's not over-built, as yet.</p> <p>7. Work, but unfortunately, most of the Work is in Douglas. Hence the amount of traffic already on the Road.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your point regarding landscape and landscape character and have developed proposals to ensure the landscape character of the North and West is protected and enhanced. Please see the Landscape Proposals of the written statement. Cabinet Office notes your concern regarding the provision of community facilities and other infrastructure in Peel, an issue which was discussed at length during the inquiry. Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community. In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions. The Area Plan for the North and West sets a development framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth and increased demand as a result of planned development.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK5D-E			55		<p>7. Work, but unfortunately, most of the Work is in Douglas. Hence the amount of traffic already on the Road.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office recognises Douglas as the Island's main employment centre. The Area Plan does make proposals for employment land in the North and West pursuant of wider Government's goals in job creation specifically in emerging industries.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK71-W			55		<p>We agree that the plan will remain beyond the plan period as whilst the plan period will formally end on 31st March 2026, this does not mean that the lifetime of the plan or relevance of the policies within the plan will come to an end. The plan will continue in operation until it is replaced and the allocations will provide housing.</p> <p>We agree with the housing figures and the approach to pro-rata the expected yield of proposals sites for the remaining plan period.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes this.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7B-E	Jenny Alford		55		<p>open ended permission given to go ahead with no further consultation</p>	<p>Cabinet Office maintains that in producing the Area Plan for the North and West, the Department has followed the Development Plan Procedure set out in Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act which includes statutory periods of consultation.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			55		<p>it should be clear that a date is set for this decision to be made for any extension by a set date or the plan expires.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes that the Area Plan for the North and West will, in all likelihood, remain in force beyond the end of the Plan Period (March 2026). However, this does not mean that the Plan or its policies will cease to be relevant after this date. Once Approved, the Area Plan for the North and West will remain in force until it is replaced.</p>		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK3H-G		Ramsey Town Commissioners	55		This plan has been in gestation for some considerable time. It is understood that its lifespan, once ratified will be relatively short. It would be of benefit to the Commission to understand what happens after its expiry. It is proposed this plan will be absorbed into any future one, and also, what will the future plan consist of? Whether a regional or national approach will be taken is clearly of interest in respect of development of local strategy.	<b>Cabinet Office notes that the Area Plan for the North and West will, in all likelihood, remain in force beyond the end of the Plan Period (March 2026). However, this does not mean that the Plan or its policies will cease to be relevant after this date. Once Approved, the Area Plan for the North and West will remain in force until it is replaced.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7B-E	Jenny Alford		56		Plan outcome 3a "delay to be minimised", presumably so that proposals can be rushed through before people can comment Plan outcome 4a "Services improved where possible" what happens when it isn't possible? All our services are overstretched before these new areas are built on	<b>The intention of this wording was to outline that issues can be brought to the fore as part of the Area Plan process which otherwise might be contentious as part of planning applications and may result in delays to development proposals.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK8W-4	Kate Lord-Brennan MHK		56		It isn't sustainable and there is nothing in the plan re seeking to deliver mix of housing types.	<b>Cabinet Office note your comment and accept that the Strategic Plan 2016 does not provide policy provision for housing mix policies but that this issue will be considered as part of the ongoing review of the Strategic Plan which will be informed by the findings of the Objective Assessment of Housing Need (OAHN) which will form an evidence base in breaking down future housing need in terms of dwelling typologies.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3T-V			56		My reasons are as set out above (that housing need has already been met and Strategic Plan targets will be sufficient for a transition period to 2030).  I object to the changes to 14.6.1. The Plan must be in line with the Strategic Plan; if CO were confident that it was, this text would not have been deleted.	<b>Cabinet Office maintain that there is a housing need in the North and West over the remained of the Plan period and that the Area Plan is in general conformity with the Strategic Plan.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK31-S		Peel Town Commissioners	57		the Commissioners remain concerned about the figures included in the Post Inquiry Modification 2025 Draft Area Plan in Table 17 - summary of residential land provision on pages 149 and 150. These figures state the following for Peel: GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 & GMC002 (totalling 38.7Ha) will provide 142 dwellings PR002 (Totalling 8Ha) will provide 52 dwellings. This equates to a density of 3.67 dwellings per hectare and 6.5 dwellings per hectare respectively. However, this is inconsistent with the densities which have received planning approval in Peel. For example, PR002 already has planning approval subject to a Section 13 agreement for 92 dwellings with 2.3 ha with field 314539 still to be brought forward for development. If an average density per Ha of 18 dwellings per hectare is applied this will provide the following number of dwellings on these sites: GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 & GMC002 (totalling 38.7Ha) will provide 696 dwellings PR002 (Totalling 8Ha) will provide 144 dwellings. 12 These figures are more realistic and clearly evidence the Draft Area Plan is preparing for the continuation of the house building rate seen in Peel over the last twenty years and is equivalent to that proposed in the existing Strategic Plan 2016 to 2026 for the whole of the West of the Island. The Commissioners believe this pre-empt the consultation and lawful development of the New Strategic Plan 2026 to 2036 and should not be allowed to occur. The Commissioners note equivalent areas of land are zoned for residential development in all the Towns and Villages within the Post Inquiry 2025 Draft North and West Area Plan	<b>Cabinet Office notes the comments of the Commissioners. It is important to note that Table 17 - summary of residential land provision as shown in the post-inquiry written statement (published January 2025) shows the likely yield of development sites in the Area Plan within the Plan period (i.e. to March 2026). This figure represents a housing yield pro-rata and is not indicative of the likely yield of the development sites in their entirety. In order to make clear the distinction between likely yield within the Plan period and the likely yield of a planning application, Cabinet Office has amended the Table in the adopted written statement to reflect both figures. On development density, Cabinet Office refer to evidence published in advance of public inquiry sessions (namely PIP 7 - updated land supply report and COD 8 - Proposed changes explanatory note) which set out that in determining the likely yield of development sites, the net developable area of a site is used and not the gross site size. On this basis, it would not be accurate to use the likely yield within the plan period and the gross site size in determining the development density of proposal sites in the Area Plan for the North and West. With specific reference to proposal sites GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002 published Cabinet Office evidence indicates that the likely yield of these sites would be 325 dwellings.</b>		y
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		57		The amendments include housing provision from sites that I do not support and delete sites that in my opinion are suitable for residential purposes.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this but do not propose changes to the sites proposed as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			57		There is not an outstanding need of over 1000 units. There were only an increase of 4-500 new residents since 2011. You want to build over 1000 units but not add, schools, infrastructure, or transport links which are affordable??	<b>In meeting the Strategic Plan housing targets Cabinet Office maintain that there is a housing need and that natural population growth is one of a number of factors which inform housing need.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK8W-4	Kate Lord-Brennan MHK		58		Absolutely object to this having reviewed 14.7.1 Specifically the following new additions which are entirely new policy concepts. Stating the below is also a falsehood. "It is judged that these are sustainable sites which are deliverable within the plan period. In the case of the sites on the edge of Peel and Ramsey, proposals would benefit from the significant employment and leisure opportunities afforded by these larger settlements." Peel does not have significant employment opportunities, that is part of the point! It also states: 14.7.2 Together, these sites have the potential to deliver 422 dwellings within the Plan Period. In terms of affordable housing, it is estimated that these sites could deliver 105 affordable homes under Housing Policy 5. This is incorrect since, by the other modification, all references to the Plan Period should be removed. In terms of initial changes to 14.7.1 I would like to know, who made representation to this effect, when and what basis. I cannot believe it has been persuasive.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Department maintains that the larger settlements in the Plan Area, the service centres of Peel and Ramsey do have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements and further reiterates that it is therefore appropriate for these settlements to accommodate a greater quantum of housing in accordance with strategic planning policy. Regarding the deliverability of proposal sites within the Plan period, Cabinet Office acknowledges that it is unlikely that many of the proposal sites in the Plan will be delivered within the Plan period and has therefore amended the wording of paragraph 14.7.1 to remove such references.  Cabinet Office does not propose an amendment to the wording of paragraph 14.7.2 as the Department is content with the current wording of the paragraph.</b>		y
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		58		Whilst the logic of the proposal is obvious I do not support the substance / detail of the Tables.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		58		I am not convinced that the "proposals would benefit from the significant employment and leisure opportunities afforded by these larger settlements." In my opinion the current housing developments and some of those in planning are purely building houses without the supporting infrastructure, leisure facilities and appropriate green spaces /biodiversity net gain therefore I am doubtful about this statement	<b>Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			58		In order to provide affordable housing the type of housing should be only agreed where it is 2-3 bed terrace or small housing.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this. Please see Housing policy 5 of the Strategic Plan 2016.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3T-V			58		I object to changes in 14.7.1, as they are unnecessary as housing need has already been met and the SP housing need contains enough headroom for a transition period.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment but contend that there is an outstanding housing need in the North and West over the Plan period</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3T-V			59		I object to the change in 1.4.7.2. No dwellings will be "delivered" from these sites in the plan period (less than 12 months from now). The figures must be replaced to represent the full figure for the plan period plus the transition period over which allocation is occurring. I propose the following text as replacement: "Together, these sites have the potential to deliver 1,950 net developable units with an expected yield of 965 dwellings within the plan period and transition period (until 2030)".	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment. The written statement at paragraph 14.7.2 states that the proposal sites in the Area Plan have the 'potential' to deliver 457 dwellings within the Plan period.  In light of your comment, Cabinet Office have amended Table 17 - summary of residential land provision of the written statement to reflect the total supply headroom of proposal sites in the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		y
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	60		The wording of point v should be re-visited to check that it reads clearly	<b>Cabinet Office notes this and have amended 14.8.2 v to read as follows:  Development sites identified in the Service Villages of Andreas, St Johns, Foxdale and Kirk Michael and the Villages of Ballaugh, Sulby and Glen Mona are in scale with the character of these Villages which already have good provision of services, infrastructure and community facilities</b>		y
BHLF-UVCN-NK3T-V			60		I object to change in 14.8.1. Again, the figure of 1560 "being delivered" between 2011 and 2026 is baseless. If pro-rata'ing to account for March 2025 to March 2026, the latest RLAS release should be used, with an estimate of mean annual rate of building of recent years added to represent the final year. A more sensible approach would be to simply discuss the numbers in terms of the 'plan + transition' period of 2011 to 2030, so no pro-rata calculations were required.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this and have amended the figure at 14.8.1 to reflect the figures in Table 17 - summary of residential land provision. Although it is important that in the preparation of development plans, the most recent available evidence is used, there has to be an 'end' point at which it is sensible to stop counting and use this as a starting point from which to examine the outstanding need to be met by proposing land for development in the Plan.</b>		y
ANON-UVCN-NK2X-Y			60		This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion." The infrastructure is not good enough, including school, drs, QE2.  I object hugely to this proposal	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.  Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			60		it states the villages and areas including Sulby, Jurby, Ballaugh Kirk Michael etc have good infrastructure and transport linked. This is just not true. The medical services are overstretched, the schools are overstretched, the bus rout does not serve the north of the island well at all and the jobs are not created in this area when they could well be by utilising better links either from Ramsey harbour for sea services to Jurby Airfield and other industrial units.	<b>Cabinet Office considers that compared to other settlements in the Plan Area such as Bride, Dalby and Glen Maye settlements such as Sulby, Ballaugh and Glen Mona do have a greater level of service provision such as, education and community facilities. Cabinet Office notes that proposal sites in these settlements which already have a good degree of service provision may help support the future viability of these community facilities.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK5W-1			61		Strongly object to the number of proposed building of houses in Peel. ENOUGH is ENOUGH . I realize we need more houses for first time buyers but not this many . Why all in Peel ?we are becoming a satellite city for the island!, Most people living in these houses will be off to work in Douglas returning in the evening. Not shopping in Peel of course, and as for other facilities, that is another BIG concern. As a resident of BALLAWATTLEWORTH estate which was built on farmland, I would insist on drainage investigations. It s a flood plain in wet weather!! Very poor clay soil	<b>Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability. The Area Plan supports the development of vibrant town centres, please see the Town Centre Proposals of the Written Statement. Cabinet Office notes your comments and those of others regarding drainage arrangements for the sites in question. Please see point 8 of the Development Briefs for the sites in question.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		61		The phrase "No sites in areas at risk of flooding" which has been deleted should be reinstated. I do not feel sufficient weight has been given throughout about flood risks and also the impact of developments on the water table	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office fully recognise the risk associated with flooding.  Plan Objective 6 as worded reflects a consistent approach to the allocation of land which may be impacted by flooding and ensures that the best evidence is taken into account for future development proposals.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	61		This is consistent with other flood risk provisions in the Plan	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK14-T			61		Regarding flooding, this area has poor drainage and sometimes experiences flooding.	<b>In site selection, Cabinet Office considered the latest available flood maps from the Department of Infrastructure</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK1B-8			61		My objection to additional housing in Peel is based on the old argument of saturated infrastructure i.e. doctors, dentists, sewerage and overcrowded schools. The proposed road is not needed; what is needed urgently is mending the existing roads and making good all the potholes that are in abundance.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your concern regarding the provision of community facilities and other infrastructure in Peel, an issue which was discussed at length during the inquiry. Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community.  Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel. It is considered that existing issues with highways maintenance sits outside of the remit of the Area Plan.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK1D-A			61		Peel was a small fishing town. When the last developments were built we were promised great things. The reverse has happened. New Peel has turned into a dormitory. Lower Peel has turned into ghost town.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comments. The Area Plan for the North and West aims to support the viability and vitality of existing settlements. Please see Town Centre Proposals 4-8.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish	Manx National Farmers Union (MNFU)	61		Omission of reference to value of agricultural land for food production. Please refer to general considerations in additional written submission	<b>Cabinet Office are content with the wording of Chapter 10 Plan objective 6.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKV2-W			61		I do not agree to any expansion. Mr Crookall said when Sunset Lakes area was developed that there would be no building in the area beyond Ballawattleworth estate	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment. Whilst the Department cannot comment on discussions between MHK's and their constituents and statements which may or may not have been accurate at the time - Cabinet Office does note that the Peel Local Plan (1989) itself does not propose any land for development west of Ballagyr Lane.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK5W-1			62		I'm convinced I have a stream underneath my property. I have to wear wellies to go in rear garden. Up to a foot deep in one corner!,,, NO building should be done without thorough investigation.  Absolutely NO more building until sewage system is finished, not put on back burner again. We are a laughing stock, like a 3rd world country.  So they want to build more properties. What about the fact our infrastructure critical. Doctors,dentists, teachers already teaching in mobiles and numbers increasing. Can't believe this proposed huge development is even being considered. We'll be building up Peel Hill next. It's got to stop	<b>The Area Plan for the North and West fully supports the development of a Regional Sewage Treatment Works for Peel and has included development brief criteria which aims to limit development until the RSTW is at initial operational capacity.  In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions. The Area Plan for the North and West sets a development framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth and increased demand as a result of planned development.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHJ-7			62		This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion. Building on the outskirts of Peel brings more people into the roads driving to Douglas as there is very little employment within Peel so this does not align with the concept of sustainable urban development. Peel has had more than its fair share of development since the last regionally development plan and we suggest that the residential areas would be better placed in small towns which are already struggling to support their drs and schools rather than in Peel where the opposite is true and residents struggle to make a drs appointment. We neither want or need a district road and this is totally unnecessary considering the roads in and out of Peel we already had. GMR023 also contains a section of protected woodland which should be preserved along with Peel's greenery. For what was once a small fishing village it is starting to lose its identity.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel. In accordance with Strategic Policy, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements, or where appropriate, in sustainable urban extensions to these settlements. Accordingly, sustainable urban extensions are not a new concept. Cabinet Office acknowledges that much of the area around Mill Road in peel allocated for employment uses in the 1989 Local Plan has not been developed for employment purposes for a variety of reasons. The Adopted Area Plan contains employment proposals 5 and 6 which propose employment land within the Peel settlement boundary. In accordance with the Strategic Plan, the Area Plan seeks to direct development primarily towards the larger settlements of Ramsey and Peel (service centres) as well as to lower order settlements with good provision of community facilities such as Glen Mona, Sulby and Ballaugh.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKWY-5			62		NO NEW DEVELOPMENTS anywhere in Peel should even be considered until the new proposed sewage plant for the West is fully operational. This , as everyone knows is a long outstanding problem for Peel. The Inspector in his report says "it has allegedly given rise to the serious problem of odour and foul discharge into the sea at Peel continues", it is not allegedly, this is and has been, a real and serious concern, including environmental, for many years.  I object, the sewage problem must be sorted	<b>The Area Plan for the North and West fully supports the development of a Regional Sewage Treatment Works for Peel and as far back as the Draft Plan in 2022 identified Manx Utilities' preferred site for the delivery of the RSTW. In addition to this, the Department notes that work has recently commenced on the site of the works.  In seeking to ensure that issues around wastewater treatment were not exacerbated by additional connections to the network, and so as not to preclude development coming forward within the Plan period, Cabinet Office has included development brief criteria which aims to limit development until the RSTW is at initial operational capacity. It is considered that this is a proportionate and balance approach.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKWY-5			62		No to proposed urban extension along with a new link road which would cut off and divide our town. Peel does not need this huge change to our boundary. The inclusion of fields GMR023; 08 and 09 were never originally included for development in the proposals from the Cabinet Office, A new link road will divide and destabilise the town further. We don't have the infrastructure.Sewage - how much longer will this go on and on and on! The town cannot possible sustain another 500 or more homes.The schools are already at capacity. The Doctors surgery is already at capacity with the number of patients they already have. The Dentists are already at capacity. A lot of our residents have to go to Dental practices around the Island. I believe the wait list for a dentist is 600! As for our children having to wait for months, in some cases years for an appointment is shameful.We have already seen a lot of development in Peel over the years and most of are greenfields within the current boundary have been taken up with large estates. This is enough. Please don't allow Peel to be a huge housing estate to service the rest of the Island. We will always require homes for the next generation of families especially those who cannot afford to own their homes. With the correct infrastructure in place, ongoing regeneration, refurbishment of existing houses and moderate carefully planned builds, this will hopefully keep Peel, Peel!	<b>Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community. In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions. The Area Plan for the North and West sets a framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth as a result of planned development. Cabinet Office recognises the critical importance of development being served by the right infrastructure. See Development Brief criteria relating to sewage and wastewater treatment. In seeking to ensure that issues around wastewater treatment were not exacerbated by additional connections to the network, and so as not to preclude development coming forward within the Plan period, Cabinet Office has included development brief criteria which aims to limit development until the RSTW is at initial operational capacity.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			62		The word residential should be removed as this opens it up for abuse by industrial or government building plans.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment but do not propose a change to Residential Proposal 2 in this regard.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK14-T			62		These areas should be retained for agriculture or as green field sites. Expanding Peel's boundaries to enable more development is unsustainable. Existing housing should be restored/refurbished to prevent dereliction of the town centre.	<b>Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability.</b>  <b>The Area Plan for the North and West supports the development of vibrant town centres and includes Town Centre Proposals 4-8 which relate specifically to Peel.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK1B-8			62		A definite NO to the district link road. There are pockets of land in Peel that have been re-zoned for building i.e former Barford engineering site. This is a large area that has change of use from industrial to private residence. This alone will put added pressure and add more concerns to the schools who are already at full capacity.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</b>  <b>Please see Employment Proposal 5.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK1D-A			62		Raw sewage in greater quantity is being poured into the bay. This entire proposed extension is on prime farm land and I foresee that the Island will need that to feed itself.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment and recognises the critical importance of development being served by the right infrastructure, including sewage and wastewater treatment. Please see Development Brief criteria in relation to sewage and wastewater treatment in Peel. In seeking to ensure that issues around wastewater treatment were not exacerbated by additional connections to the network, and so as not to preclude development coming forward within the Plan period, Cabinet Office has included development brief criteria which aims to limit development until the RSTW is at initial operational capacity. It is considered that this is a proportionate and balance approach.</b>  <b>The Area Plan includes development brief criteria which provides that where appropriate, agricultural soil quality will be assessed as part of development proposals.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3T-V			62		I object to changes to Residential Proposal 2. There is no identified need for 'sustainable urban extensions' of Peel.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment but the Proposal is to be retained. Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKV2-W			62		No need for residential development. We have enough houses, people in Peel.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK15-U			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go d=far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009 and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.  It is a necessity that the facilities of Peel are looked at before there is any thought on expanding the town any further. The residents of Peel are already struggling with schools and doctors. There is no need for a link road, residents in the newer estates will already be using the Poortown road to leave the town and that gives links to Douglas and the North.	<b>The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed at length at the inquiry sessions.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK17-W			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	These prime agricultural fields should not be zoned for residential development in the revised plan. Peel has expanded beyond its capacity already. No doctors' appointments available, no additional dentists, both primary and secondary schools bursting at the seams, existing roads full of pot holes. Few employment opportunities in Peel with most employment cantered in Douglas.  We need good agricultural land not a ring road. Peel does not need a ring road. People do not need to bypass Peel. They either come to Peel for a reason or leave Peel for a reason.  More emphasis should be given to developing brown field sites.  I object to the inclusion of 009 008 and 023 as proposed residential development.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comments. Throughout the plan process Cabinet Office has considered the existing provision of infrastructure and other community facilities as well as where future upgrades and other investment is planned. Cabinet Office accept that in some cases, the provision of infrastructure lies beyond the remit of the Area Plan but that the Plan can facilitate future investment decisions for other Government Departments and Boards in future. This stance is set out in the 'recommendations' of the Written Statement.</b> <b>Cabinet Office note your comment on community facilities in Peel, this topic was discussed at length during inquiry sessions. Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 6 of the written statement.</b> <b>Cabinet Office note your comment and those of others regarding brownfield sites. The Area Plan of the north and West does seek to encourage the development of brownfield sites as set out in Built Environment Proposal 1: Urban Regeneration. The Department does acknowledge however that it would not be wholly possible to provide sufficient housing opportunities so as to meet housing need purely using previously developed land or other land within settlement boundaries.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK1K-H	Mr Roland Martin Preston		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	In principle I have no objection to the development going ahead apart from the timing.  I STRONGLY object to any work starting until the sewage treatment plant in Peel has been upgraded or even redeveloped in order to cope with the anticipated increase in the amount of sewage that would be caused by the additional dwellings and also to PREVENT ALL spillages into Peel Harbour and Peel Bay	<b>The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed at length at the inquiry sessions.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK1T-T	Mr Roland Martin Preston		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	In principle I have not objection to the development going ahead. <b>HOWEVER</b> I do STRONGLY object to any work starting before the sewage treatment in Peel has been upgraded in order to cope with the future increase in demand and also to stop discharges into Peel harbour/bay.	<b>Cabinet Office note your comments with regards to sewage infrastructure. In the Area Plan for the North and West Cabinet Office developed proposals which aim to limit development on sites in Peel until there is certainty regarding the delivery of the planned RSTW.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK2F-D			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection refers to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. Peel has already grown and has had substantial housing developments. The school is full, it is difficult to get a doctors appointment, the roads very busy and there is still no modern sewerage disposal. The town cannot sustain more people. What is also sad (having lived here all my life) is that the community and what makes Peel special - its people- are spread so far. Living on the outskirts will not be the real part of town. It will be a satellite town. A district road will add to this split In this time how can it be justified building on more green field sites? Now, more than ever, bio diversity is in the forefront of our world. Wildlife will disappear. Green areas are lacking in Peel. 14.3.1 'These places should have the right infrastructure and facilities and sit well in the landscape.' In my opinion building on these fields do not.	<b>Cabinet Office note your comments and the of others regarding the provision of infrastructure and other community facilities in Peel - please see Open Space and Community Proposal 6 in the Written Statement. In addition, going back as far as the Draft Plan in 2022, Cabinet Office has supported the delivery of sewage treatment in Peel and the West, please see Transport and Utilities Proposal 5.</b>  <b>The Area Plan for the North and West is fully supportive of the Island's unique status as a whole nation UNESCO Biosphere reserve and this is reflected at paragraphs 4.6 and 7.4 of the Written Statement.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes your comment regarding wildlife and ecology and landscape - please see development brief criteria for the site including the requirement for a full Environmental Impact Assessment and a Masterplan to address, among other issues, substantial structural landscaping buffers.</b>		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NK2G-E			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>The addition of GMR023, GMR008, and GMR009 was not part of the original plan and would not have been subjected to the process and scrutiny of other elements of this plan. By not following robust scrutiny and being submitted at a later date suggests 'planning by the back door'.</p> <p>Peel has undergone rapid development in recent years and infrastructure is already strained.</p> <p>Health Care - already there are longer waiting times for local appointments; a situation that will become worse with the potential increase in population proposed in this plan.</p> <p>Education - local schools have already undergone or have proposed extension work; the secondary school having had to recently employ a mobile classroom. A further influx of new residents will cause even more difficulties with accommodation.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office accept that the sites did not form part of the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022) but the Department has been open in its support for the sites since they were included for consideration as part of the public inquiry papers. In preparing the Area Plan the Department has followed Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act.</b></p> <p><b>Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community. Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 6 in the Written Statement.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK2G-E			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>Sewerage works - no new developments should be permitted until Peel has a modern and efficient means of treating raw sewage; adding GMR023, GMR008, and GMR009 to the plan would exacerbate the already unacceptable current problems.</p> <p>Green Field Development - should be avoided. Other sites around the Island should be examined for building potential before Green Field areas are lost forever.</p> <p>The Link Road - this road achieves no practical purpose. The current pinch point for high traffic volumes is the Ballacraigne crossroads. Queues of traffic from the North and from Peel (via Poortown) will only cause longer queues from the Peel direction at Ballacraigne, if they use the proposed link road.</p> <p>Need - my final objection regards the unnecessary inclusion of this extension to the original plan; in my opinion, it has been driven by pure greed of those involved in the late submission of the GMR023, GMR008, and GMR009 proposals, for financial gain. Self-interest and greed have been placed above the wider social and quality of life needs of the people of Peel.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as extensions to existing service centres, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability. Proposals for a link road as part of the development brief for the sites in question are considered to be integral to ensuring development is served by the right highways infrastructure, securing wider benefit to the highways network around Peel by allowing increased permeability between the Ramsey, Poortown and Douglas Roads without the need to use junctions closer to the historic core of Peel. As noted previously, Cabinet Office consider that there is a housing need in the North and West and has developed proposals to meet this need with an uplift provided in order to meet need over a transition period in the medium term future. In accordance with a sequential approach to the delivery of housing, the Area Plan for the North and West does seek to deliver housing opportunities on land within existing settlements first but does acknowledge that in certain cases, sustainable urban extensions are required. Cabinet Office note that the sites were not part of the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022).</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK2K-J			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>Peel does not have the necessary infrastructure to support even more new housing. Medical, dental and educational facilities are already struggling, not mention the (lack of) sewage treatment.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see Transport and Utilities Proposal 5 and Open Space and Community Proposal 6 of the Written Statement.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK2P-Q			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion and we do not regard these extensions as sustainable. Peel's existing road network requires all through traffic to pass through the historic centre and this has already been grossly overloaded since the town has been extended in recent decades without any relief roads allowing for bypass traffic to avoid the historic core. Furthermore, the built character of the town has and will suffer greatly from these developments, as they make little or no provision for quality public spaces, or community facilities, or anything which treats Peel as anything other than a dormitory to be stuffed with the largest quantity of the lowest possible quality housing. Finally, the pressure that this development puts on the surrounding natural environment of the town is unacceptable and represents a threat to the amenities which the town has managed to hang onto, despite gross suburban overdevelopment of the lowest, cheapest, most soulless quality in recent years. The town can and must do better and we regard these plans as entirely unacceptable and object in the strongest possible terms.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office note that presently, in order for motorists to travel between the Poortown and Douglas Road there is a need to use the Derby Road/Albany Road and the Albany Road/Douglas Road junctions. Cabinet Office proposals for a Link road as part of the development brief for the proposal sites in question would allow for greater connectivity between the Poortown and Douglas Roads - directing traffic away from the historic core of Peel.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment regarding the provision of open space and notes the policy requirement in the Strategic Plan for open space to be provided according to the standards outlined in Appendix 6 of the Strategic Plan.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK2W-X			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023,	<p>I object to any further development in Peel (GMR023, GRM008 ,GMR009) as I feel that the current infrastructure simply cannot cope without any further increase in population. The school is full and waiting times for appointments at the doctor surgery are long. Parking is already extremely difficult.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet office note your comment and those of others. Please see the development brief for the sites in question which requires that a Masterplan address, among other things, the need for and potential local of local community facilities to support a development of this scale</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK41-T			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page 133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.</p> <p>Peel has expanded significantly in terms of residential development in the past 20 years and the associated amenities have not kept pace with the expansion. Peel does not have sufficient doctors, policing or dentists to cater for a further increased population. The primary school, Peel Clothworkers, is at capacity with little room for additional expansion without the loss of external space being detrimental to pupils.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions. The Area Plan for the North and West sets a development framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth and increased demand as a result of planned development.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK44-W			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>Objection to modification 63</p> <p>Building on our lessening green space</p> <p>Western infrastructure cannot currently support the existing housing ... doctors, dentists, school, parking, sewerage, poor roads, dog poo everywhere</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your concern and those of others regarding proposal sites in Peel.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK46-Y			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>My objections are simply to any further development in and around Peel, enough is enough. The infrastructure already can not cope with the existing developed area in and around Peel, it takes between 2 to 3 weeks to get a doctors appointment and I see no plan for improvement. The current facilities for shopping are already insufficient. Worst of all is the lack of sewage treatment. Where I live in Reayrt ny Cronk we are on septic tanks, wholly unacceptable, Septic tanks require the use of certain products that do not prevent bacteria from breaking down the waste, so, no strong bleach or other non biological chemicals. No one in this area has been made aware of these facts. In this case I have to conclude that the planning was accepted by imboseales.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Area Plan for the North and West has supported the delivery of an RSTW since the Draft Plan was published in 2022, please see Transport and Utilities Proposal 5 of the adopted Area Plan for the North and West. The Area Plan for the North and West contains development brief criteria for proposal sites in Peel which aim to limit development on site until an RSTW is at its initial operational capacity. Cabinet Office maintain that this approach is appropriate so as to not to completely preclude development in Peel within the Plan period but to ensure that when development does come forward, that it can be serviced by the necessary infrastructure.</b></p> <p><b>In addition to this, Cabinet Office note the recent news that works have recently commenced on site to deliver an RSTW to serve Peel and the West.</b></p>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NK46-Y			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	How can the natural environment benefit from over development? The plan is not appropriate or future proof and does not appear to be sympathetic to the local ecology.	Cabinet Office maintains that the Area Plan for the North and West seeks to facilitate sustainable development to meet the needs of the population - promoting sustainable growth, social progress, economic prosperity and environmental quality as noted in the Spatial Vision for the North and West.		
ANON-UVCN-NK47-Z			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion. There is not enough infrastructure within Peel and the surrounding area to support the additional population these houses would bring. Please leave Pee as it is and allow it to settle to its already new and expanded size - please no more housing and roads!!	Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel. In accordance with Strategic Policy, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements, or where appropriate, in sustainable urban extensions to these settlements. Accordingly, sustainable urban extensions are not a new concept. Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community. In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions.		
ANON-UVCN-NK48-1	Sylvia Hall		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	1. I question the wisdom of rezoning these fields from agriculture to housing. As an island nation we need to become as self-sufficient as possible when it comes to food production. Climate change brings more frequent and increasingly severe storms to our shores. This means boats cannot sail and foodstuffs cannot be imported leading to empty supermarket shelves. We should be increasing our local food production, not losing valuable agricultural land to more housing estates. 2. The amount of land proposed for new housing could lead to a huge increase in the population of Peel, at a time when there is tremendous pressure on existing infrastructure: sewage disposal; doctor's appointments; dentists' availability; school places etc. Peel has taken its fair share of new residents. I think we have reached capacity. 3. A new link road is completely unnecessary as Oak Road already links the Ramsey Road to the Poortown Road and would just run parallel. Not needed. 4. We live on a beautiful island. Why spoil it with more faceless housing estates? Witness what has happened in Ballasalla. Shocking! In the words of Joni Mitchell, 'They paved Paradise, put up a parking lot'. Lets not make that mistake.	Cabinet Office notes your concern regarding the provision of community facilities and other infrastructure in Peel, an issue which was discussed at length during the inquiry. Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community. In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions. The Area Plan for the North and West sets a development framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth and increased demand as a result of planned development.Cabinet Office notes your comments regarding Oak Road and that Oak Road is shown as an access road according to the Department of Infrastructure's Road Hierarchy. Development Brief criteria for the proposal sites in question in the Area Plan for the North and West make specific provision for a District Link Road.		
ANON-UVCN-NK4A-A			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	They should not build on the additional land in Peel	Cabinet Office notes this comment.		
ANON-UVCN-NK4B-B			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Peel does not need any more housing. The infrastructure in Peel is not able to support 517 houses. You already cannot get a doctor or dentist appointment. The local primary school is not fit to expand to accommodate the extra children. The children are getting bigger, the classrooms are small and cannot comfortably fit extra children. You cannot try to increase the local population without ensuring that the local area can accommodate it - the simple answer to that is- they cannot and it will be an after thought for many years whilst Peel suffers.	The Area Plan for the North and West incorporates the importance of infrastructure and community facilities into the Spatial Vision for the North and West. Cabinet Office have developed proposals which consider existing infrastructure as well as where improvements are planned.		
ANON-UVCN-NK4C-C			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	I object to the modification proposed and the overall zoning of land for development. This cannot be defined as sustainable urban extension on any reasonable terms. Recent development has already surpassed any logical need for additional housing. The extension into further green fields is contrary to environmental protection without any justification. 1) Lack of infrastructure (education, health, sewerage. 2) No justification for demand. 3) Over development. Development should be introduced on a far smaller scale over a longer time scale. There is no realistic increase in population envisaged and this plan should reflect this over a 20 year period.	Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing.  Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community.  Cabinet Office acknowledge that the Area Plan for the North and West will, once adopted, remain operational beyond the Plan period into the medium term		
ANON-UVCN-NK4G-G			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion. The local town infrastructure is not sufficient to support more dwellings. Services such as schools, shops, roads and maintenance, leisure facilities and policing are already inadequate. Also traffic volumes are excessive and under policed.	Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel. In accordance with Strategic Policy, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements, or where appropriate, in sustainable urban extensions to these settlements. Accordingly, sustainable urban extensions are not a new concept. In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions. The Area Plan for the North and West sets a development framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth and increased demand as a result of planned development.		
ANON-UVCN-NK4G-G			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and	The local town infrastructure is not sufficient to support more dwellings. Services such as schools, shops, roads and maintenance, leisure facilities and policing are already inadequate. Also traffic volumes are excessive and under policed.	Cabinet Office notes your comment regarding town centres and has developed proposals which seek to support the development of vibrant town centres in the Plan Area. Please see Town Centre Proposals 4-8 which relate specifically to Peel town centre.		
ANON-UVCN-NK4K-M	Tony Gurevitch		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	I think "Enough is Enough" adequately sums it up. Peel has already grown far too much for it's infrastructure and facilities as well as its character as a beautiful town and fishing port in a wonderful rural environment.	Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability.		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NK4S-V			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	I object to the development of further houses in the fields behind Ballawattleworth estate because this is a beautiful area of countryside that will be destroyed. Many people have chosen to live in this area because it is so close to this peaceful countryside location, and many people enjoy walking and cycling on the roads and railway lines nearby, away from the built up areas. It is already virtually impossible to get a doctor's appointment in Peel and we do not need more residents to make this even harder. Additionally, the primary school is full to bursting and I don't think that it could accommodate more pupils. I do not believe that it is in the best interests of the people who already live in Peel to build more houses in this location.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your concern regarding the provision of community facilities and other infrastructure in Peel, an issue which was discussed at length during the inquiry. Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community.</b>  <b>In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions. The Area Plan for the North and West sets a development framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth and increased demand as a result of planned development.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK4T-W	Sharon Jones		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009 and GMR023 for residential development as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to sustainable urban extensions for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion. There is far to many new houses in Peel, it is almost impossible to get a doctors appointment, the school are overcrowded and the sewage treatment plan is still not up and running making Peel an unsafe place to swim.  We are supposed to be a biosphere island , with the dramatic decline to wildlife due in a large part to habitat loss and climate change this is not an environmentally friendly option.  I used to be able to stand in my garden at night and listen to the sound of the sea, now all I can hear is the constant noise of the traffic on the Poortown Rd.  Peel has played its part, enough is enough!	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability.</b>  <b>The Area Plan for the North and West is fully supportive of the Island's status as a whole nation UNESCO Biosphere reserve - please see paragraphs 4.6 and 7.4 of the Written Statement which cover this topic.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK4U-X			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road.  I do no support this new development - those fields were always supposed to be the boundary of Peel, the school doctors etc are far too oversubscribed as it is so we do not need more housing. It will have a detrimental effect on wildlife and we do no want to lose more green space.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</b> <b>Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community. In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK4Y-2			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	A.1 – Population and infrastructure Peel is being suffocated - and sucked dry. The major, and consistently noted problem, is the absence of infrastructure capacity in Peel to cope with existing population numbers. This is not being resolved, and obviously will become dangerously acute with further increase in residents. This isn't just about sewage treatment — it also relates to primary school, GPs and dentists which are essential elements of a stable and healthy society.  A.2 – Population, business sustainability, traffic disruption, environment While the proposed green field area(s) undoubtedly offer land that is easily used for housing developments, the town is being suffocated and also having its modest commercial existence sucked out of it. A real, longstanding problem is the absence of parking around the commercial and cultural part of the town, which obstructs potential revival, growth and sustainability. Increased numbers of families located further out of Peel town centre will consequently travel to Douglas where they can park near shops and entertainment venues. These are also clear negative effects for the island if there is a large increase of Peel population — traffic disruption, particularly between Peel and Douglas will impact communities along the route and on the outskirts of Douglas ENVIRONMENT: - A higher proportion of Peel residents will need to commute elsewhere, both for employment and for normal shopping. - With the current steady reduction in frequency of public transport services, this will also mean a need for increased use of private	<b>Cabinet Office notes your concern regarding the provision of community facilities and other infrastructure in Peel, an issue which was discussed at length during the inquiry. Cabinet Office has included a development brief requirement for a masterplan for the site. Any masterplan would need to address, among other topics, the need for and potential location of community facilities. In addition to this, please see Open Space and Community Proposal 6 of the Written Statement.</b>  <b>Since the Draft Plan was published in 2022, Cabinet Office has supported the development of a solution to sewage treatment in Peel - please see Transport and Utilities Proposal 5 of the Written Statement.</b>  <b>In accordance with the wider aims of Our Island Plan, the Area Plan for the North and West supports the development of vibrant town centres - recognising the contribution they make to settlement character. Town Centre proposals which relate to specific character areas of the town centres and Ramsey and Peel aim to support regeneration and improvements to the public realm pursuant of building great communities. Please see Town Centre proposals 4-8 which relate specifically to Peel.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK4Y-2			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	ISLAND ECONOMY: - It also increases the likelihood of residents shopping online, not on island.  B. – Planning principles The addition of this expansion to the North West Area Plan before holding public consultation is bad practice. A major change of plan such as this must not be allowed to proceed on these terms.  C. – Road construction The proposed District Link Road 'to support traffic from Kirk Michael into Peel and Douglas' between the A4 and the A1 doesn't make sense. a)PEEL traffic from Kirk Michael. Will most likely want to get to the Prom, Peel Hill, Tesco, or the Centenary Centre and the existing route (as used by the buses) is more direct. The fitness centre and the swimming pool are other likely destinations and the same applies about using the existing route. The proposed District Link Road would make it 1 mile longer via eastern outskirts of Peel. b)DOUGLAS traffic from Kirk Michael. The most direct route is Cronk-y-Voddy, 12miles (12.5m via Brandywell). Via Peel outskirts would be around 16 miles — 33% longer.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. In accordance with the wider aims of Our Island Plan the Area Plan for the North and West supports the development of vibrant town centres. Town centre proposals focus on particular character areas of the town centres of Peel and Ramsey and seek to act as a catalyst for regeneration and improvements to the public realm. Please see Town Centre Proposals 4-8 which relate specifically to Peel town centre.</b> <b>Cabinet Office notes that the sites in question were not part of the Draft Area Plan for the North and West. The Department's support for the sites was clearly shown in the public inquiry papers published in March 2024 and during public inquiry sessions on the topic. In preparing the Area Plan for the North and West, Cabinet Office has followed the Development Plan procedure set out in Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act.</b> <b>Cabinet Office notes your comments on the proposal for a district link road as part of the development brief but consider that the proposal would result in improvements to the wider highways network of Peel, in particular enhancing access arrangements between the Poortown and Douglas Roads without the need to use the Derby Road/ Albany Road junction.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK58-2			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Over the last 2 decades Peel has expended, the infrastructure hasn't.  No further zoning for housing should be authorised until the schools have been expanded. Classes sizes are close to or at maximum capacity. Both my sons are in classes of either 29 pupils or 26 pupils. In addition to this my youngest year group has 2 separate class of around 29 pupils each. My eldest has 3 classes of approximate 26 pupils each.  The doctors surgery cannot cope with the volume of patients. I called the surgery to arrange a non urgent appointment last week and was told there were no appointments available at all and to call back. This happened on another 3 occasions before I got an appointment.  It's difficult to park in the town centre to go to the shops, especially for the older generation who cant walk far. This problem will only be compounded if more houses are developed.  We still don't have an operational sewerage system. History tells us it could be many years before we get one. This fact alone should halt any further zoning for housing.  I'm genuinely baffled why more housing is even being considered for Peel given the current state of the infrastructure.	<b>In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions. The Area Plan for the North and West sets a development framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth and increased demand as a result of planned development. Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 6.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office note your comment and those of others regarding parking. Although this issue sits somewhat beyond the remit of the Area Plan, through the Town Centre Proposals the Area Plan seeks to encourage regeneration and public realm improvements in existing town centre. Please see Town Centre Proposals 4-8 which relate specifically to Peel.</b>		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NK5F-G			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	I sympathise with others' expressed view that 'enough is enough' – Peel has had more than its fair share of new housing development in the last part of the old, and first two decades of the new century. Since the 1989 local plan, Peel has experienced more development on its green fields compared any other area in the north and west of the island. It is therefore essential to protect these areas from further encroachments and preserve Peel's green fields. The new concept of "sustainable urban extension" for Peel has recently been introduced – and should be rejected. Figures are indicating that extending land allocated for housing into these 3 fields alone could create over 500 developable housing units in the long term.	<b>Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability.</b> Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. In conformity with the Strategic Plan, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements first, but the Department does accept that where there is a housing need, the expansion of settlements through well planned sustainable urban extensions is sometimes necessary in order to ensure an adequate mix of housing typologies and to meet housing need. Please see the development brief for sites GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMC002 and GMR003. Although detailed matters such as design and layout are best dealt with at the planning application stage, the Development brief does require a masterplan.		
ANON-UVCN-NK5F-G			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	As with the '89 plan, this new one contains no design brief for the type of houses, nor the density of the dwellings envisaged. Many on the existing new estates are on tiny plots, with little outside space, and I don't want to see just more of the same on the town's diminishing number of green fields. Duplicitous and late additions to original plans meant that the fields in question, GMR023, GMR008, and GMR009, were not part of proposals for zoning for housing in the original draft plan published by the Cabinet Office. They were added later for consideration at the Public Inquiry following similar representations through the formal consultation process from landowners and developers but also the Peel local authority. It was done in a way that I think lacked transparency, and failed to actively involve or reference the residents of Peel or their interests.	<b>Cabinet Office accept that the proposal sites in question did not form part of the 2022 Draft Plan. The department has been open and transparent in its support for the sites since the publication of the public inquiry papers in March 2024 and during Inquiry sessions in July.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK5F-G			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	In my view the inclusion of these fields goes against the interests of the local community, which is already suffering the lack of infrastructure, crowded schools, shortage of doctors and NHS dentists.  Finally, I don't believe Peel needs or wants a 'District Link Road'. Its proposal (initially from Douglas Road to Poortown Road) emerged from a past submission in the "call for sites" stage years ago. This road would pass through the newly proposed housing sites (currently green fields) splitting Peel into artificial factions. The arguments for it is not compelling and will only detract from the integrity of Peel, and ultimately be used to enable more housing.  At the Public Inquiry, the arguments for a district link road as a firm proposal were a) to support traffic from Kirk Michael into Peel and Douglas (which makes no sense!) and b) the idea of a road to enabling more housing.  For reference, the proposal is stated in the core document as "a district link road to connect to the A4 Ramsey Road in the north and the A1 Douglas Road in the South" page 134.	<b>Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel. Cabinet Office's stance in support of the proposal remains as stated during the public inquiry and in the subsequent modifications consultation.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK5W-1			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Our beautiful beach littered with all sorts of human waste . It SHOCKING. I m just waiting for it to appear on national television. Personally I don't walk on beach anymore and it worries me to see young people digging in sand and swimming in sea. It breaks my heart.  What have we done to Peel we deserve better than this . A visitor asked me where the town centre and shops were. After I told him he replied ," is that it ? Empty shops, shabby properties no wonder people elsewhere. Can't believe we can't even be bothered to put MANX flags up in street, on prom. Not even on TYNWALD DAY.	<b>The Area Plan for the North and West supports the delivery of an RSTW to serve Peel and the West - please see Transport and Utilities Proposal 6.</b>  <b>In accordance with the wider aims of Our Island Plan and the Local Economy Strategy, the Area Plan for the North and West supports the development of vibrant town centres. Please see Town Centre Proposals 4-8 which relate specifically to Peel.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK5Y-3	Lisa Pugh		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.  Peel is already at crisis point with the lack of parking, amenities, doctors, and the schools are fit to bursting. Adding more houses will just create an even bigger problem!	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</b> <b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. Cabinet office note that in most cases, the direct provision of infrastructure lies beyond the remit of the Area Plan for the North and West. However, the plan does allow for the future provision of these services to be planned in line with future population increases as a result of planned development. during Inquiry sessions, the topic of community infrastructure was discussed at length and Cabinet Office has included Open Space and Community Proposal 6 as a result.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK72-X			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of the West do not support this new concept.  The outskirts of Peel have been developed intensively in the last 20 years and it has already created a divide in the town spoiling the overall character and attractiveness of this small fishing town which has a wealth of history. More housing just creates a characterless and monotonous commuter town. In addition, the plan does not give any reassurance that the facilities and services in the town would be equally supported. Already both schools are getting close to full capacity, the doctors surgery cannot cope with a large influx of an increased population and our government does not have the additional money to invest in capital projects such as new schools.  More worrying for the island's democracy is the fact the these modifications seem to have been added in by the cabinet office following feedback from landowners and. developers. The people of the West deserve full transparency and we must reject any actions which may enable further development in the area.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. In conformity with the Strategic Plan, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements first, but the Department does accept that where there is a housing need, the expansion of settlements through well planned sustainable urban extensions is sometimes necessary in order to ensure an adequate mix of housing typologies and to meet housing need. Cabinet Office notes your comment on settlement character, an issue which was discussed at length during public inquiry sessions. The Area Plan acknowledges similar themes at paragraph 8.7.2. Noting this, Cabinet Office is supportive of the wider aims of Our Island Plan and of the Local Economy Strategy (see paragraph 9.5.1 of the Written Statement) to create vibrant town centres. Please see Town Centre Proposals 4-8 which relate to Peel. Cabinet Office accept that the proposal sites in question did not form part of the original 2022 Draft Plan. However the Department maintains that it has been open and transparent in supporting the sites since the publication of the PIPs.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NK74-Z			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page 133). The residents of Peel DO NOT support this new concept or expansion.</p> <p>Why on earth would you think Peel needs more residents?</p> <p>It is already extremely difficult to get a GP appointment, (and no, being told to go to Ramsey MIU or A&amp;E is not really an acceptable alternative!!), Peel Clothworkers &amp; QEII Schools are bursting at the seams and have already had to install temporary classrooms and our sewage is still being pumped out into the bay (yes, I know a new sewage works is planned but it will be several years before that is operational).</p> <p>Open space is so important for both nature and human wellbeing, a lot of the countryside surrounding our once beautiful town has already been swallowed up by large housing developments, more so than any other areas in the North or West, enough is enough!</p>	Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel. Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. In conformity with the Strategic Plan, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements first, but the Department does accept that where there is a housing need, the expansion of settlements through well planned sustainable urban extensions is sometimes necessary in order to ensure an adequate mix of housing typologies and to meet housing need. Cabinet Office note your comment and those of other regarding the provision of community facilities and other infrastructure in Peel. Although the direct provision of community facilities and infrastructure is outside of the remit of the Cabinet Office the Area Plan supports the development of facilities in line with local need and will act in a facilitating capacity for service providers when determining where enhancements to service provision can be made in line with future planned development.		
ANON-UVCN-NK74-Z			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>Also Peel town centre is more tired &amp; rundown than it's ever been, with a myriad of empty shops so the argument that more residents equals more prosperity is also flawed.</p> <p>With regard to a District Link Road, I don't understand why the A4 Ramsey Road would need to be connected to the A1 Douglas Road, unless of course future plans are to build even more houses on the fields between Peel &amp; Kirk Michael - I sincerely hope &amp; pray not.</p> <p>In conclusion I wholeheartedly object to Modification 63, any further urban extensions to Peel would be anything but sustainable - enough really is enough!</p>	The Area Plan for the North and West supports the development of vibrant town centres. Please see Town Centre proposals 4-8 in the Written Statement which relate specifically to Peel Town centre.		
ANON-UVCN-NK79-5	Leanne Webb		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>I object to this due to the infrastructure of Peel being already under strain. I have lived in Peel all my life and have only seen issues get worse over the years.</p> <p>It currently takes 4 weeks to get a doctors appointment and the schools are over crowded with my child constantly telling me there aren't enough staff to teach proper lessons.</p> <p>With the proposed addition of further housing this will increase the population of Peel significantly therefore impacting key services like doctors availability and school overcrowding even more.</p> <p>I am genuinely concerned how this will affect families already living within Peel and don't believe this is what Peel needs.</p> <p>I also object as the proposed plans affect the allotment. The allotment is beneficial to the people of Peel creating a sense of community and is good for people's mental health.</p>	The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed at length at the inquiry sessions, Cabinet Office has also ensured that the need for and potential location of community facilities, such as education and health infrastructure, must be considered as part of the masterplan for the site. The development brief for the edge of Peel also stated that a net loss of allotment space will not be supported.		
ANON-UVCN-NK7B-E	Jenny Alford		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>Please take all my earlier objections into account. The proposed development of areas GMR8,9 and 23 would increase the area of Peel by almost a third even though the island population is static, producing urban sprawl over the beautiful landscape which is supposed to be a reason for attracting people here. Our services are already overstretched, "providing employment and leisure opportunities" is rubbish - everyone goes to work in Douglas and I have seen no "leisure opportunities" on the existing estates. At one point you say "no development to the north of Ballagyr Lane at the moment" Does this mean that once we have the unnecessary link road, you WILL build there.</p>	Cabinet Office accept that the population of the Island has not increased in line with the projections of the Strategic Plan (2016). Cabinet Office do consider that there is a housing need to be met within the Plan period. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. In conformity with the Strategic Plan, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements first, but the Department does accept that where there is a housing need, the expansion of settlements through well planned sustainable urban extensions is sometimes necessary. Cabinet Office does consider that the greater degree of service provision in larger settlements such means these higher-order settlements are able to accommodate proposal sites proportionate to the infrastructure availability. In the development brief of the sites in question that there is potential, in the longer term, for a better connection to be made between the Poortown and Ramsey Roads.		
ANON-UVCN-NK7B-E	Jenny Alford		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>There are constant references to "minimising delays" and extending implementation times in the text, giving planners carte blanche to do what they like when they like it</p>	Cabinet Office does note one reference to 'minimising delays' at Chapter 14 Plan Outcome 3a. The Department considers that this reference in context appropriately refers to the addressing of issues through the development plan process which otherwise would cause delays in planning applications being determined and homes being delivered.		
ANON-UVCN-NK7D-G	Mr David Kaniewski		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and	<p>Having realized the full impact on Peel, I truly believe this modification and the link road will be a huge mistake, maybe in the distant future if the population on the islands of man exceeds 100,000 then this development may be justified, but please until then leave our lush green fields for everyone to enjoy.</p>	The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed at length at the inquiry sessions.		
ANON-UVCN-NK7E-H			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>This modification does not solely deal with the 're-wording of development Briefs including of sewage treatment and Biodiversity Net Gain criterion' it fails to highlight the proposal of additional green spaces noted as GMR008, GMR009 and GMR023 for further residential development which in turn is supported by the Cabinet Office and were not included in the original designation of land in the 1989 Peel Local Plan. In GMR023 there is a registered tree area, GM35, RA2004 registered in 1982 area 4174 sq. m. In GMR009 there are 59 allotments, do they get sold with the land? One allotment is registered with DEFA under the 'wilder registration' category. Two important factors that must be considered and DEFA consulted on prior to approving any modifications to the original 1989 plan - I would expect at the very least a written response from DEFA be made available to all Peel residents.</p> <p>PR001 which was formally a brownsite and is currently being cleared this week is already zoned for residential housing which is a positive move for Peel but enough is enough. Brownsites to residential benefit our community but not green zones to residential. There are a number of areas in the Island that would benefit from more residential areas, Peel has had substantial redevelopment since the 1990's and further housing will only see the Islands net zero target becoming out of reach. A potential 517 houses could be built on GMR009, GMR023 and GMR008, the occupants will likely travel out of Peel in their cars for work like the majority of Peel residents already do, contributing to the carbon footprint not reducing it.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see the development brief for the sites in question which over topics including Areas of Registered Trees and the allotments off Ballagyr Lane.</p> <p>Cabinet Office note your comment regarding PR001 (Barfords). The Area Plan for the North and West proposes the site for employment use, continuing the proposal in the Peel Local Plan whilst noting the site's approval in principle for residential development.</p> <p>As noted in Chapter 3 of the Written Statement, the review of the Strategic Plan provides the opportunity to fully embed the aims of the Climate Change Act into the Development Plan. This being said, the Area Plan for the North and West plays its part in responding to the climate crisis and fully recognises the importance of the island's net zero goals.</p>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NK7E-H			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>Furthermore the 'District Link Road' needs further explanation, does it really stop just before the existing allotments? Or is the link road really just an access road into and out of the proposed new housing development, a 'dead end' / cul-de-sac type road or are the drawings completely incorrect. Will the new link road be subject to the 20mph proposal like the rest of Peel? If it truly is going to be a link road between Douglas Road and Ramsey Road / Ballagyr Lane it will turn into a more dangerous version of the switchback road. Do our emergency services have capacity for additional RTC's? Further details of the link road should be requested before a decision is made.</p> <p>I understand that this part of the puzzle is just zoning and then if successful additional planning applications will have to be submitted which in turn will include discussions on impact on the infrastructure however you must give this foresight now. If these 500 + houses were to be built over the next 10 years where is the designated site for the new primary and high school? Will the Doctors surgery get approval for a 1st floor extension....or will a second surgery be built? Nursing home provisions? If so in which zone? Peel is at capacity now in terms of schools, Doctors, nursing homes, well being support groups etc. The islands plan is to grow the population, great, but infrastructure should be in place first as it is integral to welcoming new residents in and providing them with a home / community that they want to settle not just use the Island as a stepping stone to the UK.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The route of the proposed district link road shown on Map 6 - Peel is indicative of the route a future district road would take. This being said, point 1(iii), 5 and 6 of the relevant development brief clearly set out the Department's stance when it comes to the importance of the link road as part of an overall masterplan for the site and the route it may take in future - allowing for increased connectivity between Douglas Road, Poortown Road and Ballagyr Lane (with potential to connect to Ramsey Road in the future)</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment on community facilities, please see the relevant development brief for the site which includes a masterplan requirement to consider the need for and potential location of community facilities to serve a development site of this size. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions. The Area Plan for the North and West sets a development framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth and increased demand as a result of planned development.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7H-M			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>Map 6 Peel</p> <p>I reject the changes made to the original i.e. fields GMR023, GMR008,GMR009. These fields should NOT be regarded as "sustainable urban extension" nor should the proposed "district link road" go ahead - even if private developers have secured what they consider "necessary" land for development. IF any more development is to be even considered in the future, developers and government should PAY UP FRONT for the infrastructure needed for an expanded population, including provision of adequately staffed medical and dental facilities (currently way below satisfactory - we don't all have the option of 'private' care and Manx Care and DHSS don't provide a satisfactory necessary standard of public service.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. In conformity with the Strategic Plan, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements first, but the Department does accept that where there is a housing need, the expansion of settlements through well planned sustainable urban extensions is sometimes necessary in order to ensure an adequate mix of housing typologies and to meet housing need.</b></p> <p><b>Please see the development briefs for the sites in question which cover topics including but not limited to, the need for and potential locations of future community facilities.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7K-Q	Roy Maddrell		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.</p> <p>Having been born in Peel and seen the before after states of Peel after many years of development I feel strongly that the proposals are not justified or beneficial to Peel and its residents.</p> <p>Despite the significant increase in the population of Peel the new areas of town have become nothing more than dormitories for areas such as Douglas where the majority of Peel are employed. The town lacks employment opportunities, Health Care facility and capacity and additional pressure will be placed on the Schools and Child Care facilities. The Commissioners will be faced with additional demands to maintain the green spaces within any new development areas. They are unable at present to maintain the existing town let alone any further areas.</p> <p>The "link road" will serve no real purpose other than to allow people living in the areas a route out of the town. Nobody with any sense living in Kirk Micheal of North would come into Peel to use the link road to Douglas or elsewhere.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. In conformity with the Strategic Plan, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements first, but the Department does accept that where there is a housing need, the expansion of settlements through well planned sustainable urban extensions is sometimes necessary in order to ensure an adequate mix of housing typologies and to meet housing need. The Area Pan for the North and West contains employment land proposals for Peel, please see Employment Proposals 5 and 6. Please see Town Centre Proposals 4-8 and Open Space and Community Proposal 6 of the written statement which relate to Peel.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7P-V	Kevin and Jill Christian		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>Urban growth and development models use a range of processes that help analyse and predict development and its impact on the ambient environment.</p> <p>Proposals to incorporate Sites GMR008, 009 and 023 in the development brief for Peel reflect a complete disregard for the consequences attached to any approval. Like many of the Island's towns local geography has defined the direction of expansion. For Peel these constraints are Peel Hill to the West and Sea to the North. Inevitably, expansion has been to the East, across the lowland plain, and towards Douglas.</p> <p>In recent years, the significant housing expansion on this boundary has created a hybrid version of community, referred to by locals as 'Old Peel' and 'New Peel'. At a Public Meeting, held at the time (1989?) both Government and the Developer (Dandara), argued that new development would regenerate the Centre of Peel. Alas, the tumbleweed continues to roll down Michael Street. Attempts to establish new business initiatives are short lived.</p> <p>What is required in Peel is a major programme of renewal of the Centre. In strategic terms, the proposed further expansion of the eastern boundary is in direct conflict with this renewal objective. The forecast that more housing = more local business/employment is already a failed proposition.</p> <p>A dormitory adjunct to Douglas, Peel deserves a better community outcome.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office note your comment on landscape and landscape character. Incorporating the findings of the 2008 Landscape Character Assessment, the Area Plan looks to protect our most treasured landscapes. Please see the development brief for the sites in question which includes a masterplan requirement for substantial structural landscaping buffers.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Department note that similar notions relating to settlement character were discussed during the Inquiry and are acknowledged in the written statement at paragraph 8.7.2. The Area Plan for the North and West seeks to encourage the development of vibrant town centres and has developed town centre proposals which look to encourage regeneration and improvements to the public realm where possible, helping make great places. Please see Town Centre Proposals 4-8 which relate to Peel town centre.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7R-X	Peter Bould		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>Parking: I currently live on the outskirts of Peel and it is already impossible to park in Peel centre on Saturday as old town has not adapted to the ever expanding outskirts. The town simply cannot cope with existing number of residents, never mind adding more people who simply won't be able to spend any money in the town as they have nowhere to park. Peel town should already be thriving, but there are many empty and closed shops not because there aren't customers, but the many customers living on the outskirts of Peel simply cannot park in Peel. Many Saturdays we have tried to shop in Peel, only to give up as there is nowhere to park. This issue must first be addressed before more residents are added to Peel.</p> <p>Allotments: I currently have an allotment which is enjoyed by all the family. It is great for our wellbeing and mental health, and it would be a huge detriment to Peel if these were taken away.</p> <p>Infrastructure: Peel schools and doctors cannot cope with its exiting number of resistant's, never mind adding any more.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office note your comment. The direct provision of parking lies outwith the remit of the Area Plan for the North and West. On the other hand, and as noted in response to other comments - the Area Plan for the North and West supports the development of vibrant town centres. Please see Town Centre Proposals 4 - 8 of the Written Statement.</b></p> <p><b>Please see the development brief for the sites in question, point 13 of which covers the existing allotments on the site.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment and those of others regarding the provision of infrastructure and community facilities in Peel. The Department notes that the Area Plan provide land around both schools to allow for expansion in future if needed. Please also see Open Space and Community Proposal 6.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7S-Y			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.</p> <p>Critical services in Peel such as the GP surgery currently never have any available 'routine' appointments due to the already high number of patients to doctor ratio, so adding more housing would put even bigger pressure on these resources.</p> <p>We were assured there would be never be any building in zone 023 as there are protected trees and buildings when purchasing our home.</p> <p>The fields in question, GMR023, GMR008, and GMR009, were not part of proposals for zoning for housing in the original draft plan published by the Cabinet Office. They have been later added in a way that lacked transparency and failed to actively involve or reference the residents of Peel or our interests. The inclusion of these fields goes against the interests of the local community.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. In conformity with the Strategic Plan, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements first, but the Department does accept that where there is a housing need, the expansion of settlements through well planned sustainable urban extensions is sometimes necessary in order to ensure an adequate mix of housing typologies and to meet housing need.</b></p> <p><b>In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions. The Area Plan for the North and West sets a development framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth and increased demand as a result of planned development.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7W-3			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>Peel does not need further developments of this nature. It has seen more housing sprawl in last twenty years than any other comparable area and the loss of green field sites would be disastrous especially given the current infrastructure deficiencies in the town, ie schools, doctors, dentists, retail.</p> <p>The demands of voracious developers must be resisted. Otherwise the west of the island will rapidly become a concrete jungle, populated by Douglas commuters who will choke the transport links.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comments and those of others regarding the proposal sites and the existing provision of community facilities and other infrastructure in Peel.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet office note that although the direct provision of infrastructure is beyond the remit of the Area Plan, the Plan can act in a co-ordinating capacity for decision makers when planning where improvements to service provision may be needed in line with areas of population growth.</b></p> <p><b>In addition to this, please see the development brief for the sites in question.</b></p>		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NK82-Y			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion The local infrastructure is not enough to support the addition of more housing. Health services (NHS doctors and dentists) already have waiting lists that exclude residents from reasonable access times and local schools do not have the capacity to accept an influx of new children. Sewage is still an outstanding problem that needs to be addressed.	The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. Cabinet Office has also ensured that the need for and potential location of community facilities, such as education and health infrastructure, must be considered as part of the masterplan for the site.		
ANON-UVCN-NK8B-F			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.  Any further development in peel should be tied to developer requirements to improve infrastructure accordingly, i.e. expansion/modification to school, additional medical facilities including dentists, additional park / playing facilities for kids, old town regeneration contributions, etc. Without an element of quid-pro-quo there should be no further development.	Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel. Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. In conformity with the Strategic Plan, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements first, but the Department does accept that where there is a housing need, the expansion of settlements through well planned sustainable urban extensions is sometimes necessary in order to ensure an adequate mix of housing typologies and to meet housing need. Cabinet Office notes your comment and have considered existing community infrastructure as well as planned improvements throughout the development of the Plan. In the case of open space as part of development, the open space standards of the Strategic Plan apply.		
ANON-UVCN-NK8K-R			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	These fields were never originally included for development in proposals from the Cabinet Office. Also as a resident I was only very recently made aware of this. This is not democratic and we need a longer consultation period.	Cabinet Office notes that proposal sites in question were not part of the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022) but that they were supported by the Department in advance of and during public inquiry sessions.		
ANON-UVCN-NK8R-Y			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion. Peel does not need any more housing the infrastructure will not cope. It will be more strain on Peel Medical Centre (difficult to get appointments now), schools, etc. Also, it means more traffic on roads as people commute to and from Douglas.	Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel. In accordance with Strategic Policy, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements, or where appropriate, in sustainable urban extensions to these settlements. Accordingly, sustainable urban extensions are not a new concept. Throughout the plan process Cabinet Office has considered the existing provision of infrastructure and other community facilities as well as where future upgrades and other investment is planned. Cabinet Office accept that in some cases, the provision of infrastructure lies beyond the remit of the Area Plan but that the Plan can facilitate future investment decisions for other Government Departments and Boards in future. This stance is set out in the 'recommendations' of the Written Statement.		
ANON-UVCN-NK8U-2			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Peel has suffered enough development over the past thirty years and there is no justification for further urban sprawl. Greenfield sites must not be sacrificed for needless concrete urbanisation.  These changes were never part of the Cabinet Office's original proposals and simply reflect voracious and greedy developers demands. The west of the island is in danger of becoming a massive concrete jungle with no supporting infrastructure and the plans must be rejected.	Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability. Cabinet Office note that the proposal sites were not part of the Draft Plan (2022) but the Department's support for the sites was clearly noted at the publication of the public inquiry papers in March 2024 and during public inquiry sessions on the topic.		
ANON-UVCN-NK8W-4	Kate Lord-Brennan MHK		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Consultation Submission from Kate Lord-Brennan MHK ( detailed letter to follow).  This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road.  The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion. There is no valid basis for the road which was apparent at the public inquiry, given arguments made by Cabinet Office that it would assist residents from Kirk Michael coming into Peel and to Douglas, but the ultimate justification was that a road would "enable more housing". The way this expansion is planned is simply too much, since Peel as had more development than anywhere is in the North and West since 1989 by government's own published and available figures, a fact which I stated at the Inquiry. The planning is completely unbalanced and it is not "sustainable" given the lack, for practical reasons of employment land in the town.	Cabinet Office note your consultation response, and subsequent letter detailed your objections to the sites in question. Cabinet Office note that the term of 'Sustainable Urban Extension' is used and defined in the Isle of Man Strategic Plan (2016) and forms a key part of the Plans' Spatial Vision (pg. 21) and Strategic Objectives. In accordance with the Strategic Plan, and as detailed in Built Environment Proposal 1: Urban Regeneration, the Area Plan for the North and West supports the development of brownfield, or otherwise unused or underused sites within settlement boundaries. However, there is an acknowledgement that to meet housing need and to provide an adequate mix of dwelling types, sustainable urban extensions may be required. Cabinet Office has maintained this approach throughout the development of the Area Plan including at the Draft Plan and public inquiry stages. As stated during public inquiry sessions on the topic, proposals for a district link road form a key part of development proposals and will be integral to the design scheme and masterplan for the sites. The Department maintain that the benefits of the district link road, as stated during inquiry sessions on the matter, extend beyond enabling more housing.		
ANON-UVCN-NK8W-4	Kate Lord-Brennan MHK		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	I will be expanding on these arguments / points and others directly and imminently, at a political level as the constituency MHK.  None of this proposed zoning is being done to the benefit of local residents or the town and it is unbalanced overall to expect Peel again to take such a sprawl of further development outside current settlement boundaries and on green fields. It is particularly unjust since proposals have been backed in various ways by Peel Town Commissioners, which was after May 2024 only subtly acknowledged, but recently publicly acknowledged, but they were never directly open with the public about their shared advice, agenda and representation alongside Dandara and landowners. This is not the fault of Cabinet Office, who simply respond to submissions, prior to the rightful Inquiry process, but it has added to the strong feeling of Peel in terms of "why is this happening to Peel, given the infrastructure issues we already have" when the local authority have not transparently owned their position in a timely way and in plain terms.	Cabinet Office note your comments.  In accordance with the Strategic Plan settlement hierarchy, the Department maintains that it is appropriate that Service Centres, larger settlements with a greater degree of service provision such as Peel, will be where development is concentrated to provide regeneration and a choice of location for housing, employment and services.  The development of the Area Plan for the North and West relies on input from a wide-range of interested stakeholders, including but not limited to; Local Authorities, developers, landowners, the general public and community groups.		
ANON-UVCN-NK8W-4	Kate Lord-Brennan MHK		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Government simply should not enable this type of behaviour.  These sites GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 should be removed from the proposed plan to be adopted. They should not even be kept as any sort of "strategic reserve".  There is also the proximity of the quarry and related explosive storage. The school (QEII) is effectively being penned in. The proposed road by the map finishes right before the allotments - is that so it is palatable in a presentational way?  For ease I am writing detailed comments about the modifications to the written statement that are unacceptable at a political level. In summary though, it is angering that previous constraints, in terms of policy and assessment of impact, have been watered down. Some of this was based on the representation of Dandara. I feel no weight at all has been given to the members of the public, and I include myself in that, who gave their input into the Inquiry. I had hoped some of issues represented would be addressed/examined through the public Inquiry process, but they have not been.	Cabinet Office note your comments but the sites in question are to be retained as proposed for residential development in the Area Plan for the North and West Cabinet Office do not consider there to be any risk posted by the site's location relative to the existing Poortown Quarry. Please see Minerals Proposals 1 and 2 for how the Area Plan addresses development close to minerals sites currently being worked. Cabinet Office notes your comment regarding the location of proposal sites relative to QEII. The Department notes that two fields to the north-west of the existing school playing fields are shown on map 6- Peel as civic, cultural or other use to allow the school to expand in future if required. The route for the proposed district link road is shown indicatively on map 6. The exact route of any link road would be subject to detailed assessment and design considerations as part of a masterplan prepared for the site to support a planning application. Cabinet Office notes that at paragraph 9 of the Inspector's report it is stated that all oral and written representations made to the Inquiry alongside the responses to the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022) were taken into account and given equal weight in the forming of the recommendations contained in the Inspector's report.		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NK8W-4	Kate Lord-Brennan MHK		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Cabinet Office need to rethink this, before anything is sent to Council of Ministers, prior to Tynwald, and seek to find that equivalent number of housing units elsewhere and through an All Island Area Plan process. As I have always said, you could even consider establishing a new village / settlement somewhere that would support other small communities and help them be sustainable, rather than adding to the dormitory town effect in Peel.	Cabinet Office notes your comment regarding the establishment of a new village/settlement but consider that this is an issue which will be addressed as part of the Strategic Plan review.		
ANON-UVCN-NKBF-W			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023,	There is a wooded area and a Tholtan on the proposed area. Any development would have an adverse effect on any wildlife living in the area. The infrastructure i.e. Schools, Doctors and Dentists cannot cope with extra housing.	Please see Development Brief for the site which includes a requirement for a full Environmental Impact Assessment and a masterplan which, among other issues, must consider the need for and potential locations of future community facilities.		
ANON-UVCN-NKBM-4			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion. Peel does not currently have the infrastructure to support more residential development. Until the infrastructure is in place to support more residents (i.e. more GP's, increased funding for the schools, sewerage treatment) then I oppose these plans.	Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel. Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability. In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters.		
ANON-UVCN-NKBV-D			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.  Argument 1: Enough is enough – Peel has had more than its fair share of new housing development Since the 1989 local plan, Peel has experienced more development on its green fields compared any other area in the north and west. It is therefore essential to protect these areas from further encroachments and preserve Peel's green fields.	Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.  Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing.		
ANON-UVCN-NKBV-D			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Argument 2: Dubious and Unjust Additions to Original Plans The fields in question, GMR023, GMR008, and GMR009, were not part of proposals for zoning for housing in the original draft plan published by the Cabinet Office. The inclusion of these fields goes against the interests of the local community.  Argument 3: We don't need or want a 'District Link Road'  Peel is unable to cope with any more development. It is already impossible for the residents of Peel to be able to see a doctor in the Peel surgery within a reasonable timeframe. Having tried to make appointments at the doctors, they simply advise residents to attend A&E instead. More development will simply make this situation worse.  The schools and in-particular the primary school are struggling to cope with the number of students on roll and more development will simply make this problem worse.	Cabinet Office note that the proposal sites in question did not form part of the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022). However, the Department was clear and open about its support for the sites in advance of, and during public inquiry sessions on the matter. The Area Plan has been prepared in accordance with the development plan procedure set out in schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel. In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions.  Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 6.		
ANON-UVCN-NKBY-G			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and	No more building on green fields Peel is big enough and doesn't have the Infrastructure for more houses.	Cabinet Office note your comment and those of others. Please see the development brief for the sites in question which requires that a Masterplan address, among other things, the need for and potential local of local community facilities to support a development of this scale		
ANON-UVCN-NKC5-D			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion. I have always lived in Peel and over the last few years Peel has had more than it fair share of new housing. When the houses were built we were told they would enhance peel and help support the community of peel. The majority of the people in the newer housing estates work, shop and spend majority of their money out of peel and in Douglas so the promised benefits never happened. Also they is no infrastructure in place for peel doctors, schools, healthcare and peel roads to deal with another major increase in residents. Having to wait month and sometime not even been able to get a doctor's appointment or dentist is not acceptable and more housing will only make this worse. Also the character of Peel is being slowly chipped away and we are loosing our quaint town so need to make sure we protect these areas from further encroachments and preserve Peel's green fields.	The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed at length at the inquiry sessions. Cabinet Office has also ensured that the need for and potential location of community facilities, such as education and health infrastructure, must be considered as part of the masterplan for the site.		
ANON-UVCN-NKC5-D			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	The fields in question, GMR023, GMR008, and GMR009, were not part of proposals for zoning for housing in the original draft plan published and I feel that the lack of transparency and the failure to actively involve or reference the residents of Peel or their interests and ideas isn't good. The inclusion of these fields goes against the interests of the local community and cannot help with the already growing problems in Peel. The proposal of the link road "a district link road to connect to the A4 Ramsey Road in the north and the A1 Douglas Road in the South" makes no sense and will only split peel into factions without delivering on any real need or benefit to peel as a whole and can only harm the community further. I also see the only use of this road as a idea to further develop on green site and have more of a negative impact on the already over exhausted infrastructure of peel.	The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed at length at the inquiry sessions. Cabinet Office has also ensured that the need for and potential location of community facilities, such as education and health infrastructure, must be considered as part of the masterplan for the site.		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKCA-S			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>I object strongly to Modification 63.</p> <p>My reasons are as follows:</p> <p>Firstly, the underhand way the development of fields GMR023, GMROO8 and GMROO9 have been included in the development without any consultation with the residents of Peel. This appears that the government of the Isle of Man are far more concerned with increasing the wealth of the developers and not caring a jot for the people who live in Peel.</p> <p>Secondly, my objection is to the District Link Road which simply leaves Peel wide open to further development of green belt land making it a dormer town to Douglas. It is an infrastructure that is not needed.</p> <p>Thirdly I object to the building of 517 more housing units being built in Peel.</p> <p>517 more units will inevitably mean approximately 1000 more cars in the town.</p> <p>We have less parking now than we used to making it very difficult to park in Peel how will the residents manage with even more cars to accommodate? Where will the children go to school? The local school is already over subscribed.</p> <p>What about the medical centre? It is difficult enough now to get an appointment to see a doctor without adding more patients. It is has already been shown recruitment of doctors to the island is very difficult.</p> <p>I believe this development has not been properly thought through. It is a scheme that ensures developers make large amounts of money while the people of Peel suffer. Think again!</p>	<p>Cabinet Office note your comment and do accept that the sites were not part of the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (as published in 2022). The sites were supported at the publication of the public inquiry papers in March 2024 and throughout public inquiry sessions on the subject.</p> <p>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</p> <p>Cabinet Office note your comment, please see the development briefs for the sites in question which includes a requirement for a masterplan to address, among other issues, the need for and potential location of community facilities which may include - educational, health and social care facilities a neighbourhood centre and open spaces.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKCN-6	Barbara Holland		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.</p> <p>The infrastructure in Peel cannot cope with anymore houses or residents, the schools aren't big enough, the doctors &amp; dentist cannot cope with the amount of residents it has now, and we are still pumping raw sewage into the sea! Plus the amount of vehicles this will bring to the town, could be at least another 500 cars and there's not enough car parks spaces currently. We need to protect these green spaces that make Peel a beautiful place to live.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</p> <p>In accordance with Strategic Policy, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements, or where appropriate, in sustainable urban extensions to these settlements. Accordingly, sustainable urban extensions are not a new concept.</p> <p>Throughout the plan process Cabinet Office has considered the existing provision of infrastructure and other community facilities as well as where future upgrades and other investment is planned. Cabinet Office accept that in some cases, the provision of infrastructure lies beyond the remit of the Area Plan but that the Plan can facilitate future investment decisions for other Government Departments and Boards in future. This stance is set out in the 'recommendations' of the Written Statement. Please see Transport and Utilities Proposal 5.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKCS-B			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>"This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office note your comment and your objection to the sites in question.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKCU-D	Richard James Holland		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.</p> <p>The infrastructure in Peel cannot cope with anymore houses or residents, the schools aren't big enough, the doctors &amp; dentist cannot cope with the amount of residents it has now, and we are still pumping raw sewage into the sea! Plus the amount of vehicles this will bring to the town, could be at least another 500 cars and there's not enough car parks spaces currently. We need to protect these green spaces that make Peel a beautiful place to live</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</p> <p>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. In conformity with the Strategic Plan, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements first, but the Department does accept that where there is a housing need, the expansion of settlements through well planned sustainable urban extensions is sometimes necessary in order to ensure an adequate mix of housing typologies and to meet housing need. Please see the development brief for the sites in question which includes a requirement that a masterplan for the sites is produces to address, among other issues - the need for and future provision of community facilities for the site of this size.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKCX-G			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road.</p> <p>The concept of a sustainable urban extension is a new concept and this residential extension does not achieve that. It brings people out of the centre of Peel which has plenty of brownfield sites that could be developed and onto the over-developed outskirts which are already struggling to be connected to mains sewerage etc. (and the other infrastructure is bursting at the seams). As there are very few employment possibilities in Peel this means adding more traffic to the drive into Douglas which is already heavily congested. This cannot support a vote of sustainable urban development. Furthermore the site at GMR023 contains an area of protected woodland which should not be touched.</p> <p>The people of Peel neither want or need a district road. There are sufficient roads in and out of Peel and the new road proposal would in fact run partly in parallel to Oak road and is therefore completely unnecessary.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. In conformity with the Strategic Plan, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements first, but the Department does accept that where there is a housing need, the expansion of settlements through well planned sustainable urban extensions is sometimes necessary in order to ensure an adequate mix of housing typologies and to meet housing need. Cabinet Office note your comment on brownfield development. The Area Plan aims to focus development within existing settlement boundaries however the Department does accept that, in certain circumstances there is a need to propose land outwith the settlement boundary. The Area Plan for the North and West does make employment proposals in Peel, please see Employment Proposals 5 and 6 of the Written Statement. Please see point 12 of the Development Brief for sites GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMC002 and GMR003 in relation to Registered Tree Areas.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKCZ-J	John Roberts		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.</p> <p>The infrastructure in Peel cannot cope with anymore houses or residents, the schools aren't big enough, the doctors &amp; dentist cannot cope with the amount of residents it has now, and we are still pumping raw sewage into the sea! Plus the amount of vehicles this will bring to the town, could be at least another 500 cars and there's not enough car parks spaces currently. We need to protect these green spaces that make Peel a beautiful place to live.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</p> <p>In accordance with Strategic Policy, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements, or where appropriate, in sustainable urban extensions to these settlements. Accordingly, sustainable urban extensions are not a new concept.</p> <p>Throughout the plan process Cabinet Office has considered the existing provision of infrastructure and other community facilities as well as where future upgrades and other investment is planned. Cabinet Office accept that in some cases, the provision of infrastructure lies beyond the remit of the Area Plan but that the Plan can facilitate future investment decisions for other Government Departments and Boards in future. This stance is set out in the 'recommendations' of the Written Statement. Please see Transport and Utilities Proposal 5.</p>		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKG1-D			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</b> In accordance with Strategic Policy, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements, or where appropriate, in sustainable urban extensions to these settlements. Accordingly, sustainable urban extensions are not a new concept. Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community. In most cases, infrastructure provision lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions.		
ANON-UVCN-NKG2-E	Fiona Pate		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.  Firstly, the proposed district link road is not needed and i feel that it is simply a pathway to enable more housing.  Additionally, the fields in question were not part of proposals for zoning for houses in the original draft plans. The lack of transparency and the failure to involve or reference the residents of Peel prior to the proposal to re-zone these fields leaves a lot of questions. I'd say that the inclusion of these fields goes against the interests of the local community  The fields themselves are also an area of natural beauty that provide homes for a massive array of wildlife. On top of this, the addition of a further 500 residential homes would place massive stress on the current infrastructure of Peel, something that probably needs to be looked at before 500 more houses are built!!	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</b> Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. Cabinet Office notes your comment, please see the development brief for the proposal sites in question which sets out a requirement for a full environmental impact assessment for both phases of the development site as part of an application.		
ANON-UVCN-NKG4-G			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion. We oppose the addition of a link road as it: a) is not needed, b) encourages use of cars and trucks which is in opposition to the Island's Net Zero plans, and c) advances single home estates which also lead to more Carbon emissions. IN face, the entire proposed modification runs counter to our Net Zero policy. We need more high density housing, not more single family construction. Concentrating the population in existing population centres reduces carbon emissions, enhances opportunity for mass public transport and facilitates personal powered transport (walking & non motorized bicycles). Thank you	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</b> Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability.		
ANON-UVCN-NKG5-H	Lee Morgan		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	How can Peel sustain this? Developers hell bent on destroying our beautiful countryside for money. Banks more than happy to sell more mortgages. We the residents and rate payers can't just sit back and watch our fields get filled with concrete. Peel is already too big. Can't get a doctors appointment, school classes over flowing, cars everywhere! Come on!	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKG9-N	Andrew Holton		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.  Firstly, the proposed district link road is not needed and i feel that it is simply a pathway to enable more housing.  Additionally, the fields in question were not part of proposals for zoning for houses in the original draft plans. The lack of transparency and the failure to involve or reference the residents of Peel prior to the proposal to re-zone these fields leaves a lot of questions. I'd say that the inclusion of these fields goes against the interests of the local community  The fields themselves are also an area of natural beauty that provide homes for a massive array of wildlife. On top of this, the addition of a further 500 residential homes would place massive stress on the current infrastructure of Peel, something that probably needs to be looked at before 500 more houses are built!!	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</b> Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. Cabinet Office notes your comment. Following the publication of the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022), Cabinet Office proposed the addition of the proposal sites in question as part of the Public Inquiry Papers which formed the basis for the Department's stance going into Inquiry. The proposed addition of the sites to the plan was noted as Major Change 8 in PIP 1 - Schedule of Changes, published March 2024, four months in advance of the public inquiry sessions. Cabinet Office undertook significant publicity in order to ensure maximum engagement in Inquiry sessions (including running an evening drop-in session) and does not accept that the Department's support for the proposal sites in question, or any others in the plan lacked transparency.		
ANON-UVCN-NKGE-1			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Peel already covers a large area and developing more greenfield sites proposed will create division in the town and traffic chaos traveling along the Peel to Douglas road. Peel is large enough! We do not need more housing or any link road between Ramsey and Douglas Roads. The three fields GMR008, GMR009 and GMR 023 were not part of the original plan but added for consideration later. Enough is enough, we do not want these fields used for more housing.	<b>Cabinet Office note your comment regarding the proposal sites. Cabinet Office do consider that there is a housing need to be met in the Plan Area for the remainder of the Plan period, and, considering an uplift in respect of the fact that the Area Plan for the North and West will remain in operation beyond the end of the Plan period, has developed proposals to provide adequate opportunities for that need to be met.</b>  Cabinet Office note that the sites in question were not proposed as part of the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022) but that their inclusion was supported by the Department in the publication of the public inquiry papers in March 2024 and during public inquiry sessions.		
ANON-UVCN-NKGG-3	T Harrison		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Peel is already at full capacity- as we speak there are so many brown field sites that could be developed- no need to dig up and destroy our beautiful countryside forever. We need to be supporting the landowners to use the land to produce locally grown vegetables, meat and anything else that will help our community long term - to help us be more sustainable and save food miles, be in touch with the food we consume, not build more and more houses when there are plenty of vacant sites that can be used. This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment, please see Built Environment Proposal 1 and 2.</b>  Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing.  Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability.		
ANON-UVCN-NKGK-7	Anthony Morgan		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Peel can simply not sustain the building of this. Impossible. We struggle with doctors appointments, traffic, parking, schools, sewage etc.. as it is.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKGP-C	Ian Sturgess		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	No democratic choice has been sought for this modification. I am unable to get a doctor's appointment, I am unable to park in Peel and we have already lost too much green open land for wildlife and wellbeing. The governments answer to these problems.....build more houses! The modification is illogical and greed driven. I fully oppose this modification.	<b>In preparing the Area Plan for the North and West, Cabinet Office has followed the Development Plan procedure set out in Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act which includes several statutory periods of consultation and engagement including a public inquiry.</b>  <b>The Area Pan for the North and West seeks to provide the opportunity to deliver sustainable development in the right places to provide for the needs of communities in the North and West.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKGQ-D			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Peel has lost enough green spaces. Peel infrastructure cannot cope with more houses. No dentist appointments and no doctors appointments are available. It would not be a sensible idea to build more houses in Peel.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment and those of others regarding the provision of community facilities and infrastructure in Peel</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKGS-F			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	The residents of Peel and the west of the Island do not want more housing in Peel. There are more viable options in the North of the Island. We need to protect the farmland and wildlife in the area - we can't just keep expanding without any provision of additional schools, doctors or services in advance of the houses being sold and lived in. Who is going to pay for all of that? Not the landowners who are making a big profit or the commissioners taking back-hand payments to try and push this through under the radar!! How sad that money and greed are being put above the well-being of the 1000's of people already living and working in Peel. Please do not allow this to go ahead!!	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKGJ-V			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	No substantive evidence provided as to the future demographic determination of the 517 dwellings being justified and how the social mix is to be arrived at.  Peel's greenfields being eroded by developer's commercial interests and not those of the present community residents.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Although housing mix policies are not presently part of the Strategic Plan, the findings of the OAHN, specifically relating to typologies is a consideration for the Strategic Plan review.</b> <b>Cabinet Office maintain that there is an evidenced housing need in the North and West to be met during the Plan period and as this plan transitions to the next in the medium term, this issue was dealt with at length during inquiry sessions on the topic.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKGZ-P	Graham Mitchell		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Peel cannot cope with this development. We cannot get doctors appointments for weeks, sometimes we are told that there arent any for the foreseeable future. Cannot get a dentist. Chemists cannot cope at present. School is full. Roads are terrible so how will they cope going forward when this development brings another 1000 cars on them. Parking in Peel is already a nightmare.  The infrastructure and towns services simply cannot cope with this development.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your concern regarding the provision of community facilities and other infrastructure in Peel, an issue which was discussed at length during the inquiry. Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community.</b>  <b>In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions. The Area Plan for the North and West sets a development framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth and increased demand as a result of planned development.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKH2-F			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.  Furthermore, adequate infrastructure in the Peel area doesn't currently meet the present population- in fact - very far from it! Medical appointments are non-existent in my recent experience - sewage is directly dispatched into our bathing waters, education and other "essential services" are all quickly deteriorating as a result of the burgeoning weight of recent development expansion and the lack of adequate public services to sustain even its current population. Peel town as known is lay siege by a needless and reckless creation of a satellite population that is effectively strangling the life out of the beating heart of our community. This kamikaze like onslaught has to stop before our fragile infrastructure succumbs to the greedy demands being placed on it!	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</b> <b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. In conformity with the Strategic Plan, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements first, but the Department does accept that where there is a housing need, the expansion of settlements through well planned sustainable urban extensions is sometimes necessary in order to ensure an adequate mix of housing typologies and to meet housing need.</b> <b>The Department notes that works on the site of the RSTW to serve Peel have recently commenced. The Area Plan for the North and West provides policy support for the development of an RSTW. Please see Transport and Utilities Proposal 6.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHA-X			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.  Building on the outskirts of Peel brings more people into the roads driving to Douglas as there is very little employment within Peel so this does not align with the concept of sustainable urban development.  Peel has had more than its fair share of development since the last regionally development plan and we suggest that the residential areas would be better placed in small towns which are already struggling to support their drs and schools rather than in Peel where the opposite is true and residents struggle to make a drs appointment.  We neither want or need a district road and this is totally unnecessary considering the roads in and out of Peel we already had. GMR023 also contains a section of protected woodland which should be preserved along with Peel's greenery. For what was once a small fishing village it is starting to lose its identity.	<b>The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed at length at the inquiry sessions. As part of the development brief for this site, Cabinet Office have ensured that any development will not materially affect any Registered Tree Areas.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHF-3			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	I am referring to the fields GMR009, GMR008 and GMR023.  These fields were not in the original draft and have been added at a later date.  The original draft stated that housing needs in the West had ALREADY BEEN MET and estimated 95 houses TOO MANY had already been built!  If the proposed housing is added the population of Peel would have increased 75-92% than in 2001 just from greenfield sites. This is higher than any other area.  Enough is enough, Peel is already massively stretched in terms of facilities and cannot bear a heavier burden.  This proposes substantial greenfield development mostly around Peel and to a much lesser extent in any other are of the North and West  There is no requirement for additional housing on these fields and no requirement for a bypass.  The construction of Oak Road acts as a suitable road between Ramsey Road and Dentons Road. This is suitable as it is already	<b>Cabinet Office notes that the sites in question were not part of the Draft Plan (2022) but notes that they were clearly supported as part of the evidence submitted by the Department to the public inquiry which took place in July 2024. Cabinet Office notes that at the time of the Draft Plan, the Department proposed that housing need within the Plan period could be met on a smaller number of proposal sites. However, in the time between the Draft Plan and the publication of the PIPs ahead of the public inquiry, it became clear that the Area Plan for the North and West, once operational, would remain so beyond the end of the Plan period and therefore an uplift in the quantum of housing land proposed by the Plan was required. This approach was tested during Inquiry sessions and found to be pragmatic by the Inspector. Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability.Cabinet Office notes your comments regarding Oak Road and that Oak Road is shown as an access road according to the Department of Infrastructure's Road Hierarchy. Development Brief criteria for the proposal sites in question in the Area Plan for the North and West make specific provision for a District Link Road.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKHF-3			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Objection to 14.10.2. Section 4: Second phase of development GMR008 and GMR009 North of Poortown Road. Second phase requires 'link road' or 'connecting road'. This is not required as it runs directly parallel to Oak Road which has already proved to be suitable for all traffic including heavy goods vehicles and regular IOM department of transport buses. Oak road has recently had pavements changed to allow access for disabled passengers therefore an alternative link between these roads is unnecessary. There is also no need for further housing as stated in my first answer.	Cabinet Office notes your comments regarding Oak Road and that Oak Road is shown as an access road according to the Department of Infrastructure's Road Hierarchy. Development Brief criteria for the proposal sites in question in the Area Plan for the North and West make specific provision for a District Link Road which is higher in the road hierarchy allowing for a greater degree of traffic movement.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHF-3			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	GMR008 GMR009 GMR023  This is currently a zone with allotments, fishing centre and green spaces. Removing these and adding an unnecessary road when there is already a suitable parallel road is sheer lunacy.  Also the notion of adding vibrancy and activity to Peel is nonsense. The current infrastructure for services in terms of healthcare, education and sewage management are not coping with the already bursting Peel which has seen exponential growth since 2001 of 75-91%.  Peel residents cannot get appointments at the doctors, there is no space for NHS dentist patients and the schools are not coping as seen with the increased number of mobile classrooms at QEII	Cabinet Office note your comment and reference to Oak Road. As noted in response to other comments as part of this summary document, Cabinet Office note that Oak Road is an access road which is able to accommodate a lesser degree of traffic movements compared to the proposed district link road referred to in the Development Brief for the sites in question.  In accordance with other responses as part of this summary document, the Area Plan for the North and West supports the wider aims of Our Island Plan and the Local Economy Strategy in seeking to facilitate vibrant town centres. Please see Town Centre Proposal 4-8 of the Written Statement.  Please see the Development Brief for the sites in question which include a requirement for a masterplan which among other issues would address the need for community facilities including education, health and social care and recreational open spaces among others.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHS-G			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.	The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed at length at the inquiry sessions.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHU-J			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion	The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed at length at the inquiry sessions.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHV-K			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.  The infrastructure of Peel is at breaking point, if it is not already broken, indeed. Doctors, dentists, car parking, general upkeep and maintenance throughout the town, facilities for our youngsters, etc are all in a dire state.  I currently have no dentist, there are no doctors appointments available, and the schools are fit to burst.  Whilst there may be the land upon which to build more housing, there is no way to accommodate the residents and their needs.	The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed at length at the inquiry sessions. Cabinet Office has also ensured that the need for and potential location of community facilities, such as education and health infrastructure, must be considered as part of the masterplan for the site.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHW-M			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	The plan for Peel is far too large for the area. Peel is a seaside town and would become a large none descript concrete jungle. The roads can not cope with the increase in commuters, the infrastructure would not be able to cope and the lose of green spaces is too big a price to pay for additional homes.	Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHY-P			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	The infrastructure in Peel can't support its current population. Allowing the ability to build even more gives way to further issues. You're not able to get a Drs appointment for a month, my children are yr. 1 & 4 and they are circa 60 children in yr1 and nearly 80 in year 4. The school is struggling, teaching is impacted by the volume. The swimming baths are overrun trying to accommodate the volume of people using it. There are limited green spaces now for the children, this proposal sees even fewer. The sewage is not connected to the mains and the current temporary architecture' is not fit for purpose. Before any more houses are built the town needs support to cope with the existing population.	Cabinet Office notes your comment and those of others regarding the provision of community facilities and other infrastructure in Peel. Whilst the Department maintains that the direct provision of infrastructure lies beyond the remit of the Area Plan, it is noted that the development brief for the sites does include a requirement for a masterplan for the sites which, among other issues, would need to address the need for community facilities including health, education and open space uses.  As stated in response to other comments as part of this summary, the Area Plan for the North and West can act in a facilitating capacity when it comes to the future provision of services and community infrastructure - allowing for coordinated investment decisions to be made in line with future planned development and population increases.		
ANON-UVCN-NKK4-M	Mr Jamie R Wright		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	I oppose the continual expansion of Peel as it is affecting the character of the town. Those currently living here do not want Peel to be transformed into Douglas or Onchan to feed the profits of housing companies. The golf practice field is used every day by people enjoying their hobby. It would be a terrible shame if this was taken away.	Cabinet Office notes your comments and considers that the Area Plan provides adequate policy provision to protect the vibrancy and vitality of town centres in the Plan Area. Please see Town Centre Proposals 4-8 which relate to Peel.  Cabinet Office notes your comment, and those of others in relation to the importance of the golf club practice field. In light of field 314539 being proposed for residential development, the Area Plan proposes field 311889 as open space for the purposes of golf.  Please see amended development brief for site PR002a and PR002b.		
ANON-UVCN-NKK6-P			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133).  I have serious concerns with regards to Peel having the infrastructure in place to support such an expansion. The district line proposed only joins the main routes, it doesn't create another route in or out of Peel.  The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion	The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed at length at the inquiry sessions, Cabinet Office has also ensured that the need for and potential location of community facilities, such as education and health infrastructure, must be considered as part of the masterplan for the site.		
ANON-UVCN-NKK7-Q			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	The fields identified as a proposed development for "predominantly residential uses" and construction of a main road are currently productive agricultural land, including a sheep farm; are 'greenfield' developments of this size in line with environmental protection principles? The current end of residential development is on a ridge forming a natural town limit, with the green 'lungs' of Peel beyond. Fields GMR023, GMR008 and GMR009 were not included for development in proposals from Cabinet Office and appear to have been changed in designation after consultation with developers.  Proposed modification 63 will encase the town of Peel with houses, and the road facilitates further layers of housing being added as "sustainable urban extension". I note the requirement for an operating Regional Sewage Treatment Works before development shall take place. What about other infrastructure? The current population of Peel and surroundings has difficulties with access to medical, dental and care services, needs which will increase with an aging population. Education needs more resources at present.  Public transport needs increase with such a large development. As the population ages, "improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes" become less relevant.	Cabinet Office do note that the proposal sites were not included as part of the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022) but the Department has been open and clear in its support for the sites since the publication of the preliminary publicity papers in March 2024 and during public inquiry sessions on the matter in July.  Cabinet Office notes your comment and those of others regarding the provision of community facilities and other infrastructure in Peel. Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 6 of the Written Statement.  Cabinet Office notes your comment regarding public transport. It is considered that the development plan process affords the best opportunity for service providers such as the Department of Infrastructure to be able to provide an expanded service in line with future planned development.		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKK9-S			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	I strongly object to these proposals. Peel has had enough development over the past few years with more in planning. We need to protect these spaces for generations to come and focus more on developing and repairing the town centre rather than adding more. They are not wanted!	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comments and considers that the Area Plan provides adequate policy provision to protect the vibrancy and vitality of town centres in the Plan Area.</b>  <b>The Area Plan supports the development of vibrant town centres that meet the retail and leisure needs of residents. Please see Town Centre Proposals 4-8 which relate specifically to Peel.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKKB-2			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Peel is already massively over populated without the infrastructure to support it! We can't get Dr's of dentist appointments as it is!	<b>The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed at length at the inquiry sessions, Cabinet Office has also ensured that the need for and potential location of community facilities, such as education and health infrastructure, must be considered as part of the masterplan for the site.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKKD-4	Kathryn Brondon		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	I live in Ballaquane Ave, Peel and reject to the expansion to use green field sites for further housing development and the building of a link road. This was not part of the original plan. Peel does not need more new houses, it needs investment in in the houses in the tow, grants to allow people to renovate these old properties. The infrastructure of Peel can not cope with more residents and the roads coming out of Douglas into Peel can not cope with the vast increase in traffic.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</b>  <b>Although the sites were not part of the Draft Plan (2022) Cabinet Office reserves the right to be able to propose changes to the Draft Plan ahead of Inquiry sessions. In the case of the proposal sites in question, these changes to the Draft were supported by the Inspector in his report and Cabinet Office now proposes them as modifications to the Draft.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office considers that grant or loan funding mechanisms for the renovation of property is outside of the remit of the Area Plan for the North and West although the Department of Enterprise may be able to advise in this regard.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKKF-6			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	the modifications don't address the fact there is not enough infrastructure in Peel, Drs, Schools, Sewerage disposal, parking in lower Peel. adding fields that were not part of the original proposals for zoning of housing, and the lack of transparency of the landowners, developers and Peel Commissioners in actively involving existing residents of Peel regarding this. District Link Road - not necessary, in fact it can clearly be seen that this is a ploy to enable more housing.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your concern regarding the provision of community facilities and other infrastructure in Peel, an issue which was discussed at length during the inquiry. Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community.</b>  <b>In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions. The Area Plan for the North and West sets a development framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth and increased demand as a result of planned development.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office maintain that the Area Plan process has been fully transparent and open to all participants.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKKN-E			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	There is a strong need for additional housing across the island, especially in the west, have an influx of new affordable quality housing will be a boon to the economy. The addition of the District Link Road will make the centre of Peel safer and calmer for drivers and pedestrians.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comments with regards to the allocation of sufficient land in the west of the Island, contributing to local housing needs identified in the Strategic Plan 2016 and helping to meet the requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Cabinet Office note your support for the District Link Road in reducing traffic through the centre of Peel including the Albany Road.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKKQ-H	Ellie Reynolds		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion. The schools and doctors will become heavily over run- even more than they already are; and this will lead to a dramatic fail in education and health care, with an already over populated primary school, and a struggling secondary school with a canteen too small to house its current students- let alone another 220 more these new houses will bring (based off the idea 50% of residents will be of childbearing age, and the average number of children to a nuclear family is 1.4.) This is never something the government seem to consider, and in the long run is putting lots of young peoples futures at jeopardy, not to mention the other residents would be of retirement age, requiring health care which is becoming increasingly more difficult to access due to the overpopulation of Peel.	<b>The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed in detail during the inquiry sessions. In response, the Cabinet Office developed proposals within the Area Plan that aim to limit development on sites in Peel until there is greater certainty regarding the delivery of the planned Regional Sewage Treatment Works (RSTW). The Cabinet Office has also ensured that the need for and potential location of community facilities, such as education and health infrastructure, must be considered as part of the masterplan for the site.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKKV-P			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion. This expansion is residential zoning is obscene in its scale and unjustifiable. The current housing market in the IOM is hampered primarily by the number of houses which are stood empty and have been for years. A better solution would be to provide more incentives and opportunities for people to renovate older housing. As a young family we moved to the island and initially looked for opportunities to buy a previously unloved house with a view to renovate it into a family home for the future. However, this was met with roadblocks at almost every stage. Considerations should be given to renovation grants and more support for mortgages on such properties (many of which it is impossible to get a mortgage for).	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel. Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability. In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKKV-P			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Further to this, the IOM prides itself of being the first entire nation UNESCO biosphere, yet we are willingly removing green spaces and natural habitats for the flora and fauna. As I have already mentioned I think there is more we can do to make use of the infrastructure and housing already in place before we consider removing more green and wild spaces.	<b>The Area Plan for the North and West sets a development framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth and increased demand as a result of planned development. The Area Plan for the North and West is fully supportive of the Island's unique status as a whole national UNESCO Biosphere reserve. Please see Paragraph 4.6.1 and 7.4 of the Written Statement.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKKW-Q	Matthew Corlett		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This would be an awful idea to add to peels already deteriorated town centre as we have lost most of our essential shops, we have no banks and why build more houses when there is plenty of brown land to renovate or rebuild! Dandara are a land obtaining machine and for once we should stop dandara just putting in new builds. The government need to listen to the representatives of peel and patrick and restore and improve what peel has lost as otherwise peels towns and businesses won't survive as the typical people who live in the new estates that have been built in the past 15 years mostly don't work and peel and bring nothing to peel apart from paying rates. We need something to revive peel not destroy it and congest the already massive estates.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comments and considers that the Area Plan provides adequate policy provision to protect the vibrancy and vitality of town centres in the Plan Area.</b>  <b>Please see Town Centre Proposals 4-8 which relate specifically to Peel.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKKX-R			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Good development for peel Extra revenue for local town investment Link road will help prevent accidents and take congestion out of small roads in town which need to be 20mph	Cabinet Office notes your support for additional development in Peel, particularly the benefits in relation to reducing congestion on existing roads and supporting investment in the town.		
ANON-UVCN-NKQ3-S			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion. I have major concerns with regards to infrastructure being able to support such an expansion when schools, sewage, doctors etc are already bursting at the seams. I see little point in the proposed district line running between the major routes in/out of peel	Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.  In accordance with Strategic Policy, the Area Plan for the North and West aims to focus development within existing settlements, or where appropriate, in sustainable urban extensions to these settlements. Accordingly, sustainable urban extensions are not a new concept. Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community. In most cases, infrastructure provision lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions.		
ANON-UVCN-NKQH-E			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	I object both to the proposed modifications and in particular to the zoning of fieldsGMR008, GMR009 and GMR023. In addition, the proposal for a district link road has no apparent justification or logical explanation of need/benefit. In recent years Peel has experienced major expansion without any provision of required infrastructure in support. This is already effecting quality of life and provision of services to the community in terms of education, health, sewage disposal and amenity. The lack of transparency in the addition of these areas at the request of developers and against the wishes of the local community is undemocratic. A pause in major development such as this is necessary to allow development of infrastructure, protect the remaining green spaces and protect community development	Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel. Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community. In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions. The Area Plan for the North and West sets a development framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth and increased demand as a result of planned development. The Department rejects that the position of the Department as far as it relates to the sites in question in advance of, during and after public inquiry sessions was in any way unclear or that any part of the development plan procedure.		
ANON-UVCN-NKQP-P			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	The proposed development of reference GMC002 is adjacent to the 15th Fairway of Peel Golf Club. The Golf Club strongly objects to this proposal for health and safety reasons with the risk of damage to people and property due to the close proximity of potential residential properties. Further, if, as a result of this plan and subsequent planning being approved, the Golf Club had to change the course layout to ensure the safety of residents and liability of players there would be significant cost implications to the Club which would have knock on implications for both members and visitors. Transforming this area into residential housing gives concerns about the potential for issues for the golf course caused by the new development, such as noise (to both parties), traffic, and as stated already, safety risks. Peel Golf Club and the current course have been established now for over 125 years and continues to provide excellent recreational facilities to residents and visitors to the Island. The club understands the need for additional zoning to support future residential development and are already making plans to work around likely developments that will take place on land bordering other areas of the course. Zoning GMC002 as residential however is a step too far for the Club and the Club believes it to be unnecessary given the relatively small size of the land involved which must restrict its potential compared with the issues it would otherwise create	Cabinet Office notes your comments regarding the proposed allocation of site GMC002 for residential use. The concerns raised in relation to health and safety, as well as potential operational impacts on Peel Golf Club, are acknowledged. These matters would be expected to be considered at the planning application stage, where site-specific design and mitigation measures to reduce any potential harm can be fully assessed. The allocation of GMC002 also enables a more direct route for a potential link road, avoiding agricultural land outside the proposed residential area and facilitating a junction with Douglas Road.		
ANON-UVCN-NKWA-D			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	There is a Tholtan and woodland on this area, together with a small pond. Pipistrelle bats , Woodpeckers and other wildlife inhabit these woods. The bats are protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. I do not believe the current infrastructure egg Drs, Dentists and Schools etc could cope with a further increase in the local population.	Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see the Development Brief for the sites in question which include a requirement for a full Environmental Impact Assessment of both phases of the site. Cabinet office note you comments and those of others regarding the provision of infrastructure and community facilities in Peel, please see Open Space and Community Proposal 6 of the Written Statement.		
ANON-UVCN-NKX1-X	Chris Gregory		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Unnecessary infrastructure in the form of the Link road. Increased traffic further eradicating children safety and their Right to Play. GP appointments are already hard to get and the I crease in population would only make matters harder. The primary school is already over populated and this would make matters worse. A terrible idea across the board!	Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.  Please see the Open Space and Community Proposals in the Written Statement.		
ANON-UVCN-NKX9-6			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Peel doesn't have the infrastructure to support more housing.  Poor parking Already waiting over a month for a Doctors appointment Dentist surgeries full Schools full Pumping sewerage into the bay The new housing is currently on a septic tank	Cabinet Office notes your comments, please see Open Space and Community Proposal 6 and Transport and Utilities Proposal 5 of the Written Statement which address the potential future provision of community facilities in Peel and the Plan's support for the development of an RSTW respectively.		
ANON-UVCN-NKXD-H			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	No infrastructure to support the residential properties at present time. To increase housing would be a detriment to already laden infrastructure e.g. schooling / doctors / vehicles on road.  The island infrastructure cannot cope already. Alternative routes during TT is abysmal	Throughout the plan process Cabinet Office has considered the existing provision of infrastructure and other community facilities as well as where future upgrades and other investment is planned. Cabinet Office accept that in some cases, the provision of infrastructure lies beyond the remit of the Area Plan but that the Plan can facilitate future investment decisions for other Government Departments and Boards in future. This stance is set out in the 'recommendations' of the Written Statement.		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKXE-J			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>I object to the amended Development Briefs for sites PR002 GMR008, 009,023, 003 and GMC002 on the grounds that:-</p> <p>1. Peel's infrastructure has not kept pace with the increase in the population. Peel has had a considerable amount of new housing in the last fifteen years. Peel's population has increased by around 25% in that time. The Infrastructure has not kept pace with this increase so there is no reason to believe that the infrastructure will be put into place to meet any new population.</p> <p>The Education infrastructure has not been extended to accommodate this increase. Cloth Workers Primary School has one of the biggest intakes on the Island, the recently published Department of Education's capital programme of priorities does not include any extension for the school. QE11's Stem extension has been in the D of Es capital programme for over 5 years and has yet to be procured as a building project.</p> <p>Peel's Sewage Treatment works has planning permission but again the procurement procedure is still not underway. Peel's roads and pavements are not of a suitable size and standard to accommodate increased traffic and pedestrian movement. For example the southern half of Peel has no pavement on the main Douglas Road. This makes safe pedestrian movement very dangerous.</p>	<p>In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions. The Area Plan for the North and West sets a development framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth and increased demand as a result of planned development.</p> <p>The Area Plan for the North and West has supported the delivery of an RSTW to serve Peel and the West since the publication of the Draft Plan in 2022. Please see Transport and Utilities Proposal 5 of the Written Statement. In addition to this, Cabinet Office note that work on the site of the RSTW has recently commenced.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXE-J			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>2. The allocation of @516 houses on the western side of Peel is not sustainable and is not in-line with net zero. The allocation of @516 houses will result in an additional population in Peel of @1400 persons. Of that population the vast majority of adults will be employed outside Peel (no additional employment land allocated in the Draft Area Plan for the North and West) mostly in the urban conurbation of Douglas. The round trip of 22miles per day is not in line with sustainability and hence net zero. The Government has failed to change the modal split between car and bus or cycle in the last 5 years despite some expensive improvements such as the traffic lights at Quarterbridge. It is unlikely to change the split for these commuters. In addition, Quarterbridge Roundabout is at or near capacity for safe use (see data from DOI). The addition @1000 cars at peak times will require a significant upgrade to these junctions.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office considers that due to declining household size and other prevailing demographic trends, any population increase in Peel as a result of development on proposal sites are part of the Plan would be less than the figure cited.</p> <p>Cabinet Office accept that a large amount of the land proposed for employment purposes around Mill Road, Peel has not been developed for employment purposes. This is further explained at paragraph 11.10 of he Written Statement. The Area Plan for the North and West does make employment land proposals for Peel, please see Employment Proposals 5 and 6 of the Written Statement.</p> <p>The issue of traffic generation was discussed at length during the public inquiry. The Inspector considered it unlikely that projected development allocated under the Area Plan would give rise to unresolvable problems of traffic flow or congestion anywhere on the Island.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXE-J			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>3. There was inadequate opportunity for Public Consultation on Sites PR 002 GMR008, 009,023, 003 and GMC002 because they were not in the Draft Area Pan for the North and West. Openness and transparency is a cornerstone of the pledges of this Administration. However it has failed to deliver an acceptable standard of openness and transparency with regard to the very significant land use proposals included in the Draft Plan issued in 2022. The 2022 Plan had no public exhibition or any explanation from the Government to the residents of Peel. Government has never before added in such a large area of land for development in an Area Plan without due public consultation.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office accept that the proposal sites in question did not form part of the original 2022 Draft Plan. However, the sites were supported as proposed changes to the Draft Plan (2022) in advance of public inquiry sessions as part of the publication of the PIPs and during public inquiry sessions which were fully open to the public and all other interested stakeholders.</p> <p>Following Schedule 1 of the Act, the 2022 Draft Area Plan for the North and West was subject to full public consultation for a period of 12 weeks. In addition to this, Cabinet Office ran a series of informal drop-in sessions at the House of Manannan between the 13th and 16th July 2022. Full public consultation has occurred.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXF-K			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>The infrastructure does not exist to cope with this. I live in Slieau Whallian view, was told I'd only be on septic tank for approx. 5 years, 9 years in and still the same. School not big enough, Dr surgery can't cope with existent population, no banks, sewerage cant cope.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office note your comment and those of others regarding community facilities and infrastructure in Peel. Whilst the direct provision of infrastructure does somewhat sit outside of the remit of the Area Plan for the North and West. Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 6 of the Area Plan for the Noth and West.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXN-U			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.</p> <p>The fields in question on this proposal were not included in original proposals for zoning for houses. There has been significant residential development on the outskirts of Peel already and further development will be detrimental to the green spaces around Peel.</p> <p>The area GMR023 contains a protected forest and pond, this area has been marked as predominantly residential on the plans. It is the home of a wide range of wildlife including birds of prey, woodpeckers, bats, dragonflies and hedgehogs, there has been a lot of work put in by local residents to reduce the impact from current residential properties to the existing wildlife population. I have already contacted the northwestareaplan e-mail contact details to enquire how this area will be impacted upon by residential properties but have received no response. As these areas have been added without consultation and also been added very recently the full environmental impact on these areas has not been allowed to be fully assessed by appropriate authorities.</p> <p>Further more the impact of a district link road on the environment, wildlife and residents will be detrimental by again running through green spaces, established community projects (the allotments) and is not a necessary addition and will significantly impact the area.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.</p> <p>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. Cabinet Office accept that the proposal sites in question did not form part of the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022). The Department has been open in its support for the sites in question since the publication of the public inquiry papers in march 2024 and during sessions at the public inquiry on the subject</p> <p>Please see development brief points for site GMR023 (pg. 128 of the written statement) which includes a requirement for a full Environmental Impact Assessment of the sites which would entail the assessment of a wide range of environmental factors. It is also noted that point 12 of the Development Brief relates to Areas of Registered Trees and point 13 relates to the existing allotments.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXN-U			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>Accessing vital community services (such as medical appointments) in Peel is already difficult, adding a further population increase of potentially 517 properties will significantly impact on this further. This requires plans to be in place or proposals to demonstrate how this increase in demand will be met by the local authorities prior to considering adding further residential areas. Infrastructure needs to be considered for medical access, schools, maintenance of local areas and local parking. The newer areas in Peel already receive lack of maintenance/ care and upkeep of open spaces how will the authorities manage financially and with existing capacity to maintain areas to a good standard. For example the local park in Slieau Whallian View, this has not been up kept and is now a fenced off area with nothing in it. Bushes and trees have been left to grow without any care and maintenance so are now overgrown affecting pathways. There is limited maintenance to the extended local area other than mowing the grass resulting in weeds extensively growing in roads and pathways. How will this be maintained by extending the town further?</p> <p>Much of GMR008, GMR009 and GMR023 are currently used as agricultural land offering local jobs and local produce. Losing the land to residential will result in loss of a sustainable island plan meaning we are more reliant on off island produce which has an environmental and local impact.</p> <p>It comes across that these plans have been added into the proposals without openness and transparency which has not allowed the local community to have time to consider the full impact of the plans, they will have considerable implications environmentally, financially and further strain on local resources which will significantly impact the local and wider island community.</p>	<p>In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions. The Area Plan for the North and West sets a development framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth and increased demand as a result of planned development.</p> <p>Although the maintenance of open spaces is not within the remit of the Cabinet Office, the Area Plan for the North and West supports the retention and protection of existing areas of public open space.</p> <p>Cabinet Office accept that the proposal sites did not form part of the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022) but the Department does consider it has been open and transparent when it comes to supporting the sites through the public inquiry process. In preparing the Area Plan, the Department has followed the Development Plan procedure set out in Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act which includes statutory periods of consultation.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXQ-X			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>Too many houses</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comment</p>		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKXR-Y	Chris Duff		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Peel's infrastructure is already overwhelmed. Another 517 housing units without a significant investment in infrastructure is completely unreasonable and a link road would inevitably have a negative impact on our natural environment and green spaces	<b>Cabinet Office note your comment. Please see development brief criteria which include a requirement for a masterplan to address, among other topics, the need for and potential location of community facilities to serve the development.</b>  Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel.		
ANON-UVCN-NKXU-2	Demetrios Andrea		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.</p> <p>The fields in question on this proposal were not included in original proposals for zoning for housing. There has been significant residential development on the outskirts of peel already and further development will be detrimental to the green spaces and farmland around peel. There are other areas on the island that would be benefit from development. Peel has been expanded enough.</p> <p>The area GMR023 contains a protected forest and pond this area has been marked as predominantly residential on the plan's. It homes a wide variety of wildlife including birds of prey bats , woodpeckers hedgehogs and many more.</p> <p>Peel also does not have the infrastructure to cater for potentially 517 new houses i.e. schools, doctors ,dentists parking in town.</p> <p>I feel we are in danger of losing to much good agriculture land we should be using this land to support farming and keep the island self sufficient and not relying on bringing to much produce in.</p>	<b>Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel. Cabinet Office does consider that the larger settlements in the Plan Area have a greater degree of service provision compared to smaller settlements. Accordingly, Cabinet Office maintain it is appropriate to focus development proposals within or as sustainable urban extensions to existing service centres such as Peel and Ramsey, with proposal sites in other settlements proportionate to service provision and infrastructure availability. Cabinet Office accept that the proposal sites in question did not form part of the original 2022 Draft Plan. However, the sites were supported as proposed changes to the Draft during public inquiry sessions which were fully open to the public and all other interested stakeholders.Please see the development brief for the sites in question which includes a requirement for a masterplan to address, among other matters: the need for and potential location of local community facilities. Please also note the development brief requirement for a Full Environmental Impact Assessment for both phases of the development site which will allow for the assessment of a wide range of environmental factors as part of any planning application and potential mitigations to reduce impact as part of development.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXZ-7			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>This objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion.</p> <p>There is no properly thought out development for Peel in its entirety. There has been a significant increase in housing development already around Peel, however there has been no plan to improve and develop economic opportunities for the town.</p> <p>More housing will increase the population of Peel adding further strain on the infrastructure and essential services. In turn this will increase traffic travelling to Douglas and Onchan being the main centres of employment.</p> <p>More good arable and grazing farmland will be lost at a time when food security is becoming increasingly important . Without incentives for businesses to relocate or start in Peel and thus create a need to develop the town centre Peel will continue to deteriorate . The development of tourism and leisure opportunities as suggested will create some seasonal employment Economic development must be spread around the island and not just Douglas to create a network of vibrant centres</p>	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that it is important for development to be served by the right infrastructure, including highways. Development brief criteria for a District Link Road will form an important part of any future masterplan for the sites and the wider circumferential highways network around Peel. Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing. Cabinet Office note that most of the land proposed for employment purposes in the peel Local Plan around Mill Road has not been developed for employment purpose for a number of reasons. Please see paragraph 11.10.2 of the Written Statement. This being said, Cabinet Office does propose additional employment land in Peel, please see Employment Proposals 5 and 6. In support of the wider aims of Our Island Plan and of the Local Economy Strategy, the Area Plan for the North and West supports the development of vibrant town centres and has developed town centre proposals which look specifically at character areas in the town centres of Ramsey and Peel seeking to facilitate regeneration and the development of high-quality spaces. Please see Town Centre Proposals 4-8.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK14-T			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	I object to the modifications to the zoning of fields GMR008, 009 and GMR023 to allow for residential development. This is not sustainable urban extensions as Peel is already over developed and the infrastructure is failing already due to the population needs. A district link road is totally unnecessary and should not be considered due to loss of green fields. Destruction of natural habitats and Peel becoming (more of) a visual blot on our precious landscape (UNESCO Biosphere status is becoming a joke)	<b>Cabinet Office note your comment. Cabinet Office maintain that the sites constitute a sustainable urban extension to Peel. In accordance with the Strategic Plan, the Area Plan seeks to focus development within existing centre but does acknowledge that in certain circumstances - the expansion of settlements is necessary. Where this is the case, it is important that these extensions are well planned. Development brief criteria requirement for a masterplan to address a number of issues as part of a planning application aims to ensure this is the case.</b>  The Area Plan for the North and West is fully supportive of the Island's unique status as a whole nation UNESCO Biosphere reserve and this is noted at paragraph 4.6 and 7.4 of the Written Statement.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK1B-8			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	How more housing can be considered in the west when we have such a problem with sewage. We need to protect and safeguard Peel's green spaces and we think that Peel has had more than enough of housing development!!! No further development housing units.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see Transport and Utilities Proposal 5 and the Open Space and Community Proposals of the Written Statement.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK1H-E			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	I object to the modification to the zoning for GMR008, 009 + 023. Peel is already straining the limits of its infrastructure and cannot sustain hundreds of additional residences. The environmental damage these developments would do would be catastrophic for wildlife habitats and flora. Peel has absolutely no need for a link road, which would only be used by those living in new developments as a quicker way to Douglas, further removing the need for people to shop locally in Peel. There is nothing in these modifications that takes the needs of Peel's residents into consideration.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comments. Please see Development Brief for sites GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMC002 and GMR003 which include a requirement for a full Environmental Impact Assessment for both development phases of the site</b>  Cabinet office note your comment on the proposal for a link road as part of the development brief for the sites. The route of the link road is set out indicatively on Map 6 - Peel, for further detailed please see points 1 (iii), 5 and 6 of the development brief for the site.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK2Y-Z			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Sewerage disposal not sorted out. No improvements made to infrastructure, still as it was 7 years ago. Peel can't take extras until the basics are sorted out first.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Area Plan for the North and West has supported the delivery of an RSTW since the Draft Plan was published in 2022. Please see Transport and Utilities Proposal 5 of the Written Statement.</b>  Development Brief criteria for proposal sites in Peel aim to limit development until an RSTW is at its at initial operational capacity. Cabinet Office maintain that this is a proportionate approach so as to not preclude development in Peel within the Plan period but to ensure that there is certainty than when development does come forward that it can be adequately served by the right infrastructure.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK31-S		Peel Commissioners	63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	No other additional land should be currently zoned for predominately residential development on greenfield sites on the outskirts of Peel subject to provision (iii) below. iii. Sufficient land via Strategic Reserve sites with appropriate development briefs are designated to ensure that infrastructure improvements, where required, are fully considered. These Strategic Reserve sites are a mandatory safeguard in the event a short term duration Area Plan is necessary (up to 3 years) for the transition into the New 2026 to 2026 Strategic Plan. This Strategic Reserve sites requirement will be significantly less than the 38.3 Ha provision in the Post Inquiry Modification 2025 Draft Area Plan. iv. Any medium to large sites zoned for predominately residential development within Peel's settlement boundary (identified through the call for sites consultation or subsequently through the development of this Area Plan for the North and West) should not take place until adequate supporting infrastructure such as health, education and sewerage treatment are in place.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment on strategic reserve sites as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  Strategic reserve sites have been used in past Area Plans to hold land in abeyance until there is a demonstrable need - affording a degree of flexibility in housing need over the Plan period. In the Area Plan for the North and West Cabinet Office developed proposals which aim to limit development on sites in Peel until there is certainty regarding the delivery of the planned RSTW. Accordingly, Cabinet Office do not consider it necessary to identify land specifically as strategic reserve, as development brief criteria as part of the Plan effectively serves this function already.  With regard to education infrastructure, new land has been identified and safeguarded for both Peel Clothworkers' Primary School and Queen Elizabeth II High School (QEII). This is intended to address potential capacity issues and is protected under Open Space and Community Proposal 3.		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK31-S		Peel Commissioners	63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	The Commissioners are very concerned about the new 38.7 Ha of residential land proposed within the Draft Area Plan. This is similar to what occurred when the last Local Plan for Peel was approved in 1989. The Commissioners' consultation responses reinforced the need for appropriate infrastructure by stating: "Any medium to large sites zoned for predominately residential development within Peel's settlement boundary (identified through the call for sites consultation or subsequently through the development of this Area Plan for the North and West) should not take place until adequate supporting infrastructure such as health, education and sewerage treatment are in place. This includes the following sites in the Draft Area Plan: PR002 (Call for Sites Ref PR004) and Barfords Site (No reference but call for sites Ref PR001), Faulknres Site (No reference but Call for Sites Ref PR008) and Cowley Terrace Site (No reference but Call for Sites Ref PR001)." "The designation of Peel's settlement boundary could be made clearer by including all the land within the Town boundary and any proposed development immediately outside the Town with the appropriate land classification use based on the Peel 1989 Plan."	<b>Cabinet Office notes the concerns of the Commissioners regarding appropriate infrastructure and would refer to the above Cabinet Office response in this regard.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the Commissioners comments with regards to sites within the existing settlement boundary of Peel and would refer the Commissioners to Residential Proposal 2 of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>At this stage, Cabinet Office do not propose any further changes to the settlement boundary of Peel to include all land within the Local Authority boundary.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	On the north –west edge of Ramsey is another case of a site likely to have substantial surface water flooding problems. Yet the Inspector's attention does not appear to have been drawn to this before the allocation of this very large area of land for housing. In Peel and Kirk Michael are similar large scale greenfield additions of land zoned for residential (albeit without the flooding concerns) since the 2022 drafts. None of these is the subject of any planning application and therefore cannot supply any demand unto March 2026. They appear to be solely in situ to advance an aim of the Island Plan without taking into account settlement pattern throughout the Island which is the role of the Strategic Plan and without proper consideration of impact on services in the respective settlements or the availability of infill or brownfield sites to provide "modest" increases. Immense transition zones are allocated particularly in Ramsey for "uses –on larger floorplates (or coarse grained) adjacent to the town centre that support the principal town centre uses". How many supermarkets, garages, furniture stores, community centres and car parks do you want? Surely residential is one of the prime uses in the transition zones that might support the town centre. Residential zones on greenfield sites out of town do not support town centre uses. Peel has an estimated one third of its shops on its principal shopping street empty. The reason for the changes was given as "so as to indicate the direction of growth of Peel. Land around the Poortown Road and on the eastern edge of the northern allocation is subject to High Likelihood of Surface Water flooding. There is no justification given for the amount of growth that the full extent of the allocation could represent or the consequences of it.	<b>The Area Plan is in conformity with the Strategic Plan. As discussed during inquiry sessions, proposal sites as part of the Area Plan consider existing infrastructure and community facilities and where capacity currently exists.</b>  <b>Column 'D' of Table 16 - summary of residential land provision in the Written Statement considers the availability of sites within settlement boundaries without planning approval.</b>  <b>As noted in Chapter 9 Plan Objective 3 transition zones are those areas of settlements between town centre mixed use areas and quieter residential areas.</b>  <b>Town Centre proposals in the Area Plan support the development of vibrant town centres</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK37-Y	Christine Faid	German Parish Commissioners	63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Submission with regard to proposals slipped into the North and West Area Plan Significant development has taken place in Peel over the last 40 years which is not our concern however we were outraged to discover that there is a proposed road being approved between the Peel Kirk Michael Coast Road, across the Poortown Road and culminating in a new round a bout by the Queen Elizabeth II School on the Peel to Douglas Road. The Commissioners are strongly opposed to this proposal as it can only lead to more proposed development which will now encroach out of the Peel Boundary and into German. A new road such as proposed will only serve to be an eyesore if developed on either side and it will further split the City of Peel which is already known as "Old" and "New" Peel, what will this be known as? "Another Peel"????? We do not have the necessary infrastructure to support any development in this area and Peel's infrastructure is already failing. The schools and Doctors surgeries are already over capacity and cannot cope with the present population let alone a considerable amount more. Any proposed development including the road will result in the exploitation of good agricultural land and the loss of yet more green fields in the pursuit of profit. Further development on the outskirts of Peel will result in difficulty for the Highway infrastructure which will struggle to take extra traffic onto the roads and will put more pressure on an already struggling DOI to maintain decent road surfaces in most areas. It appears that the proposed development of fields GMR008, GMR009 and GMR023 were not in the original plan but were added later I assume by Cabinet Office following key consultation which was on the side of the developers.	<b>The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed at length at the inquiry sessions. Cabinet Office has also ensured that the need for and potential location of community facilities, such as education and health infrastructure, must be considered as part of the masterplan for the site. The District Link Road is intended to improve connectivity between Poortown and Douglas Roads, easing pressure on the Derby Road/Albany Road junction. The term "sustainable urban extension" is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and refers to land outside settlements that may be suitable for development following a sequential approach.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8J-Q	Tony Bennett		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	I am a resident at Cairn Drive, Slieau Whallian Drive, Peel and I wish to object strongly to the proposals to zone areas along the Eastern edge of Peel for future residential development, specifically areas noted as GMR009, GMR008, and GMR023 in the Plan.  The proposal constitutes serious overdevelopment and is a totally unacceptable extension to the existing urban fabric of Peel.	<b>Cabinet Office note your comment but the sites are to remain as proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8Y-6	Sarah Corlett	Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	1.1 GR009 is a parcel of land which lies between Sunset Lakes and the current eastern edge of Peel: site PR003/PO005 is also in the same ownership, the latter being a much smaller piece of land which lies to the west of Ballaquane Road towards the centre of Peel.  1.2 Our previous submissions explained how we considered with both parcels of land being in the same ownership, there is a unique opportunity to deliver both additional public open space and/or community facilities and additional residential opportunities where the smaller residential area at Ballaquane Road could be re-designated from residential to open space with the larger piece of land designated as Predominantly Residential and to contribute to what we felt was a greater housing need than had been identified in the draft plan.  1.3 The modified draft Plan acknowledged this and accepted this suggestion and the land at the outskirts of the town, between the residential development served by Oak Road and Sunset Lakes, is now designated for Predominantly Residential development, along with the land to the south (GMR008).  1.4 Both the modified draft plan and the proposed modifications to the plan following the inspector's report, continue to designate this land as Predominantly Residential. However, we remain concerned that the site is constrained from being developed due to the development brief which ties it with the land to the south, all the way to the A1 Douglas Road and its development relies entirely on the binding forward of all that land.	<b>Cabinet Office note your continued support for the sites in question.</b>  <b>The Department maintain committed to the approach taken since the publication of the public inquiry papers in March 2024 specifically relating to the proposed phasing of the development sites adjacent to the western edge of the Peel settlement boundary. The Department consider that owing to the substantial size of the sites, and the need to deliver key road infrastructure as part of a cohesive and co-ordinated approach to development it only right that a phased approach is adopted with an initial focus on land south of the Poortown Road.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8Y-6	Sarah Corlett	Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	1.6 Unfortunately, despite us making a lengthy submission and appearing at the inquiry to elaborate, the development brief remains largely unchanged in respect of the points we raised and no reference has been made in the inspector's report to many of the our points and we would therefore ask that the Cabinet Office has regard to all of the points we raised and responds to them in this last stage of the development plan process.  2.1 The development brief relates to three pieces of land - GMR023 which lies on the south western side of the A20 Poortown Road; GMR008 which lies on the north eastern side of Poortown Road and which abuts GMR009; and GMR009 itself. A further site, GMR014 abuts GMR009 and connects this with the Ramsey Road (A4). This last site is not designated for development and not included in the development brief.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Inspector is clear in his report that all written and oral representations made to the inquiry, as well as consultation responses to the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022) were taken into account in the drafting of the Inspector's Report.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK8Y-6	Sarah Corlett	Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>2.2 The brief states the following:</p> <p>1. The sites shall be developed for:</p> <p>i. predominantly residential uses;</p> <p>ii. community facilities and public open space; and</p> <p>iii. the construction of a District Link Road – the route for which must be integral to the design scheme and protected in the longer term to ensure the opportunity to connect to the A4 Ramsey Road in the north and the A1 Douglas Road in the South.</p> <p>2.3 The owner reiterates that they have no issues with 1, 7, 9, 11 and the new condition 12. Phasing</p> <p>2.4 Points 2, 3, 4 and 5 all require a number of things: firstly that the three sites, GMR008, GMR009 and GMR023 are all treated as a single unit for the purposes of the preparation of an Environmental Impact Assessment and also for the phasing of the development which should proceed with GMR023 first, then GMR008 and finally GMR009 with no further development occurring to the north (GMR014) as this was not considered necessary to satisfy the housing need for the plan period. This phasing and land use designation also results in the development of GMR008 and GMR009 discharging onto the Ramsey Road via Ballagyr Lane without any allowance for a widening or improvement of Ballagyr Lane.</p> <p>2.5 GMR023, GMR008 and GMR009 are in at least five different ownerships. The requirement therefore for all three parcels of land</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comment but maintains that in order so that a full and proper assessment of the environmental impact of the development sites can be carried out it is appropriate that for the purposes of the environmental impact assessment the sites are viewed as a whole.</p> <p>Further to this, the Department maintains that it is appropriate for the individual development sites to be grouped into phases 1 and 2. Cabinet Office note that traffic from phase 2 of the development sites (part GMR008 and GMR009) would discharge onto the Ramsey Road via Ballagyr Lane. Whilst the Area Plan for the North and West acknowledges that a connection between Ballagyr Lane and the Ramey Road is for the longer term, and consequently does not propose fields north of Ballagyr Lane, the Area Plan does not preclude any necessary improvements to Ballagyr Lane in order to accommodate additional traffic.</p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8Y-6	Sarah Corlett	Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>Environmental Impact Assessment</p> <p>2.6 Whilst it is fully accepted that a broad range of information will be required for any application to develop this significant area, it is not understood why a full Environmental Impact Assessment is required given that the Strategic Plan requires only the provision of such information where the development is outside an identified settlement and the modified draft plan shows these three sites as being within the settlement boundary. It is irrelevant that the land is currently outside the existing settlement boundary as this is being modified in the proposed Area Plan. Even if it were, it would be difficult for any of the land owners involved without the knowledge and cooperation of the others, to prepare an Environmental Impact Assessment for the whole area, due to potential difficulties with survey, access etc.</p> <p>District Link Road and GMR014</p> <p>2.7 In terms of phasing, it is fully understood that in order for the proposed District Link road to be possible, land needs to be set aside within the relevant sections.</p> <p>2.8 The land use designation consciously and deliberately omits GMR014 at the northern extent, where it joins the Ramsey Road. It is not clear why this has been done, particularly given that all of the traffic from GMR008 and GMR009 and potentially that from</p>	<p>Cabinet Office note your comments relating to Environmental Impact Assessment. The Department recognises that the development sites are in different ownerships but does not consider that this represents a challenge significant enough so as to prohibit the undertaking of an Environmental Impact Assessment or to make such an assessment difficult enough so as to prevent development coming forward.</p> <p>Cabinet Office note your comment. As noted in response to comments above, the Area Plan acknowledges that a connection between Ballagyr Lane and Poortown Road is for the longer term and as a result, the fields north of Ballagyr Lane (GMR014) have not been included as part of this plan. Also as noted above the Area Plan for the North and West does not preclude improvements to be made to Ballagyr Lane in order to accommodate increased traffic as a result of development.</p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8Y-6	Sarah Corlett	Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>2.8 The land use designation consciously and deliberately omits GMR014 at the northern extent, where it joins the Ramsey Road. It is not clear why this has been done, particularly given that all of the traffic from GMR008 and GMR009 and potentially that from GMR023 will need to be able to get to the Ramsey Road in order for it to be a Link Road.</p> <p>2.9 Furthermore, the existing route from GMR009 to Ramsey Road is via Ballagyr Lane which is a very narrow, winding route which would not be suitable for such an increase in traffic without significant widening which is not possible under the current draft Area Plan. Whilst the development brief states "This phase must be able to demonstrate that there is the opportunity to connect Ballagyr lane through to the A4 Ramsey Road", even a cursory look at Ballagyr Lane will demonstrate that this is not possible.</p> <p>2.10 The brief goes on to state: "As this Phase is for the longer term the fields north of Ballagyr Lane have not been included in the settlement boundary. This full area (Phase 1 and Phase 2) has the potential - over the remaining North and West Plan Period (to 2026) and in the longer term - to provide a sustainable urban extension to Peel and to secure key highway link improvements". It is obvious that without the inclusion of GMR014 for development, these "key highway link improvements" will not and could not be fully delivered.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office consider that it is made clear in the development brief for the sites in question that a connection between Ballagyr Lane and the A4 Ramsey Road is for the longer term. Consequently, sites such as GMR014 are not proposed as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</p> <p>Cabinet Office note your comment. As noted above, there is an acknowledgement in the Plan that a connection between Ballagyr Lane and Ramsey Road is for the longer term and the Plan would not preclude any necessary improvements being made to Ballagyr Lane in order to accommodate any increase in traffic volume.</p> <p>Cabinet Office note your comment but the site GMR014 is to remain outside of the settlement boundary and not proposed as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8Y-6	Sarah Corlett	Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>2.11 If GMR014 were included for development, the likelihood of a significant part of the link road being delivered becomes much more likely along with the bringing forward of a significant part of the land designated for residential development. It is not made clear in the Plan why GMR014 was not included for development when GMR008 was as both extend the physical form of Peel outwards and both about existing residential development. Inclusion of GMR014 would also allow the development of GMR009 without reliance upon other land owners, and could deliver the development of land which is important to the provision of sufficient levels of housing for the future of the plan. The inclusion of GMR014 would also permit the safe access of GMR008 and GMR009 to Ramsey Road which Ballagyr Lane and the present proposed land use designations could not secure. Drainage 2.12 Whilst the reasoning for the requirement for no development to be undertaken prior to the initial phase of the Regional Sewage Works is operational, is understood - i.e. to ensure that there is no additional discharge of untreated sewage/wastewater into Peel Bay, we would suggest that the primary concern of the Plan should be solely that any development is capable of being satisfactorily drained of its foul and surface water, not specifying the means by which this should occur. It is notable that a current planning application for the erection of 92 dwellings in the south of Peel, 24/00055/B proposes an interim stand alone sewage treatment system pending the provision of a new Regional Sewage Treatment facility for the town. This concept does not appear to be unacceptable to Manx Utilities who state in their response to the application that "This application must be able to stand on its own merits and not rely on the delivery of Manx Utilities sewage work in Peel."</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your support for the site GMR014 but the site is not proposed for development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</p> <p>Cabinet Office note your comment. As noted during public inquiry sessions on the matter, Cabinet Office maintains that the effective management of sewage and wastewater is a priority. In this regard, the stance of the Department remains as stated in Cabinet Office Document 20 (COD 20) and no changes are proposed to the wording of development briefs or to Residential Proposal 2 as worded.</p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8Y-6	Sarah Corlett	Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>2.13 We would submit that paragraph 6 should be amended, if it is required at all, to require simply that development of this site must demonstrate that a satisfactory means of draining the site of its foul sewage in order to ensure that there is no additional discharge of untreated sewage/wastewater into Peel Bay. It should be noted that if there were to be a sewage treatment plant installed in lieu of the mains sewerage connection, there would not be the discharge of untreated sewage into Peel Bay as the condition appears to be seeking to prevent.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Following lengthy discussions at the inquiry and engagement with MUA Cabinet office amended its stance post-inquiry with the publication of Cabinet Office Document 20 (COD 20). Cabinet Office remain committed to ensuring adequate sewage infrastructure is provided in Peel by means of an RSTW and that where appropriate, development in Peel is limited until, as outlined in the development brief, the RSTW is at its initial operational capacity. Accordingly, Cabinet Office do not propose a change to the Development Brief or to Residential Proposal 2 in this regard.</p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8Y-6	Sarah Corlett	Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>Connection to the Heritage Trail</p> <p>2.14 It is not understood how the development of this land can materially contribute to better connectivity to the Heritage Trail. It is fully accepted that the development should promote and facilitate sustainable travel - walking and cycling particularly, but the Heritage Trail is a significant distance from the site, and indeed from GMR008 and there would not appear to be any requirement in the provision of the District Link Road for the accommodation of pedestrians and cyclists - such regional links are usually designed to dissuade such means of transport and are designed purely to facilitate vehicular traffic. Even if it did, it is not clear how any cycle or pedestrian route would cross the A1 and gain access to the Heritage Trail either by existing means or through any designation or proposal in the draft Area Plan.</p> <p>2.15 We would propose that this requirement within the development brief (item 8) to either the omission of the whole paragraph or the replacement of "the Heritage Trail" with surrounding amenities and facilities.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office note your comment and accept that GMR009 may not be physically close to the heritage trail (PROW 362). The Department accepts that improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes between the sites and the heritage trail may primarily focus on sites as part of phase 1 of development in securing links over Douglas Road to the heritage trail.</p> <p>The Department notes that the development brief, as worded, provides policy support for improvement to pedestrian and cycle routes in the general area which is not limited in this regard specifically to the heritage trail.</p> <p>Cabinet Office do not propose a change to the wording of the development brief for the sites in question in this regard.</p>		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK8Y-6	Sarah Corlett	Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>2.16 There would not appear to have been any assessment of the current or future demand for allotments either within the town area or this site in particular, nor the quality and use of the existing allotments. The allotments first came about when the site owner was approached to help establish a facility aimed at younger people. The allotments were created and made available at no cost. The facility has not become something that engages younger people and the allotments are now managed by older people but still at no cost to them.</p> <p>2.17 The applicant is now considering the future of the allotments and whether they are something appropriate for this site. They are clearly affected by the route of any proposed District Link Road so their future in their present location is limited. It is not clear if charging for the allotments were introduced, whether this is something that would result in a future demand for them.</p> <p>2.18 For these reasons, the owner would prefer that there is no requirement in the development brief for the allotments to be retained within the site. Alternatively, the last sentence of item 10 in the Development brief should be removed as it would seem to contradict the previous sentence which suggests that there should be a consideration of their benefits and accessibility.</p> <p>2.19 If it is concluded that they should be retained or provision for them included in any development of the site, the owner would ask that they are considered to contribute to the provision of Public Open Space commensurate with the level of development and the requirement for POS in the Strategic Plan.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comments regarding the existing allotments within site GMR009.</p> <p>Cabinet Office maintain that the allotments on the site must be retained as part of future development proposals on the site.</p> <p>Cabinet Office note your statement that if the allotments are to be retained that they should contribute to the site's provision of public open space. Cabinet Office note that the Strategic Plan recognises the importance of allotments but that they are noted as specifically excluded from the definition of playing space as a A.6.3 of Appendix 6 - Open Space requirements for new residential development. Consequently it would not be appropriate for allotments to be counted towards the site's open space contribution.</p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8Y-6	Sarah Corlett	Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>3.0 Conclusion</p> <p>3.1 The owner supports the designation of this site as Predominantly Residential but has concerns about the wording of the development brief as explained above.</p> <p>3.2 The owner is aware of the considerable concern in the public arena about the amount of land being proposed for development at the periphery of Peel and whilst the matter of determining how much of this should be designated for development is one for the decision makers, we would reiterate that our site has existing, usable transport and drainage links which would enable the site to be developed right now without the need either now or in the future, for the release and development of the land either adjacent to it or on the southern side of Poortown Road. If this concern about the scale of development land in Peel is now supported by Cabinet Office, we would emphasise that the designation of GMR009 without the remainder of the proposed development area could release housing land for Peel without the need for any other land to be designated or developed.</p> <p>3.3 It cannot be the case that there could be a concern on visual grounds that GMR009 could be developed without GMR008 to the south also being brought forward as the omission of GMR014 will result in an undeveloped field between Ramsey Road and GMR009 should the plan as set out be implemented. If GMR009 were implemented without GMR008 then the same situation would arise as viewed from Poortown Road.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office note your support for the site in question.</p> <p>At this stage, the Department does not propose any amendments to the development brief as far as it relates to the phasing of the sites in question. The sites are to be retained as proposed for residential as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8Y-6	Sarah Corlett	Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>3.4 If it is confirmed that all of the land between GMR009 and Douglas Road is suitable for designation for development, we would submit that there is no more benefit in requiring that the area starts to be developed at the Douglas Road end than any other part of it. Whilst the southern end is closest to QEII, the land to the north of Poortown Road is closer to the primary school, swimming pool, Peel Commissioners' proposed recreation and leisure hub and a greater concentration of population within safe walking distance.</p> <p>3.5 The omission of GMR014 does not prevent nor prejudice the development of GMR009 but its inclusion for development would bring about a number of significant benefits. Firstly it would enable the District Link Road to be just that, linking Douglas Road with Ramsey Road and providing an alternative route for vehicles travelling north not to have to go through the centre of the town or through Oak Road which has frontage development, so is not a true distributor route suitable for all types of traffic.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office note your comment. The Department does not propose any changes to the development brief for the sites in question as far as they relate to the phasing of the proposal sites.</p> <p>Cabinet Office note your continued support for the inclusion of site GMR014 but the site is not proposed as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKCV-E			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	I raised concerns about the two sites no's GRM009 + 008 some years ago when Simon Marshall got permission to develop his lakes project. We were given firm assurance my M.H.K. Tim Crookall that there was no change that these fields would ever be developed! What are we leaving for future generations? We claim to be so clever but we seem to be blind to reality that land is a finite resource, once our fields are covered with concrete they are lost. I'm sorry but it's time to curb development. Infrastructure is lacking- doctors surgeries cannot cope dentists cannot care for our children.	Cabinet Office notes this comment. Whilst the Department cannot comment on discussions between MHK's and their constituents and statements which may or may not have been accurate at the time - Cabinet Office does note that the Peel Local Plan (1989) itself does not propose any land for development west of Ballagyr Lane.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKH7-M			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Stop this nonsense before it's too late enough is enough services doctors dentists can not stand another overload we don't need more houses and more people I completely oppose This nightmare.	Cabinet Office note your comment and those of others. Please see the development brief for the sites in question which requires that a Masterplan address, among other things, the need for and potential local of local community facilities to support a development of this size.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKHH-5	Hazel Hannan		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>I oppose any development in areas GMR008/009/23 not only do I oppose this area of development, it is premature as there is no commitment from Government to any improvement to the Infrastructure of the Settlement of Peel.</p> <p>Government policy is to increase in Population, this proposed development to satisfy that policy is proposed without providing or doing anything to increase employment in the area or the infrastructure (health/schools/social care.) our existing population deserve better than this to dilute even further the infrastructure already available which is not serving our needs.</p> <p>We all know the developers have the upper hand and Planners seem to work with them, not for good planning results.</p> <p>The suggested Road should only run from Poortown Road to Douglas Road and if and when it is built it should be built by Government to the correct standards for a District Link Road. The Allotments must also be preserved.</p> <p>Developers cannot be trusted regarding the Road building, Oak Road, Ballawattleworth being an example of that. The area should remain Agricultural until a new plan is fully explored after further full consideration of this proposed extension of Peel into German Parish Area.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comment regarding employment opportunities in Peel. The Department has noted in other responses as part of this document that there is an acknowledgement that much of the land proposed for employment uses in the 1989 Local Plan has not been developed for such purposes. Please see paragraph 11.10 and employment proposals 5 and 6 of the Area Plan for the North and West.</p> <p>Throughout the Area Plan process the Department has developed proposals considering existing infrastructure capacity and planned improvements. As noted in response to other comments, whilst the direct provision of infrastructure lies outside the remit of the Area Plan for the North and West, the Area Plan can act as a facilitator for other Government Departments and service providers when determining where planned improvements to infrastructure are to be made in line with areas of population growth.</p> <p>Cabinet Office note your comment, please see the Development Brief for the sites in question particularly points 5 and 6 which relate to the planned phasing of the development site and how the proposal for a link road is integral to the design of the development site as a whole. In addition, please see point 13 of the above development brief which relates to the allotments which presently form part of GMR009.</p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKHH-5	Hazel Hannan		63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>GMR002 should not be built on as this would constitute ribbon development not related to an existing settlement.</p> <p>When we considered the 1989 Peel Plan the Farmer was still working the land now we've seen what that lack of attention to detail can lead to.</p> <p>Peel has Brown field sites which must be developed before any farm land is allowed to be swallowed up by even more estates and extending Peel boundaries into German Parish, IT SHOULD NOT BE UP TO PLANNERS TO EXTEND TOWN BOUNDARIES IT IS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND ULTIMATELY TYNWALD.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office note your comment regarding GMC002. Cabinet Office's stance remains as it was during public inquiry sessions and as set out in Cabinet Office Document 10 (COD 10) which sets out that the Department recognised the benefits of utilising two sites in the same ownership (GMR003 and GMC002) for the routing of a possible new road connecting the Douglas and Poortown Roads. Accordingly the site is to be retained.</p> <p>Cabinet Office note your comment on brownfield sites in Peel. In accordance with the Strategic Plan the Area Plan seeks to propose land for development within existing settlements first but does consider that in certain circumstances, extensions to settlements are necessary.</p>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NKV2-W			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	No need for expansion in area that is proposed for adding to the area plan.	Cabinet Office notes this comment.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVF-H	Nigel Godfrey	Peel and German Burial Authority	63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	The original North & West Area Plan allowed for the extension of a conventional 'lawn cemetery' to the West of the existing cemetery by the Burial Authority for Peel and German. Previously this site had planning permission for cemetery use. The current cemetery, at the present rate of use, has under 10 years space remaining on the site. The site is bordered by the golf course on its southern flank and the Peel/Douglas Road on its northern flank. Clearly the cemetery has infrastructure which it would be best to make use of, so the value of having an extension that borders the existing site will make us of the same infrastructure (Chapel and Key Car Park). This makes economic sense to the rate payers, as the Burial Authority is funded by a precept on the rates. The proposal first mooted in 2009 has been to create a woodland cemetery to the east side of the exiting cemetery on the approach to Peel. This will have the effect of: •screening with trees many thousands of graves on the brow of the hill/skyline on this main approach to Peel •Providing a new kind of cemetery to meet slowly changing demand for style of burial •Providing a new public open space/park in German on the outskirts of Peel.	Cabinet Office notes your comment. During the public inquiry sessions, the Cabinet Office expressed support for a proposed amendment to the Draft Plan, as outlined in Cabinet Office Document 10. This document recommended that sites GMC002 and GMR003 be incorporated into the proposed sustainable urban extension. Including these sites would enable a shorter route for any potential link road to connect with Douglas Road.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVF-H	Nigel Godfrey	Peel and German Burial Authority	63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	On the west side the proposal is the provision of a conventional lawn cemetery. Formal Planning approval was given for this and the eastern site in 2010. The site plan and approval stamp are attached for information (Appendix 1). Purchase negotiations at the time had been taking place with the then owner of the site Mr. Dale of The Creggans, Peveril Road, Peel, IM5 1QA who was approached by letter on 29th August 2009. At that stage Mr Dale indicated verbally he was happy for the Burial Authority to purchase the site. Mr. Dale's death brought these negotiations to an end. While there is an increasing tendency for people to want cremation with a headstone and a smaller plot, conventional burial is still in demand and is likely to be into the foreseeable future. Either way, cremation plots and burial sites are still required. Cemeteries in the Isle of Man are very different to their English counterparts. Land on the Isle of Man for burials is sold in perpetuity, rather than leased for a period of time, so land cannot be recycled for further burials. Older gravesites might be enabled to undergo re-wilding, but essentially these sites (if not their long-term care) remain with the owner and their heirs in perpetuity. It is therefore essential to safeguard a conventional burial ground for the future population of Peel and German, not just for the next decade or so, but long into the future. Land once lost for housing can never be recovered as a cemetery. The Specific site to the West of the existing Cemetery Field labelled GMC002 A planning application (No: 09/01936/C) was submitted, the land having been investigated for its suitability for burials from a soil and water table point of view.	Cabinet Office notes your comments. As shown on Map 6 - Peel, the Area Plan includes site GMC002 (Cem) adjacent to the existing cemetery which would provide the opportunity for the existing facility to expand should there be a need. Cabinet Office also note that a planning application has been submitted on this site which 'would allow for several thousand plots' if approved.  During public inquiry sessions, Cabinet Office supported a proposed change to the Draft Plan as shown on Cabinet Office Document 10 (COD 10). This document set out that sites GMC002 and GMR003 would be better included as part of the proposed sustainable urban extension as this would allow any link road to take a shorter route to form a junction with the Douglas Road.  Accordingly, Cabinet Office is satisfied that current proposals as part of the Area Plan as far as they relate to this matter		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVU-Z			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	I have been unable to find the correct space in each of the following sections to answer/comment. Unfortunately, I did not see any notice of the consultation meeting in Peel March 13th, and am reacting the proposal to zone land for development between the Peel Douglas road, Poortown road and Ramsey road. I was told that it was reported at the meeting that there would be a new road running through any housing development. I would like to suggest that a by-pass road is required, capable of withstanding the extremely heavy vehicles/lorries that wend their way through Peel in order to reach the Ramsey road. This cannot run THROUGH an estate, but to the North-East of it, with smaller estate roads designed to connect with it. This morning there were 3-4 huge container-size lorries, two of which were laden with massive, heavy logs, winding their way from the town centre up the Ramsey Road. (which incidentally is in a very bad state of repair and has been listed for improvement for many a long year). I am not against the housing development (subject to necessary sewage, health and school facilities, bus routes etc in place) . but I think that a by-pass heavy duty road is an absolute necessity for Peel (and should be paid for, at least in part by the developer, as had been mooted many years ago for the Ballawattleworth estate, but never came to pass). Kindly move this suggestion to an appropriate space in your feedback report. Many thanks	Cabinet Office note your comment in relation to proposals for a link road as part of the development brief for the sites in question.  The development brief for sites GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMC002 and GMR003 contains a proposal for a district link road. A district link road, distinct from the existing Oak Road is capable of accommodating a greater degree of traffic movement. As noted at table 3.5 of the Manual for Manx Roads goods vehicles (LGVs, MGVs and HGVs) sit at the top of the desired user hierarchy for District link roads.		
ANON-UVCN-NKGX-M			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Firstly, this objection applies not only to the modifications, which don't go far enough to address concerns, but also to the overall zoning of fields GMR008, GMR009, and GMR023 for residential development, as well as to the proposed district link road. The draft plan as modified now refers to "sustainable urban extensions" for Peel (page133). The residents of Peel do not support this new concept or expansion. There is inadequate reasoning given for the requirement of such a road. In my experience, traffic flow is not at present an issue entering or leaving the town save for the school traffic. Considering this, the issue of educational facilities should be of higher priority than road access to these prospective residents you wish to import. All of the town's infrastructure is in fact far more strained than the road network, which should be the last of concerns when considering expanding the town so. Myself being a mother to a young child (29 myself my son 4), Manx and with Manx heritage, this kind of expansion to my home town makes me question my decision to remain here. We live multi-generationally. I am university educated, and I would never be able to afford any of the housing that you are building supposedly for the good of the community, neither would my sister, my friends, my cousins. So it becomes clear that we are not who these houses are being built for. In fact I and many I speak to in my age demographic (25-40) would rather the access to the green space over the residential properties, particularly when considering the future of our children.	Cabinet Office notes your comments and those of others regarding proposals for a link road as part of development sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that such proposals form a key part of future development proposals for Peel and have important implications for the wider circumferential network of Peel. Cabinet Office notes your concerns and those of others regarding the provision of community facilities and other infrastructure in Peel. Cabinet Office considers the importance of community facilities and infrastructure and has, where possible, developed proposals in this regard. Although the provision of most infrastructure lies beyond the remit of the Area Plan, the Plan itself can act as a facilitator for the investment decisions of other Government Departments and Boards in future. Cabinet Office notes the importance of open green spaces and in accordance with the Strategic Plan, the Area Plan protects those existing spaces within the Plan Area. Cabinet Office notes that in accordance with the open space standards of the Strategic Plan, development which may come forward as part of the Area Plan will provide open space in accordance with these standards. Through good development planning, the Area Plan for the North and West seeks to direct development towards existing centres where it can be supported and is needed most. Through this, Strategic Policy seeks to protect the Island's countryside and environment from unwarranted development.		
ANON-UVCN-NKGX-M			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	You write about a 'sustainable urban extension'. I find this heart wrenching in one way and farcical in another. What exactly is the sustainability you are speaking of? You write, with tokenism, of the need to minimise the impact on biodiversity. But you know as well as I, sustainability is about more than the vital biodiversity of the flora and fauna. It does seem a moot point to suggest that any development of 'urban' territory can truly be sustainable, and is quite frankly very transparently an exercise to appease certain parties. It takes from one (green space) to give to another (residential zone), in a way that isn't reversible, and certainly not indefinitely sustainable at any rate of growth. Like a cancer if not intercepted it will consume all that it can. But the ideological argument is not my only qualm, that leads me to want to leave my homeland with a heavy heart.	Cabinet Office note that the term sustainable urban extension is defined in the Strategic Plan 2016 and is used throughout the document when referring to areas of land outwith existing settlements but which, on their merits, may be suitable for development in accordance with a sequential approach to the provision of new housing.		
ANON-UVCN-NKGX-M			63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Peel does not have the infrastructure to support the size of the proposed development. Most of the people would end up commuting to Douglas for jobs. Not exactly environmentally friendly. Peel is a seaside town, the scale of the development would make it a concrete jungle.	Cabinet Office notes your comment but the sites in question are to be retained as proposed for residential as part of this Plan.		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NK5W-1			64		It was said in past that cemetery would be in middle of town in time. Well it's on way of being true!, Why carving up more open fields and grasslands for an unnecessary road. Yet another race track going through town. Built for yet more access for future development? As a well known song says...cut down the trees and replace with concrete buildings. Stop before too late. Bring the heart and sense of community back to PEEL. Barfords would have made excellent training facilities for apprentices. Everything doesn't have to be in Douglas. Even losing a dancing school ! Where are the facilities for our young people, the next generation. What about the older people? Certainly got several new residential blocks but they are not care homes. The poor residents in Corrin Home were re homed around the island , leaving their familiar surroundings, friends and family. We should hang our heads in shame every time we pass the rapidly deteriorating building. Why did this happen? Can't believe it actually happened after staff , locals and residents pleaded for support. Time to rejuvenate PEEL and put colour and life back into our soleless community. We need this as a priority before building up to 500 new houses ! !!	Cabinet Office notes your comments and those of others regarding proposals for a link road as part of development sites in Peel. Cabinet Office considers that such proposals form a key part of future development proposals for Peel and have important implications for the wider circumferential network.  The Area Plan supports the development of vibrant town centres and has included proposals in order to support settlement character.		
ANON-UVCN-NK71-W			64		We support the removal of references to development density in all Development Briefs.	Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Department had previously supported that minimum densities of net developable area for development sites be included in development briefs but during inquiry sessions acknowledged that this may be too onerous for applicants to calculate when making a planning application.		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		64		Density should be a matter for the Town and Country Planning Process.	Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Department had previously supported that minimum densities of net developable area for development sites be included in development briefs but during inquiry sessions acknowledged that this may be too onerous for applicants to calculate when making a planning application.		
ANON-UVCN-NK8W-4	Kate Lord-Brennan MHK		64		Not clear why removed. I think many were arguing for reduced density. To just removing the reference surely just removes policy specification, and also avoids scrutiny?	Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Department supports the removal of minimum density requirements from development briefs following Inspector's RMC 60. This being said, density assumptions remain part of the plan especially when calculating the likely yield of a development site.		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			64		Although housing should now be denser than before when built as we have a finite amount of land.	Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Department had previously supported that minimum densities of net developable area for development sites be included in development briefs but during inquiry sessions acknowledged that this may be too onerous for applicants to calculate when making a planning application		
BHLF-UVCN-NK31-S		Peel Commissioners	64		The Commissioners welcomed the content of the Inspector's report concerning housing density on page 44 paragraph 299 which removed the densities placed in the 2024 PIP Draft Area Plan.	Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Department had previously supported that minimum densities of net developable area for development sites be included in development briefs but during inquiry sessions acknowledged that this may be too onerous for applicants to calculate when making a planning application.		
ANON-UVCN-NK71-W			65		We agree that greenfield sites should have no net loss of biodiversity and biodiversity net gain shall be sought according to current strategic policy or legislation.	Cabinet Office note this comment and have ensured that there is policy through the Area Plan to support the implementation of BNG when required by Strategic Planning Policy.		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		65		This is critical to protect and potentially enhance biodiversity which is in crisis and must be seen as indivisible from the climate crisis which particularly as a biosphere must guide our actions	Cabinet Office notes your support for no biodiversity net loss, and for Biodiversity Net Gain on greenfield sites when required by Strategic Planning Policy.		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			65		Biodiversity net gain should be scrapped.	Cabinet Office notes your comment but consider that it is appropriate for the Area Plan for the North and West to provide policy support for the implementation of BNG when required by Strategic Planning policy.		
ANON-UVCN-NK71-W			66		We object to the proposed additional Development Brief requirement for greenfield sites to provide a soil survey where development would entail the loss of Class 1 or 2 soils. This modification is a result of concerns raised that the available information to inform the classification of agricultural land quality is not up to date and a soil survey would aid the judgement as to the weight to be accorded to the loss of agricultural land in future planning applications. The loss of agricultural land is covered by Strategic Plan Environment Policy 14. In our view any change to this policy or requirement for a soil survey should be considered as part of the Strategic Plan review which is currently taking place. It is considered illogical to zone greenfield land for development and subsequently require a soil quality survey at planning application stage which could result in land not being developable if Class 1 or 2 soil is found which would undermine the housing figures in the Area Plan. It is noted that the requirement for a soil quality survey is not included within the Area Plan for the East Development Briefs for greenfield sites and it is therefore considered that the Area Plan for the North and West should be consistent in its approach to the matter. The Strategic Plan makes it clear that if there is any conflict between an Area Plan and the Strategic Plan, the more recently approved provisions will prevail. It is therefore considered that zoned land should not be required to demonstrate its soil quality as the loss of agricultural land is accepted in allocating land for development.	Cabinet Office have noted your comment regarding development brief criteria for a soils survey where development may result in the loss of soils of a class 1 or 2.  As discussed during Inquiry sessions, the Agricultural soils of the Isle of Man (2001) report provides an island wide evidence base on the quality of agricultural land. This being said, the report is indicative only and it can be difficult to glean specific locations from the maps included within the report.  Cabinet Office have considered the evidence further and consider that as there are no Class 1 or 2 soils within the Plan Area, the usefulness of development brief criteria seeking to protect these soils from development is limited.  Accordingly, Cabinet Office have removed this development brief criteria from the Plan.		y
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		66		This would be more relevant and effective if IOM Government had a discernible, supportive policy towards Agriculture generally and local food supply in particular.	Cabinet Office notes this comment and those of others regarding food security however it is considered that matters relating to food security are beyond the remit of the Area Plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			66		Soil capability is not shown on the Environmental Constraints map or on Manngis so information to support implementation of Strategic Plan Policy 14 is not readily available. This is aggravated by the fact that there is no soil capability information on sites allocated for development in the extant Development Plans. Such information needs to be available before sites are allocated. Stipulating that soil surveys have to be undertaken as part of planning application process is too late. The use of a biodiversity index to control where development could take place was identified as problematic during the Inquiry. Not only is it not clear by whom or how such an index is produced, it inevitably leads to sites of better agricultural quality having the most potential for having biodiversity increased and therefore being allocated for development. By way of contrast sites of poor agricultural land quality are likely to have highest extant indexes of biodiversity and therefore are selected for development as the potential for increasing their biodiversity is lower.	This issue was discussed during Inquiry sessions and Cabinet Office maintain that it is correct that soils capability is not shown as a constraint on the environmental constraints maps.  The Agricultural Soils of the Isle of Man (2001) report was available as a core document 15 before the Inquiry and was considered during the site assessment process by Cabinet Office.  Cabinet Office notes your comments on Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). The Area Plan for North and West seeks to support BNG in accordance with current strategic policy and legislation a matter which will be fully considered as part of the Strategic Plan review.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish	Manx National Farmers Union (MNFU)	66		While we support the inclusion of a consideration for agricultural land, the MNFU will repeat the concern that under current policy the protection of agricultural land is limited to 4.87% (this will have decreased marginally as a percentage since the study due to the loss of agricultural land over the period of time) of total land area due to the limitations imposed by following the UK policy with regard to protection of agricultural land. For comparison England has 21% approx. Grade 1 and 2 land types for agriculture.  It is the view of the MNFU that current policy does not fully recognise what can be considered as good quality agricultural land for food production, which should include grade 3 land at least. Much grade 3 land is successfully productive for food inc. dairy, meat and forage crops, and has great value for local food production and the rural economy as a result and preservation of it should be given more weight. It would be preferable that sites put forward can evidence that there is no alternative/there is an overriding national need for a specific site, rather than it being more profitable for development.	Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see amended development briefs for greenfield sites in the Area Plan for the North and West. On considering the issue further, Cabinet Office have removed development brief criteria which specified that a soil quality survey be carried out where development would result in the loss of agricultural land of classes 1 or 2.  Cabinet Office notes that Strategic Plan Environment Policy 14 also applies to Class 2/3 and Class 3/2 soils.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKMK-D		Department of Infrastructure - Highways Division	67	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMR002	The development brief for these sites (GMR008, GMR009 GMR023, GMR002 and GMR003) must include a transport modelling assessment of key local and strategic junctions and consideration of improvements to accommodate increases of traffic on these junctions generated from the above sites. Key junctions include the Ballacraigne junction and A20 Poortown Road/A3 junction.	Cabinet Office notes these comments and have added development brief criteria that states:  A transport modelling assessment which assesses the impact of both development phases on key local and strategic junctions must be submitted with any application. Key junctions include the Ballacraigne junction and the A20 Poortown Road/A3 junction. Where adverse impacts arise, consideration must be given to improvements needed to accommodate increases in traffic at these junctions generated from these proposal sites		y



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NK71-W			67	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>We wish to comment on the requirements of the Development Brief and the exclusion of Site GMR014 land south of Ramsey Road as detailed below. We have separately submitted a tracked change version of the Development Brief which incorporates all our suggestions below.</p> <p>Site GMR014 comprises of land south of Ramsey Road which would provide 2ha (net) of housing land to provide at least 30 units in a sustainable location close to the existing housing and infrastructure and immediately adjacent to the existing settlement boundary. The site would be accessed via Ramsey Road and is immediately available for development.</p> <p>District Link Road</p> <p>The Development Brief for GMR 003, 008, 009, 023 and GMC002 includes a requirement for the construction of a District Link Road to connect to the A4 Ramsey Road in the north and the A1 Douglas Road in the South. It is understood that there is an aspiration to achieve better access links between the secondary school/primary school and the Ramsey Road &amp; Poortown Road without having to use Albany Road, Derby Road and Peveril Road.</p> <p>However, this clearly cannot be achieved without the inclusion of Site GMR014 which is the missing parcel of land between Douglas Road and Ramsey Road. It is therefore critical that Site GMR014 is zoned for residential use and included in the Development Brief to secure the District Link Road. The development of Site GMR014 can be designed to complete the required link to Ramsey Road.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your support for GMR014 and note the acknowledgement in the Plan that this site (north of Ballagyr Lane) is part of the longer term and therefore has not been included within the settlement boundary.</b></p> <p><b>At this time, Cabinet Office do not consider it appropriate for site GMR014 to be included within the Area Plan for the North and West.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK71-W			67	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>It is noted that the Inspectors Report into the Draft Plan did not assess Site GMR014 within the Alternative housing sites section despite the site being promoted by Hartford Homes throughout the Area Plan process.</p> <p>The Site Assessment for GMR014 did not identify any critical constraints and it identified that the site offers an opportunity to strengthen the eastern approach into Peel to more clearly define this gateway into the town. The future development of the site was not ruled out and this is clear in the Development Brief as Criterion no.4 states that "As this phase is for the longer term the fields north of Ballagyr Lane have not been included in the settlement boundary."</p> <p>It is clear that Ballagyr Lane is a narrow road that cannot accommodate the traffic to be generated by the eastern expansion of the town without widening and upgrading works which is not secured in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>The inclusion of Site GMR014 would therefore secure the District Link Road connection to Ramsey Road, it would provide a safe access route and achieve the aspiration for a link road between Ramsey Road and Poortown Road.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your support for site GMR014. Following discussions during public inquiry sessions on the topic Cabinet Office maintain that in the longer term, GMR014 may well form part of the longer term phase of the development of Peel. This being said, GMR014 is not proposed for residential development as part of the Plan.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK71-W			67	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<p>Phasing</p> <p>It is considered that the current phasing approach in the Development Brief hampers development as it proposes a two-phase approach with land north of Douglas Road coming forward first before the second phase comprising of land north of Poortown Road. There is no explanation regarding the rationale for this phasing approach and there is a concern that due to multiple landownerships this will delay the release of the second phase and the delivery of new housing in the town.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed phasing requirement should be removed to allow for sites to come forward individually whilst not prejudicing the development of the wider site. The brief must also be amended to acknowledge the separate landownerships in a similar way to other Development Briefs in the plan.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Department maintains that a phased approach to development for the sites on the edge of Peel is appropriate and does not propose a change in this regard.</b></p> <p><b>Phase 1 comprises land between the Douglas and Poortown Roads as the associated link road as part of development in this area would allow for access between the aforementioned highways without the need to use the Douglas/Albany/Derby Road junction.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK71-W			67	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criterion 3 – It is noted that the brief is missing reference to Sites GMR003 and GMC002 and some of the field numbers appear to be incorrect having checked the field gazetteer.</li> <li>• Criterion 2 – We question how an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) could realistically be undertaken for the entire site due to the various landownerships which is likely to result in the sites coming forward for development individually and at different times. The zoned area is identified on the policy map (Map 6) as falling within the existing settlement boundary. Appendix 5 of the Strategic Plan is clear that an EIA is required for residential development over 30 homes outside identified settlements. The requirement for an EIA may not therefore apply and accordingly this criterion should be removed. DEFA can confirm if an EIA is required at the appropriate time when a site comes forward at planning stage.</li> <li>• Criterion 6 – We recommend that this criterion is amended to allow for greater flexibility as the Regional Sewage Treatment Works (RSTW) has the potential to delay the delivery of new homes. We are aware of a residential planning application in Peel for 92 dwellings at land adjacent to Castle View Nursing Home (reference: 24/00055/B) where an interim foul drainage system is proposed, and this appears to be acceptable to Manx Utilities. The scheme includes a temporary on-site sewage treatment plant to cover any unforeseen delay in the availability of the new MUA public treatment works. Once the new RSTW is operational the interim system is proposed to be disconnected and removed with foul drainage from the development taken directly into the public system.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comments, Cabinet Office have ensured that it is clear which sites are in Phase 1 and 2 within the development brief for these sites. Cabinet Office note your comment but maintain that it is entirely appropriate for an Environmental Impact Assessment of the whole site to be undertaken. Cabinet Office note your comment regarding sewage treatment in Peel. Whilst noting that works on the site of the RSTW have recently commenced, Cabinet Office maintain that the approach adopted by the Department is proportionate so as to not completely preclude development on proposal sites in Peel within the Plan period but to ensure that when development does come forward that it can be serviced by the appropriate infrastructure.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK71-W			67	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criterion 8 – Whilst we support the need for consideration to be given to improvements to pedestrian and cycle routes in the general area it is considered that the reference to a link to the Heritage Trail (PROW 362) should be removed as this is not appropriate given that the brief recognises that the surrounding land is in separate ownership and it is located some distance from the zoned area beyond Douglas Road. It is therefore considered that Criteria 8 should be amended to remove reference to a link to the Heritage Trail (PROW 362).</li> <li>• Criterion 12 – It is considered that the requirement for a soil quality survey should be removed. Please see our comments on Modification no.66 for our full response on this matter.</li> </ul> <p>To conclude Site GRM014 must be included in the Development Brief and zoned for residential use in order to secure the District Link Road between Ramsey Road / Douglas Road and provide a safe route for the sites to the south to access Ramsey Road.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comments, however, maintain that the inclusion of this criteria is appropriate to encourage the improvement of pedestrian and cycle links in the wider area, even where surrounding land is in separate ownership. As discussed during Inquiry sessions, the Agricultural soils of the Isle of Man (2001) report provides an island wide evidence base on the quality of agricultural land. This being said, the report is indicative only and it can be difficult to glean specific locations from the maps included within the report. Cabinet Office have considered the evidence further and consider that as there are no Class 1 or 2 soils within the Plan Area, the usefulness of development brief criteria seeking to protect these soils from development is limited. Accordingly, Cabinet Office have removed this development brief criteria from the Plan.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		67	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This warrants further in-depth investigation.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK31-S		Peel Commissioners	67	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	The Commissioners would recommend road infrastructure improvements between Poortown Road and Derby Road are included should the land be zoned for residential development. The Commissioners have proposed this location could be used as a strategic reserve site pending the development of a new Strategic Plan in 2026 and the replacement of the Area Plan for Peel. If a strategic reserve site is required for additional housing to meet the requirements of the 2026 Strategic Plan between the Poortown Road and Douglas Road it must include provision for a new link road to remove traffic off the existing Albany Road distributor road route. (See the Housing Matters section) No other additional land should be currently zoned for predominately residential development on greenfield sites on the outskirts of Peel subject to provision (iii) below.	<b>Cabinet Office notes the Commissioners comment and refer to Cabinet Office's previous response in respect to strategic reserve sites as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. Cabinet Office have developed proposals within the Area Plan that aim to limit development on sites in Peel until there is greater certainty regarding the delivery of the planned Regional Sewage Treatment Works (RSTW). The Cabinet Office has also ensured that the need for and potential location of community facilities, such as education and health infrastructure, must be considered as part of the masterplan for the sites on the edge of Peel. The District Link Road is intended to improve connectivity between Poortown and Douglas Roads, easing pressure on the Derby Road/Albany Road junction.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK31-S		Peel Commissioners	67	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	iii. Sufficient land via Strategic Reserve sites with appropriate development briefs are designated to ensure that infrastructure improvements, where required, are fully considered. These Strategic Reserve sites are a mandatory safeguard in the event a short-term duration Area Plan is necessary (up to 3 years) for the transition into the New 2026 to 2026 Strategic Plan. This Strategic Reserve sites requirement will be significantly less than the 38.3 Ha provision in the Post Inquiry Modification 2025 Draft Area Plan. iv. Any medium to large sites zoned for predominately residential development within Peel's settlement boundary (identified through the call for sites consultation or subsequently through the development of this Area Plan for the North and West) should not take place until adequate supporting infrastructure such as health, education and sewerage treatment are in place.	<b>Cabinet Office notes the Commissioners comment and refer to Cabinet Office's previous response in respect to strategic reserve sites as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. Cabinet Office have developed proposals within the Area Plan that aim to limit development on sites in Peel until there is greater certainty regarding the delivery of the planned Regional Sewage Treatment Works (RSTW). The Cabinet Office has also ensured that the need for and potential location of community facilities, such as education and health infrastructure, must be considered as part of the masterplan for the sites on the edge of Peel. The District Link Road is intended to improve connectivity between Poortown and Douglas Roads, easing pressure on the Derby Road/Albany Road junction.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3T-V			67	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023,	I object to the addition of paragraphs 14.10.2, 14.10.4, 14.10.5, 14.10.7, 14.10.8, and 14.10.12 for reasons as set out above (that housing need has already been met and Strategic Plan targets will be sufficient for a transition period to 2030, which do not require substantial greenfield allocation).	<b>Cabinet Office notes these comments but does consider that there is a housing need in the North and West. The Area plan contains proposals to meet this need within the Plan period as well as providing an uplift to meet housing need in the medium term.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKMK-D		Department of Infrastructure - Highways Division	68	RR009	The development brief for this site (RR009) must include a full Transport Assessment is required for any planning application the site providing justification for the access solution proposed and all traffic impacts on key local and strategic junction including consideration of potential impact of the Parliament Square junction with consideration of improvements to accommodate increases of traffic on these junctions generated from the site.	<b>Cabinet Office notes these comments and have added development brief criteria that states:</b>  <b>A Transport Assessment must be submitted with any application providing justification for the access solution proposed and an assessment of all traffic impacts on key local and strategic junctions including consideration of the potential impact on the Parliament Square junction with consideration of improvements to accommodate increases of traffic as a result of development on this site.</b>		y
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		68	RR009	Detailed consideration of SuDS is appropriate. The likely impact of greenfield residential development, adjacent to but outside the town boundary, on all aspects of assessment criteria including town centre regeneration should be thoroughly considered.	<b>Cabinet Office notes these comments and note that Plan Objective 4 supports the integration of drainage initiatives such as SuDS into development schemes. The development brief sets out that there must be consideration for a SuDS as part of any application on this site.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			68	RR009	The 2024 APNW draft altered the boundary of RR009 to include the above "omitted" fields. The major changes schedule states Document Map 4 Ramsey Proposed Change Amendments to the size and location of an area of public open space within [my emphasis] the site boundary of RR009, Lezayre Road, Ramsey Reason To reflect the concerns raised by the Planning Inspector at appeal (PA 20/01080/B) and at the request of the applicant. In fact this was a doubling of the area of residential allocation into another field not previously part of RR009 allocation. Therefore not only was this statement re proposed change and reason for it erroneous and seemingly deliberately misleading, the open space referred to was never shown as being part of RR009 in the 2022, this does not excuse not undertaking a proper assessment of the additional site, the flooding potential of which the appeal Inspector was not informed about. The fact that these omitted fields have long been subject to flooding and are identified on the Flood Hub map as likely to be subject to high risk of river flooding from the Glen Auldyn River has been completely ignored albeit the issue was brought up at the Public Inquiry with downstream flooding of existing properties a potential consequence of developing land here.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comments. Cabinet Office do not accept that the description of proposed pre-inquiry change 4 as shown on PIP 1 Schedule of Changes was in any way misleading.</b>  <b>The flooding risk on the site was discussed at length during public inquiry sessions and Cabinet Office have included a development brief requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			68	RR009	The Inspector's report (para 358) merely refers to flooding likely north of the former railway line on the northern edge of Site RR009 adjacent to the [Sulby] river; this may be true of the original 2022 allocation but is totally erroneous with respect to the 2024 draft and now the proposed final plan which has development adjacent to the Glen Auldyn River. [Downstream about 10 15 years ago Tynwald was informed of the developer constructing affordable housing on land subject to flooding; only after this was a small embankment constructed to help protect the houses]. The site should not be allocated let alone on the false premises that have been put forward by the Cabinet Office	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comments but the site is to remain allocated as predominantly residential as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			68	RR009	COD 107 relating flood zone areas to sites allocated for development is listed post inquiry as a core document. It is misleading in obscuring the boundaries of the sites in relation to flooding zones. When other sites that have been identified as having some risk of flooding have been ruled out at the second stage i.e. pre 2022 draft on that basis, it is totally unethical to allocate sites that have not only been recently refused planning consent but also include substantial areas of flooding. In the case of RR009 the allocation and potential development of this site could result in downstream flooding, of the same original affordable housing where it took a Tynwald decision (10-12 years ago) to compel the developer to retrospectively construct flood embankments.	<b>Core Documents 105-108 were uploaded to the Inquiry website on the 17th July which was during inquiry sessions and clearly shows the latest available flood data in relation to all sites considered as part of the Area Plan for the North and West process.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes your comment but the site is to remain as proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			68	RR009	The boundaries of this site have been altered and do not fit in with the Inspector's recommendation. Moreover it is noted the fields together er will only enable construction of 47 houses. Arising from the confusion from having two drafts 2022 and 2024 and alteration of the boundaries of Site RR009 Para 358 of the Inspector's report is totally inaccurate. The eastern field in this allocation is shown to be subject to fluvial flooding from the adjacent Auldyn River. This is why it was never allocated previously for development. This was clearly pointed out both at the appeal hearing and in written submissions before the appeal hearing. To allocate this land and ignore the flood constraints map, while simultaneously rejecting Ballachrink because it is purported not to show future flooding (increased tidal flooding) is not accepting the flood risk as shown now is a totally unjustified. Basically unspecified risks rather than factual evidence is being used to favour developers. Given the additional allocation of site L R 0 0 1 on the outskirts of Ramsey any allocation of Site RR009 bearing in mind it has also in part been recently refused at appeal, should be removed. The Inspector note that for suggested site Ballachrink which has been approved in principle (but is awaiting the s13 agreement re affordable housing and open space) as the site could only provide an estimated 60 houses, it was not in effect worth considering. Where is the logic in this plans allocations? The assessment of Ballachrink, paras 429 434 is incredibly biased given the lack of any planning applications for other sites and their negative scoring in assessments eg Ballacarbery	<b>The site boundaries changed from the previous planning applications that was at the time being determined by DEFA to a revised proposals from the site promoter to address those issues explored as part of the planning application process. The flooding risk on the site was discussed at length during public inquiry sessions and Cabinet Office have included a development brief requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3M-N		Lezayre Parish Commissioners	68	RR009	This site is not in Ramsey. It is in Lezayre. Although planning permission has been refused it is still in the Area Plan despite environmental concerns and it being on a flood plain. The Commissioners would contend that the considerable risk of flooding makes this site inappropriate for development because water quality cannot be ensured and storm damage cannot be mitigated by reducing run-off at peak flow times. The Commissioners also object to the development of this site for reasons that are not catered for in this question.	<b>Cabinet Office note your comments. The flooding risk on the site was discussed at length during public inquiry sessions and Cabinet Office have included a development brief requirement for a Flood Risk Assessment.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NK71-W			69	RR006, RR007	We support the inclusion of both sites RR006 and RR007 to be zoned for predominantly residential use, however it is considered that the sites should have their own separate Development Briefs for the reasons outlined below. We have separately submitted a tracked change version of the Development Brief which incorporates all our suggestions below. We support the amended boundary of Site RR006 to include the adjacent kennels. As the sites are in separate ownerships it is considered that the Development Brief should acknowledge this and allow for the two sites to come forward separately and not prejudice the development of the other. We suggest the following wording which has been used elsewhere in the plan: "Given the sites are in separate ownership, they may be developed at different times, but the development of one should not prejudice the development of the other." Following the Examination Site LR001 is now proposed to be zoned for residential use. It is considered that it would be logical for Site LR001 to have a joint Development Brief with Site RR007 given that the two sites adjoin one another. Whereas Site RR006 is on the opposite side of Andreas Road and forms a separate development parcel. We note that all of the Development brief requirements relating to Site RR006 have been met by planning application reference 23/00744/B. Of note we have made a separate comment on criteria no.8 which requires a soil quality survey (Modification 66).	Cabinet Office agree and have separated the development briefs of RR006 and RR007.		Y
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		69	RR006, RR007	Subsequent events have obviated the need for comment.	Cabinet Office notes this comment		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		69	RR006, RR007	This development puts unwanted pressure on the existing infrastructure and the land is frequently flooded	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		
ANON-UVCN-NKEY-K			69	RR006, RR007	It is difficult to balance the Government's desire to protect and encourage agricultural commerce when it is apparently content to allow farmland to be turned over to housing estates. This site is some distance from Ramsey town centre and will be short therefore of amenities. It will also greatly increase vehicle traffic on an already congested A9 and town centre	Cabinet Office notes these comments. As part of the development brief for RR009 a Travel Plan must be submitted, setting out the intended approach for the delivery of sustainable transport objectives.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3H-G		Ramsey Town Commissioners	69	RR006, RR007	Further to this, the Parliament Square junction remains in need of review. This has been discussed numerous times in the past, but future proposed northern development makes this more of a pressing need.	As part of the Development Briefs for LR001, RR006 and RR007, a full Transport Assessment is required for any application on these sites, including assessment of the potential impact at the Parliament Square junction.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish	Manx National Farmers Union (MNFU)	69	RR006, RR007	MNFU would reiterate concerns raised during the enquiry over the loss of valuable agricultural land and limitations of the current policy to protect agricultural land that supports food production and the rural economy.	Cabinet Office has assessed all potential development sites, including brownfield and only proposed new greenfield sites where it can be demonstrated that existing sites cannot meet the future need by way of a sustainable urban extension.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	70	AR004	We support the allocation of Site AR004 for residential use, which accords with our previous representations.  Our view in respect of the wording for future BNG provision is outlined above.	Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see amended Natural Environment Proposal in respect of Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG).		y
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish	Manx National Farmers Union (MNFU)	70	AR004	Inclusion of considerations for the lands value as agricultural should be included. Note Inspectors report para 301. Cannot locate site AR004 within the inspectors report.	The Agricultural Land Use Capability mapping, Agricultural Soils are already considered at the planning application stage under the Strategic Plan 2016 Environment Policy 14 and do not need to be repeated in a development brief. This was noted in COD21 at the Public Inquiry.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			71	MR007, MR008	The reason for the allocation was given to meet local housing need as a service village and provide pedestrian routes to the school and playing fields. There was no mention of a local access route cutting through the centre of agricultural land. Greenfield sites should not be given up wholesale to meet a theoretical aspiration of an Island population target of 100,000. There are not the community, transport, employment or utility services available to support them or the finance to provide them. Plans need to concentrate on supporting smaller settlements and the community facilities they have, not eradicating them from having new development because they don't have the full range of community facilities.	Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Local Access Route between MR008a and MR008b was discussed during inquiry sessions - the site is to remain proposed for residential development as part of the Plan.  Cabinet Office notes your comment and the Area Plan does generally take the approach of proposing land in smaller settlements, such as Ballaugh, Sulby and Glen Mona, where there are existing community facilities and infrastructure.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish	Manx National Farmers Union (MNFU)	71	MR007, MR008	Inclusion of considerations for the lands value as agricultural should be included. Note Inspectors report para 301. It appeared that little weight was given to Environment Policy 14 in assessing the sites criteria until the Public Enquiry stage. However, it continues to carry too little weight in our view. It is noted that the Inspectors recommendations do acknowledge this after concerns were raised through the Public Inquiry Process (see extract para. 301 below).  We note that significant areas of land outside of the boundary of Ramsey to the North and Northwest of the town are Grade 2 soil types of which there is currently afforded protection through Environment Policy 14 of the Strategic Plan. The MNFU are of the view that even the limited protection for Manx agriculture that this policy affords, it has evolved to be afforded less and less weight when determining site suitability. With an Agricultural and Food Security Policy having recently been approved by Tynwald that aims to increase production and local food consumption, this is concerning. While it is understood that some land somewhere will be needed for some development, and that this will likely be an extension of existing settlements, more recognition of this land type at least is needed to ensure that what remains of our valuable productive land is not lost. The Island has a very limited supply of both Grade 1 and 2 land (and accepted 2/3 and 3/2 areas). A significant area of Grade 2 land in the south has already been developed, reducing the availability of this land type still further.	The Agricultural Land Use Capability evidence is indicative only and cannot be used to determine the quality of a site. In those areas marked as 2/3& 3/2 a site survey will be required at the application stage, protected under Environment Policy 14.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKMK-D		Department of Infrastructure - Highways Division	71	MR007, MR008	The development brief for this site (MR007) must include safe and accessible facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicular access with good connectivity to local services, amenities and public transport within Kirk Michael.	Cabinet Office notes these comments but consider that development brief criteria 4 relating to a travel plan for the development of the site adequately covers this issue.		
ANON-UVCN-NK5H-J	Christopher Dodd		72	LR007	We accept the Cabinet Office's recommendation to remove the site LR007 as a proposal site.  Our reasoning has been based upon information received relating to the natural ingress of water by a natural supply ( i.e heavy rain ) which could cause future problems to the surrounding area after the natural water table has been modified. We understand the field in question, has flooded in the recent past.  We are local residents with 16 years habitation in this area.	Cabinet Office notes your comment and note that the site is not proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		
ANON-UVCN-NK5Q-U	Anthea Young		72	LR007	We support the inspector's recommendation and cabinet office's decision to remove the field from the area plan. The primary aesthetic of Old Sulby Village is one of genuine, traditional Manx stone cottages. The village's buildings – including examples of an early schoolhouse, woollen mill, and vernacular residential architecture - were constructed hundreds of years ago, something which draws international visitors to the village and in turn benefits the island's economy. The Old Village has, for example, been the subject of numerous post-cards that show off its unique character within the context of Manx tradition and identity. Any modern development of a site such as field LR007 - that field being immediately adjacent to the Old Sulby Village – would irreparably harm the character of the Old Village. The present concern mirrors the reasons cited in a 2023 case in which an appeal by against a housing refusal was rejected due to DEFA's concern that "material harm" would be done to the "established character and appearance" of the surrounding rural area, as well as biodiversity and ecology. Further still, any modern housing development on field LR007 would reduce the Old Village's appeal as a tourist attraction and impact the quality of life for its existing residents. The increased volume of traffic through the village would add further strain on the winding country roads through the village towards Sulby Valley and add further safety concerns.	Cabinet Office notes your comment and note that the site is not proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		
ANON-UVCN-NK76-2			72	LR007	I support the removal of the site. this field regularly floods , it is not connected to the main sewer. There are several other areas within Sulby village which have planning permission and these should be developed first.	Cabinet Office notes your comment and note that the site is not proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NK7C-F			72	LR007	<p>We support the Planning Inspector's motion to remove the site as a Proposal Site due to the concerns around drainage and sewerage as noted.</p> <p>As someone with over 25 years experience within the civils industry and who lives in the residential dwelling directly adjacent to LR007 I have similar concerns to the Planning Inspector in not only does the land not lend itself to significant building work (with a portion of it a designated flood risk) it would also have a direct impact on my land in terms of drainage discharge, a concern that I have already noted in my time in the property in both my personal capacity and asking the professional advice of friends/associates in the civils/surveyor field.</p> <p>Any substantial rainfall causes surface water to flood the Claddagh Road on a regular basis from the lower section of LR007 (deemed a designated flood risk), I have pictures that can be provided as evidence on request, and any building would cause this to be exacerbated both in that area as well as on my adjacent land and need additional work to be carried out on a public highway to keep this area clear for both road and foot traffic. It is therefore also patently unsuitable for any additional entry/exit from the site on to the Claddaghs.</p>	Cabinet Office notes your comment and note that the site is not proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		
ANON-UVCN-NK7C-F			72	LR007	<p>I remain sceptical that any amount of civils works would be able to sufficiently remediate the issues raised and should the decision be taken to overturn the independent Planning Inspector's recommendation to remove the site I would have no hesitation to enlist suitable professional(s) from within my subject matter of expertise to submit a full and robust objection to the decision, as I believe is the legal right following any alterations to the plan at this late stage.</p> <p>It is also noted that the sewerage for any such dwellings cannot be drained on the mains system and the distance to the nearest pumping station is significant, meaning there would have to be a number of/one large septic tank or a large amount of work undertaken to connect it, which again in view of the drainage issues and gradient of the land would give rise to additional problems which would directly impact any adjacent land.</p> <p>Sulby Glen Road, being a narrow thoroughfare to the Tholt Y Will, also has current capacity issues with the school traffic and this is being exacerbated by current work on the church at the bottom of the road, a relatively minor building project. Any such project on a much larger scale like the one proposed poses major issues not just during a lengthy construction period but with the likely additional two dozen vehicles which would need a permanent entry/exit created from the proposed site onto the narrow glen road..</p>	Cabinet Office notes your concerns and note that the site is not proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. Cabinet Office took post-inquiry advice from Manx Utilities regarding the feasibility of connecting sites in Sulby to the sewage network. Cabinet Office's stance on this issue is set out in post-inquiry document COD 22. Cabinet Office continue to share Manx Utilities concerns as set out in COD 22 and do not propose a change in this regard.		
ANON-UVCN-NK7C-F			72	LR007	<p>I concur with the other objections raised by the commissioners on grounds of joining two settlement boundaries and destruction of local habitat and the fact that such a development does not meet any documented local needs, given the lack of current infrastructure in Sulby. I fully appreciate there is a need to build more housing however there are more appropriate areas not just in the north but in Sulby itself. Effectively shoehorning a number of dwellings into a strip of inappropriate land benefits no-one in the local community, apart from the commercial value of the land owner.</p> <p>However my personal objections are rooted in solid arguments based around facts that underpin both the Planning Inspectors view and my own, backed by experience.</p>	Cabinet Office notes this comment.		
ANON-UVCN-NK7V-2			72	LR007	<p>Our reasons to support modification M72 is as follows:</p> <p>As property owners directly opposite the proposed new site entrance we have major concerns relating to the additional traffic this will incur. The Sulby Glen Road is already heavily congested around school times making it dangerous and it currently struggles to cope with the additional vehicles, without the increase of even more. Cars already park all the way up to the proposed site entrance. This creates a big issue for us trying to leave our property safely and there are also concerns for children walking to and from the school to the nursery and home etc. This will also be an issue with construction vehicles.</p> <p>We are also concerned for the loss of agricultural land and its wildlife (prime woodcock and snipe habitat)</p> <p>The infrastructure to connect the mains sewerage is in St Stephens Meadow which will cause major disruption.</p> <p>We are also concerned as this is a designated flood risk area will it create further problems in the future in relation to climate change.</p> <p>Although we appreciate the requirements for further housing we feel this proposal of residential is not in the right place as it joins 2 different settlements together (old Sulby with new).</p>	The Cabinet Office notes your comments and confirms that the site is not proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. The Inspector did not consider the development likely to give rise to undue road safety hazards, even with schoolchildren passing the site frontage. However, LR007 was excluded from the plan due to foul water drainage constraints, Cabinet Office's stance on this issue is set out in post-inquiry document COD 22. Cabinet Office continue to share Manx Utilities concerns as set out in COD 22 and do not propose a change in this regard.		
ANON-UVCN-NK7X-4	Peter Webb		72	LR007	<p>I would like to support modification M72 for the following reasons.</p> <p>Old Sulby is a relatively unchanged old settlement of which the surrounding fields form a part. Proposed development for LR 007 would join Old Sulby and the Sulby Crossroads area and totally alter the character of the two old settlements contrary to the Strategic Plan (Section 7.34.1)</p> <p>It is an old meadow and has not been ploughed in living memory and probably generations and has a rich biodiversity including old meadow grasses and vetches which would be lost if developed.</p> <p>Traffic congestion due to the school pickup, will increase, sometimes with parked vehicles all the way from the school to the Claddaghs road.</p> <p>The field cannot be serviced by mains drainage and the nearest pumping station is 1/2 a mile away, on the other side of the TT Course.</p> <p>Historically the area has flooded and is designated a flood ew risk area.</p> <p>The Lezayre Commissioners and nearby residents oppose the development.</p> <p>The development is badly sited in Sulby</p>	Cabinet Office notes your comment and note that the site is not proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. In regards to settlement coalescence, Cabinet Office note that Sulby is recognised as one village in Spatial Policy 4 of the Strategic Plan. Cabinet Office continue to share Manx Utilities concerns regarding the feasibility of connecting the site to the sewage network as set out in COD 22 and do not propose a change in this regard.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHT-H			72	LR007	<p>I have concerns over the traffic flow and parking in and around an already busy area particularly at school drop off and pick up times. If access to the site was onto the main road via a new or widened entrance this would reduce the safe parking available and increase the tendency of people to park right up to residents driveways. This would increase the risk to both drivers and pedestrians, in particular the risk to young school children who may not be very aware of traffic.</p> <p>I also believe that building there would alter the character of Sulby by joining Old Sulby to the newer Sulby crossroads area and creating the feel of development sprawl in the same way that Crosby and Glen Vine have lost their individual characters.</p> <p>I appreciate there is a need for housing on the island but don't feel this is the place for it.</p>	Cabinet Office notes your comment and note that the site is not proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. In regards to settlement coalescence, Cabinet Office note that Sulby is recognised as one village in Spatial Policy 4 of the Strategic Plan.		
ANON-UVCN-NKQY-Y	Bryan Lord		72	LR007	<p>We support the removal of this site from the area plan not just because it can't be drained by gravity, which was the inspector's reason for rejection, but we would also like to reiterate our previously submitted objections that;</p> <p>A development of the size and type proposed for LR007 would join 2 very different settlements together- 'Old Sulby' and the 'Sulby Glen Crossroads' area, and materially alter the character of each of the two settlements, contrary to the Strategic Plan (Section 7.34.1)</p> <p>It would not fit fairly in the settlement hierarchy- Ramsey, then Andreas, Kirk Michael and Jurby in a lower tier, then Sulby at the next tier below that, where the Strategic Plan states 'development should only meet local needs and where appropriate provide limited employment opportunities'. The proposed development would do neither</p> <p>The proposed density would not fit within existing planning guidelines for an area of that size, and then if it did, would be even more inappropriate for the area</p>	Cabinet Office notes your comments and note that the site is not proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. During the inquiry sessions, the Department acknowledged that minimum density requirements may be too onerous for applicants to calculate when submitting planning applications. As a result, any references to minimum densities have been removed from the development briefs.		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKQY-Y	Bryan Lord		72	LR007	<p>The land would be lost as Agricultural land and wildlife habitat in its hedges, further harming the Island's self sufficiency in food production</p> <p>It would add further traffic congestion to an already chaotic school-time pick up all the way up that part of the Glen road.</p> <p>It cannot be drained by mains sewerage – the nearest pumping station is in St Stephens meadow – ½ mile away, across private land and the TT course, and may also be privately owned</p> <p>Part of the proposed development is designated a flood risk area</p> <p>The Lezayre Parish Commissioners and nearby local residents oppose the development.</p> <p>This site is in the wrong place both in terms of where housing needs to go in the North of the Island and also in terms of where any development should go in Sulby in particular.</p> <p>We understand the need for more housing, but it needs to be in the right place, and at the appropriate density. LR007 seems to be neither of those things.</p>	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment and note that the site is not proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. As noted previously, Cabinet Office took post-inquiry advice from Manx Utilities regarding the feasibility of connecting sites in Sulby to the sewage network. Cabinet Office's stance on this issue is set out in post-inquiry document COD 22. Cabinet Office continue to share Manx Utilities concerns as set out in COD 22 and do not propose a change in this regard.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKQZ-Z			72	LR007	<p>In the inspector's report he considered the planning merits of the site, including some local objections, and concluded (para. 322) that "I find no substantive objection to the allocation". Post the planning Inquiry he received further information from Manx Utilities regarding foul water drainage of the site. He went on to conclude, para 324: "I have not been provided with any countervailing evidence that satisfactory foul drainage could be achieved. It would be for any planning application for the development of the land to be assessed on more detailed information. However, on the evidence available to the Inquiry, the allocation of Site LR007 appears inappropriate and, unless this matter is otherwise resolved before the Plan is adopted, I consider that this allocation should be deleted" I would agree that such matters would normally be left for a detailed planning application. I would also point out that the statement regarding "no countervailing evidence having been received" is very strange as, when I tried to provide information at the time, I was informed by Mr Johnstone (on 2/8/2024) that the Inspector had advised that he could not accept any further submissions on the site. Subsequently I have been in further consultation with Manx Utilities - see correspondence attached. They confirm that the foul drainage of site could be serviced either by : - (the use of septic tanks - subject to satisfactory percolation tests; or - (a connection to St Stephen's Meadow pumping station subject to a capacity assessment (septicity no longer their main concern).</p>	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. As noted previously, Cabinet Office took post-inquiry advice from Manx Utilities regarding the feasibility of connecting sites in Sulby to the sewage network. Cabinet Office's stance on this issue is set out in post-inquiry document COD 22. Cabinet Office continue to share Manx Utilities concerns as set out in COD 22 and do not propose a change in this regard.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKQZ-Z			72	LR007	<p>Please find attached a detailed Drainage and Hydrology report from BB Consulting Engineers concluding that conditions at the site are feasible for the use of septic tanks and soakaways to deal with foul and surface water drainage. Furthermore the report confirms that the development of the site would have no impact or increase the flooding characteristics of the catchment (such a confirmation was a condition of the development brief for the site).</p>	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. As noted previously, Cabinet Office took post-inquiry advice from Manx Utilities regarding the feasibility of connecting sites in Sulby to the sewage network. Cabinet Office's stance on this issue is set out in post-inquiry document COD 22. Cabinet Office continue to share Manx Utilities concerns as set out in COD 22 and do not propose a change in this regard.</b>		
			72	LR007	<p>The Commissioners are very pleased to see that this historic quarter land has been removed from the Plan. The owner has previously stated that building here would only be filling in a gap however the Commissioners would argue that, as they see it, this would coalesce two settlement boundaries, therefore encroaching into the countryside. There is consensus amongst the public that the two bungalows on the other side of the road should not have been built either after planning permission had initially been refused. They were built after intervention from the then DEFA Minister, Richard Ronan.</p> <p>The Commissioners are concerned that drainage would be a real issue on this site and that this cannot be successfully mitigated. Any dwellings built here would not be on mains sewerage so would require septic tanks which is not ideal.</p> <p>Sulby Glen Road has long been problematic in terms of parking at school opening and closing times when traffic is often heavy. The police have in the past looked into this and the school have asked parents to be mindful of dropping off and picking up their children however the issue remains. The possible addition of another 8 dwellings along here, probably each having two cars, would exacerbate traffic problems at busy times. Splayed access would also be required which would mean the cutting back of some hedgerows and there is concern about disturbing the biodiversity of the area.</p>	<b>Cabinet Office notes the Commissioners comments regarding LR007.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		73	LR040	<p>This site scored highly and favourably in the Assessment process and was allocated Predominantly Residential in the Draft Plan. It is now deleted solely on the basis of drainage following post-inquiry information, despite no information being invited or sought from the applicant. However, the Inspector states at 326 - "I see no objection to the addition of this allocation to the Plan by way of MCs 18 and 57. And at 328 - "It would be for any planning application for the development of the land to be assessed on more detailed information.</p> <p>However, on the evidence available to this Inquiry, the allocation of Site LR040 appears inappropriate and, unless this matter is otherwise resolved before the Plan is adopted etc."</p> <p>It is contended that satisfactory drainage is practicable adopting the principles and methodology of Sustainable Drainage Systems, as strongly recommended in many parts of the Inspector's Report, and that this site should revert to the allocation for Residential purposes.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your support for the site LR040 and note that the site was previously supported by Cabinet Office during public Inquiry sessions. In light of advice received from Manx Utilities following the close of Inquiry sessions (please see Cabinet Office Document 22) Cabinet Office notes MUAs concerns regarding the feasibility of draining the site by gravity to public foul sewers as well as concerns around septicity for any pumping option on the site.</b></p> <p><b>Accordingly, Cabinet Office do not support a change with regards to the status of LR040.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3B-A			73	LR040	<p>We were surprised and disappointed to find that the Inspector's Report on the Public Inquiry has recommended deletion of this site, and that CABO has accepted and implemented this, despite having satisfied the criteria of the Site Assessment Report, with the repeated Officer's statement 'No Critical Constraint Applies', and the Stage 3 Assessment confirming 'Developability' with favourable comments throughout , particularly at 24 Placemaking, resulting in the site's inclusion in the initial Draft Plan as allocated for predominantly residential purposes.</p> <p>In our opinion the Inspector's reason for removing this allocation is not borne out in factual, practical terms, and is inconsistent with comments and recommendations elsewhere in his Report.</p> <p>For example Sites LR017 - south of Jurby Road, Cronk Mayn and LR001, Andreas Road, Ramsey.</p> <p>Both sites are in Lezayre, however, the address shown for LR001 is Ramsey.</p> <p>Deletion of Site LR040 was recommended by the Inspector on one single factor, the provision of satisfactory drainage with the caveat "unless this matter is otherwise resolved before the Plan is adopted," this recommendation based upon post Inquiry information.</p> <p>Neither LR017 nor LR001 are in close proximity to existing public sewers, foul drainage from properties on the Westlands Estate, immediately to the east of LR017, Cronk Mayn, within the Ramsey Town Boundary, are connected to the public sewer via a pumping station.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comments with regards to site LR040 and other sites within the Plan Area.</b></p> <p><b>Following post-inquiry engagement with Manx Utilities with regards to sites in Sulby being connected to the sewage network it was resolved that the Authority had concerns that LR040 could be drained by gravity sewer and that any pumping solution would not be adopted by Manx Utilities with septicity potentially becoming a problem owing to the low number of properties on the site. Considering the different characteristics of the sites in Sulby compared to those adjacent to the settlement boundary of Ramsey, Cabinet Office do not propose a change with regards to the status of LR040 and the site is not proposed for allocation as part of this Plan.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3B-A			73	LR040	<p>Similarly, LR001 does not have public foul drainage readily available. Furthermore, in this instance the Inspector states "It was found to be developable, despite red scores for archaeology, agricultural land, settlement character and active travel. But it scored highly for compatibility, visual amenity, access and community facilities."</p> <p>LR040 also scored highly in those last four planning criteria and also in archaeology, settlement character and active travel. It is also a matter of record that the land at Ballacarbery featured prominently in last year's Public Inquiry in connection with the Proposed Ramsey Boundary Extension. The proposals proved to be contentious and the application by Ramsey Town Commissioners was rejected by the Chairman of the Inquiry.</p> <p>We offer no opinion as to the merits or otherwise of Sites LR017 and LR001 in terms of Town and Country Planning suitability but we do draw attention to the apparent discrepancy in the Inspector's focus upon a single aspect of Site LR040, whilst seemingly not applying the same scrutiny or requirement to other sites. We also submit that the sole reason for the deletion of this allocation, drainage, is readily resolvable both practically and in accordance with stated recommendations and objectives within the Report.</p> <p>We request, therefore, that this change be reversed and submit our justification which we trust will receive due consideration prior to ratification and adoption of the final Area Plan.</p>	<b>Further to the above, Cabinet Office notes your comments with regards to sites in the Parish of Lezayre but do not propose a change with regards to LR040.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK3B-A			73	LR040	<p>Responses to the Inspector's comments :</p> <p>326. States - "It could accommodate about three dwellings sustainably located in proximity to public amenities."</p> <p>This we agree is feasible, although it would result in individual plot sizes larger than 0.8 acres each, which is contrary to our understanding of IOM Government objectives in connection with land utilisation densities for residential development.</p> <p>The Inspector continues "However, the land is not subject to any specific landscape protection and thus far I see no objection to the addition of this allocation to the Plan by way of MCs 18 and 57."</p> <p>327. At the Inquiry we were not invited nor requested to provide further supportive information about foul water drainage. The Inspector has sought and acted upon information provided post inquiry relating to a single method of drainage with the comment, referring to connecting to the existing public sewer, "Although a pumping option could be considered it would not be adopted by MU."Clearly, such an option is not precluded, although alternative solutions are available and practicable.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office note your comments. As discussed during inquiry and as noted in Public Inquiry Paper 7 (Updated Land Supply Report) Cabinet Office assumed a density of 10 dwellings per hectare of net developable area where the site was within or abutting the existing settlement boundary of a defined village which LR040 is.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment and as noted above, based on feedback received from Manx Utilities post-Inquiry, Cabinet Office remain concerned about how the site would effectively be drained of its wastewater and therefore have not proposed a change in this regard.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3B-A			73	LR040	<p>328. Countervailing evidence was not sought. It is our understanding that drainage details are customarily a matter for a formal planning application, exactly as stated by the Inspector in his Report, however, we have undertaken Percolation Tests which produced satisfactory values ranging between 28Vp and 34Vp over a 48-hour period. We have also obtained advice and recommendations from Kingspan Klargester, the leading manufacturer of packaged Septic Tanks and drainage equipment, who confirm the suitability of ground conditions for their products.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment but the site is to remain outside of the settlement boundary as shown on Map 15 - Sulby.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3B-A			73	LR040	<p>We contend that, by adopting and incorporating the principles of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), including comprehensive design features such as Rainwater Harvesting and minimising surface water run-off from impervious hard surfaces, a satisfactory and effective drainage system can be designed and installed to make best use of the extensive land available for subterranean soakage and also the proximity of a large number of existing trees and shrubs at each site boundary.</p> <p>We also contend that such provision accords with many of the recommendations in Appendix A, Schedule of Recommended Major Changes, Chapter 5 - Spatial Vision, RMC Number 2, page 67, Paragraph 5.3.4 Item 10, "Reword as follows: 10. How to secure drainage improvements as part of planned development through SuDS etc."</p> <p>Chapter 7 - The Natural Environment, RMC 5, Plan Objective 4 and Plan Outcome 4a.</p> <p>"Reword as follows : Plan Objective 4: To support the integration of greener drainage initiatives, such as Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), into development schemes, as part of the wider approach to manage flood risk in the longer-term adaptation to climate change."</p> <p>Plan Objective 4a: "There will be an increase in the number of new developments incorporating SuDS (green drains) in the North and West adopted by a statutory undertaking."</p> <p>Chapter 10 - Transport and Utilities, RMC 18, page 69, Insert 10.10.3 : "There is an increased recognition that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) can bring enhancements to the management of surface water drainage when land is developed.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes these comments.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3B-A			73	LR040	<p>. The benefits of SuDS include being able to :</p> <p>a.Protect and enhance natural water systems while controlling and minimising effect on neighbouring properties.b.Integrate stormwater treatment into the landscape.c.Protect the quality of water.d.Reduce run-off and peak flows, ande.Minimise drainage and infrastructure costs."RMC 19: Proposal 7 Reword as follows:</p> <p>"In order to respond to the increasing risk of flooding in terms of stormwater and overland flow on new developments, neighbouring properties and surrounding catchments, applications shall, where the nature, location or the scale of development warrants, demonstrate that consideration has been given to the use of Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) in the development design and included where appropriate."In 328 the Inspector states "It would be for any planning application for the development of the land to be assessed on more detailed information. However, on the evidence available to this Inquiry, the allocation of LR040 appears inappropriate and, UNLESS THIS MATTER IS RESOLVED BEFORE THE PLAN IS ADOPTED, I consider that this allocation should be deleted by RMC68. RMC68 - Development Brief - " Delete the allocation of site LR040 ( unless foul water drainage issues resolved pre-adoption).</p> <p>Consequently, we submit that satisfactory means of foul and storm/surface water drainage can be achieved utilising Klargester Units in conjunction with a Sustainable Drainage System, full details of which will be provided with a formal planning application, this would not only satisfy the proviso in section 328 of the Inspector's Report in relation to foul drainage, but also comply with the stated Objectives and Outcomes of the Area Plan.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment but the site is to remain outside of the settlement boundary as shown on Map 15 - Sulby.</b></p>		
			73	LR040	<p>The Commissioners are pleased to see that this quarter land has been removed from the Plan. They objected to a previous application to build here in 2014 and this was also then refused by Planning. They do not believe that anything has changed since then to make this site more suitable for development, especially given its drainage issues. They do not wish to see ribbon development along Clenagh Road.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes this comment.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	74	LR001	<p>We support the allocation of Site LR001 for residential use. The site is well located in relation to the Service Centre of Ramsey and its facilities and its development would represent a sustainable urban extension of the settlement.</p> <p>Our view in respect of the wording for future BNG provision is outlined above.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your support for the site. Please see amended development briefs and Natural Environment Proposal on Biodiversity Net Gain</b></p>		y
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		74	LR001	<p>My objection expresses no opinion about the merits of Site LR001 in planning terms.</p> <p>I object to the apparent inconsistency in the manner in which the Site Assessment Criteria have been applied when compared with other sites, this site having 'scored red for archaeology, agricultural land, settlement character and active travel.' With no reference to drainage. Furthermore, in view of recent planning consents and other allocations recommended, the degree of need is not evident. The potentially adverse impact of more greenfield housing developments, close to but outside Ramsey, on Urban Regeneration and Housing Provision within the Town Centre should not be ignored.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your objection to the site LR001 for the reasons listed. Cabinet Office maintain that the site assessment framework was applied consistently across development sites in the North and West. Cabinet Office accepted during public inquiry sessions that there are no overriding planning constraints on the site and note that larger sites adjacent to existing settlement boundaries are more likely to have a potential landscape impact but that this can be mitigated as part of specific development proposals at the planning application stage.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			74	LR001	<p>This should be in the Lezayre plan not Ramsey</p>	<p><b>The site would be a sustainable urban extension to the settlement of Ramsey and is appropriate to display on the Ramsey map.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3M-N		Lezayre Parish Commissioners	74	LR001	<p>This site is 19 acres of green field land that has now been zoned for residential development of 87 properties in the Area Plan as recommended by the Inspector. The Chairman of Lezayre Parish Commissioners attended the Inquiry. This site had been rejected by the Cabinet Office, it was not in the 2022 Written Statement of the draft Area Plan, it was not included in the Inquiry agenda and was not discussed at any point during the Inquiry. It has now been included in the Area Plan. The Commissioners feel this is entirely inappropriate as this site is large and its possible development should have been given due weight in the Plan process rather than being inserted post-Inquiry, leaving the Commissioners on the back-foot in their opposition to it. They feel strongly that this is prime agricultural land and should not be developed. There are other sites on the outskirts of Ramsey that have been zoned for development already so they are unconvinced of the need for this site to be included too. Sites LR001, RR011 and RR012 should not be considered together as modifications to the Plan as they cover two different local authorities.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comments regarding LR001. Cabinet Office accept that the site was not proposed as part of the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022) or as one of the proposed changes to the Plan going into the Inquiry. However, the site was discussed during Inquiry sessions, namely under matter 7 issue 6 individual unallocated (suggested alternative) housing sites on Friday 26th July 2024. The Inspectors report also considered numerous written submissions with regards to this site.</b></p> <p><b>Considering recent planning approvals at Vollar Fields and known development constraints affecting other proposal sites in the Ramsey Local Plan at Lower Milntown and Poyll Dooley Cabinet Office accepted the Inspector's recommendation to include LR001 to ensure there is adequate opportunities for residential development for Ramsey.</b></p>		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish	Manx National Farmers Union (MNFU)	74	LR001	This proposal for a large area of land that falls outside of the Ramsey boundary is very concerning (ref Post Enquiry modifications map 4) and it is notable that it has not been exposed to the Public Inquiry Process. Although it is outside of our remit as the MNFU we are unsure as to how it can be considered an extension of Ramsey Town when it falls within the parish of Lezayre. Lezayre Commissioners should have autonomy over this. Ref para 392. It is particularly concerning in that once embedded in the APNW as residential, this will become the accepted principle in the planning process and this status will override any other concerns. To our knowledge this site was not brought forwards during the earlier stages of the plan or Public Enquiry and the Inspectors argument in favour of its inclusion as a development site is surprising and questionable. This significant site is considered to be exceptionally good agricultural land with significant historic and archaeological value as well as great habitat and biodiversity value. Ref para 391 Its blithe acceptance by Cabinet office is similarly troubling. It also does not appear in land availability assessment maps therefore further justification is required for its inclusion. It is noted that this land falls in the category of Grade 2 in the agricultural soils of the Isle of Man study 2001 and was not considered for draft plan status. The MNFU would object strongly to its inclusion as a residential development site and question the validity of its inclusion having appeared rather surprisingly after the Public Enquiry.	LR001 has been a potential site throughout the plan development process and has a full site assessment that notes the indicative Agricultural Land Use Capability grade which was available to the Inspector when making his recommendation.		
			74	LR001	This site is 19 acres of green field land that has now been zoned for residential development of 87 properties in the Area Plan as recommended by the Inspector. The Chairman of Lezayre Parish Commissioners attended the Inquiry. This site had been rejected by the Cabinet Office, it was not in the 2022 Written Statement of the draft Area Plan, it was not included in the Inquiry agenda and was not discussed at any point during the Inquiry. It has now been included in the Area Plan. The Commissioners feel this is entirely inappropriate as this site is large and its possible development should have been given due weight in the Plan process rather than being inserted post-Inquiry, leaving the Commissioners on the back-foot in their opposition to it. They feel strongly that this is prime agricultural land and should not be developed. There are other sites on the outskirts of Ramsey that have been zoned for development already so they are unconvinced of the need for this site to be included too. Sites LR001, RR011 and RR012 should not be considered together as modifications to the Plan as they cover two different local authorities.	The recommendations set out by the Inspector took account of both oral and written submissions. The submissions from the site promoter were included in written representations 339–353, which were available for both the public and the Inspector to review. The site would be a sustainable urban extension to the settlement of Ramsey and is appropriate to display on the Ramsey map and for the Inspector to include all three sites within a single recommendation.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	75	GMR001, GMR006	We support the allocation of Sites GMR001 & GMR006 for residential use. The sites are well located within a Service Village and their development would provide new housing to help meet local needs and to broaden the choice of location of housing in accordance with Spatial Policy 3 of the IoMSP.  Our view in respect of the wording for future BNG provision is outlined above.	Cabinet Office notes your support for the site. Please see amended development briefs and natural Environment Proposal on Biodiversity Net Gain		
BHLF-UVCN-NKMK-D		Department of Infrastructure - Highways Division	77	GR021	The development brief for this site (GR021) must include encouragement and improving sustainable links to the heritage trail (although it is acknowledge this could be on private land or public highway).	Cabinet Office notes the comments of the Department but as the heritage trail does not extend to this part of the Island and points 2iii, 2iv and 3 of the current development brief cover aspects relating to design, access and how future development on the site would connect to existing development and the school the Department has not amended the development brief of GR021.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKMK-D		Department of Infrastructure - Highways Division	78	GR022	The development brief for this site must include consideration of safe vehicular access design and cycling/walking links onto Glen Mona Loop Road and the A2	Cabinet Office notes these comments and has included point 4 of the development brief to read:  A Design and Access Statement is required as part of any planning application on this site. Consideration must be given to (although it is acknowledged that the surrounding land is in separate ownership) to improving pedestrian and cycle routes to the Main Road (A2) and the Glen Mona Loop Road, so as to promote active travel.		y
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		78	GR022	This is over development of the area and destruction of the rural entrance to the "village" as well as detracting from the overall landscape	Cabinet Office notes these comments.		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		79		The amended Table includes allocations which it is contended demonstrate inconsistencies in the interpretation, application and implication of Site Assessment Criteria. Greater weighting appears to have been given to significant factors such as satisfactory foul and surface water drainage, flood risk, and accessibility via existing Road Network when reviewing the allocation or deletion of sites. Specific examples of disparity include the allocation of LR027, LR017, BR010 and LR001 for Residential Development despite contra-indicators, when compared with LR040 and LR020 which have not been allocated on the basis of a single constraint in each instance.	Cabinet Office notes your objection to the site LR001 for the reasons listed. Cabinet Office maintain that the site assessment framework was applied consistently across development sites in the North and West.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	79		Table 16/17?  We support the general approach of the Modified Draft of the APNW in respect of housing provision, which takes into account relevant factors such as updated census information, Plan transition period, and wider Government policy and objectives in respect of the economy and population growth. This accords with the conclusions of the Inquiry Inspector.	Cabinet Office notes your support for the site.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	79		Table 16/17?  We support the general approach of the Modified Draft of the APNW in respect of housing provision, which takes into account relevant factors such as updated census information, Plan transition period, and wider Government policy and objectives in respect of the economy and population growth. This accords with the conclusions of the Inquiry Inspector.	Cabinet Office notes this comment.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3T-V			79		The land allocated for within-site biodiversity net gain offsetting should be explicit, how many hectares? The use of biodiversity net gain here is in effect nearly doubling the amount of land area allocated for development. You must state the figures as with the Draft Plan and show your workings: •What would the residential allocation / yield be if biodiversity net gain was not included? •There are also no workings presented for the land area expected to be used for community uses / infrastructure despite being zoned as residential. It is not acceptable to include biodiversity net gain in the yield calculations, as offsetting is likely to be conducted off-site. I object to the figures applied in Table 16 - summary of residential land provision. This table is misleading by design; the figures are meaningless as they are your 'pro-rata' figures that are supposedly meant to represent just one year of planning application approvals. The table must be reformatted such that it displays three columns: (a)Estimated yield within Strategic Plan target. (b)Estimated yield to account for transition period (i.e. to 2030). (c)Total net developable units plausible on the site based on area (before biodiversity net gain).	Workings are shown in the All Sites table and explained within PIP 7 Land Supply. Figures for sites have not changed since the inquiry and head room beyond the plan period was discussed at the Inquiry sessions and Cabinet Office documents.		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		81		These are of great value in conserving and restoring biodiversity and are an excellent tool for planners when considering any applications for development	Cabinet Office has ensured those sites noted are included on the appropriate map and noted in the written statement.	Y	Y
ANON-UVCN-NKHN-B	Bob		81		You've missed them off the Environmental Constraints map!	Cabinet Office has ensured those sites noted are included on the appropriate map and noted in the written statement.	Y	Y

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKMY-U		Manx Wildlife Trust	83		Designated Wildlife Sites have been removed from the North maps in error. They were present on the map used for the Public Inquiry. Legend remains for the Western map but does not appear to match the depiction on the map and there sites are almost impossible to see. Wildlife Sites exist to highlight important areas in the planning process, so they should appear prominently. Sites of potential high environmental pollution risk arising from natural erosion processes such as landfill should be included in these maps, as per the Inspector's recommendations. There is no justification given for why this has not taken place. Various parcels of land owned by the Manx Museum & National Trust are not shown as present - when some are. This was highlighted at the Public Inquiry. The area west of Glen Dhoo MWT Nature Reserve is still incorrectly shown as plantation when it is open hill land. This was highlighted at the Public Inquiry. Barnell MWT Nature Reserve is missing a label, when all other Nature Reserves are labelled. Registered Woodland is shown by not included in the legend.	<b>Cabinet Office has updated the Environmental Constraints maps to how the latest available data including Wildlife Sites. In man cases, the Cabinet Office is reliant on other Government Departments, Boards, Bodies and other third party organisations keeping data in their ownership as up to date as possible</b>  <b>Neither RR011 or RR012 were displayed as heritage land in the extant local plan.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office opted to amend Inspector's RMC 74 and have amended the Environmental Constraints maps to show Draft Conservation Areas. Cabinet Office do not consider it necessary for sites of potentially high environmental pollution risk arising from natural erosion processes such as landfill to be shown on the constraints maps because the data is not readily available. There are some current and former landfill sites in the Parish of Bride. Of these sites, Wrights Pit East is the only one likely to be at any future risk of coastal erosion.</b>  <b>Whilst the National Strategy on Sea Defences, Flooding and Coastal Erosion (2016) acknowledges this potential future risk, the strategy is clear that the site is unlikely to be affected for over 100 years.</b>	y	
ANON-UVCN-NKHN-B	Bob		83		You must include sites of potential high environmental pollution risk arising from natural erosion processes such as landfill!!! Aren't these Environment Constraints?!!?!	<b>Cabinet Office have considered the recommendation of the inspector and have concluded that it is not possible to include areas of potential environmental pollution risk from natural erosion on the constraints map as this data is not readily available.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			83		Why are they not mapping an highlighting pollution areas?	<b>Cabinet Office have considered the recommendation of the inspector and have concluded that it is not possible to include areas of potential environmental pollution risk from natural erosion on the constraints map as this data is not readily available.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			83		Proposed Conservation Area for Bride should be shown. The Bride Village Study is a Department (DOLGE, when i t was the policy making department) approved document.	<b>The Bride Village Study does not form part of the development plan and is not a statutory document, it is only a material consideration in so far as that it was approved by the Department at the time. Arising from this study was the Bride Development Order which has expired and no conservation area has been taken forward as an Order. This Area Plan will supersede all aspects of the study.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			83		The Inspector's report takes no account of coastal erosion on the North East coast and any proposal that might be affected by it. These issues were identified as part of submission to the Inquiry but have been ignored.	<b>This was discussed at inquiry and the Inspector made a recommendation to include on the constraints maps. After consideration it has not been possible to ascertain the extent of the areas at risk and any issues arising from planning applications in potentially effected areas would need to be explored as part of a planning application.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish		84		The MNFU are aware that historically certain areas of land were given this AEI status (1982 Plan), however it is noted that on the APNW Environmental Constraints Mapping there is significantly more zoning of AEI. In the Strategic Plan it is clearly stated that AEI are 'Sites designated in Local or Area Plans which serve to protect areas known to house important species or those which act as corridors between such'. Significant concern over this mapping has been raised by Members, and our enquiries have clarified that mapped designation of AEI has been done via the 1995 Habitat Survey and Ariel Photography resources as well as some Biological Records (dates of each recording and species for each site unknown) but no ground surveys. The Department has not provided any evidence, that can be available publicly as far as we can ascertain, of these identified sites as either 'housing important species' or acting as corridors. As AEI is considered a constraint within the planning policy, more data should be evidenced by the Department to avoid unnecessary designation of common scrub areas where no evidence of ecological protection requirements have been identified. Similarly, it is not sufficient to rely on a habitat survey of thirty years old. The habitats identified may well have changed significantly over thirty years. It would be reasonable to inform landowners if they were to have this constraint placed on their land and to be furnished with the information held regarding identified sites, so that they were given fair opportunity to accept or challenge the constraint. Once in the Area Plan, every one of these sites will become an accepted constraint potentially without the Department having any evidence or justification.	<b>AEI's are a non-statutory designation that alerts development management and applicants to the possibility of there being ecological interest on the site at the planning application stage so the appropriate surveys can be carried out. AEI's do not necessarily preclude development.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office accept the use of the word "known" in paragraph 7.12.1 in reference to these areas is not clear and propose to replace this with "potential".</b>		Y
ANON-UVCN-NKHN-B	Bob		84		Support.  Please note an error in your map, the Ramsey Bay MNR goes up to the Highest Astronomical Tide within Ramsey Harbour, the Mooragh, Poyll Dooley and the reedbed at the Whitebridge. Please see Manx Marine Nature Reserves (Designation) Order 2018.	<b>Cabinet Office has amended the Environmental Constraints maps to reflect the approved Manx Marine Nature Reserves (Designation) Order 2018.</b>	Y	
BHLF-UVCN-NKVZ-7	Ken Milne	Department of Environment, Food and Agriculture	84		Both of the Environmental Constraint Maps (Map 1a Environmental Constraints North and Map 1a Environmental Constraints West) need to be updated so that the ASSI boundaries on the map match the legend. On the legend, ASSIs are shown as green with a purple border. However, on the map some of the ASSIs are shown as green with no border.  The constraints maps need to be updated to reflect the hierarchy of protection, with internationally (Ramsar) or nationally (ASSIs, NNRs etc.) designated sites shown above lesser designations e.g. Where a site is a designated an ASSI and also a MWT reserve, the map should show its ASSI designation (legal designation) above its area plan for the nor. This may mean that some MWT reserves do not show up on the map. However, it is important to accurately show the areas which are statutorily designated.  A decision should be made as to whether the names of the protected sites are to be included as labels on the map or not. All of the MWT reserves are labelled, as is the Ayres NNR and the Ballaugh Curragh ASSI and Ramsar site, but the other ASSIs are not.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment and have made amendments to the Environmental Constraints map in this regard.</b>  <b>The Environmental constraints maps show a wide range of data from various Government Departments and statutory Boards as well as external charities such as Manx Wildlife Trust. In this respect, Cabinet Office relies on this external data being kept as up to date as possible.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office has amended the environmental constraints maps to reflect that international and national designations sit at the 'top' of the environmental constraints map layers.</b>	y	
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		84		Conservation of our marine environment is critical to us as an Island , as a Biosphere and to preserve our quality of life. Equally areas of ecological interest should be protected and developments such as the RHWP supported	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish	Manx National Farmers Union (MNFU)	84		Ref Inspectors Report Para 85 the MNFU Members raised concern over the significant areas designated as AEI's, and MNFU has now received clarification from DEFA Ecosystems on the criteria and method of designation of what has been noted as a considerably large area of AEI designations, noting that they are, for the most part, on privately owned and agricultural land on the environmental constraints map. We are not satisfied that the method applied is thorough enough to warrant including every area of scrub on the Island as an Area of Ecological Importance when it has not been evidenced on every single site that it is host to rare or protected species and that similar habitat in general is not already provided in the existing farmed landscape and hedgerows. Solid protection is already afforded to statutory designations, wildlife sites and the countryside in general, and AEI's on previous plans were limited to known areas of important habitat. We now appear to be designating every patch of gorse and sallows which seems unnecessary, and creates additional expense and a time burden on any future development be it for agricultural development or otherwise.  These will be a constraint for farm business as much as for any other business and with a declining agricultural production on the Island and this needs more consideration. Many original quarterland farms have been lost and the MNFU do not object to to their inclusion for consideration provided this do not restrict essential agricultural business investment when needed.	<b>The Area Plan for the South made extensive AEI designations across the plan area. However, as noted, The Area Plan for the East made far fewer, recognised AEI's within the parish of Santon only that were prepared as part of the data gathering process of the Area Plan for the South. The remaining designations were solely for Wildlife Sites which were surveyed and have their own assessments. The Area Plan for the North and West proposes AEI's at a similar level to that of the Area Plan for the South.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKMY-U		Manx Wildlife Trust	85		N.B. Harbour Limits (inner and outer) are shown, but have dropped off the key.	<b>Cabinet Office have amended the legend of Maps 1a and 1b - Infrastructure Constraints West and Infrastructure Constraints North</b>	Y	
BHLF-UVCN-NKVZ-8	Ken Milne	Department of Environment, Food and Agriculture	85		Since the public enquiry, the North and West Infrastructure maps have been updated so that Ramsey and Peel Harbours are outlined in blue on the maps. We believe these outlines just delineate the harbour limits. However, this does not correspond with anything in the Legend. We recommend that the legend is updated to avoid future confusion, especially as both of these areas are, at least partially, with Marine Nature Reserves.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment and have amended the infrastructure constraints map to show the harbour boundaries as well as the extent of the Harbour Limits Order 2022.</b>	y	
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		85		I am supportive of the update with the proviso that practical means of mitigation, attenuation and alleviation are noted and given adequate cognisance and acknowledgment.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish	Manx National Farmers Union (MNFU)	86		It must be acknowledged that the buffer zones that have been included on the infrastructure constraints maps encapsulate a significant area of farmland. The limitations and risks to land value have not been explored and the reasoning behind the significantly larger buffer zones in comparison to the UK has not to our knowledge been justified. Concern has been raised on the extensive buffer zones around mineral sites on the Isle of Man that were not subject to consultation. No consideration has been given, nor discussion held, on the impact or restriction this will place on farmland or land values. If these buffer zones are expanded to habitat designations, this puts the industry at even more of an unnecessary disadvantage. Concern has been raised on the extensive buffer zones around mineral sites on the Isle of Man that were not subject to consultation. No consideration has been given, nor discussion held, on the impact or restriction this will place on farmland or land values. If these buffer zones are expanded to habitat designations, this puts the industry at even more of an unnecessary disadvantage.	Buffer zones are not any larger than those used in some Local Planning Authorities in the UK and have been supported by DEFA. These consultation zones were included in the draft area plan and have been subject to extensive consultation prior to the inquiry and discussed at an inquiry session. The consultation zones place no restrictions on agricultural activities and are to prevent the intensification of vulnerable users (residential, healthcare etc.) within those areas.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish	Manx National Farmers Union (MNFU)	86		Developments must recognise and balance against other industry needs and any consequential impacts on food production. V. The MNFU would not support renewable energy projects that directly or indirectly forced tenants off land, or negatively impacted or prevented Farm Business Planning. We must protect farms and agricultural land, the natural environment, and our biodiversity from any adverse effects from renewable energy proposals and ensure we retain a productive viable agricultural industry. VI. Review and press for Reformed Payment Mechanisms for Easements, Wayleaves, and Environmental Projects for both Landowner and Tenant Farmer MNFU Members : The MNFU will advocate for clear, transparent, and updated compensation mechanisms that fully account for the impact of renewable energy projects, biodiversity net gain, and net zero initiatives on both landowners and tenant farmer Members. This includes lobbying when agricultural operations are disrupted by infrastructure or environmental projects. The MNFU will advocate for voluntary agreements that fairly compensate both landowners and tenant farmer members and lobby for best possible outcomes for compulsory purchase orders relating to any compulsory easements, wayleaves, or involuntary land-use changes	Cabinet Office notes the concerns around Biodiversity Net Gain, Renewables and other initiatives making alternative use of agricultural land at the loss of agricultural output. While the area plan can and does land use proposals on agricultural land for future settlement growth it can not change the existing frameworks for wayleaves, agricultural grant schemes and other environmental projects which will be considered through the development management process.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVZ-9	Ken Milne	Department of Environment, Food and Agriculture	86		Referencing Paper 3: Schedule of proposed Modifications regarding Modification 86 (the "Update to Dhoon Quarry). The map has been reviewed and we are in agreement that the updated safeguarding area reflects the igneous intrusion. The amendment is thus supported.	Cabinet Office notes your support regarding the safeguarding of minerals sites.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHN-B	Bob		87		Finally! Well done. Thank you to the bloke from Manx Wildlife for spilling the beans.	Cabinet Office notes this comment.		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		88	RR009	This proposed site should not be developed it will significantly adversely change the entrance to Ramsey and the view from Ramsey to Sky Hill. As a long standing meadow it will have ecological value	Sites within the existing settlement boundary have been proposed for development to meet the housing need ahead of sustainable urban extensions.		
ANON-UVCN-NKBU-C	Mandy Keig		88	RR009	To build on these fields would be devastating to the area surrounding the Grove Museum, a total eyesore! Stop building on our fields, we cannot grow anymore. Urban regeneration is all that should take place from now on & maybe if we capped the population instead of expanding it this situation would not arise . Plus these fields flood in extreme weather so why bother, not great for any potential purchaser is it .....!	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.  Sites within the existing settlement boundary have been proposed for development to meet the housing need ahead of sustainable urban extensions.  Cabinet Office notes the concern of several respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage may be proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
ANON-UVCN-NKC2-A			88	RR009	Contravenes the ethos and principles of Manx Natural Heritage Inconsistent with our Island commitment to conservation nature & biodiversity once fields are gone they are gone! The natural environment protection within the draft area plan for the north & west includes provision for the natural environment proposal covering biodiversity gain and tree planting and priorities the re-use of brownfield land Data from previous surveys available for the 2 fields reveals that they contain protected species. The Grove has entitlement to the preservation of the specific key view from the Grove farmhouse and ground and offers a sense of openness and visual relief for visitors and passersby on Bowring and Richmond Road The fields trees have been assessed by DEFA Forestry several individually registered. Specifically, RR011 contains a protected sycamore RT0698 and RR012 includes a Registered Tree Area RA1995 both a material consideration Hedgerows and banks surrounding fields benefit from a level of policy protection Two fields not accompanied by corresponding development brief. Additional residential development places further pressure on existing infrastructure . Residential development has the potential to distrust the tranquil environment of the Grove Would worsen already problematic flooding risks and strain local sewage and water systems and a significant concern regarding highway safety The two fields historically subject to covenants and restrictions - underscores their significance in planning considerations. MNH say they're "non-core" property - they are very much part of The Grove - as clearly highlighted in the "Gibb's Will Significant engineering challenges - Development would require extensive engineering intervention given the fields are prone to substantial flooding and are often severely waterlogged.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.  Sites within the existing settlement boundary have been proposed for development to meet the housing need ahead of sustainable urban extensions.  Cabinet Office notes the concern of several respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage may be proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
ANON-UVCN-NKEN-8			88	RR009	I only object due to the perceived lack of services for the people who will be living in these homes when the boundary is extended. If the Ramsey residents were assured through thorough and clear planning that along with the extension of the boundary and the development of more homes, that with that would come an extra doctors surgery, a small selection of shops etc... as there is at Governor's Hill in Douglas, then I would totally support this. I think most people who are concerned for the extension of the boundary would have similar concerns as I have spoken of.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.  Sites within the existing settlement boundary have been proposed for development to meet the housing need ahead of sustainable urban extensions.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	88	RR009	We support the allocation of Site RR009 as proposed in the Modified Draft Plan. This accords with our previous representations in respect of the site and with the conclusions of the Plan Inspector.	Cabinet Office notes your support for the site.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHN-B	Bob		88	RR009	Dandara shouldn't be destroying these beautiful barn owl fields.	Cabinet Office notes this comment.		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			88	RR009	R009 is clearly in nother district as are LR001. This is wrong and should be show in a different map accredited to the other district. This is NOT a Ramsey town or Parish development. Clearly a way of getting more land into the district by means of this proposal instead of it being allocation to its correct district.	The existing settlement boundaries identify the extent of the contiguous built development of a settlement. The Strategic Plan 2016 allows for settlement expansion through Strategic Policy 2 & Housing Policy 4 by way of sustainable urban extensions. This may or may not be within the administrative town boundary of the Local Authority.		
ANON-UVCN-NK71-W			89	RR006, RR007	We fully support the amended boundary of Site RR006 to include the adjacent kennels site. Please see our response to Modification no.69.	Cabinet Office notes this comment		
ANON-UVCN-NKEM-7			89	RR006, RR007	I do not feel the town boundary should be extended at all. I don't understand why Ramsey isn't allowed to have run out of land and let other commissioners have a share. Even if Ramsey is allowed to be full I would argue it isn't really, certainly not downtown where it looks like a 21st century blitz and has a lot of room for flats or houses. The commission could do a lot more to help this along but are taking the easy route	Cabinet Office notes these comments.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish	Manx National Farmers Union (MNFU)	89	RR006, RR007	Considerations on constraints for sites RR006 and RR007 should include the soil classifications as per the Agricultural soils of the Isle Of Man report 2001 if not already included. Please refer to general considerations in additional written submission	Notwithstanding the issues of the evidence base behind the Agricultural Land Use Capability mapping, Agricultural Soils are already considered at the planning application stage under the Strategic Plan 2016 Environment Policy 14 and do not need to be repeated in a development brief. This was noted in COD21 at the Public Inquiry.		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			90		Poylldooey is a know flood risk area and would result in changes to run off, sewage issues as well as cntamination of the river during and after build as well as against the strategic plan that detailed the requirement for open spaces for residents.	The proposed change reflects the existing residential use of Poylldooey House and its private gardens.		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKGW-K			91		<p>I have the following concerns, which underpins my objection. However, if the government has the political will and moral compass to address them, then I am open to sustainable development.</p> <p>Contravenes the ethos and principles of Manx National Heritage</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Inconsistent with our Island's commitment to Conservation, Nature and Biodiversity</li><li>• The Natural Environment protection within the Draft Area Plan for the North &amp; West – includes provisions for the Natural Environment Proposal, covering its biodiversity gain and tree planting (and prioritises the re-use of brownfield land). Data from previous surveys available for the two fields reveals that they contained protected species</li><li>• The Grove has entitlement to the preservation of specific key views from and to The Grove farmhouse and grounds and offers a sense of openness and visual relief for visitors and passers-by on Bowring and Richmond Road</li><li>• The field's trees have been assessed by DEFA Forestry - several individually registered. Specifically, RR011 contains a protected Sycamore (RT0698), and RR012 includes a Registered Tree Area (RA1995), both a material consideration</li><li>• Hedgerows and banks surrounding the fields benefit from a level of policy protection</li><li>• Two fields not accompanied by corresponding Development Briefs</li><li>• Additional residential development places further pressure on existing infrastructure</li><li>• Residential development has the potential to disrupt the tranquil environment of The Grove</li></ul>	<p><b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. Cabinet Office note that RA1995 is to the south of RR012 and does not fall within the site boundary.</b></p> <p><b>Sites within the existing settlement boundary have been proposed for development to meet the housing need ahead of sustainable urban extensions.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of several respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage may be proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKGW-K			91		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Would worsen already problematic flooding risks and strain local sewage and water systems, and a significant concern regarding highway safety</li><li>• The two fields historically subject to covenants and restrictions - underscores their significance in planning considerations. MNH say they're "non-core" property – they are very much part of The Grove – as clearly highlighted in the Gibb's Will</li><li>• Significant engineering challenges – Development would require extensive engineering interventions given the fields are prone to substantial flooding and are often severely waterlogged</li></ul>	<p><b>Cabinet Office note your comment but the sites are to remain as proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	91		<p>We support the allocation of Site RR009 as proposed in the Modified Draft Plan.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your support for the site.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK85-2	Casey Smith	Ballamanaugh Properties	91		<p>Ballamanaugh Properties Ltd ("Ballamanaugh Properties") fully supports the inclusion of site LR027 (West of Keila Close. Sulby) as an allocation for residential development in the Area Plan for the North and West (the 'APNW'). Ballamanaugh Properties has promoted site LR027 as a suitable and sustainable option for residential development through the different consultations on the APNW. Therefore, they welcome the conclusion of the Cabinet Office's Policy Team and the Inspector that the APNW should allocate site LR027 for housing development. Site LR027 is in the full ownership of Ballamanaugh Properties. It is available for development with a willing landowner and there are no site-specific viability challenges relating to the site. As evidenced through the promotion of site LR027, the site is not constrained by any technical or environmental issue, such as flood risk or drainage. It also benefits from a Certificate of Lawfulness (ref. 23/00435JLAW) confirming lha the eastern area of the site is already covered by an extant planning permission for seven dwellings. Importantly, and as agreed by the Cabinet Office and Inspector, residential development on site LR027 can be safely accessed from Keila Close without a new access required from the A3 Sulby Straight. While Table 16 - summary of residential land provision of the Written Statement sets out that site LR027 has a yield of 5 dwellings up to 2026 ~.e. the end of the APNW's plan period), it is noted in the Inspector's Report (paragraph 329) that the full capacity of the site is approximately 11 dwellings. Ballamanaugh Properties maintain its view, based on technical evidence and master planning, that a higher number of dwellings could be provided on the site.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your support for the proposal of LR027 for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. Cabinet Office notes your comment regarding the full capacity of the development site in question but do not propose a change in this regard.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK85-2	Casey Smith	Ballamanaugh Properties	91		<p>Overall, site LR027's allocation for residential development is in-keeping with the housing objectives set out within the Isle of Man Strategic Plan(2016) and the Draft APNW Written Statement. It represents an effective option for housing development and is deliverable over and beyond the APNW's plan period to 2026. Through the APNW, Site LR027 will help meet the housing needs of Sul by while reta ining the character and appearance of the village. We trust that the comments provided in response to Question 109 assist the Cabinet Office in their final preparations of the APNW, before it is adopted as anticipated later this year.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comments and your support for site LR027.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		92		<p>This open space should be preserved</p>	<p><b>The change is to reflect the existing employment use on the site.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			92		<p>The boundaries should not be altered.</p>	<p><b>The change is to reflect the existing employment use on the site.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKMY-U		Manx Wildlife Trust	93	RR011, RR012	<p>RR011 and RR012 are not labelled on the map.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office have amended Map 4 - Ramsey to show site codes for RR011 and RR012.</b></p>	y	
ANON-UVCN-NKQC-9		Manx Wildlife Trust	93	RR011, RR012	<p>1) RR011, Bowring Road (field 131149) is not shown on the latest update to Map 4 - Ramsey, invalidating this consultation. Manx Wildlife Trust conducted an independent assessment of these fields in 1993 as part of our 'Ramsey Wildlife Report 1993-4' and found field 131149 to be of notable wildlife value, classing it as MEDIUM VALUE in a range of DEVELOPED, LOW, MEDIUM and HIGH values. It was classed as MEDIUM VALUE owing to the presence of marshy grassland and wet grassland specialists species including Oval Sedge, Jointed Rush and Cuckooflower (MWT survey conducted on 16/10/1993, with a confirmatory survey from the road in 2024 confirming the continued presence of this habitat). To this day, field 131149 remains particularly wet, which could suggest that it may be suitable for some protected plants such as orchids, however as we cannot survey for these species until late May and into June, this will not be possible in time for this consultation. The series of aerial and satellite images available to MWT from 2006 to the present show that this field appears to have been managed as a pasture historically, and as more of a hay meadow with some grazing in recent years. A June 2021 image for field 131149 indicated a level of botanical species diversity which would warrant further study in the main botanical season.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comments and have amended Map 4 - Ramsey to add site codes to sites RR011 and RR012.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment regarding the ecology of the site and potential ecological value but consider that these issues can still be fully assessed as part of any future planning application for the development of the site.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comments but the sites are to be retained as residential on Map 4 - Ramsey.</b></p>	y	

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKQC-9		Manx Wildlife Trust	93	RR011, RR012	2) RR012, Richmond Road (field 135070) is not shown on the latest update to Map 4 - Ramsey, invalidating this consultation. This field has clearly been managed as a lowland hay meadow for a prolonged period of time. Lowland hay meadows are a Manx Priority Habitat which receive financial incentives from Government for their continued management owing to their high value for wildlife, and losses of this habitat (and their corresponding wildlife) of 97% since the 1940s. 3) MWT have undertaken a download of the latest biological data for the RR011 and RR012 fields from the Manx Biological Recording Partnership and found the following: a) 22 records of Wildlife Act 1990 Schedule 5 protected bats, including Brown Long-eared Bat, Common Pipistrelle, Soprano Pipistrelle, Leisler's Bat and an unidentified Myotis bat (all Myotis bats are a Manx Biodiversity Action Plan species). b) 7 indicator species of marshy grassland (a Manx priority habitat): Cuckooflower, Toad Rush, Oval Sedge, Silverweed, Field Horsetail, Jointed Rush, Soft-rush, Meadow Buttercup. c) 2 additional typical indicator species of lowland hay meadows (a Manx priority habitat): Autumn Hawkbit, Greater Bird's-foot-trefoil. d) A record of the Wall Butterfly, which is now an uncommon and declining Manx butterfly of lowland agricultural landscapes. e) One record of a Wildlife Act 1990: Schedule 8 invasive, non-native species (Montbretia). 4) Neither RR011 nor RR012 have corresponding Development Briefs within Chapter 14 of the Post-Inquiry Written Statement (presumably as they were late additions to the process), which is unusual considering the above ecological constraints, known surface water flooding and the proximal presence of Registered Trees.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comments and have amended Map 4 - Ramsey to add site codes to sites RR011 and RR012.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes your comment regarding the ecology of the site and potential ecological value but consider that these issues can still be fully assessed as part of any future planning application for the development of the site.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes your comments but the sites are to be retained as residential on Map 4 - Ramsey</b>	y	
ANON-UVCN-NKQC-9		Manx Wildlife Trust	93	RR011, RR012	Development Briefs would flag up the requirement for ecological survey, flood risk assessment and tree protection measures, should any proposal ever be forthcoming on these fields.	<b>Cbainet Office note your comment but have not added devvelopment briefs for the sites in questtion.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK1M-K			93	RR011, RR012	I object to this section because it could be critical for wildlife, in particular, bats. It shouldn't be changed from a greenfield site to a residential site without comprehensive studies of the area to see the wildlife it may impact.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK29-Z			93	RR011, RR012	The land is currently grass fields and is being farmed, supporting the local farming industry. Additionally; • The proposal contradicts the remit of Manx National Heritage – Rezoning greenfield land for housing goes completely against MNH's mission to protect the Island's natural and historical heritage. • <del>The proposal threatens Conservation &amp; Biodiversity – The proposal undermines the Isle of Man's conservation commitments and</del>	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK29-Z			93	RR011, RR012	• Any housing development would increase noise and disturbance in the area – Development would disrupt the tranquillity of The Grove, diminishing its peaceful setting. • The land in that area is subject to Flooding, with consequent sewerage issues – Rezoning could worsen local flooding, overwhelm water and sewage systems, and also increase traffic safety risks. • Historic Covenants & Restrictions – These fields were historically protected as part of The Grove estate, as stated in Janet Ann Gibb's Deed and Will. Their heritage value should not be dismissed. • Any development will result in engineering challenges – The fields are prone to severe flooding, making development costly and a challenge.	<b>Cabinet Office note your comment and those of others objecting to the site.</b>  <b>The Department notes the Inspector's findings that the current setting of the Grove Museum is well preserved by its own extensive grounds with well defined boundaries.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes your comment and notes that issues such as residential amenity and noise generation, flooding and highways access can be addressed as part of a detailed planning application.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK2C-A			93	RR011, RR012	As a former resident of Ramsey, and regular visitor to the Island, my concern relates to RR011 and RR012, and the development which is planned for these fields.  They are important natural and historic wetlands, enjoyed by visitors to The Grove, as well as town residents.  These two greenfield sites should be protected, so they remain important habitat for local wildlife.  Therefore, my objection is on the grounds of endangering a historic environmental site and in support of conservation.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK2H-F			93	RR011, RR012	I live in Thornhill Close and we rely on soakaways to draw away rainwater. When it rains, our cul de sac backs up with water very quickly. I'm unsure where these soakaways go to, but I do know that the RR011 field (which is not very far away from our property) is a very wet location, with water often pooling on Bowring Road itself during rainfall (a skid hazard to motorists). I would imagine any developer that purchases that field with a view to building houses on it, will have a lot of work to do in order to mitigate the issue.  Slowly but surely we are losing the green corridors and areas of Ramsey. The RR011 field and surrounding Grove Museum farmland are a welcome splash of green in an otherwise built up area and home to protected species, such as bats. How lovely is it for local children to see the loaghtan sheep grazing in these fields, never mind bats, hedgehogs, rabbits etc. I believe the Manx Wildlife Trust carried out a detailed survey of this field.  The Grove Museum (not in Douglas, Peel or Castletown and therefore somewhat neglected by MNH) is a peaceful place and (albeit unfashionable in MNH's eyes perhaps) a very precious place. Part of it's beauty and appeal is in the fields that surround it.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK4Q-T	Emma Louise Wellings		93	RR011, RR012	As the CEO of a PR agency, I feel compelled to voice my opposition in the hope that Manx National Heritage and the Cabinet Office will reconsider this recommendation. At a time of climate crisis, the destruction of natural landscapes, habitats, and ecosystems is deeply concerning. Such a decision is not only environmentally irresponsible but also risks triggering strong public opposition, eroding trust, and inflicting long-term reputational damage on Manx National Heritage and on the Island more broadly. While financial challenges may be a factor, prioritizing short-term economic gains over long-term environmental and social responsibility is a short-sighted approach. This decision appears insensitive to both local residents, visitors, returning visitors and environmental advocates. Additionally, the consultation process lacks clarity, with no explicit reference to The Grove or Manx National Heritage, raising concerns about transparency and public engagement From a PR and policy standpoint, the Government should prioritize development on brownfield sites rather than greenfield spaces, particularly museum land and other historically or ecologically valuable areas. Failure to do so will likely attract significant criticism. Building trust in an organization requires time and effort, but a decision of this nature risks undoing that progress. The reputational damage resulting from this development could be severe and long-lasting. I urge both Manx National Heritage and the Cabinet Office to reconsider this proposal in favour of a more sustainable and publicly supported alternative.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NK53-W	Neill Clague		93	RR011, RR012	The inclusion of fields RR011 & RR012 was done at the 11th hour and the fact that they were not included on the original map (as displayed in Ramsey Town Hall) meant that nobody was aware that they needed to object to their zoning. This in my option was underhanded and intentional on the part of the planners. The will of the Gibb sisters, who allowed Manx National Heritage to buy the Grove for a vastly reduced price was explicit that the land was to held in stewardship for the people of the Island for ever and always. I find it abhorrent that MNH now feel that they can offload part of that estate as it surely goes against their own ethos and principals. These fields are valuable wet grassland areas and to allow building on them will fly in the face of so many initiatives, such as dark skies, conservation, biodiversity and ecology. The impact on the Grove Rural Life Museum itself will be detrimental. It will no longer be a rural life experience if it is hemmed in by housing. There is also the strain that additional housing will put on local infrastructure such as drainage (these are wetland fields) sewerage and traffic issues. Once these fields are rezoned, they will be sold and they will be gone. They will be lost to the community as a whole and that was never the intention of the Gibb family.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK5C-D			93	RR011, RR012	I would like to object to the proposed rezoning of greenfield sites RR011 & RR012 fields. The result of this would overshadow and cause loss of privacy and outlook to our home. The work would also have a detrimental effect on protected trees that border the two fields. The impact would subsequently cause added strain on local amenities, sewage and drainage systems, which are currently insufficient. This area is also a known wet land and provides a natural habitat for loaghton sheep, bats, birds, and insects and any residential development would harm the local biodiversity and natural ecosystem. The greenfield sites are also prone to flooding with RR011, often severely waterlogged and overflows onto the main road, which would require extensive intervention to address the serious drainage issues. I would urge the planning committee to reconsider more appropriate brownfield sites before committing to rezoning RR011 & RR012 and spoiling the last few remaining green spaces in Ramsey.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK5E-F			93	RR011, RR012	Good to raise money for MNH Development within town boundaries Already surrounded by development Ramsey needs more modern housing	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK5M-Q			93	RR011, RR012	I object to this as it is a national manx heritage building with the land. Would be devastating if there were houses built on it plus there is flooding . They would have terrible problems building on this land.	<b>The flood risk maps were a core document at the Inquiry and the flood risk on the site is known. This issue and any mitigating measures will be dealt with at the planning application stage.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK5V-Z	Deborah Mackie		93	RR011, RR012	Contravenes the ethos and principals of the Manx National Heritage. Selling off this land for development does not support our Island's commitment to Nature, Biodiversity and Conservation. Development also contravenes the Gibbs Will and last wishes stated in a covenant to preserve The Grove and its surrounding fields forever. There is an abundance of wildlife (especially Bats), flora and fauna within the fields, hedgerows and trees (protected Sycamore). Previous surveys show that they contain protected species and this would be lost should they be developed. There is significant and problematic flooding in the field RR011 which not only sees significant standing water within the field but also across Bowring Road. Additional housing would add extra pressure to existing infrastructure. The building of houses on these fields would see loss of green spaces which passer-by's currently enjoy. It would also destroy the tranquil and peaceful vistas currently enjoyed by The Grove. I strongly object!	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		93	RR011, RR012	The inclusion of these 3 sites is premature and undesirable. LR001 having been a contentious part of the submissions to the Public Inquiry in connection with proposals to extend Ramsey Town Boundaries in 2024, proposals which were rejected. At present sites RR011 and RR012 contribute beneficially to the character and landscape of the Town providing open space between relatively dense housing. LR001 is currently actively farmed. The land provides a clear demarcation between Ramsey Town and the rural Lezayre Parish, preventing urban sprawl and acting as an effective 'green lung' for the vicinity. Regeneration within the Town, including provision of housing is more urgently needed with potential broad based benefits for the Community.	<b>The Chairman into the Ramsey Town Boundary extension concluded that the planning and land use inquiries should come first and there must be a demonstratable need that Ramsey Town Commissioners have now or in the future a developmental need to extend the town's boundaries.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		93	RR011, RR012	I strongly object to the proposal to rezone these two fields which are part of The Grove Museum. This contradicts conservation and celebration of our natural and cultural heritage. It goes against MNH's core principles and sets a very unwelcome precedent particularly given its part funding by Government and the Islands wish to preserve its Biosphere status. Additionally field 131149 remains particularly wet which aside fro its ecological value which I set out below will probably have a mitigating effect on the surrounding developments which appear to have increasing flooding problems. Of even greater importance is the ecological importance of the fields I quote from the submission by Manx Wildlife Trust "Conclusion (RR011 and RR012): The proposed development site has been known for its wildlife interest since 1993. For all of the above reasons, Manx Wildlife Trust currently objects to the inclusion of RR011 and RR012 in the North and West Area Plan until such a time as required ecological survey work has ensured that they could be sustainably developed without the loss of Manx priority habitats and without impact to protected species and also to ensure compliance with the Island's Biodiversity Strategy. Should this be the case, the sites would also require responding Development Briefs. LR001: there is a historic dub shown within field 135283 on both the 1860s series OS map and also modern mapping. While recent satellite imagery suggests that this dub has largely dried out, it still likely harbours wetland species and should be excluded (or sensitively restored) under any LR001 proposal. It should be removed from the zoned area owing to our obligations under the Ramsar Wetlands Convention."	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7J-P	Caroline Callahan		93	RR011, RR012	Having been a loyal supporter and long-term member of Manx National Heritage, regularly visiting their sites and advocating for the work they do, I am disappointed by their recent proposal to rezone two of The Grove's greenfield sites for residential development. This move is contrary to their mission of protecting and promoting the Isle of Man's natural and cultural heritage. Offering these fields for development destroys, not safeguards The Grove's cultural history. The Will of Janet Gibb clearly identifies these two fields as part of The Grove. The Deed Option granted to the Manx Museum and National Trust on purchase was to "hold the same unto the trust from the day of the date hereof absolutely and for ever." Both RR011 and RR012 were protected by covenants prohibiting any erection of buildings and while these covenants have lapsed, their existence elevates their status as areas of conservation value. The public was not given adequate opportunity to lodge objections during the 2024 consultation (as part of the Area Plan), primarily because people were unaware of the proposal. The sites, labelled as RR011 and RR012, were not identified as "The Grove" or "Manx National Heritage" and were not flagged on the "Cabinet Office – All sites and Additional Sites North" as potential areas for development and this proposal was lodged late in the process. My main reasons for objecting to Modification 93 and the amendment of Map 4 - Ramsey are as follows: Goes against the ethos of Manx National Heritage (MNH) - The sale of these greenfield sites for residential development is inconsistent with the principles that MNH stands for. These fields are valuable wet grassland areas, and an important part of Ramsey's local ecosystem.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NK7J-P	Caroline Callahan		93	RR011, RR012	Historical Covenants - These fields were once subject to covenants heightening their importance in planning decisions. The Isle of Man's commitment to Conservation, Nature and Biodiversity - The MNH proposal is inconsistent with the Island's conservation policies and ecological commitments and rezoning would result in the irreversible loss of this natural environment - contrary to established biodiversity and conservation objectives. As an Island, we are fortunate to have and have earned our Biosphere status – undermined by this proposal.	<b>Cabinet Office note your comment and those of others relating to potential conventants places on the land when its ownership was transferred to Manx National Heritage. Cabinet Office note that MNH have published information in the public domain which makes clear that there are no covenants or other restrictions that would affect the sale or development of the land in future. MNH do note however that the organisation is required to obtain Tynwald approval before the permanent disposal of real property.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office note that, as far as possible, land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is shown on the Environmental Constraints maps.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7J-P	Caroline Callahan		93	RR011, RR012	Historical Covenants - These fields were once subject to covenants heightening their importance in planning decisions. The Isle of Man's commitment to Conservation, Nature and Biodiversity - The MNH proposal is inconsistent with the Island's conservation policies and ecological commitments and rezoning would result in the irreversible loss of this natural environment - contrary to established biodiversity and conservation objectives. As an Island, we are fortunate to have and have earned our Biosphere status – undermined by this proposal. The Natural Environment protection within the Draft Area Plan - includes provision for the Natural Environment Proposal, covering its biodiversity gain and tree planting (prioritises brownfield). Data from previous surveys for these two fields (most recent in 2020 and spreadsheet sent to the official consultation email address) reveals that they contained protected species including: Autumn Hawkbit, Soft-rush, Field Horsetail, Greater Bird's-foot-trefoil, Toad Rush, Silverweed, Wall [Butterfly], Brown Long-eared Bat, Pipistrelle Bat species, Common Pipistrelle, Soprano Pipistrelle, Myotis Bat species and Lesser Noctule (Leisler's Bat). Previous surveys have also found the presence of wet grassland specialists species including Oval Sedge, Jointed Rush and Cuckooflower. These fields are an asset to The Grove and, given they are wetlands, may be an ideal habitat for wild orchids, a species that are on the decline, mainly due to habitat loss, and gradually sliding into extinction. RR011 may make an ideal Wild Orchid reserve and nature walk for The Grove.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7J-P	Caroline Callahan		93	RR011, RR012	Effect on Trees and Hedgerows - The trees bordering these fields have been assessed by DEFA Forestry, with protected species - a protected Sycamore (RT0698) and a Registered Tree Area (RA1995), both material considerations or rezoning. Overshadowing and loss of outlook and privacy - As a heritage museum, I believe The Grove has entitlement to the preservation of specific key views from and to The Grove farmhouse and grounds offering a sense of openness and visual relief for visitors and passers-by on Bowring and Richmond Road. Development would compromise the privacy, seclusion, and overall integrity of The Grove as a heritage setting. Development Brief - Does such a proposal need to have an accompanying Development Brief? Inadequate Social Infrastructure - The proposed residential development, along with other residential projects approved elsewhere in Ramsey, would exacerbate pressures on already overstretched local infrastructure, could worsen existing flooding risks and strain local water and sewage systems. Significant engineering challenges – Development would require substantial and expensive engineering interventions given that RR011 is at a lower elevation than the Rheast Mooar Estate and prone to substantial flooding, often severely waterlogged and a soakaway for a substantial volume of water from the Rheast Mooar estate. Given these and many other reasons, please can modification 93 be reconsidered by the Cabinet Office.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7N-T	Michael Callahan		93	RR011, RR012	I am writing to formally object to Modification 93 of the North and West Draft Area Plan and the re-zoning of RR011 and RR012 from greenfield space to residential development. This modification, if sustained, would have significant environmental, social, and infrastructural consequences that I believe are contrary to the long-term interests of the Isle of Man and its residents.Environmental Concerns The two fields in question, RR011 and RR012, are owned by Manx National Heritage (MNH) and have formed part of The Grove Museum for many years. Their preservation is integral to maintaining the historical and cultural heritage of the museum's site. These fields contribute to the character and setting of The Grove Museum, an important heritage site that tells the story of the island's history for current and future generations. Re-zoning them for residential development would undermine their historical value and negatively impact the visitor experience in addition to transforming the landscape of this small, rural aspect of Ramsey which, once gone, would be lost forever. Developing RR011 and RR012 would result in the irreversible loss of valuable greenfield land, which serves as an essential habitat for local wildlife and contributes to the ecological balance of the region. These areas support diverse flora and fauna, many of which include several species of bats that are on protected species lists, and their development could lead to habitat destruction and a decline in local biodiversity. Green spaces even small ones such as these, play a vital role in carbon sequestration and help mitigate climate change.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7N-T	Michael Callahan		93	RR011, RR012	Infrastructure and Community Impact The existing infrastructure, including medical and dental services, the Cottage Hospital, schools, roads, public transport, and utilities, currently are not sufficient to support additional development on top of what has already been approved without significant investment, leading to potential issues for current residents. Increased development in these areas could amongst other things contribute to ever-increasing traffic congestion, affecting the quality of life for those who live and commute in the region.  In addition, RR011 is regularly flooded, and it currently provides natural drainage from the Rheast Mooar Estate, above it. Bowring/Andreas Road is regularly flooded during high rainfall and urban development on this adjacent field could lead to increased flood risk due to higher levels of surface runoff.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7N-T	Michael Callahan		93	RR011, RR012	Planning and Development Policy Considerations The Isle of Man has committed to sustainable development. Prioritizing brownfield sites over greenfields, particularly heritage greenfield sites and aligns more closely with responsible land-use policies. There are underutilized brownfield sites within Ramsey that could be considered for development before greenfields, as evident in the planning vision previously identified by Cabinet Office, thus ensuring that urban expansion occurs in a more controlled and environmentally sensitive manner. I was unaware that these fields were included in the North and West Plan until very late in the process and after the close of the 2024 consultation – as I believe would have been the case for many people. They were not included in the initial area plan site map of proposed changes due to the proposal being submission extremely late in the process and after the production of this site map that went on public display. Had this proposal been submitted prior to the production of the site map and clearly identified as The Grove's fields (rather than RR011 and RR012), I would have had the opportunity to lodge an objection during the consultation last summer. In light of the above items and concerns, I urge the Cabinet Office to reconsider the proposed modification and maintain the current designation of RR011 and RR012 as protected greenfield sites. The long-term environmental and social benefits of preserving these areas far outweigh the short-term economic gains of development, particularly for fields of their respective sizes. I do hope that the Cabinet Office will make a decision that prioritizes the sustainable and responsible development of the Isle of Man as part of the UNESCO Isle of Man Biosphere.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. Sites within the existing settlement boundary such as RR011 and RR012 have been prioritised over greenfield sites on the edge of the settlement.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NK8C-G	Geoffrey Logan		93	RR011, RR012	My objection to Manx National Heritage's proposal to build on two of The Grove's fields, and in my capacity as Director of Phoenix with experience of construction in properties in this area, I would like to emphasize the critical risks associated with constructing on this wetland that is inherently waterlogged and prone to serious flooding – I believe it should remain a natural wetland and habitat for wildlife. The field exhibits signs of significant hydrogeological instability, as evidenced by frequent surface water accumulation during heavy rainfall in the field and neighbouring Bowring Road. This indicates poor soil permeability and a potential for high groundwater levels – which I have witnessed in the field. The resulting saturation of the ground creates conditions that are unsuitable for foundation design and can lead to settlement issues, differential movement, and structural deformation. Additionally, the presence of poor drainage characteristics, and the fact that these fields are on a lower elevation than the Rheast Moor Estate and a soak away for the estate increases the likelihood of hydraulic heave and undermines the long-term viability of any built structures. The risk of flooding, coupled with the potential for erosion and soil liquefaction will cause significant challenges to any building contractors contemplating building on this land – not to mention the problems future occupants may face. I strongly advise that this development proposal be reassessed in light of these technical concerns and preserved as it was when under the ownership of the Gibbs and now Manx National Heritage.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK8G-M	Karen Moore		93	RR011, RR012	These fields are natural wetlands, and part of our heritage.. I am also aware there are protected species.. Also wasn't able to object last year as we didn't know about it.. I am sure the community would help if funds were short.. but doing this way is deemed not appropriate..	<b>The land was purchased by MNH and they have set out their rational for proposing the site sites which were discussed at the Public Inquiry.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK8S-Z	Helen Clarke		93	RR011, RR012	This is an area of natural beauty, wonderful plants, trees and an area that should be used for the community not property development.  If funding is needed by Manx National Heritage shouldn't we be fundraising to keep this area green.	<b>The land was purchased by MNH and they have set out their rational for proposing the site sites which were discussed at the Public Inquiry.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKB2-9			93	RR011, RR012	1. The Natural Environment protection within the Draft Area Plan for the North & West – includes provisions for the Natural Environment Proposal, covering its biodiversity gain and tree planting (and prioritises the re-use of brownfield land). Data from previous surveys available for the two fields reveals that they contained protected species  2. The field's trees have been assessed by DEFA Forestry - several individually registered. Specifically, RR011 contains a protected Sycamore (RT0698), and RR012 includes a Registered Tree Area (RA1995), both a material consideration  3. Significant engineering challenges – Development would require extensive engineering interventions given the fields are prone to substantial flooding and are often severely waterlogged  4. Does not conform to the spirit and requirements of the Gibbs Will.  5. There are other development sites within the Ramsey area which have not been developed. What is the hurry and driving force behind this?	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of several respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage may be proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKBE-V			93	RR011, RR012	The fields around the Grove Museum should retain an open farmland view, which building would ruin. The fields are also prone to severe flooding, which will be worsened if built upon.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKBG-X			93	RR011, RR012	I grew up in Ramsey on Windsor Mount. My Parents still live there and my brother lives on Bowring Road. This is my neck of the woods. I object to this proposal because They form an important buffer to housing sprawl. Pockets of nature even within the town boundary are important as a green lung and a tonic for the eye and soul. Just because land has not yet been built on does not mean it should be developed. In addition: • Contravenes the ethos and principles of Manx National Heritage • Inconsistent with our Island's commitment to Conservation, Nature and Biodiversity - once the fields have gone, they have gone! • The Natural Environment protection within the Draft Area Plan for the North & West – includes provisions for the Natural Environment Proposal, covering its biodiversity gain and tree planting (and prioritises the re-use of brownfield land). Data from previous surveys available for the two fields reveals that they contained protected species • The Grove has entitlement to the preservation of specific key views from and to The Grove farmhouse and grounds and offers a sense of openness and visual relief for visitors and passers-by on Bowring and Richmond Road • The field's trees have been assessed by DEFA Forestry - several individually registered. Specifically, RR011 contains a protected Sycamore (RT0698), and RR012 includes a Registered Tree Area (RA1995), both a material consideration	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKBG-X			93	RR011, RR012	• Hedgerows and banks surrounding the fields benefit from a level of policy protection Could form future educational or scientific or fieldwork site for MNH - outdoor classroom, Could be designated as open space for children to Play (currently deficient) , fieldwork site etc. MNH has not considered alternative usages more in keeping with their charitable objectives that another charity could run for them egg adventure playground, nature reserve, sports area, camping etc - anything but housing • Two fields not accompanied by corresponding Development Trunks Briefs • Additional residential development places further pressure on existing infrastructure • Residential development has the potential to disrupt the tranquil environment of The Grove • Would worsen already problematic flooding risks and strain local sewage and water systems, and a significant concern regarding highway safety • The two fields historically subject to covenants and restrictions - underscores their significance in planning considerations. MNH say they're "non-core" property – they are very much part of The Grove – as clearly highlighted in the Gibb's Will • Significant engineering challenges – Development would require extensive engineering interventions given the fields are prone to substantial flooding and are often severely waterlogged	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKBH-Y	Liz Courtie		93	RR011, RR012	I object profusely to this application to build houses on these two fields as it is a small slice of rural Ramsey left and it would completely ruin the nature of the area, take away grazing for the sheep and interfere with the wild life and pond life when the field actually floods - and it most definitely does! These two fields should remain part of the Grove Estate as intended. This is an important and historical part of our town – for us and for future generations too. I was born and bred in Ramsey and lived in Bowring Road for many years as did my Grandparents before me (who knew the Gibb sisters very well). I am sure this nonsense would be totally objected by them too! What would future generations think of a decision made by the Committee of Manx National Heritage, the Trustees and Government to feel it fit to propose and approval of such a plan? I know that my family and friends stand with me on this. We trust the Government to do the right thing, and this certainly is not when there are surely other sites available in the Ramsey area for the building of more houses. I have only recently become aware of these proposals and these fields were not on the original site map of potential areas of development and why are they labelled RR011 and RR012 as the majority of people would not know they are part of The Grove. The Cabinet Office should have made clear, in a consultation question, that RR011 and RR012 are The Grove's fields – I luckily do now know. I believe the Cabinet Office should reconsider this decision.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKBJ-1			93	RR011, RR012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Grove has entitlement to the preservation of specific key views from and to The Grove farmhouse and grounds and offers a sense of openness and visual relief for visitors and passers-by on Bowring and Richmond Road</li> <li>The field's trees have been assessed by DEFA Forestry - several individually registered. Specifically, RR011 contains a protected Sycamore (RT0698), and RR012 includes a Registered Tree Area (RA1995), both a material consideration</li> <li>Hedgerows and banks surrounding the fields benefit from a level of policy protection</li> <li>Two fields not accompanied by corresponding Development Trunks Briefs</li> <li>Additional residential development places further pressure on existing infrastructure</li> <li>Residential development has the potential to disrupt the tranquil environment of The Grove</li> <li>Would worsen already problematic flooding risks and strain local sewage and water systems, and a significant concern regarding highway safety</li> <li>The two fields historically subject to covenants and restrictions - underscores their significance in planning considerations. MNH say they're "non-core" property – they are very much part of The Grove – as clearly highlighted in the Gibb's Will</li> <li>Significant engineering challenges – Development would require extensive engineering interventions given the fields are prone to substantial flooding and are often severely waterlogged</li> </ul>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comments regarding the sites in question. In certain cases, development briefs can be helpful in ensuring certain development constraints or considerations are addressed as part of a planning application to develop a site. It is not a requirement that all sites in an Area Plan have a corresponding development brief and Cabinet Office has not added a development brief for RR011 and RR012 to the Area Plan.</p> <p>During Inquiry sessions, the impact of the potential development of the sites on the setting of the nearby Grove Museum was discussed and Cabinet Office would refer to paragraph 438 of the Inspector's report where it is noted that the setting of the grove is well protected by well-defined boundaries and the extensive grounds of the existing house.</p> <p>Cabinet Office notes your comment on flood risk, however it is noted that neither site is shown as being at risk of flooding on the DOI' flood risk maps.</p> <p>Cabinet Office notes the concern of several respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage may be proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan. Ultimately, any future decisions on the release of this land for development would be down to Manx National Heritage.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKBJ-1			93	RR011, RR012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contravenes the ethos and principles of Manx National Heritage</li> <li>Inconsistent with our Island's commitment to Conservation, Nature and Biodiversity - once the fields have gone, they have gone!</li> <li>The Natural Environment protection within the Draft Area Plan for the North &amp; West – includes provisions for the Natural Environment Proposal, covering its biodiversity gain and tree planting (and prioritises the re-use of brownfield land). Data from previous surveys available for the two fields reveals that they contained protected species</li> </ul>	<p>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</p> <p>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKBN-5			93	RR011, RR012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Grove has entitlement to the preservation of specific key views from and to The Grove farmhouse and grounds and offers a sense of openness and visual relief for visitors and passers-by on Bowring and Richmond Road</li> <li>The field's trees have been assessed by DEFA Forestry - several individually registered. Specifically, RR011 contains a protected Sycamore (RT0698), and RR012 includes a Registered Tree Area (RA1995), both a material consideration</li> <li>Hedgerows and banks surrounding the fields benefit from a level of policy protection</li> <li>Two fields not accompanied by corresponding Development Trunks Briefs</li> <li>Additional residential development places further pressure on existing infrastructure</li> <li>Residential development has the potential to disrupt the tranquil environment of The Grove</li> <li>Would worsen already problematic flooding risks and strain local sewage and water systems, and a significant concern regarding highway safety</li> <li>The two fields historically subject to covenants and restrictions - underscores their significance in planning considerations. MNH say they're "non-core" property – they are very much part of The Grove – as clearly highlighted in the Gibb's Will</li> <li>Significant engineering challenges – Development would require extensive engineering interventions given the fields are prone to substantial flooding and are often severely waterlogged</li> </ul>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comments regarding the sites in question. In certain cases, development briefs can be helpful in ensuring certain development constraints or considerations are addressed as part of a planning application to develop a site. It is not a requirement that all sites in an Area Plan have a corresponding development brief and Cabinet Office has not added a development brief for RR011 and RR012 to the Area Plan.</p> <p>During Inquiry sessions, the impact of the potential development of the sites on the setting of the nearby Grove Museum was discussed and Cabinet Office would refer to paragraph 438 of the Inspector's report where it is noted that the setting of the grove is well protected by well-defined boundaries and the extensive grounds of the existing house.</p> <p>Cabinet Office notes your comment on flood risk, however it is noted that neither site is shown as being at risk of flooding on the DOI' flood risk maps.</p> <p>Cabinet Office notes the concern of several respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage may be proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan. Ultimately, any future decisions on the release of this land for development would be down to Manx National Heritage.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKBN-5			93	RR011, RR012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contravenes the ethos and principles of Manx National Heritage</li> <li>Inconsistent with our Island's commitment to Conservation, Nature and Biodiversity - once the fields have gone, they have gone!</li> <li>The Natural Environment protection within the Draft Area Plan for the North &amp; West – includes provisions for the Natural Environment Proposal, covering its biodiversity gain and tree planting (and prioritises the re-use of brownfield land). Data from previous surveys available for the two fields reveals that they contained protected species</li> </ul>	<p>The land was purchased by MNH and they have set out their rational for proposing the site sites which were discussed at the Public Inquiry.</p> <p>The Area Plan can only go so far as to making land use proposals providing there are no constraints that cannot be overcome. The technical aspect of how the site will be delivered will be examined at the detailed planning application stage.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKBT-B			93	RR011, RR012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hedgerows and banks surrounding the fields benefit from a level of policy protection</li> <li>Two fields not accompanied by corresponding Development Trunks Briefs</li> <li>Additional residential development places further pressure on existing infrastructure</li> <li>Residential development has the potential to disrupt the tranquil environment of The Grove</li> <li>Would worsen already problematic flooding risks and strain local sewage and water systems, and a significant concern regarding highway safety</li> <li>The two fields historically subject to covenants and restrictions - underscores their significance in planning considerations. MNH say they're "non-core" property – they are very much part of The Grove – as clearly highlighted in the Gibb's Will</li> <li>Significant engineering challenges – Development would require extensive engineering interventions given the fields are prone to substantial flooding and are often severely waterlogged</li> </ul>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comments regarding the sites in question. In certain cases, development briefs can be helpful in ensuring certain development constraints or considerations are addressed as part of a planning application to develop a site. It is not a requirement that all sites in an Area Plan have a corresponding development brief and Cabinet Office has not added a development brief for RR011 and RR012 to the Area Plan. During Inquiry sessions, the impact of the potential development of the sites on the setting of the nearby Grove Museum was discussed and Cabinet Office would refer to paragraph 438 of the Inspector's report where it is noted that the setting of the grove is well protected by well-defined boundaries and the extensive grounds of the existing house.</p> <p>Cabinet Office notes your comment on flood risk, however it is noted that neither site is shown as being at risk of flooding on the DOI' flood risk maps. Cabinet Office notes the concern of several respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage may be proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan. Ultimately, any future decisions on the release of this land for development would be down to Manx National Heritage.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKBT-B			93	RR011, RR012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contravenes the ethos and principles of Manx National Heritage</li> <li>Inconsistent with our Island's commitment to Conservation, Nature and Biodiversity - once the fields have gone, they have gone!</li> <li>The Natural Environment protection within the Draft Area Plan for the North &amp; West – includes provisions for the Natural Environment Proposal, covering its biodiversity gain and tree planting (and prioritises the re-use of brownfield land). Data from previous surveys available for the two fields reveals that they contained protected species</li> <li>The Grove has entitlement to the preservation of specific key views from and to The Grove farmhouse and grounds and offers a sense of openness and visual relief for visitors and passers-by on Bowring and Richmond Road</li> <li>The field's trees have been assessed by DEFA Forestry - several individually registered. Specifically, RR011 contains a protected Sycamore (RT0698), and RR012 includes a Registered Tree Area (RA1995), both a material consideration</li> </ul>	<p>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</p> <p>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKBW-E	Jacqueline Kelly		93	RR011, RR012	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hedgerows and banks surrounding the fields benefit from a level of policy protection</li> <li>Two fields not accompanied by corresponding Development Trunks Briefs</li> <li>Additional residential development places further pressure on existing infrastructure</li> <li>Residential development has the potential to disrupt the tranquil environment of The Grove</li> <li>Would worsen already problematic flooding risks and strain local sewage and water systems, and a significant concern regarding highway safety</li> <li>The two fields historically subject to covenants and restrictions - underscores their significance in planning considerations. MNH say they're "non-core" property – they are very much part of The Grove – as clearly highlighted in the Gibb's Will</li> <li>Significant engineering challenges – Development would require extensive engineering interventions given the fields are prone to substantial flooding and are often severely waterlogged</li> </ul>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comments regarding the sites in question. In certain cases, development briefs can be helpful in ensuring certain development constraints or considerations are addressed as part of a planning application to develop a site. It is not a requirement that all sites in an Area Plan have a corresponding development brief and Cabinet Office has not added a development brief for RR011 and RR012 to the Area Plan. During Inquiry sessions, the impact of the potential development of the sites on the setting of the nearby Grove Museum was discussed and Cabinet Office would refer to paragraph 438 of the Inspector's report where it is noted that the setting of the grove is well protected by well-defined boundaries and the extensive grounds of the existing house. Cabinet Office notes your comment on flood risk, however it is noted that neither site is shown as being at risk of flooding on the DOI' flood risk maps. Cabinet Office notes the concern of several respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage may be proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan. Ultimately, any future decisions on the release of this land for development would be down to Manx National Heritage.</p>		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKBW-E	Jacqueline Kelly		93	RR011, RR012	Proposals of RR011, Bowring Road, RR012, Richmond Road: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contravenes the ethos and principles of Manx National Heritage</li> <li>Inconsistent with our Island's commitment to Conservation, Nature and Biodiversity - once the fields have gone, they have gone!</li> <li>The Natural Environment protection within the Draft Area Plan for the North &amp; West – includes provisions for the Natural Environment Proposal, covering its biodiversity gain and tree planting (and prioritises the re-use of brownfield land). Data from previous surveys available for the two fields reveals that they contained protected species</li> <li>The Grove has entitlement to the preservation of specific key views from and to The Grove farmhouse and grounds and offers a sense of openness and visual relief for visitors and passers-by on Bowring and Richmond Road</li> <li>The field's trees have been assessed by DEFA Forestry - several individually registered. Specifically, RR011 contains a protected Sycamore (RT0698), and RR012 includes a Registered Tree Area (RA1995), both a material consideration</li> </ul>	<p>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</p> <p>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKBX-F			93	RR011, RR012	No more houses, you can't build in that beautiful field next to the Grove museum, scandalous.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		
ANON-UVCN-NKBZ-H			93	RR011, RR012	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contravenes the ethos and principles of Manx National Heritage</li> <li>Inconsistent with our Island's commitment to Conservation, Nature and Biodiversity - once the fields have gone, they have gone!</li> <li>The Natural Environment protection within the Draft Area Plan for the North &amp; West – includes provisions for the Natural Environment Proposal, covering its biodiversity gain and tree planting (and prioritises the re-use of brownfield land). Data from</li> </ol>	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		
ANON-UVCN-NKC9-H	Gordon Dickens		93	RR011, RR012	<p>This modification contravenes the ethos and principles of MNH. It is also inconsistent with the IOM's commitment to biodiversity conservation and nature.</p> <p>Removing fields around the Grove museum and replacing with development will ruin the tranquility of the Grove and the outlook from this historically important house. In addition the loss of hedgerows and banks would be highly significant ecologically.</p> <p>The trees in the fields are protected by DEFA Forestry, particularly a sycamore (RT0698) and a registered tree area (RA1995).</p> <p>Development of this land would strain an already overstretched infrastructure, particularly sewage and water systems. Also covering the land with concrete will exacerbate existing flooding problems in the area.</p> <p>Finally, the two fields are the subject of historic covenants and are clearly a part of the Grove estate, as made clear in the Gibbs family will. We do not need extra housing enough to destroy this area for ever.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</p> <p>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKCJ-2			93	RR011, RR012	Re RR011. As a Ramsey resident I would like to object to MNH's attempt to rezone two fields that form part of the Grove estate. These fields are specifically mentioned in the last will of Jane Gibb and it is clear that she intended that they should remain an integral part of the estate that she left to the Manx nation. They were green fields then and should remain so, as a natural buffer against the encroaching developments that are blighting the area.	Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
ANON-UVCN-NKCT-C			93	RR011, RR012	<p>These green fields are a rural area within the Ramsey boundary and must be protected from this infill proposed development for the sake of biodiversity and the loss of outlook of the Grove rural life museum. A development would impact the setting of the museum; instead of sheep grazing, birds and wildlife flourishing, there would be modern buildings, motor vehicles and noise disturbances. That is impact!</p> <p>The Manx National Heritage has gone against their own mandates of preservation and protection of land they were entrusted to maintain along with the Grove Museum - why.</p> <p>The timeframe of the original proposed re zone of this land was so short (that no one was aware of it) seems particularly underhand and should surely be reviewed.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comments. Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</p> <p>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKE2-C			93	RR011, RR012	These picturesque fields next to the Grove Museum have presented a pastoral scene from the road for as long as I remember (I was born in 1987) and, with their grazing loughtan sheep and views to Sky Hill beyond, are a poignant reminder of the Grove's original rural setting on the outskirts of Ramsey. The land usage map reveals them to be an island of green surrounded by existing residential areas, and should be preserved as such, not built on. People need such spaces. Have some real vision and preserve this land for everyone to enjoy - maintain the fields as a conservation wildflower meadow, a new public wild park. On an additional but related note, it's particularly disappointing to read that MNH are considering selling off these assets for development, when they could and should be delivering much more of a heritage experience at the Grove with these fields rather than without them. The Grove site could be a real MHH jewel, re-instating the dilapidated sheds to show off the rich farming and community histories of the Northern plains which have their own special cultural identities. Restore the mill as an exhibition and function space, and host workshops for local artisans. Plant some native fruit and nut trees. Establish a community orchard. Link up with Manx beekeepers and the apiary at the Grove to educate people about the globally-important Manx honey bees.	<p>Cabinet Office recognises the importance of the Grove Museum and agrees that it justifies as high-level of protection. This being said, the Department agrees with the Inspector in that the setting of the Grove is adequately protected by its own extensive grounds, which have well-defined boundaries.</p> <p>Cabinet Office notes the concern of several respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage may be proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKEK-5			93	RR011, RR012	<p>I strongly object to the proposal to build a housing estate on land owned by Manx National Heritage. This development would not only result in the destruction of protected trees but also encroach upon the historic Grove Museum, which is an integral part of our heritage. Surrounding the museum with housing would compromise its historical and cultural significance. Furthermore, this development threatens to erase one of the last remaining green spaces in Ramsey, which is vital for the well-being of the local community and for biodiversity.</p> <p>It goes against our established biodiversity policy, which should be a priority in preserving such irreplaceable natural resources. Additionally, the infrastructure in Ramsey is already under severe strain. It is nearly impossible to access basic services such as a dentist, and waiting times for medical care are excessive. Introducing a new housing estate without addressing these pressing issues would exacerbate the situation and further degrade the quality of life for residents. I urge decision-makers to reconsider this proposal and prioritize the preservation of our heritage, environment, and the well-being of the community.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comments. Cabinet Office notes the presence of a Registered Tree within RR011 but note that such trees are afforded a high level of protection through the Strategic Plan and the Tree Preservation Act 1993.</p> <p>Cabinet Office agree with the Inspector that the Grove Museum justifies a high level of protection in itself with regards to its setting but that this essentially consists of its own extensive grounds which have well-defined boundaries with the surrounding roads and existing, more recent residential development.</p> <p>Cabinet Office notes your comments.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKER-C			93	RR011, RR012	Fields RR011 and RR012 should not be taken from the Grove Museum as it was gifted to the people of Ramsey. How can the Manx Museum take it from the people of Ramsey? We have enough houses as it is and lots of building land proposed in the North West Plan. If this goes ahead it would deter many people from donating to the Manx Heritage in the future. The Gibbs Sisters should be honoured with their gift to us and the Manx Museum should look elsewhere to find funds. Being Manx, I am disgusted that this has even been proposed.	Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
ANON-UVCN-NKER-C			93	RR011, RR012	Built up enough in that area. Traffic and parking are a major issue.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		
ANON-UVCN-NKEY-K			93	RR011, RR012	Regarding RR011/12, how can Manx National Heritage live up to its name when it is prepared to allow the surrounding grazing grounds of the Grove Museum to be turned over to residential development? The MNH purports to be "responsible for protecting and promoting the Isle of Man's natural and cultural heritage". Its Statement of Purpose is to "take a lead in protecting, conserving, making available and celebrating the Island's natural and cultural heritage for current and future generations, whilst contributing to the	Cabinet Office notes the concern of several respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage may be proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
ANON-UVCN-NKG3-F	Jill Wilson		93	RR011, RR012	<p>Wasn't able to object previously as no one knew.</p> <p>Has gone in under the radar.</p> <p>MNH should be preserving our green field land. As a lifetime membership of MNH I strongly object to the principles off development as this land should be preserved.</p> <p>Least best land to build on in Ramsey due to the openness of the visits, which the Gibbs sisters lives were cherished and embellished by.</p> <p>It erodes my trust in my MNH membership. A friend who was leaving a legacy to MNH has changed her mind, as this piece of land was left to the Manx people. Developers do not care about the historic nature of the land, their end game is lining their pockets, whilst the existing community are weakened. It's all a disgrace!</p>	<p>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</p> <p>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</p>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKG6-J	Geoff Carter		93	RR011, RR012	The development will generate additional and significant traffic on Bowring Road, over and above the additional traffic to emerge once the Hartford Homes development on the Andreas/Bride Road. The level of traffic will cause congestion and queues there, generating high levels of carbon emissions and noise. This will cause disturbance, as will the actual need to dig up historical fields and surrounding roads. Finally, the fields involved are marshland and boggy making them a great habitat for wildlife and an awful habitat for new houses.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		
ANON-UVCN-NKH8-N			93	RR011, RR012	Contravene the ethos and principles of Manx National Heritage Inconsistent with our islands commitment to conservation nature and biodiversity The natural environment protection within the draft area plan for the north and west includes provisions for the natural environment proposal covering its biodiversity gain and tree planting and prioritises the reuse of Brownfield land data from previous surveys available for the two fields reveals that they contain protected species The Grove has entitlement to the preservation of specific key views from and to the Grove farmhouse and grounds and offers a sense of openness and visual relief for visitors and passes by on bowing and Richmond Road The fields trees have been assessed by DEFA forestry several individual individually registered specifically RR011 contains a protective sycamore RT0698 and RR 012 includes a registered tree area RA1995 both a material consideration	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.  Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
ANON-UVCN-NKH8-N			93	RR011, RR012	Hedge Rose and Banks surrounding the fields benefits from a level of policy protection Additional residential development places further pressure on existing infrastructure Residential development has the potential to disrupt the tranquil environment of the Grove Would worsen already problematic flood risks and strain local sewage and water systems and a significant concern regarding highway safety The two fields historically subject to covenant and restrictions underscores their significance in planning considerations makes national heritage say the non-core property. They are very much part of the Grove as clearly highlighted in the Gibbs will. Significant engineering challenges development would require extensive engineering interventions given the fields are prone to substantial flooding and are often severely waterlogged	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.  Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	93	RR011, RR012	As stated above we support the allocation of Site LR001 for residential development, which accords with the conclusions of the Plan Inspector.	Cabinet Office notes your support for the site.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHQ-E	David Callaghan		93	RR011, RR012	I object to the two Manx National Heritage fields RR011 and RR012 being proposed for residential development. This is an area housing many indigenous wildlife species some of which are probably protected, including registered trees. This is appears to contradict the islands commitment to our Biosphere status. In addition it is an areas with known flooding risks. I feel that any proposed zoning of land should be on brownfield sites and derelict sites. This has not been highlighted as Manx National Heritage land within the consultation which does not appear to be open and transparent. I would have objected to this proposal in the original consultation had this been evident.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.  Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHZ-Q			93	RR011, RR012	I would like to strongly object to the proposed rezoning of greenfield sites RR011 & RR012 fields for residential development. The result of this would overshadow and cause loss of privacy to our home. The work would also effect protected trees that border the two fields. The impact would cause additional strain on local infrastructure and amenities, including sewage and drainage systems, which are currently insufficient for the current population size. These fields are also known wet lands and provide a habitat for loaghton sheep, bats, birds, and insects and any residential development would harm the local biodiversity and natural ecosystem. These greenfield sites are also severely prone to flooding with RR011, often heavily waterlogged and overflows onto the main road. I would recommend the planning committee reconsider more appropriate brownfield sites, before committing to rezoning RR011 & RR012.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.  Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
ANON-UVCN-NKQC-9		Manx Wildlife Trust	93	RR011, RR012	5) LR001: there is a historic dub shown within field 135283 on both the 1860s series OS map and also modern mapping. While recent satellite imagery suggests that this dub has largely dried out, it still likely harbours wetland species and should be excluded (or sensitively restored) under any LR001 proposal. It should be removed from the zoned area owing to our obligations under the Ramsar Wetlands Convention.	Cabinet Office notes this comment and consider that the development brief requirement for a preliminary ecological assessment, as a minimum, as part of any planning application to develop the site is sufficient and do not proposes changes in this regard at this time.		
ANON-UVCN-NKQC-9		Manx Wildlife Trust	93	RR011, RR012	Conclusion (RR011 and RR012): The proposed development site has been known for its wildlife interest since 1993. For all of the above reasons, Manx Wildlife Trust currently objects to the inclusion of RR011 and RR012 in the North and West Area Plan until such a time as required ecological survey work has ensured that they could be sustainably developed without the loss of Manx priority habitats and without impact to protected species and also to ensure compliance with the Island's Biodiversity Strategy. Should this be the case, the sites would also require responding Development Briefs.	Cabinet Office notes these comments but the sites are to be retained as shown as residential on Map 4 - Ramsey  Cabinet Office do not consider that it would be appropriate to add development briefs to development sites in the North and West at this late stage in the Plan's development		
ANON-UVCN-NKQQ-Q	Chrissy Callaghan		93	RR011, RR012	I object to the two Manx National Heritage fields RR011 and RR012 being proposed for residential development. However, this consultation does not make this clear and I would have objected to this originally had I known about this within the original consultation. This is not transparent and clearly hidden which is not appropriate and open for a consultation. This is a well known biosphere site with many indigenous wildlife some of which are probably protected, including registered trees. This seems to directly contradict our commitment as an island to our Biosphere Status and would seem to me to be the least appropriate site within Ramsey to develop. This should focus on derelict and brownfield sites rather than areas of land previously held under covenant. As this has been recommended I find it hard to believe this was not flagged within the original consolation.	Cabinet Office notes these comments regarding RR011 and RR012. The sites in question were discussed at length during Public Inquiry sessions.  Cabinet Office notes your comments but the sites are to be retained as residential on Map 4 - Ramsey  Cabinet Office considers that the housing needs of the North and West cannot be provided for on brownfield or otherwise previously developed land alone.		
ANON-UVCN-NKWR-X			93	RR011, RR012	As a resident of the Rheast Mooar Estate, we wish to register our objection to a proposed housing development on land owned by the Manx National Trust, known as The Grove.  The field on entry to the Estate, from the Bowring Road, is considered by residents a vital Green Space. With the development and progression of Ecology and Biodiversity on the Island, surely all existing small Green Spaces should be preserved for the continuation of a natural environmental area for both nature and the mental well being of residents.  For this reason, it would be sad to see this important residential Green Space ignored and used for housing.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		
ANON-UVCN-NKX8-5			93	RR011, RR012	The field at Rheast Mooar floods and causes huge pools of water in the field and on the road. We already have issues with drainage and extra houses will just exacerbate the issue. An extra exit/ entrance on the main road will also cause issues. I would like to add with planning being approved for a LARGE development already on Bride Road at the top of Ormily could cause flooding and with an extra entrance/exit further up the road to the new estate added to this one could potentially cause traffic issues. I personally are very disappointed with MNH in wanting this, we were unaware and if I had known sooner, I would have objected then. If they want to raise funds, why not get the communities behind them instead of trying to sell every bit of green space they have and annoying the communities. Additionally, we have wildlife in the field and considering we are BIOSPHERE status, we should be protecting out green spaces/wildlife and heritage.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.  Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
ANON-UVCN-NKXB-F	Karl Corkish		93	RR011, RR012	The objections to the proposed development highlight concerns that it contradicts the principles of Manx National Heritage, threatens the Island's commitment to conservation and biodiversity, and risks damaging protected species and trees. The fields in question are key to preserving views from The Grove, an important historical site, and contribute to the area's openness and tranquillity. Additionally, the development could exacerbate flooding, strain infrastructure, and disrupt the natural environment. The fields are also historically subject to covenants, making them significant in planning considerations, and would require extensive engineering to overcome environmental challenges.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.  Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKXC-G	Nick Pinder		93	RR011, RR012	I do not believe that MNH, of which I am a Life Member, should be able to dispose of land it holds in trust and am concerned at the reduction of wildlife habitat, particularly for bats that would ensue should this proposal go ahead	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			93	RR011, RR012	LR001 is not within the Ramsey boundry currently. No Objection the the other sites.	The existing settlement boundaries identify the extent of the contiguous built development of a settlement. The Strategic Plan 2016 allows for settlement expansion through Strategic Policy 2 & Housing Policy 4 by way of sustainable urban extensions. This may or may not be within the administrative town boundary of the Local Authority.		
ANON-UVCN-NKXK-R	Carole Corkish		93	RR011, RR012	This development is a terrible idea and shouldn't happen. It goes against everything Manx National Heritage stands for and messes with our commitment to nature and wildlife. Once these fields are gone, that's it—no going back! It's putting protected animals and trees at risk and ruins important views from The Grove, which is a historical place. This is also going to make the area worse for people living here, with more flooding, sewage problems, and even more pressure on our already struggling infrastructure. These fields are special and have rules about how they should be treated, so why ignore that? It's going to cost a lot of money and effort to	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXS-Z			93	RR011, RR012	Modification 93, RR011 objection to development of residential estate due to consequential risk of increased flooding to nearby properties. It is also a field of natural interest with wildlife including bats.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXT-1			93	RR011, RR012	I do not think the land should be built on due to existing drainage issues. The fact that there are endangered species that habitat the field which should be protected.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXX-5			93	RR011, RR012	Contravenes the ethos and principles of Manx National Heritage. Inconsistent with our commitment to Conservation Nature and Biodiversity. Increased pressure on existing infrastructure. Land is clearly marked in Gibbs will	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXY-6			93	RR011, RR012	I like on Rheast Mooar and there already severe flooding issues for this area at times of heavy rainfall. Development will compound this given the fields and surrounding areas are prone to substantial flooding and are often severely waterlogged Contravenes the ethos and principles of Manx National Heritage • Inconsistent with our Island's commitment to Conservation, Nature and Biodiversity - once the fields have gone, they have gone! • The Natural Environment protection within the Draft Area Plan for the North & West – includes provisions for the Natural Environment Proposal, covering its biodiversity gain and tree planting (and prioritises the re-use of brownfield land). Data from previous surveys available for the two fields reveals that they contained protected species • The Grove has entitlement to the preservation of specific key views from and to The Grove farmhouse and grounds and offers a sense of openness and visual relief for visitors and passers-by on Bowring and Richmond Road • The field's trees have been assessed by DEFA Forestry - several individually registered. Specifically, RR011 contains a protected Sycamore (RT0698), and RR012 includes a Registered Tree Area (RA1995), both a material consideration	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXY-6			93	RR011, RR012	• Hedgerows and banks surrounding the fields benefit from a level of policy protection • Two fields not accompanied by corresponding Development Trunks Briefs • Additional residential development places further pressure on existing infrastructure • Residential development has the potential to disrupt the tranquil environment of The Grove • Would worsen already problematic flooding risks and strain local sewage and water systems, and a significant concern regarding highway safety • The two fields historically subject to covenants and restrictions - underscores their significance in planning considerations. MNH say they're "non-core" property – they are very much part of The Grove – as clearly highlighted in the Gibb's Will	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK12-R			93	RR011, RR012	There has been/going to be enough greenfield development in the North of Ramsey lately. The infrastructure is already under stress as it is.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK13-S			93	RR011, RR012	Extra traffic resulting from RR0012 would likely be using Richmond Road as a entrance/exit for this development. This road has seen a noticeable increase in traffic in recent year mainly as a result of the new amenity site. People also use this road as a quick cut through which also adds to the problem. Beside all this we thought MNH was meant to look after what they were gifted not sell it for a quick buck!! What happened to the green agenda?	Highways will have the opportunity to comment on the proposed developed at the planning application stage		
BHLF-UVCN-NK16-V			93	RR011, RR012	Field RR011 is a bog and floods regularly.	<b>The flood risk maps were a core document at the Inquiry and the flood risk on the site is known. This issue and any mitigating measures will be dealt with at the planning application stage.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK18-X			93	RR011, RR012	It is lunacy to build on wetlands!	<b>The flood risk maps were a core document at the Inquiry and the flood risk on the site is known. This issue and any mitigating measures will be dealt with at the planning application stage.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK19-Y	Colin Freeman		93	RR011, RR012	I am appalled that MNH would sell off these precious open spaces that I presume were gifted to them for the nation. They are visually import and integral to the attraction of the Grove Museum. As Ramsey expands it is essential we retain greenfield spaces rather than just covering every space with housing. These fields are special and should not be touched.	<b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK1F-C			93	RR011, RR012	Field RR011 is a bog and regularly floods onto Bowring Rd. Access at present is from one way Rheast Moar Lane. Any new access onto Bowring Rd would be on a bend in the road. RR012 would also have access problems.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK1N-M			93	RR011, RR012	The land was gifted to the nation to preserve its identity and should not be re-zoned in order to build on for private profit	<b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK1P-P			93	RR011, RR012	Neither site is suitable for residential development due to lack of safe access. RR011 could only have access onto a curved section of main road, or into Rheast Mooar Lane, which itself only allows ingress into Ormly Estate because egress was not considered safe. As there is only one exit from Ormly (onto Bride Road) extra traffic through the estate is undesirable. RR012 also gives access to a curved section of Richmond Road. Access onto the main road would be undesirable as it would lead to two junctions in close proximity. In addition RR011 often floods (as confirmed by Govt. flood maps) which already spill out onto the main road. Finally, MNH should not be allowed to divest itself of land it has been entrusted with.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK1Q-Q			93	RR011, RR012	1) land gifted by Gibbs sisters to M.N.H to avoid development 2) Infrastructure in this area is poor + would need massive improvement 3) Access poor- increase in danger	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK1R-R			93	RR011, RR012	With all the other developments in the area I object to MNH being permitted to cover the fields in their protection with concrete. Where will all the water from the flooded field go? The drains overflow when it rains and toilet paper litters the road. There's no spaces left at dentist, doctors, vets etc!!!	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  Cabinet Office notes the concern of several respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage may be proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK1U-U			93	RR011, RR012	Our green spaces are important, especially so as Ramsey expands. Manx National Heritage should be caretaking their green field open spaces for the future. The infrastructure in our area can not cope already, do not add more development here.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK1V-V			93	RR011, RR012	This land was given to the nation by the Gibbs sisters. MNH have no right to sell it for profit.	<b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK1W-W	Conor Howard		93	RR011, RR012	- Gifted by the Gibb's for museum not for development. - Theres alot of vacant land in town which should be built on first rather than destroying the countryside.	<b>Cabinet Office has assessed all potential development sites, including brownfield and only proposed new greenfield sites where it can be demonstrated that existing sites cannot meet the future need.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK1X-X			93	RR011, RR012	The property and land was given to MNH to look after NOT sell. Too much green land is being allocated for building, soon the whole of Ramsey will have no fields left. The bungalows behind one of the fields always have their gardens flooded when it rains and so does the field. Where is all the water going to go if there is a load of concrete there? The government should be allocating more funds for the MNH sites and help preserve them. Please keep the rest of Ramsey green no more building!	<b>The flood risk maps were a core document at the Inquiry and the flood risk on the site is known. This issue and any mitigating measures will be dealt with at the planning application stage.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK1Y-Y			93	RR011, RR012	The land proposed is boggy + water logged. Building on the land will only create further issues with drainage as there will be more run off, putting homes further downhill at risk (Clifton Drive, Gibbs Park etc).	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK2J-H	Sandra Anderson		93	RR011, RR012	Capacity of sewerage systems:  unpleasant odour noted on Rheast Moor Avenue - against wishes of Miss Janet and Miss Alice	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK2V-W			93	RR011, RR012	Manx National Heritage should keep greenfield space for all to enjoy. There are more suitable development sites in particular next door to Quay House Flats in Ramsey waiting for a buyer to proceed	<b>Cabinet Office has assessed all potential development sites, including brownfield and only proposed new greenfield sites where it can be demonstrated that existing sites cannot meet the future need by way of a sustainable urban extension.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK32-T			93	RR011, RR012	This development should not be allowed to go ahead	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3A-9			93	RR011, RR012	It floods- not development land	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3C-B			93	RR011, RR012	MNH are misappropriating this land!	<b>The land was purchased by MNH and they have set out their rational for proposing the sites.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3E-D	J Roberts		93	RR011, RR012	This land should be left as it is.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3F-E	James Bishop		93	RR011, RR012	We need more education fewer civil servants + politicians. Make the most of the housing we have. We need green spaces and peace.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3H-G		Ramsey Town Commissioners	93	RR011, RR012	It is fair to say that the majority of public attendance related to this matter. It has create significant contact with Commissioners and me. Concerns articulated include: - The contravention of the ethos of Manx National Heritage (MNH) principles who should be preserving the views and surroundings of the Grove Museum. The land was sold with the intent it be used as a museum, not a development land-bank - The removal of biodiversity and open spaces and tranquillity. - The impact on registered trees - The aforementioned additional impact on the Stone Bridge route with increasing traffic. - Further impact on health service provision with no apparent plan forthcoming even with existing issues. - Flooding risks and sewerage strain.	<b>Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3J-J			93	RR011, RR012	The land should be left	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3K-K			93	RR011, RR012	I am writing to you about the proposal to rezone the two fields RR011 and RR012 as part of the Grove Museum property owned by MNH.I strongly object to this proposal being given a green light by the Planning Office and these two fields being sold for building land and subsequent development. This is for the following reasons: 1) In my view they constitute one of the most scenic parts of Ramsey together with the larger 11 acre field, which is very special and beautiful, just south of the museum. 2) All of the green spaces within Ramsey town have either been built upon or are in the process of being built on. This now includes the fields on a flood plain for the Sulby River at Poyll Dooley where planning permission has now been given for about 170 houses to be built.3) In my view Ramsey town is now becoming an over-developed town and will suffer from anti-social problems like many other places have done in England and Douglas when they become too large.4) Planners must learn that we must protect our undeveloped and green spaces within towns. If we don't they will all become massive conurbations from which, for psychological and maintaining balanced health reasons, inhabitants will just want to escape.I am disappointed that there has been no public consultation regarding this issue and MNH have pushed ahead without asking the residents of Ramsey town whether they are in agreement with this proposal, or had objections.	<b>RR011 and RR012 are not public open space and do not provide any amenity to residents that would abate anti-social behaviour. The sites are separated by the highway from the museum while the larger 11 acre field continues to form the setting of the Museum. These sites and were discussed at the Public Inquiry.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3P-R	Jonathan Anderson		93	RR011, RR012	Do not develop this land.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3Q-S			93	RR011, RR012	It is a sorry event when the Manx Museum and National Trust have to respond to committee decisions in selling land to balance budgets. The word 'trust' in the charities should surely mean having confidence that the Grove and the land would remain without residential designation to such a peaceful and picturesque area. Whilst the trust acknowledge that they only seek to zone for potential development whereas the upheaval development would bring, contractors, lorries, new entrances, think again.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3U-W			93	RR011, RR012	Keep the countryside rural open and free from development	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK3Y-1			93	RR011, RR012	Keep the land free	Cabinet Office notes this comment.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8H-N	Shaun Murphy	Manx National Heritage	93	RR011, RR012	Manx National Heritage supports the modification in respect of RR011 and RR012 on the basis that both are sustainable sites within the settlement boundary and suitable for and capable of development. We note that while the Proposals map shows RR011 and RR012 as Residential, the Environmental Constraints map shows RR011 as a constraint (Manx National Heritage land) and we suggest that this should be amended.	Cabinet Office notes your support for the site.  <b>As noted at paragraph 7.14 of the written statement, Manx National Trust land may be valued for a variety of reasons. The Department maintain that as the land in question remains in the ownership of MNH, it is appropriate that the site remains shown as such on the Environmental Constraints map.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8X-5	Stephanie Waters		93	RR011, RR012	I am emailing you to highlight my concerns about the proposal by the Manx National Heritage to rezone a green space near the Grove Museum Ramsey. Please can you consider the following:- 1.The land that has been proposed is a green space near the museum. It is an area of beauty where nature prevails, gifting us with the pleasure and delight of enjoying the country side, insects ,birds and wildlife. There are significant numbers of people (young and old), on our island with mental health issues additionally there are concerning numbers of people who have died by suicide. Please consider the research about this , where it highlights the healing benefits of enjoying the natural environment. I would suggest the importance of preserving our islands heritage and the surrounding beauty not destroying it by development when there are plenty of brown field sites available.	Cabinet Office notes these comments.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8X-5	Stephanie Waters		93	RR011, RR012	2.It is my understanding that the proposed green zone area was gifted to the people of Ramsey by the Gibbs sisters who were the owners of the land surrounding the Grove Museum. I ask that you consider their will and wishes upon their death before making any decision regarding rezoning the land. 3.The MNH highlight in their website that they look after the islands most special places, promoting the islands natural heritage. MNH statement of purpose:- 'MNH exists to take a lead in protecting and conserving , making available and celebrating the islands natural and cultural heritage for current and future generations.' The fact that MNH are not willing to protect these green field sites would suggest that they are not adhering to their statement regarding protecting and preserving our heritage. Moreover they have failed to consult purposely with the local community, there has been no consultation meetings regarding this and indeed i would argue there has been a complete and utter lack of transparency. Consequently the community have not been able to raise questions about these proposals.I would be very grateful if you would take my above reasons seriously before reaching a decision.Indeed,I hope that a public consultation could take place for further serious discussion before any decision is reached.	The land was purchased by MNH and they have set out their rational for proposing the site sites which were discussed at the Public Inquiry.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKCC-U	Ruth Howard		93	RR011, RR012	These two sites were gifted in the will of the Gibb sisters as part of the Victorian rural life museum and should remain this way. If more housing is required use empty sites in Ramsey first, as this green space is valuable for nature. Richmond Rd is already used as a cut through and if more houses are built on the corner the volume will increase. More cars will park in the road and as pavement on one side only with an increase of traffic there is a high risk of accidents.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.  Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKCY-H			93	RR011, RR012	This is public land which MNH have ownership and as such, I oppose. The land being used for MNH profit ie building land.	Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKE7-H			93	RR011, RR012	We need more doctors, dentists, schools etc. before any more housing	Cabinet Office notes your comment		
BHLF-UVCN-NKQ2-R	Nicholas Williamson		93	RR011, RR012	There are many existing brownfield sites in Ramsey that should be utilised for development/redevelopment before taking green spaces. Once green fields have been built on, they will never be green again!	In line with the sequential approach to the development of land in the Strategic Plan, the Area Plan for the North and West prioritises development inside of existing settlement boundaries first before extending into the countryside. Cabinet Office considers it necessary to allocate new land for residential development as it not possible for the housing needs of the Island to be met wholly on brownfield land.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKQ4-T			93	RR011, RR012	Surely, Manx Heritage means you look after the land not sell it. At times field RR011 is full of water. Houses are still being built around the Grove on Clifton Drive, plus a very modern house opposite the entrance, which alters the character of the Grove. No attempt was made to screen the view from the Grove when a whole estate was built it six years ago. It feels as if the Grove is a low priority to Manx Heritage. If sold will the money be ploughed back in to much needed repairs or lost to other area's on island.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.  Cabinet Office notes the concern of several respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage may be proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKQ7-W	Josephine Simpkins		93	RR011, RR012	While I recognise that more houses are needed on the Isle of Man due to rising population, it seems a pity that the proposed residential development needs to be sited near one of the few places of interest still available to the general public and visitors to the North of the Island. The Grove Museum, although in a parlous state sits in a tranquil setting providing please to all those who visit and glimpse a way of life long gone. To surrounding such a facility with yet another busy housing estate will change this forever. This is a small voice from an old resident who has seen many a green field on the Island filled with houses. I would like to think that there are still people on the Island who care enough about the environment to consider carefully the proposition to use these particular fields when there are other sites available. Manx National Heritage are custodians of the Grove, is this proposed development the only way the museum can be preserved?	Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKQB-8	Laurence Roome		93	RR011, RR012	Large field is a flood plain	The flood risk maps were a core document at the Inquiry and the flood risk on the site is known. This issue and any mitigating measures will be dealt with at the planning application stage.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKQK-H			93	RR011, RR012	RR011 drainage needs sorting - very wet field	The flood risk maps were a core document at the Inquiry and the flood risk on the site is known. This issue and any mitigating measures will be dealt with at the planning application stage.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKQU-U	Susan Copestake		93	RR011, RR012	I have briefly read some information regarding approximately three acres of land near the Grove Museum which is being considered for sale for the use of residential building in order to raise funds. I wondered if changing the land use to allotments and renting plots out could be considered instead of building. There is a potential of approximately 50 plots on three acres and although it wouldn't provide the initial high sum that selling the land would bring as a one off hit, allotments could bring a continuous income and a facility to current residents in the Ramsey area which is lacking. Allotments would be a bit more ecological as they would still offer a relatively open green space and wouldn't add any extra stresses on the drainage system in place. New buildings tend to offer very little garden space and some people want to try to grow their own. There are a lot of mental health stimulus connected to allotments.	Cabinet Office notes these comments regarding allocation of sites RR011 and RR012 as open space for the purpose of allotments.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKV1-V	Julie Case		93	RR011, RR012	We need to keep our open spaces please!	Cabinet Office notes this comment.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKV4-Y			93	RR011, RR012	I fully object to the rezoning. This is a Greenfield site and it is apart of our heritage. No public consultation either! No opportunity to have dialogue/ open discussion with Manx National Heritage.	The land was purchased by MNH and they have set out their rational for proposing the site sites which were discussed at the Public Inquiry.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKV5-Z	Stephanie Waters		93	RR011, RR012	I totally object- how dare MNH sell off this beautiful land- our heritage- for redevelopment. They should be ashamed of themselves. We need at the very heart a public consultation meeting so that Ramsey Residents can voice their opinions, and ask questions. This is a Greenfield site!!	The land was purchased by MNH and they have set out their rational for proposing the site sites which were discussed at the Public Inquiry.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKV7-2			93	RR011, RR012	I object to the two fields to be rezoned for residential development. There has been no public consultation about this and it feels like the plans have been steam rolled over our heads- very disappointed!! Very unhappy about how the MNH have enabled this to happen- they should be protecting our heritage not destroying it!!	The land was purchased by MNH and they have set out their rational for proposing the site sites which were discussed at the Public Inquiry.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVB-D	Richard Crowhurst		93	RR011, RR012	Ramsey town needs green spaces within the town development for psychological reasons to maintain good health and stability for its residents	Cabinet Office notes this comment.		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NKVD-F			93	RR011, RR012	There are many protected species, some endangered, even if they were re-located many cannot adapt and die regardless or be wandering.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVE-G			93	RR011, RR012	Protection of wildlife- Gibbs wishes to be carried out	Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVH-K			93	RR011, RR012	Please keep this land free from development. It is one of the gems of Ramsey	Cabinet Office notes this comment.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVK-P	Andrzej Mrozek		93	RR011, RR012	I definitely object to the above. Should be left as it is.	Cabinet Office notes this comment.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVM-R			93	RR011, RR012	We should be keeping our open spaces clear and undeveloped	Cabinet Office notes this comment.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVN-S			93	RR011, RR012	I strongly object to the proposed re-zoning of 2 greenfield sites RR011 + RR012 The Grove, Ramsey. Very disappointed the land could be sold off to a building company and then developed. No-one would expect that could happen when they purchased nearby properties. MNH should be keeping the land for heritage for the future and it would have a detrimental effect on residents views/house values if they were to sell in the future. It could have an impact on light and will certainly be an extra burden on infrastructure- roads/sewers and the road through from Ramsey to Andreas is already increasing with traffic from other developments on route. A nearby junction is already difficult to get off at present- without more houses proposed and increased traffic through the area. Services would be affected that are already under strain eg. Drs, dentists and Ramsey Cottage Hospital and local schools. It will impact wildlife in the area and there are currently only few greenfield sites for wildlife and the Loaghtans graze in one site. There are plenty of brown-field sites which could be redeveloped repaired and regenerated and empty shops could have a 'change of use' and re-developed rather than take more greenfield sites that will affect peoples health & welfare when there are not many in the area as it is. Greenfield sites should be preserved for everyone to enjoy and for their importance to the wildlife habitat. I hope that peoples views will be considered and that this does not go through. with many thanks	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVP-U	Beastie Doven		93	RR011, RR012	Object Strongly	Cabinet Office notes this comment		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVR-W	John Garrett		93	RR011, RR012	I cannot believe that M.N.H. are prepared to sell off our heritage. I lived for many years in this area and always thought we were free from greed. I am disgusted at MNH. You have no conscience as house values. quite apart from the congestion + demand on a failing health service.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.  Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVT-Y			93	RR011, RR012	Leave our Manx Heritage Green space alone!!!	Cabinet Office notes this comment.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKW1-W			93	RR011, RR012	As a former resident of the Rheast Mooar Estate, the idea of building on RR011 is ridiculous. During rain the field completely floods, including the road. when this happens the gardens of the surrounding houses have inches of water. the sewer system over flows causing sewerage to cover the roads. This land is owned by MNH. When the two houses were built on the lane, MNH objected to the plans as it wasn't in keeping with the area. But now they are at with building an estate on there, why the sudden change of heart. On the island flood maps this land is an at risk area. how are the prospective owners meant to get house insurance.	The flood risk maps were a core document at the Inquiry and the flood risk on the site is known. This issue and any mitigating measures will be dealt with at the planning application stage.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKW2-X	Valarie Smith		93	RR011, RR012	Enough housing already taking green spaces away	Cabinet Office notes this comment		
BHLF-UVCN-NKW5-1			93	RR011, RR012	I strongly object to the rezoning of these fields. As someone who used to live in the Rheast Mooar Estate, I know how prone to flooding field RR011 is, and how negatively the properties in the area (including their sewage systems) are affected when the area becomes saturated. It does not make any sense to build here, and would negatively effect the surrounding homes. Some examples of the negative effects are loss of privacy, loss of natural light, strain on already struggling sewerage and water system. Not to mention the negative impact on the wildlife that lives in these green spaces. How can the island claim to have a biosphere status if the government and one of its subsidiaries are willing to rezone protected green fields. Lastly, this will detract from the historical impact and value of the area for visitors to the Grove Museum.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. The flood risk maps were a core document at the Inquiry and the flood risk on the site is known. This issue and any mitigating measures will be dealt with at the planning application stage.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKW6-2			93	RR011, RR012	Grove museum needs fields full of wildlife to look out at for tourists not houses. It wont be good for sewerage and water systems. where will vehicle access be.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKW8-4	William Clague		93	RR011, RR012	The fact that these two fields were included at the last moment, therefore negating any opportunity for residents to object was, in my opinion, very underhand and sneaky!	Sites can be submitted for consideration right up to the point of the public inquiry and Cabinet Office published details of the submission as soon as practicable in February 2024.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKW9-5	Noel Woodland		93	RR011, RR012	There are already too many approvals for large scale residential development in North Ramsey and on greenfield sites. In my view this is close to madness because it would take decades for all the necessary support eg. doctors, nurses, hospital availability, employment opportunities etc. etc. to be found	The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed at length at the inquiry sessions.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKWB-E			93	RR011, RR012	The field is a marsh. Why build here of all places	The flood risk maps were a core document at the Inquiry and the flood risk on the site is known. This issue and any mitigating measures will be dealt with at the planning application stage.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKWD-G			93	RR011, RR012	greenfield space should remain greenfield. Too much development already in this area	Sites within the existing settlement boundary have been proposed for development to meet the housing need ahead of sustainable urban extensions.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKWF-J	Barbara Bagley		93	RR011, RR012	There is the heritage aspect as the fields came with the grove House. RR011 how would this boggy field be drained? Also, if built on where would the access road be? The lane beside the field is only one way off the Andreas Road	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.  Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKWG-K			93	RR011, RR012	Floods, it is a heritage site it should be treasured. - couldn't object before, nobody knew before	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.  Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.  The sites were submitted and discussed at the inquiry where both written and oral submissions could be made.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKWK-Q			93	RR011, RR012	The land behind RR011 is the run off for the estate behind and is always very waterlogged/flooded. This is also opening the door for the other MNH land nearer the Grove to be used for development.	The flood risk maps were a core document at the Inquiry and the flood risk on the site is known. This issue and any mitigating measures will be dealt with at the planning application stage.		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NKWP-V			93	RR011, RR012	This proposal will have an adverse effect on the rural appearance of this area of Ramsey, of the Grove Museum itself and will effect wildlife, which is a notable benefit of the area. Loss of trees etc. north Ramsey has suffered! Areas in central Ramsey are seriously in need of redevelopment. MNH has lost the trust of some supporters due to the very late publicity of any of this proposal. The reputation for the Island's beauty, history, ethics and rural attraction seriously needs to be upheld to encourage visitors and income to the Island. Fundraising and donations should be pursued to support MNH buildings, upgrading of old properties remedial work etc.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. Sites within the existing settlement boundary have been proposed for development to meet the housing need ahead of sustainable urban extensions.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKWQ-W			93	RR011, RR012	It floods, the infrastructure doesn't support the buildings that are already here. What about a access? There will be no green spaces left in Ramsey soon	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKWS-Y			93	RR011, RR012	MNH should not be permitted to rezone fields RR011 and RR012 for development, these are green spaces that they have been entrusted to caretake for our children's children. Our green spaces are so very important for health + well being. Once they are gone they are gone forever. The Grove Museum is a Victorian country home, should development be permitted on these fields- particularly RR011- the outlook from the museum's front gate will be one of urbanism, an objection used by MNH themselves to a previous	Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKWU-1			93	RR011, RR012	North Ramsey has already lost a great deal of greenfield space to housing	Sites within the existing settlement boundary have been proposed for development to meet the housing need ahead of sustainable urban extensions.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKWX-4			93	RR011, RR012	Too many houses built recently around the area. Field subject to flooding & access to the area problematic	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKWZ-6			93	RR011, RR012	Why do we need to rezone this area. There are plenty of other areas that could be used that do not impact on the natural surroundings	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. Sites within the existing settlement boundary have been proposed for development to meet the housing need ahead of sustainable urban extensions.		
			93	RR011, RR012	The Bowring road and Richmond road fields should not be zoned for development, they are part of the Grove rural area and the last vestiges of the Victorian landscape and if built on would ruin the area once and for all , leaving the actual house, garden and one remaining field all that is left of an idyllic landscape of a bygone age. It is not ethical to build on the land and not feasible anyway as both fields are flooded for periods each year. They blend the edge of the town/country across the town boundary and provide a breathing space in which is now, with all the large developments that have been completed in my lifetime, (Ormley, Thornhill, Clifton Park, Royal Park, the Vollar, Grand Island, Gibbs Park, ) a hodgepodge of development, they help to preserve what remains of the old wildlife corridors between the Jurby road and the Vollar area. It is ludicrous to even consider these 2 small but beautiful green spaces could be ever considered available to be built on. It is also an insult to the memory of the Misses Gibbs who lived their lives quietly and peacefully in Ramsey . They should be retained as they are in my opinion, just because there is a small amount of land in existence does not mean it should be available to the builders who will build anywhere, whether suitable or not ,with greed and profit in mind. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I cannot comment on Ballacarbery as I am not familiar with it.	Cabinet Office notes your comments. Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.  Cabinet Office notes the concern of respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
	Pauline John-Garrett		93	RR011, RR012	Totally object to this enough flooding in that area now	Cabinet Office notes this comment.		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		94		I have refrained from objecting on the assumption that all constraints raised elsewhere are rigorously applied to this site.	Cabinet Office notes this comment		
ANON-UVCN-NKE6-G	Kath Giles		94		I hugely object to the fields being sold off to developers. These fields are underwater for the majority of the year but they also attract lots of insects, birds and wildlife that thrive on the boggy environment. The fields were given to MNH as part of the Grove Museum for the public to enjoy and I have enjoyed seeing the nature in those fields which would be completely lost if developers were to build on the site. I considered leaving a favourable amount of money in my will to MNH, who I have had lots of dealings with due to very important Historical Viking and Bronze age finds which are now on display in the Manx Museum. I feel very offended, however, and would consider it an insult if I were to leave property/funds which may well be sold off for profit in the future which seems to be the case in this instance. MNH is a charitable organisation and should not be using land donated to them to make a tidy little profit, it is inexcusable.	Cabinet Office notes your comments. Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.  Cabinet Office notes the concern of several respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
ANON-UVCN-NKET-E	Ian Giles		94		I object wholly to the potential rezoning of these fields for redevelopment. They are part of the Grove Museum History and should not be a tool for MNH to make money. The fields themselves are very boggy and always under water. I also feel that our existing sewage system cannot cope with any more buildings in the area. We live close by and raw sewage can be seen coming up through the drains at various times during the year, it is disgusting and nothing has been done to repair the sewers. The Biodiversity, the variety of animals, plants, fungi that survive in this boggy environment should be protected, with the huge amount of development in Ramsey we are losing this environment every day. I believe that MNH have found a loophole to earn a tidy little profit without considering what the people who donated the fields would think if they knew what was being proposed here.	Cabinet Office notes the concern of several respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	94		We support the allocation of Site LR017 for residential development as proposed in the Modified Draft Plan. This accords with our previous representations in respect of the site and with the conclusions of the Inquiry Inspector.	Cabinet Office notes your comment		
ANON-UVCN-NKWC-F			94		The islands environment and character is being spoilt by development. The infrastructure cannot cope with the population we have, we are still discharging raw sewage into our rivers and sea, the roads are congested and crumbling, footpaths are being worn away, we have to wait weeks for Dr appointments, the hospital is cutting back its services, there is increased noise from traffic and barking dogs, our dark night skies are disappearing along with our open spaces and there is a vast decline in biodiversity. If the Government feels it has to increase the housing stock then please just redevelop the unused buildings in the town centre. It is not clear from the description but is / was this not MNH land. If so I object to the principal that land held by MNH / MNT being re zoned in this way especially if it was bequeathed for its protection for the people of the island.	Cabinet Office have not been presented with any evidence to suggest that there are development constraints affecting the sites which would mean they are unsuitable for development and support their development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.  Sites within the existing settlement boundary have been proposed for development to meet the housing need ahead of sustainable urban extensions.  Cabinet Office notes the concern of several respondents that land in the ownership of Manx National Heritage is being proposed for residential development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. This being said, the ownership of the sites is not typically considered to be a material planning consideration and does not impact the suitability of the sites for potential future residential development as part of the Area Plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK2A-8			94		RR012 is a quiet cul-de-sac with a narrow road. The road is in a poor state as few of the residents drive, this is not reported. There have been numerous water breaks in the water pipes (the infrastructure can't cope with existing use).  There is no gas and little fibre so facilities are limited. There would be major upheaval if development goes ahead as these would be requirements.  MNH has not used the Grove museum to its full potential. The garden is not fully utilised. There are other avenues which could be considered before selling land! The fields could be used for allotments or recreational i.e dog field for walking etc.	An application for development of the site will have to demonstrate adequate highways access and infrastructure provision as part of the assessment.		
			94		The Commissioners continue to assert that this is green belt land and should not be built on. This site is currently the boundary between rural Lezayre and urban Ramsey. Building on it would effectively extend Ramsey into the countryside.	The areas surrounding the site excluding the museum are all predominantly residential and do not form a green gap between the settlement of Ramsey and any other identified settlement.		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NK23-T			95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Until such times that infrastructure is in place for additional doctors and dentists, schools and other related facilities needed for the increase in population, there should be no further development in Peel.	Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions		
ANON-UVCN-NK25-V			95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	No further housing should be endorsed without investment in the school , Doctors and Dentists, and sewerage . A new road will open up the fields to future residential development , so much building has already been done ... Peel is being spoilt .	Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions		
ANON-UVCN-NK2N-N	Peter Corlett	Peel Allotment Society	95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	With regards to the North and West area plan, we the Peel Allotment Society, occupy land in field GMR 009. This field after initially not being included for re-zoning it is now included in the proposed plan. After reading the comments in the Report To The Cabinet Office On A Public Inquiry Into The Draft Area Plan For The North And West specifically item 314 that states:- "314. The brief further requires a sustainable travel plan, improved general pedestrian and cycle links, in particular to the Heritage Trail in support of active travel, protection of registered trees and retention or replacement of the allotments at Ballagyr Lane with no net loss. The viability of the allotments is questioned but there is scope in any application for this requirement to be set aside if justified." While we acknowledge the stated intention to retain or replace the allotments, we must emphasize that any replacement would represent a significant disruption to land that our members have carefully cultivated over many years. We categorically reject any questioning of our allotments' viability. These spaces are not merely recreational—they are essential resources that directly contribute to the health and mental wellbeing of our community. Research consistently demonstrates that gardening activities reduce stress, anxiety, and depression while improving physical fitness, cardiovascular health, and cognitive function. For many of our members, their allotment represents a crucial outlet for maintaining balanced mental health and physical wellbeing through meaningful outdoor activity. The consistent demand for these plots speaks for itself: since their establishment, the allotments have maintained an unbroken waiting list. Currently, all 60 allotments are occupied, with an additional 20 individuals eagerly waiting for an opportunity to secure a plot and experience these health benefits for themselves.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The Area Plan for the North and West recognises the importance of open spaces for sport and recreation and has included proposals which protect and retain existing open spaces as well as making proposals in areas where currently supply is particularly lacking.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office recognises the potential for the existing allotments to be incorporated into the design of a residential development scheme for GMR009 and considers that development of the site does not necessarily prejudice the use of the allotments in future.</b>  <b>At this stage, Cabinet Office is content that an appropriate balance has been struck between the ability of the allotments to provide a community facility and the potential for GMR009 to provide residential development in future. Accordingly, the Department does not propose any changes to the allocation of GMR009 as part of the Area Plan at this stage.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK2N-N	Peter Corlett	Peel Allotment Society	95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	It's worth highlighting that the majority of our members reside in the historic section of Peel, where homes typically have minimal or no gardens and lack private outdoor space. For these residents, the allotments represent their only opportunity to grow nutritious food, connect with nature, and enjoy the therapeutic effects of gardening—benefits that cannot be understated in our increasingly urbanized surroundings. We urge you to reconsider these proposed changes and recognize the irreplaceable value our allotments bring to the physical health, mental wellbeing, and overall quality of life of the Peel community.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment and reconiges the importance of allotments. Please see point 13 of the Development Brief for the sites in question.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK2N-N	Peter Corlett	Peel Allotment Society	95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	As spokesperson for the Peel Allotment Society, I write to express our serious concerns regarding the proposed planning zoning changes. With regards to the North and West area plan, we the Peel Allotment Society, occupy land in field GMR 009. This field after initially not being included for re-zoning it is now included in the proposed plan. After reading the comments in the Report To The Cabinet Office On A Public Inquiry Into The Draft Area Plan For The North And West specifically item 314 that states:- "314. The brief further requires a sustainable travel plan, improved general pedestrian and cycle links, in particular to the Heritage Trail in support of active travel, protection of registered trees and retention or replacement of the allotments at Ballagyr Lane with no	<b>Cabinet Office notes these comments.</b>  <b>Please see criteria 13 of the Development Brief of the sites in question which relates specifically to the allotments.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK2N-N	Peter Corlett	Peel Allotment Society	95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	For many of our members, their allotment represents a crucial outlet for maintaining balanced mental health and physical wellbeing through meaningful outdoor activity. The consistent demand for these plots speaks for itself: since their establishment, the allotments have maintained an unbroken waiting list. Currently, all 60 allotments are occupied, with an additional 20 individuals eagerly waiting for an opportunity to secure a plot and experience these health benefits for themselves. It's worth highlighting that the majority of our members reside in the historic section of Peel, where homes typically have minimal or no gardens and lack private outdoor space. For these residents, the allotments represent their only opportunity to grow nutritious food, connect with nature, and enjoy the therapeutic effects of gardening—benefits that cannot be understated in our increasingly urbanized surroundings. We urge you to reconsider these proposed changes and recognize the irreplaceable value our allotments bring to the physical health, mental wellbeing, and overall quality of life of the Peel community.	<b>Cabinet Office notes these comments.</b>  <b>Please see criteria 13 of the Development Brief of the sites in question which relates specifically to the allotments.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK2U-V			95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	I disagree with green fields being used before green sites are used The infrastructure of Peel will not cope with more residents We would never get a doctor's appointment and the schools are full now	Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions		
ANON-UVCN-NK49-2	Richard Barrett		95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023,	peel has got to big already we do not have the infrastructure for more houses, we have to wait two weeks for a doctors appointment. plus the dentist is only taking private not nhs so where are all these new people going to go and the schools are full . the only people on the island that can afford these new houses are the very rich or people that don't live on the island and just want to rent them at stupid costs	Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions		
ANON-UVCN-NK5P-T	Vanessa Kelly		95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	over intensification of residential development for sewage supply and traffic flow and overload of Peel infrastructure in general	Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions		
ANON-UVCN-NK7Y-5	Marion Allison Cowin		95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Peel does not need more housing. So far the addition of Ballawtleworth and Ballateson developments have not made any difference to the town except to cause more chaos on the roads, more action for the police to take, no appointments for Doctors and Dentists. There doesn't appear to be any provision for children's play areas. Dandarra didn't enlarge the play area in Reart Ny Cronk which was on the plan and they have not provided extra lighting on Port Town Road which they promised to do for the Peel Commissioners. We were told at a meeting before Ballawtleworth was first started that there would be no congestion on the roads but we did not know what was about to happen in the future. This development will only make matters worse. We certainly don't want a "little England" in the Isle of Man.	Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions		
ANON-UVCN-NKBY-G			95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Peel does not have the infrastructure for more housing estates the roads on the new estates we have are too narrow for the size of cars and vans people have.	Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKCM-5			95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	We don't need a through road, causing more traffic right next to our home, not creating a safe place for our children. There are too many houses also built in peel, with not enough infrastructure- can't get children into nurseries or childcare, dentists, doctors... also much bigger classes in Peel Clothworkers primary School now!	Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions		
ANON-UVCN-NKCP-8			95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	There is enough green field expansion already in peel, we need to reserve our green spaces left in Peel so it does not loose what Peel is known for its beauty and green spaces. Children need spaces to play, animas need land to graze lets stop expansion now	Community Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions		
ANON-UVCN-NKGR-E	Claire Bassett		95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Peel is already struggling, I cant get a Doctors appointment, the parking is awful, the school QE11 is too small with many portable cabins used. It can not support any more houses , cars, people. The green fields on the outskirts of peel need to be kept as such , as beautiful as they are, full of wildlife, they also provide a clear greenbelt as you enter Peel. But much more than that, the town just cannot support more people.	Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions		
ANON-UVCN-NKGU-H	MR Long		95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	The place is at breaking point. There aren't enough facilities, doctors, dentists, school places, parking spaces etc. if you cannot already see this, the problems are bigger than we think.	Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions		
ANON-UVCN-NKHF-3			95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Objection to addition of this area in the plan. GMR008 GMR009 GMR023- not previously part of the initial plan. No requirement for road or additional housing on this site These fields should not be changed to residential use, there are already enough houses in Peel These were never on the original plan and have been added at a later date? Why? Whose pockets are being lined? There is no requirement for a link road a Oak road has been proved to be a suitable road for all vehicles to link the two main roads	Cabinet Office has assessed all potential development sites, including brownfield and only proposed new greenfield sites where it can be demonstrated that existing sites cannot meet the future need by way of a sustainable urban extension.  Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions with through traffic on Derby Road and Athol Street being identified early on as an issue.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHP-D	Margaret Killey		95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Peel can not support more housing. Doctors surgery is under pressure and appointment are being booked up to two weeks ahead. Peel needs help to develop the town centre. Central Government promised funds to help with this but nothing has been forthcoming.	Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions.  Seven brownfield sites in Peel are on the Unoccupied Urban Sites register and eligible for grant funding from the Department for Enterprise.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHW-M			95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Totally object to the use of greenfield or agricultural sites, there are plenty of brownfields sites around the island that would be used. Cleaning up brownfield sites would be more beneficial to the island instead of carving up greenfield areas.	Cabinet Office notes your comments. In accordance with the Strategic Plan the Area Plan for the North and West does seek to focus development within settlement boundaries first but there is an acknowledgement that in some cases, sustainable urban extensions may be required.		
ANON-UVCN-NKK3-K			95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Do not require the link road if no further development (which is objected by all residents) goes ahead	Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions		
ANON-UVCN-NKKT-M			95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	NO to the district link road from Ramsey Road to Douglas Road in Peel this is unnecessary infrastructure residents from Kirk Michael won't use this road to go to Douglas as they would use the TT Road  The entry for the road goes through the green space which is the allotments in peel what about sunset lakes that are used for fishing so instead of a nice green open space you would have a road and houses I'm sure the business would see a reduction in revenue	Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions		
ANON-UVCN-NKKZ-T	Aileen and Malcolm Stoddart		95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This land was not zoned for building when we bought our house in Quarry Lane. This proposed development will far exceed the infrastructure Peel has, or has even planned for. Peel is already suffering from lack of parking spaces, ( our road doesn't have a pavement, or spaces for guest parking) sewage system and medical facilities. The so called Island Plan brought in by the Chief Minister with absolutely no mandate from a lot of the public is something we strongly disagree with, we do not need an increased population, we need to look after the people already here.	Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions and provides sufficient development opportunities to meet the needs of the Strategic Plan 2016 and in part the Objective Assessment of Housing Need.		
ANON-UVCN-NKVC-E			95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	This is crazy - 517 (unaffordable for the young) houses in an already very struggling town! No Doctor appointments, no sewage, schools absolutely bursting at the seems! Another possible 1,000 residents is just insane!	Cabinet Office note that infrastructure needs were discussed during public inquiry sessions on the matter.		
ANON-UVCN-NKVC-E			95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Peel can't cope with the traffic now so more development will strain things even more. The schools, GP service and drainage is already stretched.  Peels population has doubled since 1997 so another potential increase of over 1000 people will only make things worse.  It will also take out the allotments and apparently one of those fields contains a protected forest	Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions.  Cabinet Office note that the population of Peel has increased since the 1996 census but do not consider that this was akin to a doubling of the town's population.  Cabinet Office has included development brief criteria relating to the provision of the allotments on the site. Please see the relevant development brief.		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Before increase in housing, there needs to be the infrastructure, change in bus routes that do not go round all housing when travelling from the norther ( i.e. Peel to have it s own buses that are from a central hub located further out of peel.) , Schools and roads to be better devised and affordable housing, not large 3 beds but smaller starter homes.	Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK37-Y	Christine Faid	German Parish Commissioners	95	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Submission with regard to proposals slipped into the North and West Area Plan Significant development has taken place in Peel over the last 40 years which is not our concern however we were outraged to discover that there is a proposed road being approved between the Peel Kirk Michael Coast Road, across the Poortown Road and culminating in a new round a bout by the Queen Elizabeth II School on the Peel to Douglas Road. The Commissioners are strongly opposed to this proposal as it can only lead to more proposed development which will now encroach out of the Peel Boundary and into German. A new road such as proposed will only serve to be an eyesore if developed on either side and it will further split the City of Peel which is already known as "Old" and "New" Peel, what will this be known as? "Another Peel"????? We do not have the necessary infrastructure to support any development in this area and Peel's infrastructure is already failing. The schools and Doctors surgeries are already over capacity and cannot cope with the present population let alone a considerable amount more. Any proposed development including the road will result in the exploitation of good agricultural land and the loss of yet more green fields in the pursuit of profit. Further development on the outskirts of Peel will result in difficulty for the Highway infrastructure which will struggle to take extra traffic onto the roads and will put more pressure on an already struggling DOI to maintain decent road surfaces in most areas. It appears that the proposed development of fields GMR008, GMR009 and GMR023 were not in the original plan but were added later I assume by Cabinet Office following key consultation which was on the side of the developers.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comments. Cabinet Office maintain that proposals for a district link road as part of the development of the sites in question form a key part of any future development proposals. A proposed link road would allow for more effective vehicle movements between the existing Douglas and Poortown Roads with a connection to Ballagyr Lane and Ramsey Road in the future and is not solely to enable more housing development in future.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes your comments and those of others regarding community facilities and other infrastructure in Peel and have considered these issues throughout the development of the Area Plan. Please see the Development Brief for the sites in question for further information.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes that these sites did not form part of the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022) but that the sites were supported by the Department during public inquiry sessions which were open for all interested stakeholders to engage in.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK25-V			96		What exactly is the plan for this piece of land ? It is vague , access to and from here could be difficult , so important to know what exactly is intended!	Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 6 of the written statement.		
ANON-UVCN-NK28-Y			96		As further explained in response to modification 97 below, the map on COD 15 which was agreed at the Public Inquiry meeting shows PC007 as Open Space, not Civic Cultural or Other uses.  Map 6 should be amended to accurately reflect COD 15 and the discussions of the Public Inquiry.	<b>Open Space and Community Proposal 6 is clear that the site is for a mix of uses including, Health, education, community, leisure, open space or a mix of any of those uses.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office note that COD 15 was produced for illustrative purposes only as part of the Inquiry, policy stances contained therein are clearly marked as being subject to the Inspector's recommendation. RCM81 is not in reference to PC007 (which is covered under RMC 80/M96) but the land to the west (to the rear of the existing camp site) which the Area Plan for the Noth and West supports as open space.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK2U-V			96		Stop building any more residential property on green sites	Cabinet Office note your comment.		
ANON-UVCN-NKBY-G			96		Peel does not have the infrastructure for more residents the schools are overflowing stop building now.	Cabinet Office notes your comment and that infrastructure needs were a topic discussed as part of the public inquiry sessions on the matter. Please see the development briefs in the written statement which relate to the site's in question.		
ANON-UVCN-NKGR-E	Claire Bassett		96		Lovely green fields that need to be kept as such, Peel cannot support more development	Infrastructure needs to serve the new residential developments were discussed at the inquiry sessions		
BHLF-UVCN-NK31-S		Peel Commissioners	96		ii. The Commissioners would recommend PC007 is correctly zoned as Open Space in accordance with the Inspector's report and COD15. The Inspector was clear that the Cabinet Office agreed and he supported the Open Space designation on the fields with an established use as a campsite and the undeveloped land shown on COD15 (See Appendix). This undeveloped land is the land between the campsite and Ballaquane Road. However, part of this land which is shown on Map 6 (New ref PC007) in the Post Inquiry Modifications remains designed as Civic, Cultural or other Use contrary to the Inspector's recommendations and the Cabinet Office Inquiry document COD15 Relocating between 1.57 Ha of land currently zoned for predominately residential development between Ballaquane Road and the Commissioners' campsite in the Peel Local Plan 1989 to allow this land to be zoned for public open space use. (Or a total of 2.7 Ha if the Barfords site is retained for employment)	<b>Open Space and Community Proposal 6 is clear that the site is for a mix of uses including, Health, education, community, leisure, open space or a mix of any of those uses. It is considered that this potential mix of uses would be best accommodated by a civic designation.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office note that COD 15 was produced for illustrative purposes only as part of public inquiry sessions on the topic and represented the stance of the Cabinet Office, at the time, subject to Inspector's recommendation. The Inspector's findings are recorded at RMC 80 and paragraphs 414-415 of his report in which he recommends that the civic designation on the site is retained and that the uses which might be deemed acceptable on site are further specified in the written statement.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK28-Y			96	PC007	The amended Map 6 does NOT show PC007 as Open Space, it continues to show it as designated for Cultural, Civic and Other Uses.  The proposed amended to PC007 to civic, cultural or other uses goes directly against both a) the Cabinet Office's own document COD 15 issued in August 2024 shortly after the Public Inquiry meetings and b) Cabinet Office's own document, paper 3 schedule of modifications, linked to this survey, where the Cabinet Office claims it has accepted the Recommendation RMC81 as evidenced by COD 15.  The Inspector's Report, and the discussions at the Public Inquiry meeting which resulted in COD 15 being issued, are all clear that PC007 should be zoned to Open Space.  There is no mandate for this site to be zoned as Civic, Cultural and Other Uses, and Cabinet Office have NOT amended Map 6 to Open Space, as claimed in this survey and in their written response to the Inspector's Report.  Map 6 should be amended to accurately reflect RCM81 and COD 15, showing PC007 as Open Space.	<b>Open Space and Community Proposal 6 is clear that the site is for a mix of uses including, Health, education, community, leisure, open space or a mix of any of those uses. It is considered that this potential mix of uses would be best accommodated by a civic designation.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office note that COD 15 was produced for illustrative purposes only as part of public inquiry sessions on the topic and represented the stance of the Cabinet Office, at the time, subject to Inspector's recommendation. The Inspector's findings are recorded at RMC 80 and paragraphs 414-415 of his report in which he recommends that the civic designation on the site is retained and that the uses which might be deemed acceptable on site are further specified in the written statement.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK2U-V			96	PC007	Leave as open space	<b>Open Space and Community Proposal 6 is clear that the site is for a mix of uses including, Health, education, community, leisure, open space or a mix of any of those uses. It is considered that this potential mix of uses would be best accommodated by a civic designation.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office note your comment but accept Inspector's Recommendation 80 of his report.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKGR-E	Claire Bassett		96	PC007	Parking - where are people to Park you cant park in Peel now without more attractions	Cabinet Office note your comment but do consider that matters pertaining to parking are beyond the remit of the Area Plan process.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK31-S		Peel Commissioners	96	PC007	The Commissioners welcome the Inspector's designation of the Derby Road campsite and undeveloped land shown on COD15 (see Appendix) to Open Space which has not been reflected in the Post Inquiry Modified 2025 Draft Area Plan. The Commissioners welcome the Tourism, Leisure and Recreation designation at Marine Parade proposed in the Inspector's report (including COD15) and the Post Inquiry Modification 2025 Draft Area Plan for site PO007 on page 122. Peel Town Commissioners' position on this matter predominately remains as cited within section 6 of their submission to the North and West 2022 Draft Area dated 16 September 2022 from Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy and our 28 June 2024 inquiry position statement. The Commissioners welcome the contents of the Inspector's report where: On page 34 paragraph 219 the Inspector has stated: "However, it was agreed at the Inquiry that a campsite off Derby Road and adjacent to Ballaquane Road, Peel, should be included within a designed areas of Open Space within an area of Civic, Culture and Other use, The campsite is established and I agree that this is entirely logical modification put forward by AMC9 to be implemented by RMC81." On page 39 paragraph 260 the Inspector states: "The designation of undeveloped land between Ballaquane Road and the Primary School on Derby Road, Peel, is appropriately changed from Civic and Cultural to Open Space to facilitate future recreational development, as already implemented by RMC81 to map 6 with respect to the adjacent campsite considered above in relation to Tourism." RMC81 references COD15 and states:"Amend designation of Derby Road/Ballaquane Road Campsite and undeveloped land from Civic and Cultural to Open Space as shown on map attached to COD15." The Post Inquiry Modification Draft Plan on page 125 introduces paragraph 13.7 for PC007 and it states the following: "Map 6 identifies site PC007, off Derby Road peel as Civic Cultural or Other Use.	<b>Open Space and Community Proposal 6 is clear that the site is for a mix of uses including, Health, education, community, leisure, open space or a mix of any of those uses. It is considered that this potential mix of uses would be best accommodated by a civic designation.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office note that COD 15 was produced for illustrative purposes only as part of public inquiry sessions on the topic and represented the stance of the Cabinet Office, at the time, subject to Inspector's recommendation. The Inspector's findings are recorded at RMC 80 and paragraphs 414-415 of his report in which he recommends that the civic designation on the site is retained and that the uses which might be deemed acceptable on site are further specified in the written statement.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK31-S		Peel Commissioners	96	PC007	The Inspector's Report acknowledges that in closely urban and partly residential area of the town, the potential use of the site should be more clearly defined." As referenced above the Inspector says nothing of the sort and recommends PC007 and the campsite should be zoned as Public Open Space. It should be noted the campsite already has a fully compliant new access off Derby Road which could be used to access PC007. This new access was built after receiving planning consent in 2019. The Commissioners welcome the contents of the Inspector's report on pages 34 and 35 paragraphs 220 to 221 and page 39 paragraph 258 concerning the reinstatement of tourism, leisure and recreation designation for PO007 on Marine Parade at the end of Peel Promenade. The Commissioners welcome the reinstatement of 1989 Local Plan Tourism designation in Post Inquiry Modification 2025 Draft Area Plan on page 122 as cited within RMC81 (COD15).	<p>Open Space and Community Proposal 6 is clear that the site is for a mix of uses including, Health, education, community, leisure, open space or a mix of any of those uses. It is considered that this potential mix of uses would be best accommodated by a civic designation.</p> <p>Cabinet Office note that COD 15 was produced for illustrative purposes only as part of public inquiry sessions on the topic and represented the stance of the Cabinet Office, at the time, subject to Inspector's recommendation. The Inspector's findings are recorded at RMC 80 and paragraphs 414-415 of his report in which he recommends that the civic designation on the site is retained and that the uses which might be deemed acceptable on site are further specified in the written statement.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK4P-S			98	PR001	Barfords is an eye sore and is nothing beneficial to it, it's not green space but ugly ex commercial so have no issues with this being developed	Cabinet Office notes this comment		
ANON-UVCN-NKGB-V			98	PR001	<p>Modification: PR001 (Barfords) is not suitable for employment land. The site is derelict and would need to be completely redeveloped for any employment to be viable. It is unlikely that this will occur and the site will remain derelict. Considerable housing development has occurred around the site since it was first built and employment land in such a built up residential area is not suitable or appropriate, and will cause disturbance to local residents.</p> <p>The road around the site are residential roads and not suitable for the additional traffic caused by the land being zoned for employment.</p> <p>Given that the site is surrounded on all four sides by residential developments, the site is clearly only suitable for residential development, and should be looked at first for residential development, rather than the green field sites of GMR008, GMR009 &amp; GMR023</p>	<p>With the draft plan Cabinet Office considered that highways access to many of the exiting employment sites in Peel was inadequate with alternative provisions in the plan area made as part of the draft plan.</p> <p>It was the Inspectors recommendation to maintain the existing use on these sites (Barfords and Faulkners) should they be needed. This Area Plan will not expunge the existing approval for residential development. Any residential dwellings delivered on the site would be counted towards housing delivery figures as a windfall.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKGB-X			98	PR001/PR010	Wouldn't want to create excessive noise	Cabinet Office notes this comment		
ANON-UVCN-NKGR-E	Claire Bassett		98	PR001/PR010	So long as parking is taken into consideration, but a sit is the building is an embarrassment and the owners should be ashamed of them selves	Outside of the Area Plan process Cabinet Office has included the Barfords site on the Unoccupied Urban Sites Register and grant funding is available to assist in its redevelopment through the Department for Enterprise.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHP-D	Margaret Killey		98	PR001/PR010	More employment for Peel	Cabinet Office notes this comment. Please see Employment Proposals 5 and 6 of the Written Statement.		
ANON-UVCN-NKVC-E			98	PR001/PR010	No need to build any more houses!	Cabinet Office notes your comment		
ANON-UVCN-NKWY-5			98	PR001/PR010	<p>I object on the basis I need confirmation as to what exactly this terminology means re Barfords (PR001). There appears to have been a few amendments re the change of designation. Initially I understand Barfords was classed as Industrial,</p> <p>Paper 2 dated January 2025 states change of designation from Residential to Employment.</p> <p>Paper 3 also dated January 2025 says it's proposed for Employment and Land Development. What is Land Development ? Is this house dwelling?</p> <p>I have just been informed that planning permission was granted for the Barfords site for houses. How is this possible?</p> <p>Re Faulkner (PR010) the same designation has been given.</p> <p>I believe these pockets of land should be made available for any possible future employment opportunities. Once they are built on the opportunity to bring some well needed employment into Peel is gone!</p> <p>I object until this matter is clear.</p>	<p>The site in question was proposed as residential in the Draft Area Plan for the North and West and in the Public Inquiry papers (March 2024). Cabinet Office accepted Inspector's Recommended Major Change 33 and now proposes the site for employment.</p> <p>Likewise, the Faulkner's site in Peel was identified at the Draft Plan stage (2022) as proposed for employment use with Cabinet Office accepting during Inquiry sessions that both the premises of the existing business and the adjacent land should be proposed for employment uses.</p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKHH-5	Hazel Hannan		98	PR001	The Barford/Middle Coolil Ushtey site on Ramsey Road should be redesigned as residential as it already has Planning approval for Residential development	Cabinet Office accept the Inspector's recommendation that the site be proposed for employment uses. This Area Plan does not expunge the approval and can be revisited again in a future Island Area Plan.		
ANON-UVCN-NK25-V			99	PR002(b)	<p>Object to any further residential development .</p> <p>How are all the extra rates being used .</p> <p>What extra amenities will be put in place to offset any further development!</p>	Cabinet Office do not have oversight of any spending arising from developer contributions made to either the Local Authority or Government Departments		
ANON-UVCN-NKBY-G			99	PR002(b)	No more housing estates Peel does not have the Infrastructure	The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed at length at the inquiry sessions.		
ANON-UVCN-NKGB-X			99	PR002(b)	Field for open space would support	Cabinet Office notes this comment.		
ANON-UVCN-NKGR-E	Claire Bassett		99	PR002(b)	Stop turning green fields into more housing that the town cannot support	Cabinet Office note your comment.		
ANON-UVCN-NKVC-E			99	PR002(b)	Not required as the 517 shouldn't go ahead!	Cabinet Office note your objection to the sites.		
BHKF-UVCN-NKMH-A	Karen Cain		99	PR002(b)	The proposed change from a locations close to the clubhouse facilities to a more distant location is likely to have a discouraging affect on the younger and older users. The current location is easily accessible and a short distance from parking and toilet facilities. The proposed field will require users to travel (on foot) significantly further and will discourage casual use. It would also require users to cross several fairways increasing the risk/probability of user conflict. The current facility has served the local golfing community whilst the probably is likely to only serve a few well off individuals and further the reduction in external activities by the younger and older generations. They could just build affordable housing on 311889.	This issue was dealt with during the Public Inquiry sessions. There are no overriding planning constraints that affect the continued proposal of field 314539 for residential use as it currently is under the Peel Local Plan. Please see the amended development brief for PR002a and PR002b.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKEH-2	Eileen Mellor		99	PR002(b)	Field 314539 had been designated Open Space in the Draft Plan, but a reported "suggestion" was discussed of "replacing the golf practice area on another Field 311889", adding "which offers a more suitable location for that activity", consequently releasing the current practice area "to residential allocation" , resulting in "an incidental addition of around ten dwellings" The Report goes on to say that "CABO does not object to it" and that the Inspector considers "these changes logical and appropriate". Whilst it is stated that "there are no insurmountable planning constraints upon this proposed change", there are many practical constraints that make Field 311889 an unsuitable location for golf practice facilities. The current practice Field 314539 is very close to other practice facilities, (putting, chipping and practice net) adjacent to the Clubhouse and easily accessed from the car park. The replacement option, Field 311889, is situated at the southern boundary of the golf course, and would require users of the practice field to walk a large distance, across and/or along 6 active golf holes, which would be inappropriate in terms of health and safety to say the least - a definite no go I would suggest. With reference to the change to be implemented by RMC83, Field 311889 is designated as "Open Space for the purpose of golf". I request clarity please concerning the above Open Space designation in regard to the "purpose of golf" detail, as it does not appear to reflect the suggestion discussed of the practice facility being reinstated elsewhere. I fear that all the available facts in relation to said discussions were either not fully presented, or not fully considered. My concern is that I know Field 311889 was recently purchased by Peel Golf Club Ltd, and is being considered for use in the redevelopment of Peel Golf Course.	Cabinet Office notes your comment - please see the amended development brief for site PR002a and PR002b. The amended development brief recognises the existing use of field 314539 (existing golf practice field referred to in the development brief as PR002b) and sets out that there is potential for the site to be used for residential development in future if the current use of the field for golfing purposes stops.		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NKEH-2	Eileen Mellor		99	PR002(b)	A review has been undertaken by a golf design company, and indeed this Field 311889 is likely to be used to create 2 proposed replacement golf holes, subject to planning approval. The designer said, at a recent meeting with Members of Peel Golf Club, in answer to a question, that there is no space within his plans for a practice area. So, I question if the discussion at the inquiry, to release the current practice field for practice facilities on Field 311889, was thoroughly explored. I am concerned that the resultant designation is now open to interpretation, which will probably result in the loss of an important practice facility, and is contrary to what the Inspector thought he was achieving.	Cabinet Office notes your comment - please see the amended development brief for site PR002a and PR002b. The amended development brief recognises the existing use of field 314539 (existing golf practice field referred to in the development brief as PR002b) and sets out that there is potential for the site to be used for residential development in future if the current use of the field for golfing purposes stops.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKH4-H	Eileen Rosemary and Brian Mellor		99	PR002(b)	I write further to my email dated 30 November 2024. Thank you for meeting with my husband and myself on 11th March to discuss our concerns. We are now better informed about the designations applied to areas of land by the planning office. In this respect we accept that the Independent Inspector at the public enquiry was not perhaps concerned about the particular golf activity being performed on the "practice field", and was persuaded to agree to the change of designation of Field 314539 from Open Space for a particular purpose, to Predominantly Residential. However, our concern remains that, nevertheless the Inspector was misled as it is clear from his report of this matter that he was led to believe that another field (Field 311889) "would offer a more suitable location for that ( "practice") activity", following a "suggestion" at the enquiry. <del>Peel Golf Club had been offered that field, Field 311889, and another adjacent to it, as part of a larger purchase of land.</del>	Cabinet Office notes your comment - please see the amended development brief for site PR002a and PR002b. The amended development brief recognises the existing use of field 314539 (existing golf practice field referred to in the development brief as PR002b) and sets out that there is potential for the site to be used for residential development in future if the current use of the field for golfing purposes stops.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKH4-H	Eileen Rosemary and Brian Mellor		99	PR002(b)	Certainly the designation now allocated to one of the two fields will be welcomed by the Golf Club. They will no doubt be applying for the same designation to be applied to the adjacent field, as the proposed new layout design clearly sets out the two fields being used for the golf course in terms of new tee boxes/greens/ fairways. I will send photo's of the proposed layout design (as shown to you when we met with you) by separate email for your information. There never was, and there is no intention for the activity currently undertaken on the "practice field", which includes a short flag course for junior members, to be relocated to Field 311889. It would be inappropriate because of its distance from the clubhouse, and because golf as a sport is inherently hazardous, any essential risk assessment carried out to provide a safe route for members and visitors to walk across many active golfing holes to Field 311889 to practice, would probably discount it being used as such. There is one public right of way that crosses the golf course from the main Peel to Douglas Road to the Heritage Trail, which passes over two active golfing holes. There are notices at each access point warning of the dangers on the golf course. I will send photos of these notices by separate email for your information. The north and west area initial draft plan designated the practice field, Field 314539 as Open Space for a particular purpose. Field 311889 and the adjacent field were both in the ownership of Peel Golf Club at the time of the Public Enquiry, but were not included in the All Sites for Assessment West Preliminary Publicity map. Their use had already been earmarked by Peel Golf Club, but not for practice facilities. In our opinion it would be short-sighted to lose this open space, Field 314539, (which is a well used practice facility that includes a short Flag Course for juniors), just to increase the residential land bank by 10 properties, when there is currently a huge increase in the allocation of land in Peel for residential development.	Cabinet Office notes your comment - please see the amended development brief for site PR002a and PR002b. The amended development brief recognises the existing use of field 314539 (existing golf practice field referred to in the development brief as PR002b) and sets out that there is potential for the site to be used for residential development in future if the current use of the field for golfing purposes stops.		
ANON-UVCN-NK25-V			100		This land is supposed to be for the good of the people of Peel . We need another residential care home to replace the Corrin home . Definitely should not be residential houses , who is benefitting from this ! The elderly of peel could only benefit from this as a retirement village , with warden control . As some people seem to be excluded from commissioners warden controlled flats !	Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 3 of the Written Statement. This Proposal recognises that the home, albeit now closed, would potentially be suitable to provide a care use again given the site's former use and that any proposals to develop the site for a purely residential use (i.e. Class 3.3 'dwellinghouses') would need to have regard to future land needs outlined by the Department of Health and Social Care as part of currently on-going strategies.		
ANON-UVCN-NK2U-V			100		Should be used for residential care as it was	Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 3 of the Written Statement. This Proposal recognises that the home, albeit now closed, would potentially be suitable to provide a care use again given the site's former use and that any proposals to develop the site for a purely residential use (i.e. Class 3.3 'dwellinghouses') would need to have regard to future land needs outlined by the Department of Health and Social Care as part of currently on-going strategies.		
ANON-UVCN-NK4P-S			100		Again Corrin Home is an eye sore and something needs to be done but it should be a bigger doctors, bigger school, or dentists not further residential	Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 3 of the Written Statement. This Proposal recognises that the home, albeit now closed, would potentially be suitable to provide a care use again given the site's former use and that any proposals to develop the site for a purely residential use (i.e. Class 3.3 'dwellinghouses') would need to have regard to future land needs outlined by the Department of Health and Social Care as part of currently on-going strategies.		
ANON-UVCN-NK5N-R			100		This site is ideal for social housing, possibly for the elderly.	Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 3 of the Written Statement. This Proposal recognises that the home, albeit now closed, would potentially be suitable to provide a care use again given the site's former use and that any proposals to develop the site for a purely residential use (i.e. Class 3.3 'dwellinghouses') would need to have regard to future land needs outlined by the Department of Health and Social Care as part of currently on-going strategies.		
ANON-UVCN-NK5P-T	Vanessa Kelly		100		remain as Care Home or sheltered housing	Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 3 of the Written Statement. This Proposal recognises that the home, albeit now closed, would potentially be suitable to provide a care use again given the site's former use and that any proposals to develop the site for a purely residential use (i.e. Class 3.3 'dwellinghouses') would need to have regard to future land needs outlined by the Department of Health and Social Care as part of currently on-going strategies.		
ANON-UVCN-NKBY-G			100		We need an old people's home that elderly people can afford to live in not more houses we don't have the infrastructure	Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 3 of the Written Statement. This Proposal recognises that the home, albeit now closed, would potentially be suitable to provide a care use again given the site's former use and that any proposals to develop the site for a purely residential use (i.e. Class 3.3 'dwellinghouses') would need to have regard to future land needs outlined by the Department of Health and Social Care as part of currently on-going strategies.		
ANON-UVCN-NKGR-E	Claire Bassett		100		The re - use of existing buildings is a good idea	Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 3 of the Written Statement. This Proposal recognises that the home, albeit now closed, would potentially be suitable to provide a care use again given the site's former use and that any proposals to develop the site for a purely residential use (i.e. Class 3.3 'dwellinghouses') would need to have regard to future land needs outlined by the Department of Health and Social Care as part of currently on-going strategies.		
ANON-UVCN-NKHP-D	Margaret Killey		100		That is more expectable than using Green field sites	Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 3 of the Written Statement. This Proposal recognises that the home, albeit now closed, would potentially be suitable to provide a care use again given the site's former use and that any proposals to develop the site for a purely residential use (i.e. Class 3.3 'dwellinghouses') would need to have regard to future land needs outlined by the Department of Health and Social Care as part of currently on-going strategies.		
ANON-UVCN-NKVC-E			100		This would be useful to be made like the last 3 sheltered accommodation for people over 60 to free up social housing (ridiculous that elderly are living in 3 bed houses when young families are struggling with high private rents!	Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 3 of the Written Statement. This Proposal recognises that the home, albeit now closed, would potentially be suitable to provide a care use again given the site's former use and that any proposals to develop the site for a purely residential use (i.e. Class 3.3 'dwellinghouses') would need to have regard to future land needs outlined by the Department of Health and Social Care as part of currently on-going strategies.		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			100		The care home should remain a care home and rejuvenated and updated.	Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 3 of the Written Statement. This Proposal recognises that the home, albeit now closed, would potentially be suitable to provide a care use again given the site's former use and that any proposals to develop the site for a purely residential use (i.e. Class 3.3 'dwellinghouses') would need to have regard to future land needs outlined by the Department of Health and Social Care as part of currently on-going strategies.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKHH-5	Hazel Hannan		100		No replacement for the Corrin Home has been progressed so I support this land being dedicated to some type of housing for community use.	Cabinet Office notes your comment. Please see Open Space and Community Proposal 3 of the Written Statement. This Proposal recognises that the home, albeit now closed, would potentially be suitable to provide a care use again given the site's former use and that any proposals to develop the site for a purely residential use (i.e. Class 3.3 'dwellinghouses') would need to have regard to future land needs outlined by the Department of Health and Social Care as part of currently on-going strategies.		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		100		The proposed area is too large. The existing site has no landscaping and is a visual eyesore. Its functionality is not in question but now and if further developed it should be landscaped to be better concealed in the rolling agricultural landscape and also actions taken to mitigate the noise. Ironically residential development will move closer if the proposals in this plan proceed AR004. In short a reduced increase in area with clear development requirements	Cabinet Office notes your opposition to the site. The area of AE001 represents the extent of land covered by a number of different valid planning approvals for employment uses on land previously not zoned for development.		
ANON-UVCN-NKX4-1			101	AE001	Andreas doesn't have the infrastructure, roads, schools or facilities to facilitate residential growth.	Cabinet Office notes your comment but is content to retain residential proposal sites in Andreas as part of the Area Plan for the North and West		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK54-X	Robert Morrey		101	AE001	<p>I am formally writing in response to the planning Inspector's report on the Area Plan for the North and West as the owner of Andreas Airfield referred to as AM001 in the plan. I also own adjacent land on both Braust and Ballacorey Farm which we actively farm. Within the boundaries of the two farms is the old airfield, of which its curtilage sits inside the overall farm boundaries. We have not received payments on the ineligible ground of Andreas Airfield since the inception of either the Countryside Care Scheme (DAFF), to its successor, the Agricultural Development Scheme (DEFA). We have not received payments due to the fact the Airfield has been deemed as 'ineligible land' under both schemes. To quote", "surface airstrips and grass airstrips used for any flying activity" are precluded from either of these schemes."For quote – see page three, under 'Ineligible land', bullet point four, attached: <a href="https://www.gov.im/media/1356473/chapter-4-ads-land-eligibility-0419.pdf">https://www.gov.im/media/1356473/chapter-4-ads-land-eligibility-0419.pdf</a></p> <p>Both these schemes have been passed by Tynwald, and as such have deemed the Airfield as 'non-agricultural'. Having read the Inspector's report, it is my opinion under IMSP'16 more frequently referred to as 'previously developed land' (PDL), also known as 'Brownfield', it defines this as land that is, or was occupied, by a permanent structure including its curtilage and associated fixed structures.</p> <p>I appreciate there will be certain ecological restraints, but we cannot accept the Airfield is anything other than PDL, or 'Brownfield'. The development of Andreas Airfield occurred during the Second World War (WWII) and has documented evidence to substantiate the site and it's PDL designation.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your support for this site but maintains that it would be inappropriate for the Area Plan for the North and West to propose the whole of Andreas Airfield for employment uses.</b></p> <p><b>The Area Plan for the North and West does recognise an existing area of employment land at the airfield (off Oatlands Road) and has proposed this area (AE001 on Map 8 - Andreas) for employment purposes.</b></p> <p><b>Whilst the Department notes your statement that the former airfield should be considered as previously developed land in its entirety it is noted in the Strategic Plan that there is no presumption that this means that the whole of the curtilage should be developed.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK54-X	Robert Morrey		101	AE001	<p>Please see below the video curated by Culture Vannin regarding the Airfield and it's history during WWII: <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zna2IkOqHil">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zna2IkOqHil</a></p> <p>It is also worth noting that the Airfield was subject to secondary development in the late 1950's/early 1960's (post war era) as a tracking station for the TSR2 Jet Programme, where a huge mast was constructed in the centre of the Airfield, and the tracking building was built on runway 1735. The tracking building is there to present day as a dwelling house, and the mast foundations are still in place.</p> <p>When the original map for the Airfield zoning was created by Cabinet Office for the Inspector it is my opinion that part of the Airfield was cherry picked arbitrarily and ignores the curtilage of the whole Airfield which was developed, including all three runways.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your support for this site but maintains that it would be inappropriate for the Area Plan for the North and West to propose the whole of Andreas Airfield for employment uses.</b></p> <p><b>The Area Plan for the North and West does recognise an existing area of employment land at the airfield (off Oatlands Road) and has proposed this area (AE001 on Map 8 - Andreas) for employment purposes.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK54-X	Robert Morrey		101	AE001	<p>It is worth noting that some of the existing boundary fencing from the war still exists, both at the north and south of the Airfield. I totally accept that the whole initial AM001 application is maybe a bridge too far under the North and West Area Plan, but there is no doubt with regards to the Airfield when large amounts of it have no agricultural merit at all. Land within the curtilage was also moved by bulldozer during the construction of RAF Andreas, leaving it with much poorer soil type than it was prior to the building of the Airfield. It is also worth noting that a campsite will be constructed on the PDL having just been passed by the planning committee. In conclusion, I respectfully request that the whole of Andreas Airfield is treated as PDL which I appreciate will still have to go through the normal planning procedures, but I believe it will fit in with both Tynwald Policy of 2024 for Agriculture and its inclusion of Energy Production in this, as well as general Energy Policy 2024, both of which have been taken to Tynwald and passed</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your support for this site but maintains that it would be inappropriate for the Area Plan for the North and West to propose the whole of Andreas Airfield as employment land.</b></p> <p><b>Whilst the Department notes your statement that the former airfield should be considered as previously developed land in its entirety it is noted in the Strategic Plan that there is no presumption that this means that the whole of the curtilage should be developed.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK5K-N	Stephen Moore	Department for Enterprise (Business Isle of Man)	101	AE001	<p>We thank the Cabinet Office for its inclusion of AM001 at Andreas, noting the site could support light, general or special industrial, research and development, storage or distribution, HGV parking and other compatible 'sui generis' uses (i.e. not falling within a defined use class) that would otherwise be unacceptable in or adjacent to residential areas, but note our request for the inclusion of the wider former Andreas Airfield i.e. the area that is formed by the remaining runways for Industrial use, was not taken up. We also note that our suggestion of the inclusion of the former Parade Ground in Jurby was also not included within the designations in the Area Plan.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes the Department's comments but does not propose a change with regards to the proposal of land for employment uses at Andreas Airfield.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK84-1	Tony Lloyd-Davies		101	AE001	<p>1.0 INTRODUCTION</p> <p>1.1 The site which is approximately 207Ha in area lies to the south of the A17 Burma Road which runs from Andreas to Bride and to the East of the A9 Oatlands Road which links the north with Ramsey. There is highway access from a designated heavy haulage route to the site. To the West of the site is the industrial area known as Landrace which houses 50+ local businesses. To the East and South are general agricultural uses.</p> <p>1.2 AM001 is recognised in the Draft Local Plan, as a suitable location for sustainable development of mixed commercial use including a renewable energy hub and potential for sustainable housing utilising community heating and renewable energy in an area adjoining the current Andreas Settlement Boundary.</p> <p>1.3 Andreas Airfield is wholly owned by a single family. The total area sought for inclusion in the study area is 207.13ha of which part is identified within the Draft Area Plan as employment land – this area is largely already developed out.</p> <p>1.4 There is one residential house adjacent to the site which is separated from the perimeter road by the Silly Moos Camp site. Approved by planning committee on the 17th March 2025.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment and those of others expressing support for the proposal in question.</b></p> <p><b>At the Draft Plan stage (2022) Cabinet Office recognised that there were a number of businesses operating from the Airfield on land that had not previously been zoned for any particular purpose. Because of this, Cabinet Office took the approach to regularise the existing employment uses on part of the land between the former airfield and Oatlands Road. However, the proposal of employment land in this regard (AE001 on map 8 - Andreas) did not represent the Department recognising that the airfield as a whole was a suitable location for a mixed commercial use or renewable energy hub.</b></p> <p><b>As noted above, the Department maintains that it would not be appropriate for the Area Plan to support the proposal of the whole airfield for either an employment use or other uses which may be related to the generation of renewable energy. The Department notes the location of the airfield outside of the existing settlement of Andreas and does not consider that an area plan proposal supporting the development of the airfield in its entirety would be in general conformity with the strategic plan.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK84-1	Tony Lloyd-Davies		101	AE001	<p>1.4 There is one residential house adjacent to the site which is separated from the perimeter road by the Silly Moos Camp site. Approved by planning committee on the 17th March 2025.</p> <p>1.5 During the process for the Area Plan assessment we have submitted consistent papers supporting the designation of the site addressing the important national need matters of sustainable baseload non intermittent renewable energy provision by several ground based technologies.</p> <p>1.6 Our submissions to the public inquiry process were extensive and provided responses to the inspectors' headings and listed issues.</p> <p>1.7 The inspector hearing the public inquiry and considering the written representations makes the following comments about this site: 37 Section 11.9 Employment Proposal 4 Renumber and reword to read: Employment Proposal 7 Site AE001 - Andreas Airfield supports light, general or special industrial, research and development, storage or distribution, HGV parking and other compatible 'sui generis' uses (i.e. not falling within a defined use class) that would otherwise be unacceptable in or adjacent to residential areas. Any application must provide an annotated location plan to describe nearby uses and buildings to provide a context for any new applications.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comments and other of others in support of the site in question. However, the Department maintains that it would not be appropriate for the Area Plan to support the proposal of the whole airfield for either an employment use or other uses which may be related to the generation of renewable energy. The Department notes the location of the airfield outside of the existing settlement of Andreas and does not consider that an area plan proposal supporting the development of the airfield in its entirety would be in general conformity with the strategic plan.</b></p>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK84-1	Tony Lloyd-Davies		101	AE001	<p>Site AM001 – Andreas airfield</p> <p>362. The site put forward comprises the whole of Andreas airfield and surrounding land, proposed for a large-scale mixed renewable energy commercial hub, incorporating a residential element. A comparatively small part of the land between the airfield and the settlement of Andreas is designated as employment site AE001 in the 2024 modified version of the Draft APNW.</p> <p>363. The major proposal, especially the residential component outside any defined settlement, would not meet the strategic spatial strategy of national policy in terms of the general conformity of this Plan with the IMSP16. Accordingly, I make no recommendation regarding the larger site. However, the project might form a subject for the ongoing IMSPR.</p> <p>2.0 COMMENT:</p> <p>2.1.1 We wish to continue to promote the site per the previous submissions and request that CABO fully embrace the significant unique opportunity that this site provides to enable the Isle of Man Government to meet their targets under the Climate Change Act 2022. The compliance with National Need criteria is set out in the representations.</p> <p>2.1.2 We assume and formally request that CABO inform the decision makers of the immediate site availability and to ensure that the full information provided to the process, including that disregarded by the inspector, is made available and understood by them, all to address the stated National Need.</p>	Cabinet Office notes your comments and other of others in support of the site in question. However, the Department maintains that it would not be appropriate for the Area Plan to support the proposal of the whole airfield for either an employment use or other uses which may be related to the generation of renewable energy. The Department notes the location of the airfield outside of the existing settlement of Andreas and does not consider that an area plan proposal supporting the development of the airfield in its entirety would be in general conformity with the strategic plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK84-1	Tony Lloyd-Davies		101	AE001	<p>2.1.3 The site represents the single biggest opportunity on the Island due to its size and location to adequately provide a site area away from the general public to deliver ground mounted renewable energy. This site can be used to develop further acceptable practices which could then be rolled out elsewhere on the island.</p> <p>2.1.4 The site is in a bowl with very restricted views into the site from out with the boundaries.</p> <p>2.1.5 The site is accessed via two established haulage routes with direct access to rural areas and Ramsey quayside.</p> <p>2.1.6 Associated built development is required to provide support buildings associated with the provision of renewable energy.</p> <p>2.1.7 The location of the renewable energy park allows for district heating proposals to be trialled – this is the reason behind a housing request within the representations.</p> <p>2.1.8 The brownfield nature of the site is well documented and this communication should be read in conjunction with the landowners separate submission to CABO ref Ballacorey Farm, March24,2025 which clearly sets out the brown field nature of the site. There is significant benefit available to the agricultural industry from a development such as this.</p>	Cabinet Office notes your comments and other of others in support of the site in question. However, the Department maintains that it would not be appropriate for the Area Plan to support the proposal of the whole airfield for either an employment use or other uses which may be related to the generation of renewable energy. The Department notes the location of the airfield outside of the existing settlement of Andreas and does not consider that an area plan proposal supporting the development of the airfield in its entirety would be in general conformity with the strategic plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK84-1	Tony Lloyd-Davies		101	AE001	<p>2.1.9 Importantly the inspector concludes his note : I make no recommendation regarding the larger site. However, the project might form a subject for the ongoing IMSPR. We submit that there is no reason to delay this decision and that the process has been fully transparent to identify proposed use and potential that a Development Order/Brief could be made to allow the site to be developed as proposed and to contribute significantly to the published National Need.</p> <p>2.1.10 The development as proposed would be carried out with no cost to the public purse, the benefit of which would be sovereign renewable energy with known source and provenance from which several existing industries will benefit.</p> <p>2.1.11 During the prolonged process several investment opportunities have been lost for inward investment. This simply cannot continue, the site is the best the island has to offer for renewable energy opportunities of the type proposed and this opportunity should not be missed.</p> <p>3.0 CONCLUSION:</p> <p>3.1 The site boundary as set out in the submissions to the APNW process clearly sets out a brown field ring fenced site with minimal LVI which can be developed to provide sustainable energy, the benefits of which are not for this process. In the round the development also allows for the circular economy benefitting the agricultural industry in what are very difficult times.</p> <p>3.2 We STRONGLY submit that the site as set out and identified should be zoned as described to allow immediate development to take place.</p>	Cabinet Office notes your comments and other of others in support of the site in question. However, the Department maintains that it would not be appropriate for the Area Plan to support the proposal of the whole airfield for either an employment use or other uses which may be related to the generation of renewable energy. The Department notes the location of the airfield outside of the existing settlement of Andreas and does not consider that an area plan proposal supporting the development of the airfield in its entirety would be in general conformity with the strategic plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8T-1	Adam Silverston		101	AE001	<p>I am writing on behalf of residents of Andreas village in my capacity as an Andreas parish Commissioner to express my strong support for the proposed renewable energy site at Andreas Airfield. In my discussions with village residents, I have been met with consistent and enthusiastic support for this project, which is widely recognized as a significant opportunity for the village, the North of the island, and the local farming community. The development of this site by a reputable company with a proven track record in delivering successful renewable energy projects is a rare and valuable prospect for the Isle of Man. The proposed development would not only revitalize a brownfield site and bring external investment to the village, it would also contribute meaningfully to the island's efforts to reduce its carbon footprint and meet its future environmental commitments. I understand that there have been recommendations to re-zone the airfield site as agricultural land. I would urge the Planning Department to reconsider this, as it would be an illogical decision given the site's long-standing history and potential for future development or aviation use. The airfield was purpose-built 85 years ago, and its infrastructure could still serve its original function if needed. With an abundance of agricultural land available on the island, it makes far more sense to preserve the limited brownfield sites we have for sustainable development or potential future aviation purposes. The renewable energy project at Andreas Airfield represents a rare alignment of environmental, economic, and community benefits. It would provide a vital boost to the local economy, create job opportunities, and enhance the island's energy resilience. I, along with the residents I have spoken with, firmly believe that this project is in the best interests of the village and the broader island community.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comment and those of others expressing support for the proposal in question.</p> <p>As noted above, the Department maintains that it would not be appropriate for the Area Plan to support the proposal of the whole airfield for either an employment use or other uses which may be related to the generation of renewable energy. The Department notes the location of the airfield outside of the existing settlement of Andreas and does not consider that an area plan proposal supporting the development of the airfield in its entirety would be in general conformity with the strategic plan</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	102	AR004	<p>We support the allocation of Site AR004 for residential development as proposed in the Modified Draft Plan, as set out in our previous representations. This accords with the conclusions of the Plan Inspector.</p>	Cabinet Office notes your support for the site.		
ANON-UVCN-NKEX-J			103	JE001	<p>The inclusion of land to the north of the Ballamenagh Road as 'Industrial' conflicts with the advice which has been given by DEFA Planning for many years that Industrial Development should only be located to the south of the Ballamenagh Road, and indeed Government funds were expended to support the removal of previous industrial premises from the north of the road to new premises to the south of the road. The zoning also ignores the wider access requirements for the proposed housing development in Jurby (Application No.20/01516/B) shown on Approved Drawing 2020-DOI-PEH-37/P08A) and the improvements that would be brought by the introduction of this access which addresses the lack of a continuous public footpath on Bretney Road. The land should also not be considered for zoning as 'Industrial' until Condition 9 of the above Planning Approval has been satisfied. Various Governments over the last 20 years or so have been working to make Jurby a Sustainable Settlement and grow the population of the settlement. The land zoned as 'Industrial' to the north of the Ballamenagh Road should be retained for future housing development as part of the longer term development of Jurby so as to satisfy the previous aims and objectives of Government. There is already space for future industrial development within the boundaries of the existing Industrial Estate.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comments but does not agree that the proposal of field 124728 for employment land ignores or in any way prejudices the wider access arrangements for development approved under previously approved planning applications. Please see the development brief for site JE001 and field 124728 which requires development proposals to consider how the development of the site would relate to the Jurby Initiative at a minimum.</p> <p>Cabinet Office considers that additional employment land, particularly sites which would be able to accommodate units of a larger floor plate, will contribute to making Jurby a more sustainable settlement as well as contributing towards Government's wider objectives regarding the creation of new jobs.</p>		
ANON-UVCN-NKQT-T		Jurby Parish Commissioners	103	JE001	<p>We refer to the Inspectors Report paragraph 194 which is used to make this modification. The last sentence of this paragraph says ' I make no recommendation regarding site JE001'</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes the comments of the Commissioners in this regard.</p> <p>The Department accepts the wording of paragraph 194 of the Inspector's report. The Department considers that the report, as worded, did not recommend that JE001 not be proposed for development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</p> <p>The Department supports the inclusion of this site and does not propose a change to the Plan in this regard at this time.</p>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK5K-N	Stephen Moore	Department for Enterprise (Business Isle of Man)	103	JE001	We are conscious of the emphasis on the redevelopment of brownfield sites over greenfield following the Report of the Select Committee on the Development of Unoccupied Urban Sites 2017-2018 [PP No 2018/0108] and cognisant of that, we request that that the former Parade Ground at Jurby (Site JR011 - Jurby -Ballamenagh Road) be reconsidered for industrial use as it offers a sufficiently large area of flat, previously developed land (circa 56,000 m2 / 600,000sqft) which would complement the existing land south of the Jurby Road previously zoned for industrial development. The former Parade Ground offers new opportunities for development with the land to the south of Jurby Road only offering relatively small footprints and mindful of the proximity with the new zoning of residential land, we propose that the JR001 land could be zoned for Light Industrial use, together with Storage and Distribution which would minimise any potential nuisance and would in so doing, provide employment opportunities for local residents.	<b>Cabinet Office notes the Department's comments.</b>  <b>The Area Plan for the North and West recognises Government's wider goals in respect of job creation and proposes land for employment uses considering existing opportunities in the North and West including Jurby and Andreas airfields. Cabinet Office does not propose a change to the status of the Parade Ground, Jurby within the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office would bring to the Department's attention that the Area Plan does propose additional employment land in Jurby which would be capable of accommodating units of a larger floorplate.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK5K-N	Stephen Moore	Department for Enterprise (Business Isle of Man)	103	JE001	In addition, the Agency respectfully submits that the area of the former Andreas Airfield not included within the designation of AM001, which retains its three concrete runways, each circa 4,000ft / 1,220 meters long and circa 155 feet/ 48 meters wide with associated perimeter track to the north with the remains of blast pens, is a previously developed land and therefore a brownfield site and whilst accepting that the site is not in an urban setting, we consider that it should be identified as such within the Area Plan for the North and West and/or any forthcoming revision of the Unoccupied Urban Sites Register. In so doing, this could offer the opportunity to redevelop the runway areas to support light, general or special industrial, research and development, storage or distribution, HGV parking and other compatible 'sui generis' uses (i.e. not falling within a defined use class) that would otherwise be unacceptable in or adjacent to residential areas, in addition to the provision of renewable energy uses previously mentioned that are reliant on scale that is difficult to accommodate elsewhere on the Island. The Agency believes that designating these two sites provides a scale that other industrially zoned sites on the Island are not able to offer. For instance, Planning Application 23/00239/B, approved on November 14, 2024, for a purpose-built medicinal cannabis production facility and headquarters for Gro Labs Organic, covered approximately 13,097 square meters (140,975 square feet). Few sites are large enough to accommodate such a facility and we are only too aware that businesses have found it difficult to locate sites for larger floorplates. Such businesses would complement existing businesses in the area, bringing much needed employment to the north of the Island.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comments and other of others in support of the site in question. However, the Department maintains that it would not be appropriate for the Area Plan to support the proposal of the whole airfield for either an employment use or other uses which may be related to the generation of renewable energy. The Department notes the location of the airfield outside of the existing settlement of Andreas and does not consider that an area plan proposal supporting the development of the airfield in its entirety would be in general conformity with the strategic plan.</b>  <b>The Unoccupied Urban Sites Register is an evidence base of previously developed or otherwise unoccupied areas of land within existing settlement boundaries and informs, but is separate to, the Area Plan process.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office is content with the proposals for employment uses in Jurby and Andreas.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK8N-U			104	MR011	Kirk Michael needs more properties and the sites identified are perfect. It would be irresponsible to build on the other side of the main road due to the coastal erosion issue. I am in favour of Proposed Modification M104 as the sites being predominantly residential, especially in respect of MR011	<b>Cabinet Office notes your support for this site.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKCH-Z			104	MR011	As a previous resident of Slieau Curn Park, Kirk Michael, I am pleased to see that MR011 has been included for Predominantly Residential Development and I fully support Modification M104. By including this piece of land, it will enable the estate to be properly finished off, following a suitable planning application. It would be great to see it being used for something positive.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your support for this site.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKH1-E			104	MR011	I am a resident of Kirk Michael and actually live in Slieau Curn Park. I fully support development in the village of Kirk Michael. The village is a popular place to live and there is a shortage there of reasonably priced houses. There are not many property for sale there and when ones at the lower end of the price range (around £300,000) do come on the market, they are quickly snapped up. The top of Slieau Curn Park (MR011) would be ideal for reasonably priced properties and would enable the estate to finally be completed and I believe other residents on the estate would also like to see it finally finished. I am in favour of Proposed Modification M104.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your support for this site.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKQ6-V	Lorna Johnson		104	MR011	I especially support 104. The Inspector and Cabinet Office have recommended it for predominantly residential.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your support for this site.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			104	MR011	Why has the open spaces not been highlighted ( Glen Wyllin campsite) as well as Industrial areas such as the fisheries?	<b>The Area Plan recognises the importance of existing open spaces, including campsites and where it would be appropriate has shown these on the maps. In some cases, open spaces fall outside of existing settlements and in planning terms are considered to be 'in the countryside'. This is often the case with campsites which form an important part of the Island's rural tourism accommodation offer, allowing visitors and residents alike to experience the Island's landscapes and countryside. Because of this, it is not always appropriate for open spaces, including campsites to be shown on the maps.</b>  <b>Generally, Area Plans make land use proposals within, or directly abutting, existing settlements in accordance with the Strategic Plan. In some cases, it is appropriate for an Area Plan to recognise land for a particular purpose outside of a settlement to reflect an existing use - for example, Tynwald Mills in St Johns (retail) or Andreas Airfield (employment - part). Cabinet Office has not recognised the former hatchery at Glen Wyllin and does not propose a change in this regard.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK71-W			105	GMR001, GMR006	We fully support the zoning of Site GMR001 for residential use and the extension to the boundary of the site. We also support the inclusion of Site GMR006 zoned for residential use and the amended Development Brief for both sites.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your support for this site.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	105	GMR001, GMR006	We support the allocation of Sites GMR006 & GMR001 for residential development as proposed in the Modified Draft Plan, which accords with the conclusions of the Plan Inspector.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your support for this site.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		108	LR027	The Settlement Boundary as indicated is illogical and unnatural at the West, adjacent to Site LR040 and East, adjacent to Site LR020, both sites being indicated as outside a boundary which does not follow natural landscape feature but has abrupt 90 degree changes of direction for no apparent reason. LR027 has constraints with drainage, vehicular access from the A3 which is exacerbated by the severely limited off-street car parking in the vicinity, landscape, visual amenity and wildlife. As previously observed these constraints do not appear to have been applied as rigorously as the single issues precluding allocation of LR020 and LR040.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. The existing settlement boundaries shown on the maps show the general extent of the existing built form of a settlement</b>  <b>Cabinet Office notes your comments and your support for the development sites LR040 and LR020 however the Department does not propose a change regarding the status of either of these development sites and both are not proposed as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3M-N		Lezayre Parish Commissioners	108	LR027	By Sulby standards this site represents a large development. The Commissioners feel strongly that Kella Close is already difficult to navigate, due to the number of parked cars along it, and that building on this site with access to it from the end of Kella Close would only make this worse. The junction of Kella Road and Kella Close is already very busy during the evenings and at weekends. The Commissioners would be against access being from the main Sulby Road due to it being on the TT course.	<b>Cabinet Office notes the concern of the Commissioners regarding the site in question. However, the Department is content that matters such as design and access of specific development sites is a matter which will be dealt with at the detailed planning application stage.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK85-2	Casey Smith	Ballamanaugh Properties	108	LR027	Ballamanaugh Properties Ltd ("Ballamanaugh Properties") fully supports the inclusion of site LR027 (West of Keila Close, Sulby) as an allocation for residential development in the Area Plan for the North and West (the 'APNW'). Ballamanaugh Properties has promoted site LR027 as a suitable and sustainable option for residential development through the different consultations on the APNW. Therefore, they welcome the conclusion of the Cabinet Office's Policy Team and the Inspector that the APNW should allocate site LR027 for housing development. Site LR027 is in the full ownership of Ballamanaugh Properties. It is available for development with a willing landowner and there are no site-specific viability challenges relating to the site. As evidenced through the promotion of site LR027, the site is not constrained by any technical or environmental issue, such as flood risk or drainage. It also benefits from a Certificate of Lawfulness (ref. 23/00435JLAW) confirming that the eastern area of the site is already covered by an extant planning permission for seven dwellings. Importantly, and as agreed by the Cabinet Office and Inspector, residential development on site LR027 can be safely accessed from Keila Close without a new access required from the A3 Sulby Straight. While Table 16 - summary of residential land provision of the Written Statement sets out that site LR027 has a yield of 5 dwellings up to 2026 (the end of the APNW's plan period), it is noted in the Inspector's Report (paragraph 329) that the full capacity of the site is approximately 11 dwellings. Ballamanaugh Properties maintain its view, based on technical evidence and master planning, that a higher number of dwellings could be provided on the site.	<b>Cabinet Office note your continued support for the site and the site is to be retained as proposed for residential development within the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK85-2	Casey Smith	Ballamanaugh Properties	108	LR027	<p>This can be considered further as part of any future planning application.</p> <p>Overall, site LR027's allocation for residential development is in-keeping with the housing objectives set out within the Isle of Man Strategic Plan (2016) and the Draft APNW Written Statement. It represents an effective option for housing development and is deliverable over and beyond the APNW's plan period to 2026. Through the APNW, Site LR027 will help meet the housing needs of Sul by while reta ining the character and appearance of the village.</p> <p>We trust that the comments provided in response to Question 109 assist the Cabinet Office in their final preparations of the APNW, before it is adopted as anticipated later this year.</p>	<b>Cabinet Office note your continued support for the site and the site is to be retained as proposed for residential development within the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKM7-S			110		<p>We are pleased to note that Dhoon Church Hall has been designated as being available for residential use. However, we are currently in the early stages of undergoing a process to decide which of the buildings at the Dhoon should be developed and used as a worship and community centre. It is quite possible that once this process is complete we could decide to dispose of the church and develop the hall, if that proves to be the more viable option. We would not wish, at this stage, for anything in the Area Plan to preclude that option as, if we were to decide to sell the church, it would need to be capable of being developed for residential purposes. In the same way, if the decision is to sell the hall and develop the church that would need the hall to be sold for residential use. On the draft plan the area around the church is all designated as for Civil, Cultural or other use and I assume that if this remains the case it would be difficult for us to sell the church, should we choose to, for residential purposes. There is also an issue on the area I am discussing in that the Dhoon Parsonage has been in private ownership for residential purposes for a number of years so therefore the proposed designation does not fit its current use. I understand Garth Commissioners will also be drawing your attention to this issue. If there is any way that the Dhoon site, including both the hall and Church and the land which surrounds them, could be designated in a way that allows for future residential use that would be very helpful. The key thing for us is that we leave open as many options as possible to allow us to retain the most suitable building and are able to sell the other to raise the necessary funds to develop the building we retain. In this way we aim to create a building at Dhoon which meets not only worshipping needs but also serves the wider community. There is no issue with retaining the Open Space designation for the remainder of the Dhoon land.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment regarding the Church and Hall in Glen Mona. In terms of land use, civic, cultural or other use covers a wide range of uses and Cabinet Office considers it important that where appropriate, community facilities are identified and retained as part of development plans. Cabinet Office notes Strategic Plan Community Policy 3 which states:</b></p> <p><b>"Development (including the change of use of existing premises) which results in the loss of a local community facility (other than shops and public houses) will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that it is no longer practical or desirable to use the facility for its existing use or another use likely to benefit the local community".</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office do not propose a change to Map 16 - Glen Mona as far as it relates to the Church.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office do however note the residential status of the dwelling 'Dhoon Parsonage' and have amended Map 16 - Glen Mona accordingly to reflect this.</b></p>	y	
BHLF-UVCN-NKMW-S		Garff District Commissioners	110		<p>We note that the boundary and zoning around the Dhoon Church in Glen Mona indicates that the area around the church is designated as for 'civic, cultural, or other use'. The Commissioners advise that the buildings immediately to the east of the church structure are actually in a separate privately owned curtilage. These buildings are known as Dhoon Parsonage and this has its own curtilage as indicated on the attached site plan from a planning application lodged in 2013</p>	<b>Cabinet Office notes this and have amended Map 16 to reflect the residential status of the dwelling 'Dhoon Parsonage'.</b>	y	
BHLF-UVCN-NKMW-S		Garff District Commissioners	110		<p>Please also note that the Commissioners have been made aware that the church authorities are considering their options for the Dhoon Church building and the adjacent hall. Previously they had indicated that they would sell the Dhoon Hall site for residential development and retain the Church for community use; however, we are advised that they are considering reversing these designations for the two buildings. We have contacted them to advise them to consult the modifications document on the Consultation Hub and to liaise with yourselves directly.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment regarding the Church and Hall in Glen Mona. In terms of land use, civic, cultural or other use covers a wide range of uses and Cabinet Office considers it important that where appropriate, community facilities are identified and retained as part of development plans. Cabinet Office notes Strategic Plan Community Policy 3 which states:</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office do not propose a change to Map 16 - Glen Mona as far as it relates to the Church.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		111	GR022	<p>This is an over development of the area and should be left as agricultural</p>	<b>Cabinet Office notes your opposition to this site.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHN-B	Bob		112		<p>Save the pub. We need a public house. A village without a pub and social hub is dead.</p>	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3H-G		Ramsey Town Commissioners	112		<p>It was noted that the North and South of the Town is currently only services by one over-river link at the Stone Bridge on Bowring Road. Whereas it is understood that this is presently deemed a resilient structure, it is unclear how future development will impact upon this. With the Swing Bridge becoming increasingly dependent on care and maintenance, any unforeseen closure of the Stone Bridge will have significant impact on anyone living north of there. The only available detour is via Sulby, and would lead to substantial increases in traffic on Lezayre Road. In short, the provision of a second river crossing in the Ramsey area should be seen as a strategic necessity.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Built Environment proposal 2 iv of the Draft Area Plan for the north and West had previously given policy support to exploring the feasibility of a new 'over-river' link in the Area of North Shore Road/ Bowring Road. In advance of Inquiry sessions it was proposed that this criteria of the Development Brief was removed as pedestrian access in that area is adequate.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office does not propose a change and the wording of the proposal as at January 2025 is to be retained.</b></p>		
ANON-UVCN-NK46-Y			113		<p>If I understand this correctly I agree with strict building control which does not over stretch infrastructure or impact on the environment.</p>	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK71-W			113		<p>We fully support the removal of paragraph 8.16 relating to Building Densities.</p>	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			113		<p>Building density is important, this should remain part of the plan, as it defines that infrastructure hold be considered and in place, and there should be consideration to move liveable flats and apartments in towns rather than houses which would solve some affordability issues.</p>	<b>Building densities remain part of the plan in terms of yield assumptions for development sites. Cabinet Office accepted the Inspector's recommendation that minimum development densities as part of development briefs were over potentially proscriptive and therefore removed this part of the written statement and Built Environment Proposal 3.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		114		<p>All such data must be factual and accurate.</p>	<b>Cabinet Office agree with your comment</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHN-B	Bob		114		<p>So many more buildings should be protected.</p>	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment but the statutory responsibility for the Protected Buildings Register rests with DEFA.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK46-Y			115		<p>All of this infrastructure is important. Road congestion is on the increase, better intrastation needs to be in place before considering the over development of the Island</p>	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		115		<p>This would be logical and advisable if the recommendation included due reference to appropriate and available mitigation and attenuation.</p>	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		115		<p>The revised wording softens the approach to this critical area. Published flood maps are one source of data but the impacts felt from new developments and the effects of climate change may not be reflected in these maps so a much wider data capture is required to assess any new/ further development. I do not support removing 6b this seems to me an important requirement which should be retained</p>	<b>Cabinet Office is content with the current wording of the Objective and considers that using the most up to date flood maps allows for the ongoing assessment of flood risk which can be influenced by a number of factors including development and climate change. Cabinet Office does not propose change to the wording of the Objective.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKC8-G			115		<p>Please ensure Plan 7a is put in place before any consideration for new builds in Peel and also incorporate a method of dealing with the silting of the Marina on a continual basis rather than the methodology of a mass dredging on a ineffectual periodic basis.</p>	<b>The Area Plan for the North and West supports the development of an RSTW to serve Peel and notes that work has recently commenced on site.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKHK-8	David Humphrey	Dandara Homes Limited	115		<p>The amended wording as proposed better reflects the approach taken to development and flood risk</p>	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKVV-4			115		<p>Peel infrastructure struggles as it is. Schools, GP surgery, drainage already stretched, severe lack of parking for vehicles.</p>	<b>Cabinet Office notes your concerns and those of others regarding community facilities and infrastructure availability in Peel.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			115		<p>Considered possible flooding due to building works should be considered. This has been removed to allow for current flood maps. Once an area has been built this flood risk changes. The previous wording should be used.</p>	<b>Cabinet Office is content with the current wording of the Objective and considers that using the most up to date flood maps allows for the ongoing assessment of flood risk which can be influenced by a number of factors including development and climate change.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			115		<p>Section 10.3 plan Objective 6 = totally ignored in allocation of site RR009 Lezayre Road and LR001 which both included significant areas of land subject to Fluvia l flooding and Surface water flooding respectively. Why are they allocated?</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment, please see the development brief for site RR009 which requires that a flood risk assessment be carried out as part of any development. The flood risk maps were a core document at the Inquiry and the potential for flood risk on this site was known to the Inspector.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office do not consider that the flood maps published by DOI show LR001 as being of any particular risk of fluvial flooding.</b></p>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK38-Z	Andrew Johnson	Manx National Heritage	115		7.3vi and 7.18 We are disappointed at the loss of Plan Objective 6 and Plan Outcome 6a which sought to protect Dark Skies. We seek reassurance that this omission, if not reversed, will be compensated for by inclusion in the revised Strategic Plan instead.	Cabinet Office notes the position of MNH in this regard. Cabinet Office note that the countryside itself is afforded significant protection by strategic planning policy and Environment Policy 22 specifically covers light pollution. The Department therefore maintains that it is not necessary for the Area Plan to repeat issues covered in detail in the Strategic Plan.		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		116		Submission in connection with LR020 makes specific provision for this.	Cabinet Office notes your comment but do not support the allocation of LR020 as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		117		I do not believe that Jurby is a credible contingency for Ronaldsway.	Please see paragraph 10.7.1 of the Written Statement.		
ANON-UVCN-NKER-C			117		Jurby has always been an airport in the past and should be again. Not so much fog either.	Please see paragraph 10.7.1 of the Written Statement.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish		117		Support proposals to adhere to full public engagement and consultation with regards to the inclusion of Jurby Airfield in any future masterplan.	Cabinet Office notes your comment.		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		118		Implementation will require broad 'outside the box' thinking.	Cabinet Office notes your comment.		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		118		Although I support in principle any development should only be done subject to detailed environmental assessments	Cabinet Office notes this. Please see Transport and Utilities Proposal 3.		
ANON-UVCN-NKC8-G			118		Grater thought on the use of park and ride - even to the use of free transport for locals outside of peak times	Cabinet Office notes your comment but contend that such matters fall outside of the remit of the Area Plan for the North and West		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish		118		Consideration should be given to protecting any adjacent farmland from inappropriate use or intrusion including boundary fencing to protect livestock from loose dogs littering and biosecurity risks etc. Prevention is better than cure.	Cabinet Office notes your comment but contend that such matters fall outside of the remit of the Area Plan for the North and West		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8F-K	Sarah Comish		118		Any additional infrastructure to increase public access to the countryside must also support the protection of livestock, crops, and biodiversity from risk and damage, this includes, but should not be limited to, adequate fencing and signage	Cabinet Office notes your comment but contend that such matters fall outside of the remit of the Area Plan for the North and West		
ANON-UVCN-NKEY-K			33 and 34		The removal of this paragraph appears to do nothing more than pave the way for the revised paragraph 11.5, satisfying the Government's 'need' for an additional 12 hectares of 'employment sites'. There is no separate justification for this other than a desire to create new industrial parks (rather than redevelop existing ones - as listed in paragraph 11.8	As set out in the Inspector's Report an internal review of the findings of the Employment Land Review highlighted an historic under provision of employment land. In recognition of this, Cabinet Office has developed proposals which better align with the Island Spatial Strategy for the future development of employment land.		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			4 and 5		This should be a 360 degree views uninterrupted. The changes leave it open to build or change the landscape to the South. These are uplands and they should not be disturbed.	Cabinet Office notes your comment, Modifications 4 and 5 seek to correct an erroneous reference to the Southern Uplands in Landscape Proposal 3 and 7 of the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (as published) and do not seek to change the level of policy protection afforded to our landscapes.		
ANON-UVCN-NKKS-K			54-72	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	The infrastructure of peel is already beyond its limits. We do not need more houses we have collapsing roads all over, no available dentist, impossible doctors appointments, the schools are having to erect temporary classrooms, the Main Street is pitiful, the beach has raw sewerage being pumped into it. Fix the actual problems rather than ruining more green land. The whole idea of more people putting pressure on what little we have is embarrassing and the people coming up with these plans need to be accountable for the existing problems.	Cabinet Office notes your concern regarding the provision of community facilities and other infrastructure in Peel, an issue which was discussed at length during the inquiry. Throughout the plan process, Cabinet Office has considered existing infrastructure provision when making decisions on where proposal sites are located and Plan proposals and development brief criteria consider the needs of the community.  In most cases, direct provision of infrastructure lies outside of the remit of the Area Plan and this is noted at paragraph 1.2.3 of the Written Statement. As set out in the Plans 'Recommendations' there are issues outside of Cabinet Office's control but which the Plan can facilitate and encourage investment and collaborative working from other Government Departments and bodies pursuant of delivering on particular matters, sites, policy statements or intentions. The Area Plan for the North and West sets a development framework for the future of the area, allowing for a co-ordinated approach to the provision of infrastructure in line with areas of population growth and increased demand as a result of planned development.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVQ-V			61, 62 and 63	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	1. Link road is unnecessary 2. Development considered very premature- the town has expanded in a major way in recent years - period of consolidation is now priority.	Cabinet Office notes your comment with regards to proposal sites in Peel. Cabinet Office notes that of the land proposed in the Peel Local Plan for residential development only proposal site 5 (Ballaterson Farm) remains undeveloped and this land is subject to a live planning application.  The Department considers that it is foreseeable that following the approval of the Area Plan, a period of consolidation will follow where limited development occurs as planning applications are prepared, submitted and determined before development commences on sites in the Area Plan for the North and West.		
ANON-UVCN-NKGF-2	Gary Smith		69,70, 71, 95 and 99	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	The town can not cope with more people, it can not cope now.	Cabinet Office notes this comment.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK38-Z	Andrew Johnson	Manx National Heritage	81, 84		7.14 Having reviewed this section and the associated mapping (see Map 1aN Environmental and Map 1aW Environmental), it is particularly obvious that there is inadequate description and mapping of MNT lands in comparison with DEFA's national glen and plantation assets, and MWT's various nature reserves which are described within this section and also listed in Appendix 1. The environmental and biological importance of MNT lands is underlined by the fact that several are obscured on the mapping because they underlie existing ASSI and Wildlife Site designations listed in Appendices A.1.1 and A.1.3 – and it was our long-term management of them which preserved their value until DEFA legislation could be used to designate them. We appreciate that the maps might be difficult to rectify at this point, but a list similar to Table A.1.2 for MWT sites could be easily agreed. This could include the following: Ballakeylil Ayres, Andreas, Ballaugh Curragh, Ballaugh, Ballakesh Ayres, Bride, Ballawhannel, Bride, Killabrega, Lezayre Slieau Managh, Lezayre, Maughold Brooghs and Port e Vullen, Maughold, Dhoon Glen, Maughold, Gob ny Rona and Port Lewaigue, Maughold, Eary Cushlin and Creggan Mooar, Patrick, Niarbyl Brooghs, Patrick	Cabinet Office notes your comments and has, where data up to date mapping data was available, shown MNT sites on the correct map as part of the Area Plan for the North and West. Please also see Table A.1.4 of the written statement.	Y	Y
ANON-UVCN-NKEC-W			88 and 89	RR009	I appreciate that housing development is needed in the Ramsey area. However, as a resident by one of the fields, I am deeply concerned that the government may not have the political will and ethical robustness to insist that the developers provide sufficient infrastructure to address an issue of paramount importance, that the fields are flood plains. As rains become more frequent and heavier due to climate change, I observe every time after rainfall that the fields are saturated by an increasing amount of water. Building on these fields will further undermine their ability to drain water, and I am deeply concerned that rain water will flood the area, also leading to existing properties near the fields suffering 'backflow' that will cause water gushing out of toilets and manholes. Developers, being businesses, would instinctively want to minimise building costs, so I am not confident they would care about such implications. Thus, it is up to the government to ensure that adequate infrastructure is put in place by the developers to prevent such implications. Do I have confidence in the government to do so? My answer is, unfortunate, no. It would be good if the government could respond specifically to this point, which is widely shared. Thank you	Cabinet Office notes that these issues were discussed at length during public inquiry sessions and refer to Modification 68 (M68) which makes amendments to the Development Brief of site RR009 to require a Flood Risk Assessment and consideration of a Sustainable Drainage System as part of any planning application to progress the development of the site.		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		<p>11 At the Inquiry it was proven and accepted by the Inspector that housing figures had been partly calculated based on the erroneous theory that if developers had consent than they would have to build all the houses they had consent for within 4 years; following on from that that they were assumed to have built one quarter of the houses they had consent for by the Area Plan end date of March 2026. This is completely wrong. A consent gives a developer 4 years in which to start his development; therefore, in more recent consents for larger developments upon which the figures rely, no houses may have been built within 1 year i.e. by the end of March 2026 / the Plan period.</p> <p>In some cases Cabinet Office estimated number of houses for a site is unto 50% lower than the developer already has planning consent for. However the plan in allocating new sites does not give any estimate of the total amount of new housing it is planning for beyond 2026. It is completely misleading to say that the "looks to plan modestly beyond the end of the Plan Period". Not only will large applied for (i.e. planning application submitted) sites where no final consent has yet been given only produce housing after the 2026, the huge allocations made may last many more years than a modest extension beyond 2026.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office acknowledges that once in force the Area Plan for the North and West will remain so past the end of the Plan period. In light of this, Cabinet Office's stance going into Inquiry was to provide an uplift in respect of housing need whilst remaining in general conformity with the Strategic Plan. This approach was tested at Inquiry and found by the Inspector in his report to be 'pragmatic' and in general conformity with the Strategic Plan.</p> <p>The yield of proposal sites in the Plan is outlined in Table 16 of the written statement. Cabinet Office Document 11 (COD 11) which was produced during the Inquiry, shows the likely yield and overall supply headroom of proposal sites.</p> <p>In light of your comments, Cabinet Office has amended Table 17 - summary of residential land provision to reflect the likely yield of development sites within the Plan period as well as the total likely yield.</p>		y
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		<p>Para 8.14.3 1 Should specify Supermarket (Bowring / Station Road) as there are other sup remarkets in the town The words "where possible" should be deleted as usual this diminishes the importance of built heritage. 8.17.3 There is no justification let alone factual basis for any of this. The Biosphere designation recognises the built heritage of the Island. This whole paragraph which simply seeks to diminish it should be eradicated.</p>	Cabinet Office agree that this proposal must be clearer in explaining where this proposal relates to and have amended the wording of Built Environment Proposal 1: Urban Regeneration.		Y
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		<p>Town Centres The continued mixing of made up locality names with street names is a nightmare throughout this chapter. The number of errors in identifying places suggests a lack of attention to detail. There is very little of distinguishing features from one area to another.</p>	This is covered in Core Document 71 - Townscape Character Assessments for Ramsey and Peel of which the recommendations of that paper are contained within the plan. Where required the names of streets or character areas has been clarified.		Y
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		9.3.4 it is West Quay not East Quay which is subject to flooding.	<p>Cabinet Office agree and propose the following amendment:</p> <p>9.3.4 Ramsey - The town centre in Ramsey is vulnerable to flood risk, particularly along the West Quay. Under-investment in quayside buildings has resulted in vacant properties and under-occupied urban sites that mar the public face of Ramsey. Consequently, there is a need for regeneration of these sites, together with sympathetic flood risk alleviation measures and public realm improvements, so as to enhance the public face of the town centre and bolster the local economy.</p>		Y
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		9.7.2 Should refer to Parliament Street not High Street	<p>Cabinet Office agree and propose the following amendment:</p> <p>9.7.2 There are three Character Areas within the historic core of Ramsey Town Centre that encompass a mix of land uses, namely: 1.The Quayside (East Quay and West Quay); 2. Parliament Street (Parliament Street East and Parliament Street West); and 3.Old South Ramsey.</p>		Y
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		9.7.3Castle Street does not lead to Michael Street; it does lead to Market Place	<p>Cabinet Office agree and propose the following amendment:</p> <p>9.7.3 The study for Peel identifies five Character Areas within the historic core of Peel Town Centre that encompass a mix of land uses, namely: 4. East Quay; 5. Market Place; 6. The High Street (Castle Street leading Market Place, Douglas Street, Michael Street and Athol Place); 7. The Waterfront (referred to as the Shore Promenade); and</p>		Y
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		9.8.6 Our L ady	Cabinet Office agree and "Lady" in "Our Lady Star of the Sea and St. Maughold Church" has been capitalised.		Y
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		9.9.2The use of the term High Street is just confusing Refer to Michael Street locality	<p>Cabinet Office agree and have reworded this paragraph to be specific to the Mix Use Area 6 - The High Street.</p> <p>MUA 5: Market Place - situated on the more elevated levels to the east of East Quay - comprises a small town square that serves as a key gateway into Mixed Use Area 6 - the High Street. The green space within the site of the former St. Peter's Church provides a welcome green lung for both local residents and visitors in an otherwise densely developed townscape. There is further scope for improvements to the townscape quality within Market Place.</p>		Y
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		9.8.5 Parliament Street between East Street and Christian Street is already included in Parliament Street East i.e overlapping.	Cabinet Office agree and have deleted the following from paragraph 9.8.5 "(including Parliament Street between East Street and Parliament Square)"		Y
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		No Waste Propo al 1 need renumbering of 2 and 3	Cabinet Office has made this amendment as part of the general re-numbering of proposals.		Y
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		National glens: These should be shown on Environmental constraints map if they are to be retained. Eleven National Glens exist in the area covered and in addition there are three gardens / arboretum. Development around these glens must recognise the importance including the setting of the glens. Without appearing either as a constraint on the constraints map or as land use on the proposals map their importance is diminished contrary to all other 'green' objectives put forward in this chapter.	Cabinet Office notes your comments regarding the Island's National Glens and have amended the Environmental Constraints maps to show National Glens in the North and West.	y	
ANON-UVCN-NKMV-R			Comment not specific to a Modification		Employment should be aligned with availability of childcare. There is a distinct lack of breakfast/after school clubs in the West - a reason many parents struggle to get suitable work. Peel Clothworkers is such a large school too.	The Area Plan for the North and West makes employment land proposals in line with the settlement hierarchy of the Strategic Plan. The Area Plan for the North and West includes safeguarded land in the vicinity of both Peel Clothworkers and QEII in order to allow both schools to expand in future if necessary. Wider capacity issues at Peel Clothworkers school was an issue addressed during the public inquiry.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK35-W		IOM Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group	Comment not specific to a Modification		<p>Comment not specific to a modification: We write as the IOM Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group, an elected and constituted representative and advisory organisation supporting commercial agricultural production alongside wildlife and biodiversity here on the Isle of Man. As an organisation we work alongside the MNFU and are party to the response already provided by that organisation. We wholly concur with the points made by the MNFU but as a separate organisation wish to amplify and make certain points in our own right.</p> <p>We are also mindful as an organisation following representations made to us by members of the significant size and area of buffer zones for key projects being far in excess of similarly identified areas on the adjacent isle. This zonation has the capacity for significant impact on practical farming activities, may also limit the development of key habitat areas on farm and as a consequence devalue land owned by the islands farming industry.</p>	<p>Cabinet Office notes your comments and those of others with regards to buffer zones around mineral sites in the Area Plan for the North and West.</p> <p>Mineral buffer zones as part of the Area Plan for the North and West were developed in cooperation with DEFA and their technical mineral advisors. The issue was discussed during inquiry sessions and Cabinet Office would refer to Inspector's Report paragraph 180 which states:</p> <p>"In the particular circumstances of the Isle of Man, the defined extent of Consultation Zones is justified, even though the threshold distances are greater than those generally applied in the UK".</p>		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		<p>Housing development is promoted on an unwarranted scale through the belief that affordable housing can be built most cheaply on greenfield sites and therefore the promotion of the latter is far in excess of need. Rather than assessing different parts of large suggested sites against other planning needs, it allocates whole ownerships of sites for development thus encouraging high prices for land rather than competitive prices. What developer is going to pay out and construct road links between sites that don't serve development on either side of the road link when he can gain access from a single point without having the road link of Braddan Road, Douglas where over 300 houses are going to be served by a single access point contrary to any enforcement of the policy for an overall masterplan (definition of a masterplan is that it has to be implementable and have agreement of all parties to implement it) a second road link and access to it. It gives far too great weight to factors for which technical evidence is either not available or held and promoted by non Government organisations. In site selection it does not give adequate weight, or even weight between potential sites, when considering availability of / proximity to / need for retail, public transport / reality of active travel (try walking a 4 year old child 2 miles to primary school and see how long this takes), employment and community facilities as against environmental considerations including flood assessment</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comments. Cabinet Office has undertaken a viability assessment in order to better understand the implications of various 'planning asks' on development viability. The report, which is available online, suggests that larger greenfield sites provide the greatest opportunity for scope to bear affordable housing contributions. Whilst issues around land ownership can be a consideration in determining sites to be proposed in an Area Plan, Cabinet Office has also considered sites deliverability to ensure there are adequate opportunities to meet needs over the plan period and in the medium term beyond.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office considers that the proposal for a link road for Peel forms an integral part of the masterplan for the overall development of both phases of the sites.</b></p> <p><b>As part of the site assessment process, Cabinet Office did consider the proximity of sites to existing community facilities, public transport links and potential for active travel links. These topics are all addressed in turn as part of the Development Brief for sites GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMC002 and GMR003.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		<p>The Town and Country Planning Act 1999 Schedule 1 makes it clear that the stages to be followed in creating an Area Plan are as follows Initial consultation, Public draft within 12 months i.e. 2022 draft [my emphasis] Consultation on draft Publication of response to consultation in the form of proposed modifications to the draft Inquiry on draft and proposed modifications Inspectors report Any further modifications by Cabinet Office in response to Inspectors report Consultation on further modifications something of a gap as to what happens to suggestions made in response to that consultation / adoption by Cabinet Office Report to Tynwald for approval or refusal i.e. no modifications allowed by Tynwald The Public Inquiry into the Draft Plan supposedly the 2022, not the 2024, draft was closed by the Inspector on 26th July 2024. The subsequent Inspector's Report states</p> <p>13. Consequent upon discussions during the Inquiry, CABO also put forward 29 suggested Additional Major Changes (AMCs) together, written evidence further to Inquiry discussions and rebuttals to the WRs [CODs1 34]. There were also certain written legal submissions regarding procedure [LS. All such post Inquiry documentation was posted in the online Inquiry Document Library and final responses accepted from CABO and Respondents as appropriate. The Act and Schedule do not allow for two drafts and major and minor changes. It does not allow for additional suggested changes post the closure of the Public Inquiry prior to the Inspector reporting on it.</p>	<p><b>Development Plans are produced following the Development Plan procedure set out in Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act. Following a Draft Plan in 2022, Cabinet Office issued a series of Public Inquiry Papers (PIPs) in advance of inquiry sessions to show changes proposed by the Department. Cabinet Office was clear at this stage, and throughout the Inquiry that the PIPs did not replace the Draft Plan (2022) and were for illustrative purposes only - to aid discussions at the Inquiry.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office therefore rejects that two separate Draft Plans were produced and maintains that the Department followed Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act in producing the Area Plan for the North and West.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		<p>In fact a total of 58 submissions are listed as being submitted after the Inquiry. I consider that in respect of some of the issues raised post Inquiry I was a respondent. I was never offered the opportunity to comment on these later responses. I was never aware that one had to keep watch on the web site to see what further information was submitted / changes proposed. As below in terms of both figures and sites I believe some of the major changes put forward by Cabinet Office were based on misleading information submitted post Inquiry. don't consider that adding additional information after the Inquiry that has not been heard or given to the Inquiry is following correct procedure. The Inspector's report states:</p> <p>Following public consultation on the Draft Plan from June to September 2022, the Cabinet Office Planning Policy Team (CABO) published a series of Public Inquiry Papers (PIPs) including 58 proposed Major Changes (MCs) to the Plan text and its accompanying maps [PIP1.1].</p> <p>In fact Cabinet Office produced a revised draft plan in 2024 with proposals maps. While the Inspector refers to various papers (PIPs), current documentation mixes these with the 2024 draft which the Inspector does not name anywhere.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes that the Inquiry website states clearly that the content of the site will be updated frequently so persons with an interest are advised to check the site on a daily basis.</b></p> <p><b>The Public Inquiry Papers (PIPs) were produced for illustrative purposes only - to show changes proposed by Cabinet Office to the Draft Plan and did not replace the Draft Plan (2022). This was made clear throughout the Inquiry process.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office therefore rejects that two separate Draft Plans were produced and maintains that the Department followed Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act in producing the Area Plan for the North and West.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		<p>Clause 2 (3) (c) of TCPA 1999 states "Any proposals in the plan must be accompanied by a reasoned justification for them. It would follow that the proposed changes to the plan should also be listed with a reasoned justification for them. This is not done. By virtue of Clause 6 (2) of Schedule 1 of the TCPA 1999 if the plan is to be altered from the draft, i.e. in this case the 2022 draft it also has to state "the general effect of the proposed modifications" The format produced in the consultation does not provide this and is anything but transparent</p> <p>For example Paper 3 Modification Number 55 "Re wording paragraph setting out Cabinet Office's approach in recognising that the Area Plan for the North and West may well remain in force beyond the end of the Plan Period and to this end, Cabinet Office looks to plan modestly beyond the end of the Plan Period in 2026</p>	<p><b>In preparing evidence for the Inquiry, the Cabinet Office was clear that the public inquiry papers, including the written statement and maps, were for illustrative purposes only and did not replace the Draft Plan 2022. Cabinet Office notes that PIP 1 (and PIP 1.1) did set out a list of major and minor changes proposed by Cabinet Office to the Draft Plan. The reason for each of these changes was also listed.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		<p>14 Table 16 - summary of residential land provision Summary of Residential Land use Provision E Total Allocated sites The total figure of 457 is meant to represent housing that can be built on allocated sites by March 2026. In fact 90% of the sites listed either are not subject of a current application or are subject of an application that has not yet had a final approval. 247 of the 457 planned housing units are represented by such sites in Ramsey, Peel and Kirk Michael alone. As a consequence any aspiration that this is primarily a plan unto 2026 is completely misleading. The likely housing figures are based on estimated densities of development. The Inspector recommended that the actual figure for these is removed from the text. Further, as witnessed by one possible development, the densities used in the calculations may be around 50% lower that what a developer seeks to construct on a site. Therefore land allocated could not only take a very long time to be utilised, the development densities are likely to be much higher. As such much less land is required. In reality the amount of land allocated is pre-empting proper consideration of settlement policy in the ongoing revision of the Strategic Plan</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comments and does acknowledge that once adopted, the Area Plan for the North and West will remain in force beyond the end of the Plan period (March 2026). Therefore, it is not the case that the Area Plan for the North and West is only a plan until March 2026 and instead seeks to ensure there are adequate opportunities to meet housing and other land requirements in the medium-term.</b></p> <p><b>Inspector's RMC 12, accepted by the Cabinet Office as M13, was referring to Built Environment Proposal 3 which related to minimum densities of net developable area. Cabinet Office initially proposed this change to the Draft Plan in order to encourage the most efficient use of land but did concede during inquiry sessions that it was perhaps overly prescriptive on future applicants. This being said, density calculations still form a part of the Area Plan in calculating site yields and are an important consideration in this regard.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		<p>The Inspector's report clearly muddles some of the facts in relation to the two different drafts, 2022 and 2024. Members of the public at the inquiry also did not know about some of the changes between the two drafts. At least some of these changes to sites may not have been assessed under the original selection criteria applied to sites suggested for development prior to the 2022 draft. The 2022 draft allocated a site which had been refused for development at appeal only on 1st March 2023. Inter alia the appeal Inspector's report identified that the development would be isolated from Ramsey by virtue of fields in between Ramsey and the site which were not allocated for development and were no part of the RR009 site.</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office notes your comment but as stated previously, the Department has followed Schedule 1 in producing the Area Plan for the North and West and Cabinet Office's case submitted to the Inquiry did not replace the Draft Plan as published in 2022.</b></p> <p><b>Cabinet Office has proposed land at lower Milntown (RR009) as part of the Area Plan taking into consideration the reasons for refusal for the previous planning application on the site, including that part of the site boundary directly adjacent to Lezayre Road, as shown on the 1982 Plan map (North) does not directly abut the settlement boundary of Ramsey. Cabinet Office does not propose a change in this regard and RR009 is to be retained as predominantly residential.</b></p>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		<p>Lists Ancient Monuments / Archaeology Sites in Legend but does not show on map. Proposal is to delete reference in Legend. Surely all the sites shown on the 1982 Development Plan for this area should be added in. There are 109 Ancient Monuments and a further 89 sites of archaeological interest shown on the latter in the North and West of the Isle of Man. Importance of such sites is not just limited to those identified in the Written Statement text. The importance of such sites has not changed and, unlike Areas of Ecological Importance, they are statutory. Some are in public ownership or guardianship. Information on the sites is available on the web but is not linked to the Government Manngis web site. It is therefore not otherwise readily available to planning when assessing development proposals</p>	<p><b>Cabinet Office note you comments and consider that it was appropriate to remove Ancient monuments from the constraints mapping of the Area Plan. Some of the Ancient Monuments and areas of archaeological interest shown on the 1982 Development Plan have later been found to be natural landscape features and have therefore been removed from the Area Plan for the North and West maps. The Archaeological significance of a site and the presence any Ancient Monuments were both factors considered as part of the site assessment process of the Area Plan for the North and West in consultation with Manx National Heritage.</b></p> <p><b>Ancient Monuments are afforded significant protection outwith the planning system by statute under the Manx Museum and National Trust Act (1959) and in Strategic planning policy such as Strategic Policy 4 of the Strategic Plan. The Area Plan for the North and West does recognise the significance of Ancient Monuments and their contribution to our landscape, listing some of the most significant at 9.40 of the Written Statement.</b></p>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		Para 8.3.1 Objective 3 How can the character of towns and villages be protected when there is no substantive analysis of it given in the plan whether buildings are single or two storey does not define character. The plan is incompetent in this respect. 8.6 Ramsey doesn't even mention it has a harbour let alone a commercial port and architecturally historical quayside 8.7.2 Peel It is not just infill development that relies on community facilities including primary and secondary school capacity ; new development on the outskirts will be beyond the capability of existing community facilities . Again these points were made in writing and verbally at the Inquiry but are simply ignored. Vacancy rates of 11% are NOT low. They are just lower than elsewhere.	Cabinet Office has produced a substantive evidence base on the town centres of Ramsey and Peel and has assessed townscape character in proposing townscape character areas for both town centres.  Paragraph 8.6 of the Written Statement is not meant to be an exhaustive assessment of the characteristics of Ramsey. PIP 9 - Townscape Character Assessments provides a full and detailed assessment of the character of the town centres of Peel and Ramsey, including recognising the harbour and historic quayside of both settlements.  Cabinet Office notes your comments and those of others regarding community facilities in Peel and does consider that there appropriate and possible, the Area Plan supports existing facilities - allowing room to expand in line with demand. The Department notes your comment on vacancy rates and does note that this figure sits below the average noted in the 2021 census report.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		Para 8.20 What is the point in only identifying the most notable. They are probably not the ones most at risk. As MANNGIS, the Island's mapping system does not encompass the Historic Environment Record produced by Manx National Heritage it is / should be important to identify all Ancient Monument Sites as per the Development Plan Maps 1982.	Some of the Ancient Monuments and areas of archaeological interest shown on the 1982 Development Plan have later been found to be natural landscape features and have therefore been removed from the Area Plan for the North and West maps. The Archaeological significance of a site and the presence any Ancient Monuments were both factors considered as part of the site assessment process of the Area Plan for the North and West in consultation with Manx National Heritage.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		9.8.1The Quayside ; West Quay, not East Quay	Cabinet Office notes your comment but considers that references to East Quay, Ramsey in this context are correct.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		Town Centre Proposal 1a West and East Quay character area 4 Delete "Where Possible" again this just diminishes the importance of the historic buildings and would allow developers simply to argue it is not possible to retain them. Such terminology is never used when it comes to the Natural Environment so why is there this consistent emotion of the Built Environment policies for which are the responsibility of Cabinet Office. 9.8.2 1 As above Delete "Where possible"	Cabinet Office note your comment but have not made a change in this regard to Town centre proposal 1a and 1b. Cabinet Office recognises the important contribution historic buildings make to town centres in the North and West but do consider it pertinent to note that it is not always possible or feasible to retain and renovate historic quayside buildings as part of development proposals.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		Urban tree planting would be totally out of character and quickly spoilt by vehicle exhaust fumes given the amount of the area devoted to parking. Where did the reason for including this come from not Inspector's report Para 9.9.3 Use of term High Street is just misleading Area names ? are being used side by side with actual street names. You should stick to the latter. Town Centre Proposal 6 Peel High Street again a misnomer Town Centre Proposal 7 the Waterfront? It is the beach / sea front if anything.	Cabinet Office note your comment but retain the wording of Town Centre Proposal 5: Market Place, Peel as far as it relates to Urban tree planting.  Cabinet Office note your comment regarding the use of the terms 'High Street' and 'Waterfront' in regards to Peel. The Department considers that the use of these terms is appropriate as these character areas cover a large number of streets and roads and to list these individually would be inappropriate in the Written Statement. This being said, paragraph 9.9.3 and 9.9.4 of the Written Statement do clarify some of the streets in these areas which is further shown in greater detail on map 7 - Peel Town Centre.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		10.1.3 Regrettably this reads as if it has been taken from another document. As witnessed by your allocations of development land in relation to full consideration of impact on the road system it just is not followed through e.g. Andreas Road and Lezayre Road Ramsey and suggestion for park and ride.	Increasing demand to make future bus services viable is supported by the Department of Infrastructure and implemented through this development plan.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		10.1.4 and 10.1.5 Reference to Area Plan for the East is inappropriate. In allocating land to the north of the Douglas to Peel Road and employment land to the south of it, it actually breaches any form of sustainable travel options as use of car or two buses minimum (Which is impracticable) is generated contrary to other greener aims of any development plan. In APNW development land is allocated where there are no employment areas and no sufficiently regular bus services how practical / green is that?	Employment land has been proposed in such a way as to be accessible to HGV's, industries that require bigger floor plates, limited disturbance to residential areas and for minimal loss of agricultural land. The increase in traffic movements is a necessary concession to create viable development opportunities that suit the future business that will occupy them.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		10.3 Objective 6 is substantial In changing the wording there appears to be an acknowledgement that allocation e.g. RR009 will have an impact downstream as was recognised at the Inquiry by the Inspector. However the outcome would require a reassessment of sites since some have been not considered due to flooding possibilities but in others flooding has been ignored.	Cabinet Office note your comments and note that a critical constraint was triggered as part of the site assessment if the site was at risk of fluvial or tidal flooding and outside of the settlement boundary. Cabinet Office note that no sites in Ramsey were discounted solely on flood risk.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification	RR009	Objective 6a Allocation of site s such as RR009 d should be taken out if this is to be an objective. Tynwald already forced developers to undertake remedial action to properties downstream on the Glen Auldyn River because of this risk of flooding. This will just be increased substantially by the allocation of RR009.	The Department of Transport report prepared by Bullen Consultants recommended that developments be protected from flooding to the height of 5.75 meters above sea level. The proposed development of RR009 sits above this level in its entirety as proposed whereas RR004 sits at just above or below this level. Cabinet Office have therefore proceeded with RR009 for proposed development.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		10.5 Traffic flows at Parliament Square Junction in Ramsey as originally drafted this did not include allocation of sites at Vollar Fields and Ballacarbery (LR001 over 17 hectares with access from Andreas road) both in North Ramsey and Lezayre Road. It is insufficient to simply recognise that the problem will increase and not propose any remedial action.	Junction improvements and traffic generation will be assessed with any mitigating measures at the application stage and this plan only identifies those issues early but is not for the plan to address directly.  Please see the development brief for site RR009, in particular point 5 in relation to Transport Assessment for strategic junctions including Parliament Square.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		10.5.2 This suggested change / statement is hardly likely to be applicable now given there is no employment land or alternative shopping or school facilities or even a regular bus service which will alleviate let alone take the necessity of using this junction. This paragraph is therefore totally worthless.	Cabinet Office notes this comment.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		10.6.1 What are "preferred sites". It is accepted there may be little change before the 2026 deadline but this plan is meant now to look beyond that . Ag aim it makes the plan worthless and the statement pointless. 10.6.2 iii The add in note seems to recognise t his. This makes the objectives of the plan and the plan itself even more useless. This is totally unfounded / unproven given hundred plus houses proposed for certain sites and unnecessary given the changes in 10.5.2. Traffic numbers will increase significantly along some routes and junctions will be much busier. This paragraph which was not recommended by the Inspector should be removed. 10.7 .1 Added in response to concerns expressed after the public inquiry i.e not in public consultation There were three airfields in the north Hall Caine Airport being the third. The current Jurby airfield as shown in the 1982 Development plan map should surely be shown on the Infrastructure constraints map	The DOI intend on reviewing their future airport and runway needs as part of a separate process outside of the Area Plan.  The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		10.8 Transport Proposal 2 reads as if Tynwald could approve removal of the MER in order to use it as a cycle route for weekend cyclists . It is a dangerous statement and the inclusion of it is dubious. Minerals 10.1 5. 3 There are other non working quarry sites in the north both for hard rock and sand viz Star ch Mills / Ballacuborough in the Sulby Valley (hard rock) and Cronk Breck near the coast in Jurby (sand) which are shown on the Isle of Man Development Plan 1982 and were still operational until at least the 1990s Minerals Proposal 4 should include reference to restarting previous mineral workings otherwise it could be argued this proposal does not apply to long closed / non operating quarries at Dhoon, Dreemskerry Starch Mill Sulby Valley , Gob y Volley etc	Transport and Utilities Proposal 2 makes no mention of the MER route for active travel routes. The Area Plan for the North and West recognises the importance of the MER as a secondary link as noted in the Key Diagram of the Strategic Plan and where development is likely to be close to the existing line (in the case of GR022) development brief criteria relate to ensuring the setting of the railway is not adversely affected.  Regarding which minerals sites the Area Plan makes specific reference to, Cabinet Office have taken advice from DEFA on which mineral workings should be included and did consider sites not in operation such as Cronk y scotty. There is further opportunity to look again at minerals policies as part of the Strategic Plan and future Island Area Plan but at this moment the provisions of the Area Plan are considered adequate.		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		11.10.2 Wording inappropriate Should recognise that at least half of the industrial allocation has now been superseded by the approval and rezoning of the land for silt storage and for sewage treatment works	<b>Cabinet Office note your comment. As acknowledged at paragraph 11.10 of the Written Statement, there are a variety of non-employment uses in the vicinity of Mill Road, including silt storage and the site for the RSTW. Cabinet Office do note that the planning approval for use of field 315179, Mill Road for a silt store was temporary and that the land would revert to industrial use once this activity has come to an end.</b>  <b>There is a net increase of Employment Land in the Plan Area and opportunities still exist for employment land development on both PR001 (Barfords), PR010 (Faulknors) and on other plots on Mill Road.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		Tourism 12.3.1 Totally wrong to add in abundant wildlife not a land use or topographical factor in itself. Not in Inspector's report. Unjustified. The wildlife could be destroyed by uncontrolled visitor pressure and wildlife sites are not necessarily open to the public. Just appears to add to the impression of MWT seeking to control whole planning process.	<b>The promotion of the Islands wildlife is a unique selling point promoted by Visit Isle of Man.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		Open Space and Community Recommendation 2 planting schemes should add subject to the limitation imposed on tree planting of 5% incorporated in the TCPA .	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification	RR004	Housing 14.3.6 90% of housing sites allocated for development up to 2026 are not even the subject of a planning application let alone a consent. It is self deluding that the targets set can be met by March 2026 . This is not a plan for just a year and there is little point in proposing that it is. Given the Inquiry including the Inspector recognised that the pro rata calculations were done on the total misconception that development on sites had to be undertaken within 4 years instead of started within 4 years the figures should be recalculated and sites which have some opportunity of gaining planning consent but been turned down in your site selection process contrary to all other outcomes already stated, included in the allocations e.g. Ballachrink RMC 62 While the recognition of soil capability may be welcomed; the assessment should be undertaken before the allocation of sites not after it. The plan is wholly deficient in this respect and it is one of the major reasons it should not be adopted. It will be only too easy for developers to ignore examples of soil which do fall within the protected categories	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment. Cabinet Office have carefully assessed the developability and deliverability of development sites proposed as part of the Area Plan for the North and West and in most cases development sites have been supported throughout the process by a willing landowner and/or developer. Cabinet Office recognise the importance of deliverability of development sites in ensuring that the plan can provide adequate future development opportunities for the North and West.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office further maintain that the approach to pro-rata the housing yield on development sites within the Plan is an appropriate way to gauge the delivery of development sites as tested during Inquiry sessions.</b>  <b>Following Inquiry sessions and the Inspector's recommendation, Cabinet Office included development brief criteria for the assessment of soil capacity as part of greenfield development where class 1 and 2 soils were present. Prior to the adoption of the Plan, Cabinet Office removed this criteria however on the basis that there are no class 1 or 2 soils present in the North or West of the Island.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification	RR009	Para 357 14.10.2 is erroneous in that the Eastern field of the revised allocation was not part of the previous planning application that was refused at appeal Para 358 14.10.3 I inspectors report appears totally muddled about flooding area. Flooding g north of the railway mostly relates to the previous planning application and Site RR009 as denoted in the 2022 draft plan. Para 359 Revision of the boundaries of Site RR009 as proposed at the public inquiry took in Field 134281 previously donated as open n space in 2022 draft. This field was never given a separate allocation number has always been shown as substantially adversely impacted by high risk of river flooding (from the Glen Auldyn River). Its allocation is therefore contrary to other objectives of the plan concerning the non allocation of land for development which is subject to flooding in itself and likely to cause downstream flooding of existing property. The non allocation of the land previously in extant Ramsey Town Plan and as repeated in 2022 and assumed to be understood as part of that draft was always because of the flooding risk in that area. It has never had anything to do with the figure of housing assessment.	<b>Site RR009 at the time of the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022) reflected a live planning application that was explored through that process.</b>  <b>The provision of open space was part of that application. The site proposer made amendments to their proposals that addressed those concerns raised at the application stage and the draft plan was subsequently amended to reflect what is now proposed.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification	RR009, LR001	It is noted that CODs 105 108 submitted after the Inquiry appear deliberately misleading in that housing sites are shown on top of and blanking out the full extent of areas subject to river, tidal and surface water flooding. This is particularly relevant in the cases of RR009 and LR001 and may have led to the Inspector's apparently muddled statements and conclusions / recommendations in respect of these sites.	<b>Cabinet Office note your comment but do note that Core Documents 105 - 108 (Updated flood risk mapping) were submitted during the Inquiry, not afterwards, and discussed at a session before the Inspector with a representative from the Department of Infrastructure, Flood Management Division (FMD) present at the time. The mapping evidence shown in Core Documents 105-108 was prepared wholly by the FMD within the Department of infrastructure and Cabinet Office had no input into its production nor how this evidence was submitted to the Inquiry. This being said, Cabinet Office do consider that the mapping evidence allows for a full and proper assessment of the flood risk posed to a number of sites in the North and West.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification	MR007, MR008	Kirk Michael Para 334 & 335 Site MR007 & MR008 There is no proven need substantiating this allocation to greatly expand Kirk Michael in advance of reconsideration n of settlement policy in the revised Strategic plan consultation on which has already taken place but no analysis of response has been published and the problems encountered by being an area trapped inside the TT course. No justification is given for the e policy or for the change from the 2022 draft. Para 340 Site MR 007 / 8 Field 230794 appears to be totally outside of the proposed allocation. It should not now be included.	<b>The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification	PR002, GMR008, GMR009, GMR023, GMR003 and GMC002	Peel 14.10.2 The allocation of Sites GMR008, GMR009, GMR2023, GMR003 and GM C002 represents total overprovision of housing in advance of reconsideration of settlement policy in the revised Strategic plan consultation on which has already taken place but no analysis of response has been published	<b>The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification	LR001	Ramsey 14.10.12 Site LR001 Ballacarbery Para 393. CABO accepts should an increase in supply be warranted" . In advance of reconsideration of settlement policy in the revised Strategic plan consultation on which has already taken place but no analysis of response has been published allocation of this site is unjustified. This is a large site of 15.67ha on the north west edge of Ramsey to be served from Andreas Road. How would the sole access to Ramsey Town Centre via the stone bridge cope given the Vullan Fields allocation as well. How will surface water flooding be catered for?	<b>Cabinet Office note your comment. There were no constraints presented at the inquiry that would preclude the land at Ballacarbery from being proposed for residential use. A Planning application will examine any further issues regarding traffic and drainage or what mitigating measures need to be in place at that stage.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification	PTR004(b)	Foxdale 14.10.14 Para 346 PTR004 b South of Mines Road should include reference to assessment of historical mine remains and how they will be treated.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment and considers that the development brief for PTR004(b) makes reference to the mine workings which can be explored as part of the planning application process.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Comment not specific to a Modification		14.11.2 figure of 1540 is from 2011=20 26 already large number provided so will be over provision Estimate of housing figures is totally unrealistic and is based on a false understanding of how planning consents are given. This was proven at the Inquiry both by the Inspector and others in terms of written submissions. The Cabinet Office based their estimates on a quarter of all sites with outstanding planning consents or planning applications having to be built by the end of the plan period. This was based on a complete misunderstanding b y Cabinet Office that any consent given was only valid for a period of four years. In fact any consent given only has to be started within four years so very few of the figures q quoted are accurate e and most based on this false assumption. Moreover densities s are quite likely to be far higher than estimated. For example Vullan Fields is estimated as having a full capacity of 109 dwellings. Planning consent (still subject to appeal) has been given for 153.Any sites without a valid consent are unlikely to now be built within this time frameThus the total housing estimate that the allocations could achieve is completely array and the density of development will destroy the Manx landscape without, based on previous large developments in Peel give any benefits to the individual settlements due to the lack of employment opportunities in them.	<b>Housing densities and likelihood of development assumptions come from the Residential Land Availability study which has all housing approvals, completions and lapses since 2001. Yield assumptions have already been proved to be accurate not only in this plan, but within the Area Plan for the East. The Likely yield column in the All sites table is the quantum of housing which takes into account that some sites will not be developed for the purposes of calculating the final yield for the plan. RR006 has an assumed developable housing of 198, not 109. However the application that came forward for 153 units reserved some land for a school which lowered the quantity.</b>		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NK3H-G		Ramsey Town Commissioners	Comment not specific to a Modification		In the first instance it is of note that at this stage, the plan has become very difficult to navigate because of the way the amendments are presented. It requires a high degree of application in reading the amendments and then cross-referencing back to the original to fully assess the impact of the proposed change. It is asked that in the future exercises, this is reflected upon and a more easily navigable process developed	Cabinet Office notes this feedback and have made every attempt to ensure that the proposed modifications to the Draft Area Plan for the North and West are as accessible as possible.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3H-G		Ramsey Town Commissioners	Comment not specific to a Modification	RR004	Ballachrink The site is currently being stripped. It was noted that despite the view of the inspector of this being an unsuitable site, an approval in principle has been granted subject to normal arrangements. This contention of the Plan with a decision from the planning office was noted as a concern. One of the key purpose of any plan is to provide terms of reference for both developers and interested parties. Where decisions are made outside of the parameters, it reduces the validity and credibility of the document.	Cabinet Office notes your comment. The site in question is not proposed as part of the Area Plan but the Department does note that the area is proposed for development as part of the Ramsey Local Plan 1998. The Local Plan will remain a material consideration on planning applications in Ramsey until replaced by the Area Plan for the North and West. The Area Plan will come into operation once approved by Tynwald.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK8A-E			Comment not specific to a Modification	BR010	We continue to strongly object to this proposed zoning of agricultural land to residential. As stated previously if this zoning goes ahead it is going to affect so many people in the village in one way or another. We have lived in Ballaugh for 15 years and have always been here for T.T. Although extra traffic is inevitable and as a lover of T.T. the parking near to Ballaugh Bridge would have to be witnessed to know that every nearby road and Cul de sac is virtually blocked by parked cars and bikes causing an access issue for emergency services if needed. The main worry for us is that our home and others which adjoins the field in question definitely does flood with surface water throughout the winter and building houses/bungalows there will undoubtedly cause issues for us residents that will be affected, by development due to flooding. The field has a gradual slope towards a number of properties but hey how as long as the developers, owners etc. of this field are only affected, by a bigger bank balance then I guess they won't care!! The access from this field is also another area that is well known to surface flooding. We sit and watch the hares run and play, 5 at a time in this field which is a wonderful sight, but we guess they will have to find a new home!The general feeling around the village is against this proposed zoning of BR010 as proven by a signed petition of 124 residents, collected in just a few days. Unfortunately, a lot of people that are against it will not put pen to paper to object as it takes an awful lot of understanding and effort. These consultations take far too long and are too complicated for most people to fully understand. This is our view and of everyone we have spoken to over the last few days.	Cabinet Office notes your continued objection to the proposal of BR010 but the site is to be retained as proposed for predominantly residential development as part of the Area Plan. Additionally Cabinet Office notes that the site was proposed in the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022) and is therefore not the subject of a specific modification to the Draft Plan as published.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKM3-N		Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	Comment not specific to a Modification		1.1 We would refer to our original submission, referenced above which referred to this site which is not shown on the draft plan or modified draft plan as being for residential development.1.2 We made written representation to the inquiry to ask that the site is included as part of the residential area (see below justification).1.3 Despite having made a written submission to the inquiry, there is no reference in the inspector's report to it, nor have the points we raised been addressed. 1.4 We would hope that, despite not being a comment in respect of the proposed Modifications, that this omission may be addressed in this last stage of the area plan process and proper consideration be paid to comments which were dutifully made at the correct time and through the appropriate process. 1.5 We refer to this site which lies between two existing dwellings - Barony View to the north and Fieldhead to the south. The site has a frontage of approximately 31m to the Glen Mona Loop Road which runs south from the settlement of Glen Mona and re-joins the A2 east coast road around 1km to the south. The site extends between 75m and 107m to the east. 1.6 The site is alongside the Manx Electric Railway which crosses the Loop Road just to the west of the frontage of the site. 1.7 Our submission is that this site should be designated for Predominantly Residential use and also that the settlement boundary should be reconsidered. 2.0 Submission 2.1 The site has planning approval for the erection of a dwelling. Approval in Principle was granted under 18/00200/A and reserved matters approval was granted under 22/01558/ REM. Development has not yet commenced on site. The approval of the reserved matters was granted on 28th February, 2023 with the development to commence prior to 28th February, 2025. That approval was then further extended under 24/90997/B.	Cabinet Office notes your comments. Cabinet Office notes that the Inspector is clear (at paragraph 9 of his report) that all submissions, written representations and responses to the original Draft Plan consultation (2022) were taken into account in the Drafting of his report and the forming of its recommendations.  Cabinet Office notes your support for this area of land but do not consider that it would be appropriate to be proposed as predominantly residential as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKM3-N		Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	Comment not specific to a Modification		The modified draft plan appears to have taken the MER line as the eastern boundary of the settlement, and the proposed development area GR022 as the southern extent. This ignores the existing dwellings which sit to the west, east and south of the MER and which run contiguously with either built development or proposed development land - Ballasholague to the west of the Loop Road, Archallagan and Barony View to the east of the MER and to the south, Glen Mona Bungalow, the submission site, Fieldhead, Reayrt Cornah, Ballaholague Cottage and Cedar Lodge. The inclusion for development of GR021 visually joins the existing school with the rest of the village and the submission site would perform a similar function with Fieldhead and the housing to the south of that. As noted by the Minister in the appeal referred to above, the site is clearly infill and we would now go further and suggest that it is visually and functionally part of Glen Mona as envisaged in the modified Draft Area Plan. Glen Mona is identified as a settlement in the Strategic Plan (Spatial Policy 4) where development can provide for local housing need and where appropriate to provide opportunities for employment. The inclusion of GR021 and GR022 clearly establish that Glen Mona is suitable for additional development at quite a large scale compared with the extent of the existing built form. The settlement boundary however, appears to follow a rather arbitrary boundary, omitting a number of peripheral properties that are visually and functionally part of the settlement (Strawberry Cottage, Glen Shone, Fuchsia Cottage, Ballacholague, Archallagan, Glen Mona Cottage, Barony View, Fieldhead, Reayrt Cornah, Ballaholague Cottage and Cedar Lodge).	Infill development' is defined in Appendix 1 of the Strategic Plan which notes that such development may be acceptable in built up areas but that the value of spaces between buildings should not be underestimated, even in smaller settlements.  Cabinet Office do not agree that the site in question, visually or functionally, forms part of the village of Glen Mona as it currently stands. Cabinet Office reject that the settlement boundary as shown on Map 16 is arbitrary and are content with its position with regards to the existing built fabric of Glen Mona.  No changes are proposed in this regard.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKM3-N		Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	Comment not specific to a Modification		One of the implications of the designation of land as predominantly residential rather than not for a particular purpose, is that not only would the principle of new development be considered favourably (and in this respect, as the principle of residential development here in the form of a single dwelling, this would reinforce the current situation) but any proposal for replacement, alteration and extension would only be subject to the tests set out in General Policy 2 and those existing dwellings would not be required to satisfy the criteria set out in the suite of Housing Policies - 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16. These policies are clearly designed to be applicable to houses and sites in the countryside where isolated buildings have a much more significant and prominent impact and where the tests contained in these Housing Policies are entirely reasonable, arguably essential. Where a property sits in a line of other dwellings, within minutes' walk of the centre of a settlement, it is not considered reasonable or appropriate that its replacement, for example, should be subject to it being on the footprint of the existing, no greater than 50% larger than what exists or either innovative and modern or traditional or indeed any of the other tests in Housing Policy 14, when the salient considerations should be those set out simply in General Policy 2. As most of the existing properties in this area are modern, any applications for extension would also be subject to the tests in Housing Policy 16 that any such work which increased the public visual impact of the building should be presumed against, when similar properties only a little over 200m away are not subject to the same constraints and are subject to a completely different set of policies.	Cabinet Office maintain that it would not be appropriate for the site to be included within the settlement boundary of Glen Mona as shown on Map 16 of the Area Plan for the North and West. Further to this, Cabinet Office maintain that it is appropriate that the site's status as 'countryside' in strategic planning terms links to the appropriate policies in the Strategic Plan 2016.		
BHLF-UVCN-NKM3-N	Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy		Comment not specific to a Modification		2.2 The approval in principle was approved on appeal, the application having been initially refused by the Planning Committee. The Minister who overturned the refusal, stated the following: "I can confirm that by reason of the fact that the site is surrounded by the residential curtilages of two properties, Barony View to its north and Fieldhead to its south, and by the fact that it doesn't have any boundary with the open countryside to its west, in the Minister's opinion this results in the site being seen and perceived as an 'infill' development within the surrounding pattern of residential development along this part of the Glen Mona Loop Road, such that of itself and in this context, it does not read as being in the 'open countryside'. Furthermore, and notwithstanding the fact that there will be a new building sited to the foreground of the appeal site with the proposed front building line being that of the adjacent dwellings, in the Minister's opinion, this will not adversely block view of the countryside to the rear which is elevated in nature and form compared to the appeal site. When set in this context, therefore, I can confirm that the Minister is not persuaded that the character and quality of the surrounding countryside and its landscape would be harmed by granting permission to the proposal. As such, I can confirm that the Minister is of the opinion that the proposal satisfies the provisions of Environment Policies 1 and 2 and in that regard I can confirm that the Minister attaches determining weight to this in the planning balance exercise. Finally, and in respect of the matter of sustainability and the Minister's consideration of the proposal against the provision of Strategic Policy 10 of the Isle of Man Strategic Plan, 2016, I can advise that the Minister notes the comments of the Inspector at paragraph 30 in his report such that other forms of public transport are available to any potential occupiers of the proposed dwelling."	Cabinet Office notes your comments but the site is to remain as countryside and is not proposed for development in the Area Plan for the North and West.		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NKQF-C		Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	Comment not specific to a Modification	PTR011	A written submission was made in support of the designation of this land for residential use and the case put forward to the inquiry is set out at Appendix One of this document. The inspector refers to the submission as follows: "425. This 0.12ha undeveloped site, fronting the east side of the A27 through Dalby, could potentially accommodate two infill houses between existing dwellings, Kinsale and Driftwood. Dalby includes several properties under refurbishment or new development following planning approvals. 426. The site was assessed as developable and I accept that an appropriately designed small residential scheme could be a suitable further addition to the village, subject to detailed consideration of all planning effects. However, the land is outside the defined settlement boundary of Dalby and I see no evidence of local housing need or special justification for allocating Site PTR011 in the APNW. I therefore make no recommendation in this respect. But potential variation of settlement boundaries might be a question in relation to the IMSPR and meanwhile any proposal would fall to be considered on individual merit." We are heartened that the inspector states that an appropriate design small residential scheme could be a suitable further addition to the village, subject to detailed consideration of all planning effects and this reflects the permission that was formerly granted on the site (96/01550/A). However, we take issue with his suggestion that the potential variation of settlement boundaries might be a question in relation to the Isle of Man Strategic Plan Review. The Strategic Plan is not the vehicle which defines settlement boundaries and is largely a non geographical document. We note that in other settlements within the same tier in the settlement hierarchy, settlement boundaries have been changed to facilitate new development - Ballaugh and Glen Mona for example where much more significant areas are now included in the settlement boundary.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comments in support of this site and also note that the Strategic Plan (Spatial Policy 4) states that it is for Area Plans to define the development boundaries of such settlements so as to maintain their existing character.</b>  <b>This being said, Cabinet Office are not minded to make a change to the status of this site in this regard and the site is not proposed as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKQF-C		Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	Comment not specific to a Modification	PTR011	We are struggling to understand why in this case the inspector, and Cabinet Office in accepting his recommendation, chose not to take the opportunity to change the boundary in the case of Dalby where, as the inspector concludes, a development could be a further suitable addition to the settlement. The inspector states that there is no social need or special justification for additional housing in Dalby but we are unaware that there was a need for such a demonstration as there would not appear to have been such in the cases of Glen Mona and Ballaugh where additional land was designated for development. The inspector is not critical of the proposal in the sense of any environmental impact and raises no harm as a result of development here. It is our belief that it is the Area Plan not the Strategic Plan's responsibility to define settlement boundaries in response to development needs. In fact, looking at the preliminary documents which defined the settlement boundaries, there have been proposed changes to almost all, if not all of the settlements as a result of proposed residential development opportunities, including Dalby where the preliminary documents show the former scout hut site at the southern end of the hamlet as being outside the settlement boundary but it is now designated for development and is redefined as being within it. There is clearly a need for additional housing opportunities in the plan area and other designations which have been proposed and/or accepted by Cabinet Office demonstrates that every tier in the settlement hierarchy has its part to play in contributing to meet this need. Dalby is no different and the proposal is proportionately modest as to meet any local need which may arise, as the Strategic Plan Spatial Policy 4 states is the role of this level of settlement.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comments in support of this site and also note that the Strategic Plan (Spatial Policy 4) states that it is for Area Plans to define the development boundaries of such settlements so as to maintain their existing character.</b>  <b>This being said, Cabinet Office are not minded to make a change to the status of this site as part of the Area Plan for the North and West and the site should remain as shown on Map 17 - Dalby.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKQF-C		Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	Comment not specific to a Modification	PTR011	The amount of housing which could arise from the allocations made in Ballaugh and Glen Mona are surely far in excess of purely local need and yet have been accepted with no question of the amount or existence of local need. We would request that this site is predesignated as being within the settlement boundary and providing an opportunity for a modest addition to the local housing supply.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your comment, Cabinet Office has set out the Department's stance to site selection and satisfying the 'outstanding need' at paragraph 14.7.1 of the Written Statement. This paragraph sets out that proposal sites are located so as to help meet local need in smaller settlements (such as Sulby, Ballaugh and Glen Mona) which have retained village pubs, school and other community facilities - non of which are present in Dalby.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVA-C			Comment not specific to a Modification	PTR011	I am emailing directly as the plan has gone on so long now and the consultation hub processes for objection is so convoluted and complicated for a layperson to understand that I feel there is little other way of getting my points across for this particular site. To have my written objection which took an awful lot of time and effort to put together, alongside 124 local signatories basically ignored and glossed over in three paragraphs by the inspector just adds to my feelings that the process is, and has always been a done deal. Other sites put forward in the plan have been thrown out for much less than my reasons for objection on this land. A short rebuttal of the Inspectors brief comments is below; The land is zoned as high flood risk. The inspector feels building on part of the site not at risk will be fine. Any buildings or hardstanding on the site will cause increased issues in the areas around it. This has been proven to be the case in Royal Park and	<b>Cabinet Office notes your continued objection to the proposal of BR010 but the site is to be retained as proposed for predominantly residential development as part of the Area Plan. Additionally Cabinet Office notes that the site was proposed in the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022) and is therefore not the subject of a specific modification to the Draft Plan as published.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVA-C			Comment not specific to a Modification		The issues with potential residents parking in and around the village during TT causing congestion and extra car movement at already busy times was ignored also. I cannot stress enough how busy Ballaugh gets during racing. A resident from this new estate rushing to get out before a road closure (or ignoring the closure) could have serious consequences. Building new estates inside the course places undue risk on the competitors and unneeded pressure on race organisers and officials such as marshals. The more logical extension to the village would be in an area which has access to the A10 during race periods, such as land behind the Glebe Aalin estate, which could then extend around over time. To build a small number of houses blocked in doesn't make sense. I also worry that due to the number of dwellings being proposed for the site the future developer will not be obliged to provide any affordable housing. In all likelihood these will be expensive bungalows beyond the means of local people. They would appeal to retirees from the UK, further fuelling our housing crisis. To say the land is next to an active travel route is plainly wrong, it is next to a heritage railway footpath. It is muddy and not suitable for commuting, neither would it be if it was surfaced, it doesn't lead to any employment centres. You can only get as far as Sulby one direction and Glen Wyllin the other. No one other than an extremely keen cyclist would commute daily to Douglas from Ballaugh anyway. All these houses will require cars. Zoning additional land in employment centres such as Ramsey would be much more environmentally friendly. I note the most walkable site in the plan (Poyll Dooley) is suggested to not be zoned! Yet open fields on the outskirts of Ramsey near Milntown and on Bride Road (which would likely require car drop off to school etc) are being zoned. I'm not sure how this fits with well publicised climate targets.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your continued objection to the proposal of BR010 but the site is to be retained as proposed for predominantly residential development as part of the Area Plan. Additionally Cabinet Office notes that the site was proposed in the Draft Area Plan for the North and West (2022) and is therefore not the subject of a specific modification to the Draft Plan as published.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKVZ-5	Ken Milne	Department of Environment, Food and Agriculture	Comment not specific to a Modification		Referencing Paper 1: Report to the Cabinet Office....., paragraph 179. With regards to the statement that development proposals will be subject to assessment, we wish to query how this will be monitored? Presumably, the planning application boundary will be uploaded into a GIS (or similar) database and any constraints affected (e.g. mineral safeguarding area/buffer zone) will be flagged and then the relevant statutory consultee asked to comment?	<b>Cabinet Office note your comment and confirm that this is how statutory consultees will be approached for comment.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK78-4	Robert Keith Dalrymple		Comment not specific to a Modification		Minor changes generally provide descriptive correction, explanation and clarification, however, overall there is no recognition that the desired objectives and outcomes of the various chapters and aspects of the plan are intrinsically linked and to a great extent interdependent.	<b>Cabinet Office notes this comment and will prepare a summary outlining objectives and outcomes and how they have been addressed by the plan.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NKQD-A		Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	Minor Change 72		We would refer to our original submissions, referenced above which referred to these two sites. They were identified as Residential on the Ramsey Local Plan of 1989 but changed to Open Space in the draft Area Plan for the North and West (APNW). The Modified draft Area Plan which was submitted to the inquiry showed the northern site (shown in orange below) as wholly residential with which we are content, but the southern site (shown in green below) is residential but also partly shown as an area of green space. It is this area of green space to which the inquiry submission referred. Despite having made a written submission to the inquiry, there is no reference in the inspector's report to it, nor has the point we raised been addressed. We would hope that, despite not being a comment in respect of the proposed Modifications, that this omission may be addressed in this last stage of the area plan process and proper consideration be paid to comments which were dutifully made at the correct time and through the appropriate process. Excerpt from the draft Area Plan: the area edged red is that which we would request is included as Residential. We would request that all of the site which formed part of the planning approval for the erection of a dwelling on this southern site (23/00465/B), is included as residential - i.e that the green area up to the hammerhead turning space, is changed from Open Space (green) to Predominantly Residential (pink). This planning permission remains valid until September 2027. All of the area referred to above is within the settlement boundary and all is within the residential curtilage of the approved dwelling referred to above and thus benefits from Permitted Development rights.	Cabinet Office notes the status of planning application 23/00465/B and have amended Map 4 - Ramsey	Y	
BHLF-UVCN-NKQD-A		Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	Minor Change 72		The site is highly sustainable within walking distance of the town centre and its shops, amenities and employment as well as the town's primary and secondary schools. It also has no notable vegetation or habitat other than trees and mostly large shrubs around the periphery and any trees of significant size are protected outwith the planning system under the Tree Preservation Act 1993.	Cabinet Office notes the status of planning application 23/00465/B and have amended Map 4 - Ramsey	y	
BHLF-UVCN-NKQD-A		Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	Minor Change 72		The area of proposed green space incorporates the entrance to the approved property and the approved property's garden, and is not an area landscaped space worthy of specifically identifying as green or open space. The identification of this area as Open Space would conflict with the approval that has granted permission for the site to be a residential curtilage with the Permitted Development Rights which go hand in hand with that, along with the presumption in favour of development as set out in General Policy 2 of the Strategic Plan. Trees are protected by the Tree Preservation Act 1993 and the Environmental Constraints map does not show this area as being of ecological or tree-related interest or value. We believe that the site should be residential in its entirety as approved under 23/00465/B shown below. We would ask that the entirety of the curtilage of the approved dwelling, as shown in 23/00465/B below is designated as Predominantly Residential. This would result in the Area Plan and the planning approval being consistent and would also ensure that this area to the east of the approved residential plot, is properly maintained. There is no physical boundary between it and the approved residential curtilage and unlikely to be distinguishable therefrom.	Cabinet Office notes the status of planning application 23/00465/B and have amended Map 4 - Ramsey	Y	
BHLF-UVCN-NK3T-V			Paper 7 - Minor change 121		121 - I object to the removal of 7.18 dark skies. Dark sky sites are an important component of the West and are not provisioned for in the Strategic Plan. This section should remain.	Cabinet Office note that the countryside at large is afforded significant policy protection through the provisions of the Strategic Plan. In particular, Environment Policy 22 iii) which relates specifically to noise pollution.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK36-X			Paper 7 - proposed Change 121		Why is all information with regard to Dark Skies omitted. There is no discussion of this in the draft or at Public Inquiry. It is not suggested as an RMC.	Cabinet Office note that the countryside at large is afforded significant policy protection through the provisions of the Strategic Plan. In particular, Environment Policy 22 iii) which relates specifically to noise pollution.		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			Paper 7 - Proposed Change 158		Proposed Change Number 158 Rewording of Plan Outcome to read: 'Average speed and average journey times remain within acceptable tolerances' enforcing active travel in an area which has extremely poor bus services, lack of taxi services and other means of getting around is hypocritical. The Government should first be able to provide regular services which travel to destinations via the fastest route (i.e. from Ramsey, this is not going via peel) on a regular timing basis (1 per hour s not good enough in the mornings) and gets you to a place of need at a time suitable. Those in the north also must contend with very high elevations, making it unattainable for the average person to cycle. The travel within the zones such as peel, Ramsey etc also would not be viable. The pathways should be first looked at and reinstated, regularly kept up to an excellent condition (rather like the TT course) so these are usable. Making it pedestrian havens where you are unable to drive into a town or shopping area with decimate these areas as a majority of the residents are elderly, non working and require the ability to park nearby any facilities. The current system works well. It would be of benefit to enable a full restoration of the railway line for cycle purposes, removing cycles from the main road which is a cause of concern and potential accidents when it is used by multiple cycle groups and cyclists who are not wearing visible clothing or lights.	The Cabinet Office does not set transport policy. Instead, it aims to support the ambitious goals and objectives established by the Department for Infrastructure through the planning system.		
ANON-UVCN-NKXH-N			Paper 7 - Proposed Change 158		10.9.9 10.12.2 - sewage / sustainability - it has reported that there was an increase of just over 400 residents to the island in the last 5 years. Where therefore does this immense housing need come from? Also before any new housing is built there should be an infrastructure to cope, especially in waste both household and sewage which we are still pumping into the sea. The sustainability with wind should be scrapped as it will go against the biodiversity points continually raised in this plan, and instead solar, biomass and hydro considered.	Cabinet Office note your comment. The approach of the Department, which was found to be in general conformity with the Strategic Plan during Inquiry sessions, is to provide opportunities to meet housing need within the remainder of the plan period, acknowledging that the Area Plan for the North and West will remain in force beyond March 2026. In light of this, the Department proposes an uplift to meet housing need in the medium term as this plan transitions to the next.		
ANON-UVCN-NKEY-K			Paper 7 - Proposed Change 62		Proposed Change 62: This erroneously refers to the site as "Thornhill Manor". It has not been part of the property known as Thornhill Manor for approximately lately 40 years. The area of land described as "lawn and private tennis court" has not been used for this purpose for a similar length of time and therefore the existing use should be more properly described as "open space" (and remain so).	Cabinet Office do consider that the site generally forms part of the wider predominantly residential area and do not consider that the site should be shown as open space. No change is proposed in this regard.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3X-Z	David Jones		Paper 7 - proposed Change 89	PE002	Proposed change 89: The site is approved for 21 houses which has commenced construction that can be continued in perpetuity. This has been confirmed to you by DEFA Building Control which you have given blind eyed indifference to.  The site, which was designated 'predominantly industrial' on the 1989 plan is now residential following the granting of planning approvals for residential and is established in perpetuity by commencement. You have chosen to designate the site as 'Green Space' which is false and this action is considered for nefarious gain. The area plan team firstly alleged expired planning when they were unable to view any commencement on the site. The team deceitfully withheld information and had only to contact the Building Control Office to receive proof of commencement. This has now been done but the team has sought to decline this.	While building control records have been provided, by both the site promoter and DEFA, pre-commencement conditions relating to the planning application have not been confirmed to be complied with by DEFA nor any certificate of lawful development made. Cabinet Office cannot therefore conclude if the application has commenced.		
BHLF-UVCN-NK3X-Z	David Jones		Paper 7 - proposed Change 89	PE002	I have made attempts to provide the team with additional proof of commencement which have been ignored. I then sent proof to Inspector Sims who refused to accept it unless it is endorsed by the Area Plan Team. He then sent the team the proof which they again chose to ignore. On the appointment of David Ashford as the new minister for CABO I wrote to him requesting: "CABO maintains that any previous residential approval has lapsed." This statement is at 411 in the draft plan. Kindly provide the evidential reasoning behind this claim. No evidential reasoning has been forwarded. Such behaviour is disingenuous. If the planning was spent you would have taken legal enforcement to remove the commencement works and restore the land to its previous condition. The designation of PE002/field 311788 as 'Green Space' is incorrect and the Area Plan North and West should not be approved until this site is correctly designated as residential. If this is not done then legal action will have to be taken.	While building control records have been provided, by both the site promoter and DEFA, pre-commencement conditions relating to the planning application have not been confirmed to be complied with by DEFA nor any certificate of lawful development made. Cabinet Office cannot therefore conclude if the application has commenced.  Planning Enforcement is not the responsibility of the Cabinet Office.  The site is to be retained as open space.		
ANON-UVCN-NK7A-D	Vivienne Davies		Paper 7 - Proposed Change 90	AR019	Change No. 90 ARO19 proposal for residential development given that "the site comprises a former plant nursery (now disused) and is enclosed by development (existing or proposed) on all sides." No account is taken of the fact that the whole area is very wet with regular flooding which effects the existing developments. The opportunity should be taken to use this area as a green sink with water features which will alleviate flooding now and in the future as well as maintain the attractive nature of the centre of the village	As the site is previously developed it has been subsumed into the predominantly residential area that surrounds it. There were no constraints presented to the inquiry that could not be overcome that would preclude it from development. However, whether it can be delivered will be examined more carefully at any future planning application stage.		



Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
ANON-UVCN-NKWC-F			PIP 1		The islands environment and character is being spoilt by development. The infrastructure cannot cope with the population we have, we are still discharging raw sewage into our rivers and sea, the roads are congested and crumbling, footpaths are being worn away, we have to wait weeks for Dr appointments, the hospital is cutting back its services, there is increased noise from traffic and barking dogs, our dark night skies are disappearing along with our open spaces and there is a vast decline in biodiversity. If the Government feels it has to increase the housing stock then please just redevelop the unused buildings in the town centre.	<b>The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed at length at the inquiry sessions.</b>  <b>There is significant financial difficulty in developing solely on brownfield sites which is set out in CD98 and as the Area Plan requires to provide the opportunities for a specific number of housing units be delivered it will necessitate an amount of greenfield land be provided.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NKB6-D			PIP 1 - Minor Changes		I strongly oppose proposed development in and around Peel.	<b>The Area Plan for the North and West provides sufficient land allocations to deliver on the Strategic Plan 2016 and some further land to go beyond the plan period but not enough to satisfy completely the housing requirements set out in the Objective Assessment of Housing Need. Infrastructure requirements were discussed at length at the inquiry sessions.</b>		
BHF-UVCN-NKQD-A	Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy		PIP 1 - Proposed change 68		2.2 We are at somewhat of a disadvantage as we have seen no explanation as to why our original submission was rejected so cannot respond to any reasons why this was decided and are not aware of the material considerations which have resulted in this site not being designated as part of the surrounding residential area. 2.3 This area is in two ownerships: one section extends to 1.6 acres and the other, to the south just over half an acre. The site has residential development - both old and relatively new - on all sides. Crescent Road lies to the west from where the site is currently accessed. 2.4 The site is within 1km of the town centre of Ramsey and within 500m of a bus stop. 2.5 The site has all services available to it including surface water which is available through a now adopted drain in Bog Lane into which this site may connect. 2.6 In the 1990s when Crescent Road was an unadopted highway, the road was upgraded and adopted and at the same time, radius kerbs were introduced to Lhergy Vreck which would serve any additional development on this site. 2.7 Mains electricity has also been brought into the site and is available for any further development to be connected to. 2.8 Development has been approved on and around this site up until very recently. Planning approval has previously been granted for 7 plots (09/00464/B) on the larger section and 2 dwellings on the smaller section (12/00433/B). Two dwellings were approved to the south of the site as can be seen in the aerial photograph which was submitted previously and which were under construction at the time of that image (15/01055/A and 16/01083/REM). 2.9	<b>Cabinet Office notes your support for this site but it is to remain as Open Space in the Plan.</b>		
BHF-UVCN-NKQD-A	Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy		PIP 1 - Proposed change 68		This planning history of the site and surrounding land demonstrates that it has been considered acceptable and possible to develop the land for residential purposes in accordance with the Strategic Plan policies and constraints. Indeed, Briarville Crescent, a development of fourteen dwellings which lies to the north of the access lane to this site was approved as recently as 2013 and the two dwellings to the south off Cloughbane Walk, were approved in 2016.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your support for this site but it is to remain as Open Space in the Plan.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKMM-F		Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	PIP 1 - Proposed change 68		We would reiterate our original submission which states that we believe this site should be residential in its entirety, as it was in the Ramsey Local Plan. The Strategic Plan is clear that new development should be directed to existing settlements. In the north of the Island, Ramsey is the primary settlement in the settlement hierarchy in the Strategic Plan, to where new development should be directed in accordance with Spatial Policy 2. It is close to secondary and primary schools and employment opportunities. It is highly sustainable and its development would support Strategic Policies 1, 2 and 10, Transport Policy 1, Housing Policy 4 and Spatial Policy 5. As such, there should be a presumption that the site should be developed and used for residential purposes unless there are material constraints which would justify the site not being so used.	<b>Cabinet Office notes that the site forms part of the wider predominantly residential area in the Ramsey Local Plan and that it forms part of the 'Ballure' area on the maps. The Corresponding specific area development briefs in the written statement recognise that most of the area is already developed or benefits from planning permission but that development should have regard to the amenity value of existing trees and gardens.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office are content with the site's proposal as open space and do not support its development as part of the Area Plan for the North and West.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKMM-F		Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	PIP 1 - Proposed change 68		2.10 We would submit that this site, shown as Open Space in the draft Area Plan, should be designated as part of the wider residential area, which would be consistent with the extant development plan land use, the permitted use in terms of the historic planning history of the site and in accordance with the principles of sustainable development and optimising the use of under-used sites in accordance with Strategic Policy 1, 2 and 10, Spatial Policy 5, Housing Policy 4 and Transport Policy 1 as well as addressing Climate Change in accordance with the Climate Change Act 2021. 2.11 Whilst there are trees within the site (as there were when the planning applications for residential development were approved - notably 12/00433/B and 09/00464/B) these are protected outwith the planning system under the Tree Preservation Act 1993. Any application for development would duly consider the impact of the proposed development on these trees (in assessing the development against General Policy 2c and Environment Policies 3 and 4) with appropriate reference to the professional officers of the Department in respect of trees and ecology. 2.12 The site is not identified as an area of Registered Trees or of ecological value. 2.13 We therefore fail to understand why this area of green space has been designated as Open Space whilst it is surrounded by housing and has been approved a number of times on previous occasions, for residential development. 3.1 We do not know and have had no explanation as to why our submissions have not been published or acknowledged at any stage in the area plan process and have only this last stage to seek remediation of this situation.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your support for the site in question to be included within the wider predominantly residential area but at this stage do not consider that it would be procedurally fair and administratively correct to include this site as within the residential area at this stage in the development of the Plan.</b>		
BHLF-UVCN-NKMM-F		Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	PIP 1 - Proposed change 68		The area plan process has to now taken almost five years to complete and we find it extremely unsatisfactory that our submissions have not been acknowledged at all throughout this time and that there is still no explanation as to why the site was removed for residential development in the first place nor why there is no reference to our submission to the inquiry by the inspector.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your support for the site in question to be included within the wider predominantly residential area but at this stage do not consider that it would be procedurally fair and administratively correct to include this site as within the residential area at this stage in the development of the Plan.</b>		

Respondent code	Respondent name (if permission given to publish)	Organisation	Modification Number (Paper 3)	Site code (if site specific comment)	Extract of Representation of Objection	Cabinet Office Response	Map amendment	Written Statement amendment
BHLF-UVCN-NKMM-F		Sarah Corlett Town Planning Consultancy	PIP 1 - Proposed change 68		3.2 We feel let down by the process and disadvantaged in our efforts to promote this sustainable site for development opportunities and hope that this submission will be acknowledged and taken into account in the final iteration of the plan. 3.3 This site is not in public ownership and is not of any acknowledged ecological, archaeological or other value which would justify its removal from development status. There are no known constraints and as has been demonstrated in the previous planning approvals on the site, it is capable of being provided with all necessary services. 3.4 We would ask that the entirety of the curtilage of the approved dwellings, as shown in 12/00433/B and 09/00464/B is designated as Predominantly Residential as part of the surrounding designation.	<b>Cabinet Office notes your support for the site in question to be included within the wider predominantly residential area but at this stage do not consider that it would be procedurally fair and administratively correct to include this site as within the residential area at this stage in the development of the Plan.</b>		
ANON-UVCN-NK46-Y	Neil Whybrew		PIP 1 - Proposed Change 83		Number 83 - Parking within Peel Town Centre is already almost impossible, considering the proposed increase in conurbation is completely insufficient. I also note that there seems to any development to the existing infrastructure prior to new building. Infrastructure first including sewage, water and electricity supply, parking, shopping medical care.	<b>Cabinet office notes your comment but does consider that parking falls outside of the remit of the area plan for the north and west.</b>  <b>Cabinet Office note that the direct provision of infrastructure is beyond the remit of the Area Plan</b>		
					I find it completely unacceptable that Diane Brown, head of planning policy, has refused to publish an updated 'all sites table' to show these figures as part of this consultation process. This action is in effect hiding the scale of development from the public with intent.The "Grand Total" should be the true allocation including with the transition period (e.g. to 2030). The grand total figure would – if based on CO's expected yield – be more like 2,100 than the 1,595 given.	<b>Cabinet office note your comment. The most up to date All Sites table, published in advance of inquiry sessions remains available online on the Inquiry website. Cabinet Office rejects the notion that the Department has attempted to in any way hide the expected yield of development sites through the Plan process.</b>  <b>Please see Amended table 17 in the final Written Statement.</b>		